



Kent Academic Repository

Ecevit, Mehmet Cihan (1988) *Petty commodity production : A village of tobacco producers in northern Turkey*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/86262/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.86262>

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives)

Additional information

This thesis has been digitised by EThOS, the British Library digitisation service, for purposes of preservation and dissemination. It was uploaded to KAR on 09 February 2021 in order to hold its content and record within University of Kent systems. It is available Open Access using a Creative Commons Attribution, Non-commercial, No Derivatives (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>) licence so that the thesis and its author, can benefit from opportunities for increased readership and citation. This was done in line with University of Kent policies (<https://www.kent.ac.uk/is/strategy/docs/Kent%20Open%20Access%20policy.pdf>). If y...

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION: A VILLAGE
OF TOBACCO PRODUCERS IN NORTHERN TURKEY

MEHMET CİHAN ECEVİT

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Sociology and Social Anthropology Department
at the University of Kent at Canterbury

January 1988

To Yildiz Sandiklili

ABSTRACT

Until the mid 1950s, Turkey was an agrarian society. In some 60 years, the active population in agriculture has fallen from about 80 % or more to around 50%; and Turkish agriculture has changed drastically and become largely commercialised and technical. The state intervention that started in the early 1930s intensified after the 1950s. The State provided the infra-structure, cheap credits, subsidised technical inputs and agricultural machinery, extended market networks to encourage the scale and volume of commodity production.

The agrarian structure has been dominated by small land holdings both in Ottoman and Republican Turkey. In the development of agriculture and the transition to capitalism, petty commodity production (PCP) has played a dominant role.

I argued that petty commodity production does not have a 'separate' relations of production but that its relations are defined by the capitalist laws of motion and by the central conflict between capital and labour. The simple reproduction structure of petty commodity production is highly commoditised, yet they still expend labour and own land in non-commodity forms. Thus petty commodity production differs from capitalist commodity production in both agriculture and industry, although it exists within capitalist relations.

In this context this thesis analyses the petty commodity production in a village of tobacco producers in Northern Turkey. It explores the conditions for and limitations of capitalist transition by focusing both on the conditions of viability, and on the factors making for differentiation. I argue that both the non-commodity and the commodity features of PCP and the way its simple reproduction is integrated into capitalist commodity relations determine the conditions and limitations of capitalist transition of agriculture. PCP'ers survive by increasing their scale and volume of commodity production and by adapting technical inputs and mechanisation. They must be able to maximise the productive expenditure of the labour of all members of their household by intensification and extension of their labour-time and use seasonal wage-labour to a level not to decrease this maximisation. PCP'ers must seek means to be a competitive commodity producers whether under subsidy policies of the State or not. They must organise politically and economically to face capital and the State in their struggle to control the conditions of their production and to pursue their interests to increase their standard of living. Thus in spite of changes, petty commodity production seems to persist as a form of organisation of agricultural production within capitalist social formation, although at the same time there is a continuous tendency of differentiation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	xi
List of Abbreviations	xii
List of Tables	xiii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1. The Significance of Petty Commodity Production in the Capitalist Transition of Agriculture	1
2. Petty Commodity Production and Turkish Agriculture	6
2.1. Some Features of the Ottoman Agriculture	6
2.2. The Basic Elements and Changes of Turkish Agriculture	9
2.2.1. The Land Tenure System	9
2.2.2. Agricultural Production	10
3. The Political Economy of Turkey	15
3.1. The Pre-Republican Turkey	15
3.2. The 1923-1929 Liberal Period	16
3.3. The Import Substitution of 1930-1939 Period	19
3.4. The War Economy of the 1940-1945 Period	22
3.5. The Post-War Agriculture and Foreign Trade Based Accumulation Model of 1947-1953 Period	23
3.6. The Import Substitution Industrialisation Model of 1954-1979 Periods	25
3.6.1. The Period of Return to Import Substitution of 1954-1962	25
3.6.2. The Rapid Import Substitution Period of 1963-1970	27
3.6.3. Externally Financed Import Substitution Period of 1971-1979	28
3.7. The Liberalisation and Export Promotion Period of 1980s	36
4. Tobacco Production in Turkey	36
5. Petty Commodity Production and Gokceagac Village	44
5.1. Labour	45
5.2. Land	45
5.3. Means of Production	47
5.4. Means of Life	50

5.5.	Labour Process	51
5.6.	Capital and Petty Commodity Production	52
5.7.	The Limits of Simple Reproduction	54
5.8.	The External Relations	56
CHAPTER 2	THE THEORIES OF CAPITALIST TRANSITION IN AGRICULTURE	61
1.	Introduction	61
2.	The 'Classical' Views	61
2.1.	Lenin's Views on Development of Capitalism	61
2.2.	K. Kautsky's Views on Agrarian Transition	64
2.3.	Chayanov's Views of Peasant Economy	67
3.	Underdevelopment and Capitalist World Economy: Latin American Dependency View	71
3.1.	Dependency Theory of A. G. Frank	72
3.2.	The Views of I. Wallerstein	76
3.3.	Dualism of Internal Structure of Dependent Social Formation	76
4.	The 'Articulation' Argument	78
5.	The Penetration of Capital and Differentiation of Peasantry: 'Penetration' and 'Differentiation' Model	83
6.	The Capitalist Nature of Petty Commodity Production	86
6.1.	The Views of Harriet Friedmann	87
6.2.	The 'Capitalist' Nature of Petty Commodity Production	92
CHAPTER 3	SOURCE, FIELDWORK AND TOBACCO PRODUCTION	101
1.	The Fieldwork	101
1.1.	The Selection of the Crop, the Region and the Village	102
1.1.1.	The Selection of the Type of Crop Combination	102
1.1.2.	The Choice of the Tobacco Region	104
1.1.3.	The Selection of the Village	105
1.2.	The First Phases of the Fieldwork	106
1.2.1.	The Research on Bafra Town	106
1.2.2.	The Preliminary Interviews in the Village	109
1.3.	The Second Part of the Fieldwork	110
1.4.	Few Comments on the Fieldwork	111

2.	The Technical Characteristics and the Stages of Tobacco Production	112
2.1.	The Characteristics of Tobacco Production	113
2.2.	The Stages of Tobacco Production	116
2.2.1.	Seedling Growing	116
2.2.2.	Planting	118
2.2.3.	Field Maintenance	119
2.2.4.	Harvesting	120
2.2.5.	Dampness, Handling and Bailing	122
CHAPTER 4	HISTORICAL INFORMATION ABOUT GOKCEAGAC VILLAGE	124
1.	Introduction	124
2.	The First Period: The Formation of Gokceagac Village and the First Settlers (1870-1885)	126
3.	The Second Period: Kocabaso, From a Small Peasant to a 'Landlord' (1886-1910)	133
3.1.	The Early Residents and New Settlers of Gokceagac	135
3.2.	The Limits of Farm-Labouring	136
3.3.	The Emergence and Extension of Sharecropping	138
3.4.	What Was Produced in Gokceagac?	142
3.4.1.	The Scale of Production	143
3.4.2.	The Forms of Labour Expenditure	145
4.	The Third Period: A Sharecropping Village (1911-1925)	147
4.1.	The Elements of Production	149
4.2.	The Labour of the Sharecropper Family-Household	152
4.3.	The Impact of War on the Adult Male Population	156
4.4.	The Relations of Production	156
5.	Fourth Period: The Disintegration of the Landlord Structure and the Beginning of Small Peasant Production (1926-1945)	162
5.1.	The Sources and the Means of Surplus Appropriation	165
5.2.	The Limits of Appropriation	167
5.3.	The Disintegration of the Landlord Structure	167
5.3.1.	Land Ownership	167
5.3.2.	The Involvement of the State	175
5.3.3.	The State Credits	175
5.3.4.	State Purchases	176

CHAPTER 5	THE OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE AND PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION	179
1.	The Significance of Ownership Structure	179
1.2.	The Means of Ownership	183
1.2.1.	The Land	183
1.2.2.	Labour	185
1.3.	The Alternatives to Ownership: Land, Labour, Machinery	188
1.4.	Changes in the Ownership Structure with Their Implications	189
2.	Means of Production	193
2.1.	Objects of Labour	194
2.2.	Means of Labour	196
3.	Means of Life	199
3.1.	Immediate Consumption Goods	199
3.1.1.	Food	199
3.1.2.	Immediate Household Goods	201
3.2.	Household Durable Goods	202
3.2.1.	Bedding Durables	204
3.2.2.	Clothing Durables	206
3.2.3.	Kitchen-Utensil Durables	210
3.2.4.	Furniture	211
3.2.5.	Electrical Appliances	212
3.2.6.	Other Household Durables	213
3.3.	Services	214
3.3.1.	Medical Services	214
3.3.2.	Educational Services	217
3.3.3.	Administrative Services	218
3.3.4.	Legal Services	218
3.3.5.	Recreational Services	219
3.3.6.	Communal Village Services	219
3.4.	The Other Expenditures	220
CHAPTER 6	LAND AND PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION	222
1.	Introduction	222
1.1.	Land and Household Labour	222
1.2.	Land as an Element of Nature	223
1.3.	Land and Conditions of Extention of Production	225
1.4.	Land and Volume of Output	226

2.	The Land Ownership Structure	229
2.1.	Distribution of the Land Owned	229
2.1.1.	Land Owned Within and Outside of the Village	230
2.1.2.	The Number of Parcels of Land Owned Within and Outside of the Village	233
2.2.	The Means of Ownership of Land	235
2.2.1.	Land Distribution and Forms of Land Ownership	236
2.2.2.	The Sizes of the Inherited Land	238
2.2.3.	The Size and the Time of Purchase of Land	239
2.2.4.	The Sale of Land	240
3.	The Use of Owned Land in Gokceagac	242
3.1.	Renting-out Owned Land	242
3.2.	Sharecropping Owned Land	243
3.2.1.	Use of Lands by Renting	245
3.2.2.	Sharecropping: The Use of Land	247
3.3.	The Production of Different Crops	248
3.3.1.	Crop Combination in Gokceagac	249
3.3.2.	The Scale of Production	250
3.3.3.	The Scale of Production in the Four Crops Cultivated and the Sizes of Lands Owned	253
3.3.4.	The Volume of Output in the Four Crops Cultivated	257
3.3.5.	Volume of Output and Land Ownership	259
CHAPTER 7	HOUSEHOLD LABOUR AND PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION	263
1.	Introduction	263
2.	The Labour Requirements and the Technical Division of Labour in Tobacco Cultivation	264
3.	The Household Labour Capacity	271
3.1.	The Size of Households	272
3.2.	The Ages of Household Members	275
3.3.	The Sex of Household Members	278
3.4.	The Marital Status of Household Members	279
3.5.	The Level of Education of Household Members	280
3.6.	The Type of Households	282
3.7.	The Size of Household Labour	283
4.	The Forms of Actual Labour Expenditure	285
4.1.	Child Labour	287

4.2. Female Labour	289
4.3. Non-Enterprise Labour	293
4.4. Labour Cooperation	295
5. Seasonal Wage-Labour and Petty Commodity Production	299
5.1. The Reasons for the Use of Seasonal Wage-Labour	300
5.2. The Conditions of Use of Seasonal Wage-Labour	301
5.3. The Sources and Characteristics of Seasonal Wage-Labour	304
5.4. Changes Related to Seasonal Wage-Work	306
5.5. The Implications of the Use of Seasonal Wage-Workers	307
CHAPTER 8 CAPITAL-PEASANT RELATIONS	314
1. Introduction	314
2. Capital-Peasant Relations: The Historical Past of Gokceagac Village	318
2.1. Structure of the Closed Economy and the Restricted Commercial Relations	318
2.2. Disintegration of the Landlord Structure and Establishment of Small Peasant Production	324
2.2.1. The Landlords	325
2.2.2. The Sharecroppers	326
2.2.3. Capital and the State	327
3. Petty Commodity Production and Capital-Peasant Relations	329
3.1. Introduction	329
3.2. The Commodity Nature of Petty Commodity Production	330
3.3. Subsistence Goods Production	332
3.4. The Commoditisation of the Simple Reproduction Structure of Petty Commodity Production	337
3.5. The Limits of Commoditisation of Petty Commodity Production	342
3.6. The Commoditisation and the Use of Seasonal Wage-Labour	346
3.7. Commoditisation and Land Ownership	348
3.8. Commodity Ownership and Farm Machinery	350
3.9. The Relations of Production	352
3.10. The Forces of Production	356
3.11. The Differentiation of Peasantry	357
3.12. Expropriation and Landlessness	360
4. The Role of Capital in Capital-Peasant Relations	361

4.1. Introduction	361
4.2. The Usury Capital	368
4.3. Commercial Capital	371
4.4. The Trade in Industrial Commodities	376
4.5. The Role of the State in Commercial Relations	377
CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSION	385
APPENDIX	409
LIST OF REFERENCES	415

Acknowledgements

This is a doctoral study about petty commodity tobacco production in Gokceagac village of Northern Turkey.

I owe special gratitude to my supervisor Paul Stirling. I learned the skills of social science from him. He made constructive comments, supported and encouraged me throughout this study.

I owe a major intellectual debt to Henry Bernstein who originally introduced me to the main ideas of this thesis, and on whose writings I have drawn heavily.

The villagers of Gokceagac were unbelievably generous. A stranger arrives -in the pursuit of his own interests- and asks from them time, trouble and sometimes confidential information. They welcomed me as a guest, and a friend, and did all manner of things to help me during the field work, and in the reciprocal visits which have continued and still continue. I thank them; I am indeed in their debt.

I received considerable support, during my fieldwork, especially from the governor of the district Ismail Guzelis, the Directorate of Tobacco Monopoly, the Monopoly experts, the Directorate of Technical Agriculture, and other related officers. I would like to acknowledge their valuable assistance.

This study would not be realised if the Turkish Ministry of Education did not provide a scholarship. I am specifically grateful to the Ministry.

The Population Council in New York financed me in the last stages of this study. I owe many thanks to Frederic Shorter and Beth Orson of the Population Council.

Joan Dobby offered valuable help with the data processing and Wenonah Lyon and Stafford Mawhinnv read through parts of the thesis and made corrections to the final draft. I thank them for their help.

I thank my students in Middle East Technical University, Ankara, where I had the chance to discuss some of the ideas in this thesis with them in the related courses.

I thank my son Emek Can for putting up with a very preoccupied father during the final stages of this thesis.

Finally, I can tell my wife Yildiz privately how grateful I am to her. But I want the world to know that how long suffering, how supportive, how consoling she has been; and more than all that how much she has helped and inspired me as a fellow sociologist.

Abbreviations

C-P	Capital-Peasant
CCP	Capitalist Commodity Production
CWE	Capitalist World Economy
ECLA	Economic Commission Latin America
HH	Head of Household
HFL	Household Family Labour
LA	Latin America
PCP	Petty Commodity Production
PLD	Peak Labour Demanding
SCP	Simple Commodity Production
SC	Sharecrop
SR	Simple Reproduction
SWL	Seasonal Wage-Labour

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1.1. Area Cultivated, Output, Yield and Number of Families in Tobacco Cultivation (Absolute and General Indexes)	39
Table 1.2. The Internal Terms of Trade Between 1973-1979	42
Table 6.1. The Distribution of Total Land Ownership in Terms of Number of Household Enterprises	230
Table 6.2. The Distribution of Owned Land Sizes Within and Outside the Village in Terms of the Number of Households	231
Table 6.3. The Distribution of Land Within and Outside the Village in Terms of Number of Households	232
Table 6.4. The Distribution of Land Owned Outside the Village by Total Land Owned in Terms of the Number of Households	233
Table 6.5. The Distribution of the Number of Parcels of Land Within and Outside of the Village in Terms of the Number of Households	234
Table 6.6. The Basic Means of Ownership in Terms of the Number and Percentage of Households	236
Table 6.7. Basic Forms of Land Ownership According to Total Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households	237
Table 6.8. The Distribution of the Sizes of Land Inherited According to Total Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households	238
Table 6.9. The Distribution of the Amounts of Purchased Land in Relation to Total Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households	239
Table 6.10. The Distribution of the Period of Purchase of Land According to Total Land Owned in Terms of the Number of Households	240
Table 6.11. The Distribution of Sizes of Land Sold in Relation to Total Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households	241
Table 6.12. The Agricultural Holding Types Within and Outside the Village in Terms of Number of Households	242
Table 6.13. Opinions Regarding the Size of Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households	243
Table 6.14. The Distribution of the Amounts of Land Rented in Terms of the Number of Households	245
Table 6.15. Renting Land With Regard to Size of Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households	246
Table 6.16. The Distribution of Sharecropped Land in Terms of the Number of Households	247
Table 6.17. The Distribution of Households which Sharecropped in the Past in Terms of Total Land Owned Now	248

Table 6.18.	The Distribution of Agricultural Holdings in Terms of the Number of Households	248
Table 6.19.	Crop Combination in Relation to Total Land Owned in Terms of the Number of Households	249
Table 6.20.	Distribution of All Crop Holdings According to Areas of Cultivated Land	251
Table 6.21.	The Distribution of All Crop Holdings According the Size of Areas Cultivated in Terms of the Number and Percentage of Households and Crop Holdings	252
Table 6.22.	Distribution of Scales of Production in All Crops Cultivated According to the Size of Land Owned in Terms of the Number (N) of Households	254
Table 6.23.	The Distribution of Cultivated Areas of All Crop Holdings Except Tobacco According to the Sizes of the Area of the Owned Land in Terms of the Number (N) of Households	256
Table 6.24.	The Distribution of All Crop Holdings According to Volume of Output in Terms of the Number and Percentages of Households	258
Table 6.25.	The Distribution of Volume of Output of All Crops Cultivated According to the Sizes of Owned Land in Terms of the Number (N) of Households	260
Table 7.1.	The Distribution of the Number of Households in Terms of the Number of Household Members	271
Table 7.2.	The Distribution of Household Members According to Their Numbers in Terms of the Number of Households	273
Table 7.3.	The Distribution of the Number of Household Members in Terms of Their Age Groups	275
Table 7.4.	The Distribution of the Number and Percentage of Household Members in Terms of Their Sex	278
Table 7.5.	The Marital Status and Sex of All Children Above the Age of 14 in Terms of Their Age Groups	279
Table 7.6.	The Distribution of the Number and Percentage of Household Members in Terms of Their Status of Education	280
Table 7.7.	The Distribution of Types of Households in Terms of Their Numbers	282
Table 7.8.	The Distribution of the Size of Households in Terms of Number and Percentage	283
Table 7.9.	The Distribution of Labour Capacity of Households in Terms of the Number and Percentage of Households and Members	284

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1. The Significance of Petty Commodity Production in the Capitalist Transition of Agriculture

Sociology in one sense began as an attempt to underline the European transition from an 'agrarian' to a capitalist/industrial society. The different approaches in the study of agrarian problems do reflect the major theoretical views in social sciences: (a) the focus on social systems of agrarian communities which employ holistic analysis; (b) the emphasis on individuals which employ neo-classical method with similarities to dualistic models ; and (c) the historical and structural schools which use Marxian methodology. The different perspectives in terms of the object and theoretical standpoint do overlap and each differ considerably in their traditional and neo-classical analysis.

I found that the third perspective the most helpful in explaining the internal dynamics and the integration of PCP'ers to capitalist relations and have written about Gokceagac in terms of it.

I am well aware that my research data could be approached with other theoretical perspectives. But on reflection, I decided to stay with my original plan and wrote within a specific theoretical framework. I have sought to use my data to criticise and advance theoretical arguments within

this framework and to understand my data in the light of it.

Classical Marxist writers have traditionally written concerning the change from one mode of production to another.¹ The historical process of transformation from feudalism to capitalism² has been seen as inevitable. Several paths of this transformation had been proposed. As an historical process, this was seen as involving complicated changes and developments. The development of capitalist relations was considered as a unilinear process,³ and a progressive role is attached to capitalism.

This view has been challenged, reformulated and rejected on several grounds by writers representing a wide range of perspectives. Almost all of these criticisms involved the analysis of petty commodity production (PCP).⁴

(1) First of all,⁵ K. Kautsky argued that small land holdings together with large capitalist ones are both possible and necessary within the inevitable and progressive transformation perspective: coexisting small and large holdings in agriculture are inevitably and progressively transformed.

(2) In relation to the progressive role of capitalism, there exists a controversy about the possibility of merchant capital supplanting industrial capital in the development of capitalism outside Western Europe.⁶

It is still controversial to what degree capitalist expansion in its 'colonial' and 'imperialist' forms played a 'progressive' role in those non-capitalist societies that it had penetrated.⁷ While capitalism disrupted, plundered and exploited these societies, it is usually disputed that it had led to the development of industrial capitalism in

the 'backward' regions of the world. This had stimulated a wide range of different formulations about the conditions of underdevelopment in Third World countries.

(3) One such formulation, usually considered outside of Marxist discourse, is the formulations of the Dependency School of Latin America. The transition to capitalism, in this view, is related to and dependent on the conditions of integration of the backward/peripheral societies to the world capitalist economy. The degree and the nature of specialisation in international trade and commodity production are the primary factors which determine the relationship between peripheral and metropolitan societies. The capitalist transition of agriculture within the social formation and the place of PCP in agriculture are analysed within this broad view of capitalist transformation.

(4) On the other hand, the nature of capitalist transition in agriculture and conditions of existence of PCP has been one of the main issues that occupied the writings of neo-Marxist writers. They have criticised and reformulated these different views of the capitalist transformation.

The differences among neo-Marxist writers mainly originated from the way they conceptualised capitalism and its relations of production in agrarian structures and within the social formation including the conditions of their integration to the capitalist world economy.

The primary focus of emphasis was on the nature of the relationship between PCP and capitalism. The compatibility of the relations of production determining both capitalism

and PCP was the major problematic in these studies.

The issues originating from the distinctions between (i) PCP in agriculture and in industry (ii) and the conditions of existence of PCP in advanced capitalist societies are used in their analysis. But, until recently, the Third World societies were the main area of their studies.

Here, in the remaining part of this section, I will point out the main sources of different conceptualisations of PCP and its place in the transition of capitalism. These will be discussed in detail in the following chapter on the theories of capitalist transition and taken up in the remaining parts of the thesis.

The characterisation of the existing relations of production specific to PCP were mainly based on the following basic issues:

- (1) The conditions of existence of PCP enterprises which are reproduced with their commodity and non-commodity relations under capitalism: that is, the conditions of viability and survival or the differentiation and expropriation of PCP.
- (2) The conditions under which surplus is created in PCP.
- (3) The degree PCP is 'functional' to capitalism and the different forms and conditions under which the surplus labour of PCP is appropriated within capitalist relations: unequal-exchange (Emmanuel, 1972; Amin, 1975); 'concealed wage-labourers' (Banaji, 1977a); 'wage-labour equivalence' (Bernstein, 1977); 'colonial mode of production' (Alavi, 1975).
- (4) The possibility of the existence of a 'non-exploitative' structure between PCP and capitalist relations: the relationship between two commodity producing enterprises

under capitalism and the role of the state and the class position of PCP in the class alliances and struggles (Gibbon and Neocosmos, 1985).

(5) The feasibility of existence of PCP independent of capitalist relations (Chayanov, 1966).

In this study, I consider PCP as a simple reproduction structure or as a form of production which includes commodity (commodity content) and non-commodity (non-commodity content) relations. The differences that exist between agrarian and industrial commodity production are conceptualised within capitalist relations.

When I identify PCP within a mode of production, I use the reproductive structure of PCP as a form of production which is 'formally subsumed'¹¹ (rather than real) to capitalist mode of production. The laws of motion of capitalism are understood not only as generalised commodity production but also by its central conflict between capital and labour. I consider that the relations of production of PCP are defined by the relations of production of the dominant capitalist mode of production. That is, there is no need to define 'a' different or a separate set of relations of production in conceptualising PCP. So, the commodity and the non-commodity relations of PCP together with its differences from industrial commodity production constitute a reproductive enterprise which is integrated into, reproduced by and dominated by capitalism.

Thus my primary aim in this study is to use such a conceptual framework to understand and analyse the significance of PCP in capitalist transition by focusing on

one village which primarily produces tobacco on the coast of Northern Turkey.

In the remaining four parts of this introductory chapter, a summary of the basic features of the Ottoman and Republican Agriculture, the Political Economy of Turkey, tobacco production in Turkey and the major characteristics of Gokceagac village are presented. This is intended to provide 'preliminary' background information for the arguments of the thesis.

2. Petty Commodity Production and Turkish Agriculture

In this part, I will discuss briefly those points in the recent and past history of Turkish agriculture that should be considered in understanding and analysing PCP in contemporary Turkey. Some of these issues are taken again in the following section on the political economy of Turkey.

2.1. Some Features of the Ottoman Agriculture

12

The original agrarian structure of the Ottoman Empire was based on a traditional land tenure system called dirlik. In this system, the Islamic State was the owner of all land which was called miri. Land was classified according to its yearly income depending mainly on the productivity of land. These as timars were granted to sipahi's. The latter were representatives of the state (bureaucrats or military man) and their duty was to collect taxes from peasants (reaya) who did not have legal ownership right to land. The peasants had usufructuary rights to the land. This right

was inheritable, provided that the land was not left uncultivated for three successive years or more. There were restrictions on the mobility of peasants. Part of their produce (varying from one tenth and one half of the crop) was collected as a tax by the sipahi and transferred to the central State. Sipahi was also responsible for providing soldiers during wars. Sipahi's rights were not inherited and depended on the discretion of the central State. This system was designed to secure the financial needs of the Empire by appropriating the surplus of peasants and to secure its military needs by providing soldiers during wars.

The traditional land system of the Ottoman Empire began to decline in the second half of the sixteenth century. It was replaced by the iltizam system. The tax (osr) was sold, usually for ten years periods, to multezims (tax farmers). Multezims undertook the organisation and collection of tax. This change is attributed mainly to decreased power and financial sources of the central State. This change influenced the commercialisation of agriculture. Merchants and usurers found opportunities to exercise control over production and land. The predominance of small land holdings, the state ownership of land, the appropriation of the surplus of peasants by the central State, the existence of high land/labour ratio were important factors which hindered the differentiation of peasantry.

Multezims in the iltizam system gained a strong position, together with the strong notables (ayans), in some provinces and by 1808 the State confirmed their position. In 1858, a land code was issued which eased the sale of the 'right of

possession', mortgage, and the inheritance of peasants' land. However, the state land continued to be owned by the central State.

The conditions and the nature of the commodity nature of the agricultural production showed regional divergences and uneven development throughout the history of the Empire but intensified after 19th Century.

The part of the Ottoman Empire which corresponded to the present Turkish Republic (Anatolian mainland) mainly produced cereals and livestock. It was considered self-sufficient in terms of food-grains. It supplied the needs of some of the large cities of the Empire.

On the other hand, the coastal districts specialised in commercial crops such as cotton and tobacco. Cotton served the domestic needs of the state owned textile factories from 16th Century onwards.

The integration of the Ottoman Empire with the world economy especially after the second half of nineteenth century, increased commodity production and foreign trade. Cotton, tobacco, opium, grapes, sesame seeds, figs, pulses and olive oil were the main export items.

The building of the railways in late 19th Century by British, German and French companies integrated primarily regions dominated by commercial crop production. But these railways also contributed to the commercialisation of the cereal dominated Anatolian mainland.

The main elements of the Ottoman Empire, then which affected the Turkish Republic in 1923 were the changes in the system of land tenure, the pattern of geographical specialisation and the uneven development of crop

cultivation, the shrinking of the financial resources and of the authority of the central state, and the integration of the Ottoman agriculture and industry with the world economy.

2.2.The Basic Elements and Changes of Turkish Agriculture

In this section, I briefly present some of the basic elements and changes in the agrarian structure of Republican Turkey. I have deliberately reduced these to a simple model, and realise that in detail, the facts are far more complex and controversial.

The population of Turkey increased from 13.6 million in 1927 to 50.6 million in 1985. 75.8 % of the total population in 1927 was living in rural areas. This declined to 47 % in 1985. The rural population increased but after 1950 its relative share began to decline. After 1980, it started to decrease in absolute terms. There are 35 074 villages in 1981 in Turkey. In 1950 there were 2.3 million families living in villages and this number increased to 5.6 million in 1981. During the period between 1950-1984 the rural population increased by 51 % and the number of rural families by 140 % (Erdost, 1987:14).

2.2.1. The Land Tenure System

The distribution of land ownership is unequal and small holdings are predominant. The number of small holdings almost doubled between 1950 and 1981, and the number of large land holdings declined (1977:15). A small portion of

the big land holdings are owned by capitalist farmers, mainly in the Western and Southern coasts. The rest of the big holdings are landlord structures combining different forms of tenure systems and are usually found in the Eastern and South Eastern regions. Owner-cultivation dominates the small land holdings. The percentage of landless families (including those families who earn their living mainly by seasonal wage-work and/or sharecropping) increased from 14.5 % in 1950 to 30.4 % of total rural families in 1981 (1977:15).

The 1926 Civil Code replaced all Ottoman Land laws and left no barriers to the private ownership of land.¹⁵ In Turkish agrarian structure, no substantial land reform programme, except an unsuccessful regional trial in 1971, has been implemented.¹⁶ However, part of the state land was distributed after 1947 and the land of Armenians and the emigrated Greeks were redistributed to new Turkish migrants from Balkan countries. Immediately after the First World War, land was plentiful, and the limits on arable production was the shortage of manpower and animal power. Even by 1947, manpower was limited.

2.2.2. Agricultural Production

The intensification of commodity relations and the commoditisation of agricultural holdings was the dominant feature of the history of Republican agriculture. This feature manifested itself in the commercialisation and monetisation of agriculture (a) in increases in agricultural output; (b) in the expansion of area under cultivation; (c)

in increases in the productivity of land; (d) in the use of modern technology and inputs; and (e) in different forms of state intervention.

The Growth in Crop Output:

Gurkan and Kasnakoglu (1986) calculated that the annual growth in crop output during 1950-1980 period varied between 4.5% to 3.7%. If the whole agricultural production is considered, they argue that there is a 'turning point' (that is, a significant drop in the growth of output) in 1960 for cereal and all crop production. The turning point for other field crops (except cereals), fruits and vegetables was observed in 1965 and for fisheries and forestry products in 1970 and 1978, respectively. A second drop began in 1976 for agricultural crops (specifically cereals).

It is important to note that the percentage of output marketed in cereal production is increasing in Turkish agriculture.

The Area Under Cultivation

The area under cultivation (the arable land) was 14.5 million hectares in 1950 and increased to 22.9 million in 1984 (Erdost, 1987:14). This increase was mainly achieved during the 1950s. This was mainly possible due to the high land/labour ratio of the pre-1950s, the rapid mechanisation of agriculture, and the distribution of state land, the land evacuated by Armenians and Greeks, and the opening of marginal land and pastures and the clearing of forests.

The expansion of arable land in all crop production

reached its limits in 1956 except for fruits and vegetables, which was achieved in 1967 (Gurkan and Kasnakoglu, 1986).

In 1985, almost 77 % of arable land was still allocated to cereal production and only 7 % to industrial crops (DIE, 1986). Industrial crops (such as tobacco and cotton) are concentrated mainly in the coastal regions. Cereals dominate the central, eastern and southeastern parts of Turkey. Except for cotton which is cultivated in both small and large holdings, small holdings dominate the cultivation of industrial crops which are mainly labour intensive. Seasonal wage-labour is used during the peak labour demand.

Although large holdings were dominant in the expansion of arable land, small holdings also found opportunities to expand.

Mechanical and Technical Inputs

The use of tractors and combined harvesters in Turkish agriculture became significant after 1950. In 1950, there were only 1658 tractors in agriculture. This number increased to 40 282 in 1955 and to 556 781 in 1984. On the other hand, the number of draft animals, 2.5 million in 1950 only dropped to 1.5 million in 1984 (Erdost, 1987:16). The extensive use of tractors in Turkish agriculture was mainly due to the widespread establishment of a tractor market at regional levels. The combined harvesters were added later to the machinery park of agriculture. After 1965, the increased consumption of technical inputs, such as artificial fertilizers and insecticides, accompanied the mechanisation of agriculture. The amount of fertilizers

used increased more than seven times in the period between 1966 and 1970 (Aras, 1981:155). Thus, productivity increased significantly due to the technical commoditisation of the agriculture. Gurkan and Kasnakoglu (1986) argue that the 'turning points' in the productivity increases were reached in 1967 for fruits and vegetables and in 1976 for other crops. The contributions of area cultivated and productivity increases to growth in output were very marked for the period between 1950 to 1980: In 1950-1960 expansion in area cultivated contributed about 95 % to the growth in output. By contrast in 1960-1970, the contribution of productivity increases was almost 70 %, and in 1970-1980 95 % (1986:15)

The Role of the State

From 1923, government policies were aimed at the commercialisation of agriculture. The main instrument of these policies were intervention in the agricultural commodity markets thus the purchase and marketing of agricultural commodities, and state subsidised industrial inputs; and the extension of state agricultural credit. ¹⁷

In the agricultural inputs market, the State subsidised prices. In the agricultural commodity market, it both subsidised prices (by monopolistically determining the state purchasing prices) and guaranteed the marketing of most of the crops by acting as the main purchaser. For this purpose, the State established an extensive administrative structure as early as late 1930s. The private nature (informal and non-market usurious character) of the agrarian

credit market was almost replaced by and organised nation-wide by the subsidised short-term credits of the State.

Furthermore, the State made significant investments towards the formation of the agrarian infra-structure in the areas of irrigation, electrification, transportation, communication and technical extension (Tural, 1978; Yetener, 1977). The State encouraged cooperatives under its control (Soral, 1981) and did not tax agriculture (Akalin, 1975).

The combined effects of the intervention of the State on the commercial and commodity relations in agriculture were very significant. The main purpose of the State was to to maintain and mediate the class structure. It implemented policies and acted to (a) increase the commodity output and the productivity of agricultural production such a way to provide the conditions for extended appropriation of agricultural surplus to be transferred for industrialisation; (b) create a large market for industrial commodities; (c) establish a 'self-sufficient' agriculture, at least in foodgrains; (d) supply the required raw materials and labour for the domestic market; and (e) increase its foreign exchange earnings through the export of agricultural products. And as normally happens in almost all cases of intervention, the large and powerful holdings and the already commercialised holdings benefited more than the small ones. All these changes contributed in several aspects to the expropriation and migration of those small holdings which were not able to compete and adopt to the evolving commodity relations in Turkish agriculture. On the other hand, the policies and provisions of the State also provided the conditions for the commoditisation of the small

holdings (i.e., the establishment of systematic commodity production in agriculture) and under certain conditions even consolidated them.

3. The Political Economy of Turkey

I divide this account of the political economy of Republican Turkey into seven periods. In each period, I briefly outline state economic policies, economic growth, social and economic development, industrialisation, and the class structure; and Turkish integration into the changing world economy.

3.1. The Pre-Republican Turkey

In the period just before the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the economy of the Ottoman Empire was integrated to the world economy mainly through foreign trade. The Ottoman economy was an unprotected market for European manufactured goods, exporting in return agricultural products such as grains, cotton and tobacco and raw materials. Thus the Ottoman economy was deeply influenced by European manufactured goods and the growth of factory production in Europe in the 19th Century. The easy terms of foreign trade facilitated by the commercial treaties signed with several European countries impeded the transformation of its manufacturing industries to factory production and even ruined the already existing ones. The Ottoman manufacturing industry was small scale and using

primitive techniques just after the turn of the 20th Century.

Local non-Muslim minorities largely controlled the foreign trade in the Empire and they were also the representatives of the existing foreign companies. Commercial capital was largely foreign; there was no industrial bourgeoisie.

The esraf (local notables) and the large landowners controlled the small towns and agriculture. These dominant local classes strengthened their position during the First World War and they mobilised the masses for the Turkish War of Independence (1918-1922). The commercial capital benefited and accumulated from the war economy under the conditions of inflation, speculation and black-marketing.

3.2. The 1923-1929 Liberal Period

After the First World War and the Turkish War of Independence, the immediate task of the new Republican regime was reconstruction. The population was largely illiterate, rural and engaged in subsistence agriculture. The Republic had inherited railways, mines some urban services, and a few functioning factories from the Ottoman Empire. Almost all industrial production was in small scale craft workshops. Trade, banking and finance had been largely in the hands of non-Muslim minorities. Some of whom left with 'exchange of populations'. In some areas, agriculture was already geared to cash cropping for the European market. The government adopted an open system to the outside world and the State encouraged the private

sector. The period is characterised as 'liberal' not in the sense of minimum intervention of the State but pursuing an active role in the economy to create the conditions for the capital accumulation for private capital.

The various State monopolies inherited from the Ottoman Empire that engaged mainly with the production, marketing and importation were transferred partly to private and partly to foreign capital. This simply meant the sharing of the monopoly profits by the domestic and foreign capital.

The Is Bank (Business Bank) in 1924 was set up with State help and private capital. It mainly aimed to finance domestic manufacturing industry. Foreign capital was also encouraged on condition of seeking domestic partnership.

The next year (1925), Sanayii and Maadin Bankasi (The Bank for Mining and Industry) was established to administer the state-owned industrial establishments. It encouraged the investments of the private sector more than it administered the public enterprises.

The Law of Encouragements of Industry which was issued in 1927 guaranteed financial support to private enterprises, providing a wide range of subsidies and exempt them from several major taxes. Foreign capital invested as partners of the new corporations and the leading politicians and the high bureaucrats became the founders and the share-holders of these establishments. (Timur, 1971)

The Lausanne Treaty prohibited a protective foreign trade policy until 1928. But in any case, the new regime was in favour of open policy and a foreign capital to collaborate with domestic capital. The regime did not attempt to evade

the limitations of the Lausanne Treaty and the tariffs prepared for after 1928 were mild. The predominant and dependent merchant capital played a significant role in avoiding to have a strong protectionist foreign trade policy. (Boratav, 1977)

In the sphere of agriculture, the legislative and institutional changes contributed to the increase of production and to the strengthening of the position of big landlords. The Civil Code adopted in 1926 recognised in full the private ownership on land and the cadastral surveys that started consolidated the existing unequal distribution of land. The 1923 Constitution provided guarantees against nationalisation of land. In addition, they were powerful enough to appropriate large sections of the land evacuated by the Greeks. The big landlords considerably benefited from the import of animals that were exempt from customs duty and from the import of duty free agricultural machinery by the State owned Agricultural Bank. Mechanisation remained minimal in this period. Although state subsidised agricultural credits were significantly extended (39 times between 1922 and 1930), the small peasants were still depended on the loans of the usurers and the big landlords for their credit needs. The uneven distribution of the State credits and the power of the usurers, big landlord and merchants prohibited small peasants to benefit largely from the subsidised State credits. (Ozgur, 1975)

In 1925, the traditional agricultural tax asar one-tenth in kind of the agricultural produce was abolished. Instead land was taxed in cash. The subsistence nature of the small peasants made them impossible to pay this tax in cash. On

the other hand, the big farmers that produced for the market benefited significantly from the abolition of the asar tax. The revenues from the asar tax had been almost half of the state revenues. The State increased the prices of the essential goods, such as salt, sugar and paraffin in order to compensate part of its lost revenues. Furthermore, in 1925 the road tax was increased. Most of the subsistence small farmers were not able to pay all these taxes and thus they were either forced to borrow from the usurers or they paid their duties by working on state projects. (Timur, 1971)

The impact of these measures, together with the increases in the arable land, the agricultural production increased. The price of wheat, compared to other crops and world prices and with the following periods, increased significantly in this period. The production of cotton also showed a steady and continuous increase.

The big landlords, especially the commercial farmers and usurers benefited from the considerable growth achieved in the agricultural production during the 1920s. The inequalities between small and large farmers also increased. But the development of the industry was limited and the merchant capital was still dominant in the economy.

3.3. The Import Substitution of 1930-1939 Period

The 1930s are usually considered as the period of state capitalism, etatism, in the Republican history. It is conventional to accept that the first three years of this

period as a transition period to the actual implementation of the statist policies. Boratav (1977) does not simply take these years as transitional, but he argues that it was a period dominated by private capital with protectionist measures and import substitution methods.

It was known in 1920s that the restrictions of the Lausanne Treaty will end and the new tariffs would start to be implemented in 1929. In addition, the first installment of the Ottoman debt would also be paid in the same year. These initiated a speculative import of goods and caused the foreign trade deficit to increase and this rapidly decreased the value of the Turkish Lira and induced a monetary crisis.

At the beginning of this period the Turkish economy was still based on agriculture and its exports. The 1929 Great Depression made a significant impact on Turkey. The prices of the agricultural products fell sharply on international markets. The export earnings of Turkey declined together with the levels of its imports. This contributed considerably to the disintegration of the coalition between the ruling political power and capital concentrated in foreign trade. Economic policies shifted towards rigid protectionism. The mild customs tariffs prepared in late 1920s became heavy protectionist measures after the decreases in world prices (Boratav, 1977). These protectionist measures were followed by an import substitution industrialisation (ISI). This helped to create an internal market for the traditional agricultural export products that lost their international markets. It also promoted industry to produce the products that were imported. Since the industrial bourgeoisie was weak and not

capable of carrying out such an industrialisation programme, the State took the initiative. However, this new control over the industry, foreign trade and wholesale domestic trade was not in the form of a comprehensive state ownership. Although the State increased its influence in industry and trade, the private sector shared the protectionist rents and resources. The increases in the public investments and the growth achieved in the public sector did not contradict the interests of the private capital and the State was not in competition with the private sector. On the contrary, it complemented in several aspects the development of private sector: (1) The private sector both provided inputs for the State industries and used the intermediary products produced by the State. (2) The private sector appropriated some of the intermediary profits through carrying out the major state investment projects as contractors. (3) The private sector benefited directly from the increased economic activities. (4) Private capital was protected in the domestic market with high tariffs. (5) The decreases in the prices of agricultural products supplied cheap food and raw materials, for example wheat and cotton. (6) The Law of Encouragement of Industry provided duty exempt imports for the private sector. (7) Favourable internal terms of trade meant transfer of sources from agriculture to industry. (8) The industrialisation was internally financed and the tax burden was mainly on the masses, because the majority of the State revenues were largely collected through indirect taxes. The big farmers were exempt from income taxes and the share of the tax

burden of merchants and industrialists were very small in the total tax revenues. (Timur, 1971) Thus the state capitalism of 1930s was not against the interests of the private sector. It meant an increase of influence in trade and industry in line with the interests of the private sector. The State extended its involvement in those areas where the private capital failed or it was not strong enough, in sub-sectors such as infrastructure, electrical power, railway network, iron and steel. The State left to private sector the areas of agriculture, commerce and services.

The success in the policies of the etatist period were mainly achieved by eradicating the foreign trade deficit (except the year 1938), decreasing the imports and positive growth in the Depression years.

The etatism was important in showing the possibility of growth by decreasing external dependence; however it was also consistent with the conditions of the world recession. It laid foundations of industrial experience and maintained Turkey's economic growth in a period of general stagnation.

3.4. The War Economy of the 1940-1945 Period

Although Turkey did not enter into the Second World War the working population was recruited to the army and the military expenditures constituted a huge share of national income. The productivity in the economy and the volume of foreign trade decreased. The wheat production dropped and the inflation was rampant. While the burden was on the masses, the merchants and the big farmers benefited

significantly from the war economy.

In the agricultural sphere, the main burden of the introduced Soil Products Tax (Toprak Mahsulleri Vergisi) was on the small farmers because the majority of them were still subsistence farmers.

The commercial capital and the big farmers and the large landlords were able to accumulate considerably under the speculative and black marketing conditions of the war economy.

3.5. The Post-War Agriculture and Foreign Trade Based Accumulation Model of 1947-1953 Period

The growth and development in the Turkish economy in this period was based on foreign trade, especially the traditional export crops.

At international level, the period after the Second World War was the restructuring of the world economy under the dominance of United States. The Turkish economy was integrated into it through the Marshall Aid Plan. The aid came as credits to finance the mechanisation of agriculture and the establishment of the infra-structure through public enterprises. The World Bank reports recommended Turkey to (a) reduce etatism; (b) give priority to agricultural development and production of raw materials; (c) open economy to private capital; and (d) revise the regulations related to foreign capital (Gulalp, 1980).

The high level of agricultural and raw material exports and the inflationary conditions of the Second World War years were an opportunity for the private sector to

accumulate. This induced a desire to pursue a liberal economy in the post-War period.

In 1947 a development plan was prepared. Although it was not implemented, it remained as the basic economic text of the period. It was based on an economic model that was export oriented rather than aiming at import substitution. Instead of the public sector and industry, the plan gave priority to private sector and agriculture. The Plan gave priority, in the order of importance, to sectors of transportation, communication, agriculture, energy and consumption goods industry. All those economic activities except energy, transportation and communication were left to the private sector which were aimed to provide the essential infra-structure for the private sector. The financing was planned to be made from external sources (ibid.).

The post-War period was intended to be open to foreign capital and the legal changes for the transfer of capital to abroad was made and measures were taken to encourage the foreign capital.

On the other hand, the international conditions for the export of agricultural products were favourable. The United States was stocking grain because of the Korean War. Marshall Aid financed the mechanisation of the agriculture and the area under cultivation was increased significantly. The State extended cheap agricultural credits and supported the price of agricultural products. Agricultural production doubled. The liberalisation of the imports and the inflationary conditions all contributed for the 10 per cent annual growth rate achieved and the ratio of total exports

to GNP increased to seven per cent in this period. (Pamuk, 1984).

3.6. The Import Substitution Industrialisation Model of 1954-1979 Periods

Import substitution industrialisation (ISI) model adopted for the second time in the period between 1954 and 1979. Industry became once more the mainstay of economic growth; thus the private sector -a new industrial bourgeoisie- steadily strengthened its class position.

The nature and the differing characteristics of the ISI are analysed in three sub-periods: (1) 1954-1962; (2) 1963-1970; and (3) 1971-1979 (ibid.).

In the first sub-period, the crisis of the early 1950s was overcome and the ISI started. In the second a rapid growth and accumulation was achieved through financing mainly by internal savings and limited foreign exchange sources. In the third phase of the ISI the foreign exchange was ample, but the structure of the industry was still dependent on foreign exchange and entered into crisis in the second half of the 1970s.

3.6.1. The Period of Return to Import Substitute Industrialisation of 1954-1962

The Turkish economy faced a crisis in 1954 when the internal and external conditions returned to normal: The extension of arable land reached its limits. The Korean War ended and the United States started to market its stocked grains. Consequently the volume of Turkish exports and the

ratio of exports to GNP decreased and with the prevailing high imports, Turkey faced again a balance of payments problem. Thus the import liberalisation model based on agriculture and foreign trade entered a crisis in mid-1950s. Once again, from 1954 onwards, ISI model was adopted, this time, under the control of the private sector. The customs duties rose and import quotas were reintroduced. This protectionism created new domestic market.

The reoccurring idea of privatisation of the public sector enterprises was forgotten. Existing public enterprises were extended, especially those that were established in the early 1950s in the communication and transportation sectors. New ones were formed to produce inputs for industry.

The idea of comprehensive planning gained importance, supported by the international organisations such as IMF and OECD.

In this period, the annual growth rate of GNP was four per cent, lowest in the whole ISI period until the late 1970s crisis. The agriculture stagnated with only 2.1 per cent annual growth. The manufacturing industry grew annually at the rate of 7.6 per cent. (Pamuk, 1984) The food and textiles continued to be the major manufacturing industries. The latter lost their relative dominance at the end of 1960s.

The level of both imports and exports decreased and the economy had a foreign trade deficit of 1.8 per cent of its GNP (ibid.). The deficit was mainly financed from the sources of NATO, OECD and bilateral loans. Although foreign capital in cooperation with the Turkish capital invested

directly in the production of luxury consumption goods, its share was small.

3.6.2. The Rapid Import Substitution Period of 1963-1970

The ISI continued during 1960s with very high growth and accumulation. The annual growth rates of agriculture was still 2.6 per cent, industry was 10.4 per cent and GNP grew at 6.4 per cent per annum. These results were considered as highly successful. Agriculture continued to stagnate with curtailed exports. The ratio of the imports to GNP was 6.8 per cent and the ratio of foreign trade deficit to GNP increased slightly to 2.1 per cent, creating a mild scarcity in foreign exchange. (ibid.) The dependence of the economy on external sources of foreign currency was limited. The Turkish workers abroad started to send remittances but the amount was less than the following period.

The growth achieved was mainly financed by the increased domestics savings and there was a gradual increase in the share of the import saving domestic production. In the 1960s, the foreign capital investments increased. Industrial production moved from non-durable (textiles and food processing) towards durable consumption goods such as cars and refrigerators; and in due course to intermediate products.

The First Five Year Development Plan (FFYDP) started in 1963. The contribution of the ISI to growth in production in the first planning period was calculated at 35 per cent. However, it grew less in the second planning period (Gulalp, 1980).

3.6.3. Externally Financed Import Substitution Period of 1971-1979

The ISI continued in this period with ample foreign exchange obtained from external sources. The foreign currency sent by Turkish workers abroad increased very rapidly, especially after a devaluation in 1970. It was comparable to export earnings. The economy also relied more on the foreign loans. The foreign exchange abundance of the first half of the 1970s was not structural and healthy, because it was not financed through the export earnings. Furthermore, the annual foreign exchange deficit increased from 2.1 per cent of GNP to 4.7 per cent in this period (Pamuk, 1984).

In the second half of the SFYDP (1968-1973) the contribution of the ISI to the production growth was negative and the contribution of exports (especially in textiles, clothing and food) to industrial production was only ten per cent (Gulalp, 1980). These indicated that the easy phase of ISI, that is the import substitution on consumption goods, had passed. Moreover, the domestic market was saturated with the durable consumption goods. Furthermore, the imports increased to very high levels due to the dependence of the industry on intermediate and some final products imported from abroad. In the second half of this period the production slowed down and the stocks increased. In order to overcome the crisis, the purchasing power of the middle classes was increased by administrative measures and high prices were fixed for agricultural

products. A high level of devaluation of Turkish currency and the measures taken to encourage exports meant a transfer of industrial resources to the export sector. Due to the relatively easy means of importing the intermediate products and the existence of foreign exchange sources, the private sector rather than passing to the difficult stage of production of intermediate products and investment goods continued importing them. These made pressures to relax the import quotas and high exchange rate policies were adopted.

Although the production of intermediate products continued in the public sector in 1970s, the private sector concentrated on the durable consumer goods. In this complementary division of labour, the public sector was providing cheap inputs to the private sector. Although the bottlenecks of the ISI started after 1974, it was delayed for several years until 1978 mainly by the foreign workers' remittances and a huge increase in short term credits, and in 'crisis' aid.

After 1974, the relative importance of the foreign workers' remittances declined. The high share of imports in the production of consumption goods, the high consumption levels in the domestic economy, the increases in the petrol prices at international levels, the transfer of technology, the import of intermediate and investments goods and the participation in military pacts which necessitated large military expenditures increased the dependency of the economy on external sources. The short-term foreign borrowing was the measure used to delay the crisis. The exchange-rate deficit to GNP increased to 8.5 per cent. The foreign-workers' remittances financed only one third of this

deficit and the rest are financed by foreign borrowing (Pamuk, 1984). After 1978, when the dates for repayment on external loans were due, the economy entered once more into a crisis.

During the long ISI period (1954-1979) agriculture was mostly left to its own dynamics of growth. After the 1947-1953 period, the annual growth of agriculture on the average stagnated around 3 per cent. Although agriculture remained as an important sector in the foreign-exchange earnings through exports, the share of agriculture in GNP declined. In order to finance industrial development after 1963, measures were taken to decrease fallow land, and grain cultivation, and to increase the production of commercial crops. The development plans envisaged capital intensive agriculture. Although emphasis was given to mechanisation of agriculture and the wide use of technical inputs, such as chemical fertilizers, insecticides, pesticides and improved seeds and the latter are highly subsidised through the State policies, the increases in production had not met the expectations of the development plans.

The State intervened and regulated the prices in agriculture and kept the prices of wage goods as low as possible to transfer sources from agriculture to industry. Although the State with political considerations, especially prior to election years implemented 'high' (although the real prices have been in decline) subsidy prices and created demand for the domestic market which was compatible with the ISI policies, the unequal distribution of the means of production between the large and small agricultural

enterprises continued and the percentage of landless peasants together with the seasonal wage-labourers increased.

The ISI model of economic growth and development adopted for long periods in the history of Turkey. The comparison of the 1930s ISI with the one adopted in this period (1954-1979) and the evaluation of the reasons of emergence of the bottlenecks in the model could explain certain aspects about the development trials of Turkey and the conditions and patterns of its integration to the world economy.

Pamuk (1984) groups the widely accepted reasons of the crisis in ISI models adopted in Turkey into four: (a) the dependency on the technology of the advanced countries; (b) the low levels of domestic savings; (c) the difficulty of finding markets; and (d) the shortages of foreign exchange.

Although all these four factors contributed in differing degrees to the crisis of ISI model after the second half of 1970s, inability to create a sustained foreign-exchange earnings to finance the industrialisation was the major reason of the crisis in the Turkish case.

The use of the capital intensive technologies of the advanced countries although contributed, did not overcome the unemployment problem in Turkey. The level of employment was far below the investment and growth rates. Moreover, the import load of the adopted technologies grew as the technologies become more complex. Furthermore, the role of foreign capital increases together with the extensive use of technology in the manufacturing industry.

The second common bottleneck in ISI models is the low volume of domestic savings in financing the required

investments. Although the domestic savings did not increase after 1963, the model did not enter into a crisis due to the insufficient funds for investment, because the protectionism created significant sizes of rents in the economy to be appropriated by the dominant classes to finance the investments. Moreover, oligopolistic profits in the private sector were secured by low interest rates and cheap credits. On the other hand, the large investments of the public sector for the formation of the infra-structure and the production of intermediate products contributed also to the accumulation in the private sector which were accompanied by inflationary policies in the financing of these investments. Furthermore, the external funds were used in these investments and the latter was an additional factor in the increase of the internal demand in the economy.

The third factor, the insufficient internal demand and the existence and extended inequality of income were not the major factors for the crisis of late 1970s. The populist policies of the State and the parliamentary democracy (excluding the two military interventions in this period) contributed for the development of the internal market. From 1960s onwards significant increases in the real wages achieved through the collective bargaining (excluding the 1972-1974 period). On the other hand, the subsidy policies of the State, not only contributed to increase the incomes of the large landowners, but also to the commoditisation of the widely distributed small and medium peasant enterprises. It is widely accepted that the internal terms of trade usually favoured agriculture prior to the national

elections. The implementation of such policies were made possible through the increases in the overall production and specifically in the industrial output and the accumulation through protectionism.

In addition to these, the remittances of the Turkish workers abroad was a significant factor for the extension of the market and a source of external finance.

The last factor, the foreign-exchange bottleneck was the major reason of the crisis in Turkish experience which originated mainly through (a) the increased demand for consumption goods that had high import shares; (b) the dependence of investments on imports; (c) the high exchange-rate policies; and (d) the existence of a large domestic market.

In the specific case of Turkey, the major bottleneck of the ISI model was the foreign-exchange difficulties and the adoption of high inflationary policies. These caused resources to be transferred from productive areas to speculative investments and commerce (Gulalp, 1980) which decreased the productive capacity of the economy, specifically the industry.

The comparison of the basic features of the two ISI models experienced in Turkey would provide a ground for their evaluation. The first difference was that the 1930s ISI started after the conditions of Great Depression and 1960s ISI after the foreign exchange bottlenecks of mid-1950s. Second, while the 1930s model depended more on the domestic sources, the second trial kept its links with the capitalist world economy. Third, the 1930s ISI was implemented through the public sector but the private sector

was in command in the 1960s. Fourth, in 1930s, the participation of foreign capital was almost absent, but in 1960s, the foreign capital acted in coalition with the domestic industrial bourgeoisie. Fifth, in 1930s, the ISI depended mainly on domestic raw materials, but in the 1960s on the foreign inputs. Finally, while in 1930s the industrial production was oriented towards basic consumption goods, in the 1960s it depended on the durable consumption goods (Gulalp, 1980).

Several concluding remarks are drawn in relation to the general evaluation of the ISI models implemented in Turkey. The first observation is that the political crisis in Turkey followed the crisis in the economy and the political power is changed with the change in the economic model and the new governments implemented the new policies (ibid.).

The second point is that the periods of liberalisation in the economy corresponds to integration to the international division of labour with an outward orientation and specifically with emphasis on exports. On the other hand, during ISI, the economy is more inward oriented with certain degrees of staying outside of the international division of labour and takes measures to solve the accumulated problems of the liberal periods through policies of protectionism and state intervention.

The third point is related to the class nature of the models. The interests of the traditional ruling classes, the big landowners that are oriented towards foreign markets and the commercial bourgeoisie were not contradictory to the policies pursued in periods of liberalisation of the

economy. On the other hand, the development of the industrial bourgeoisie, to the degree it can seek policies to protect itself from the international division of labour gets into conflict with the interests of the commercial bourgeoisie, especially with its foreign-trade component. However, in 1930s, since the industrial bourgeoisie was not strong, the State took the responsibility to implement the policies. The large landlords and the commercial bourgeoisie, due to the adverse effects of the Great Depression were not in a position to get in conflict with the ISI policies. On the contrary, the ISI provided them markets internally that they lost at international level by creating demand in the markets of consumption goods and raw materials.

On the other hand, during the outward oriented liberalisation period after the Second World War, the traditional ruling classes benefited from the increasing exports and the inflationary policies as the economy once more integrated to the international division of labour. The integration did not create conflicts because of the lack of a strong industrial bourgeoisie.

After 1954, in the second adoption of the ISI model, the foreign capital made investments in industries that used imported inputs as intermediate and investment goods rather than using the domestic raw materials. In addition, during this period, part of the commercial capital transformed into industrial bourgeoisie as the latter developed through the coalition with the foreign capital to become the dominant partner of the ruling classes. One other feature of the developed industrial bourgeoisie was that it organised

within large industrial holdings that were not only concentrated in manufacturing industry but also incorporated trade, especially the foreign trade.

3.7. The Liberalisation and Export Promotion Period of 1980s

In 1980, once more the model of economic growth and development changed after the delayed crisis of the late 1970s. In this current model, measures were taken to give priority to export-oriented industries using domestic inputs. The domestic economy was once more opened to international competition and anti-inflationary monetarist policies were adopted and the measures for encouragement of foreign capital are extended.

The prices were freed, the industrial wages in real terms were drastically reduced and the subsidies to agriculture are gradually decreased.

4. Tobacco Production in Turkey

The practice of smoking tobacco was first introduced to the Ottoman Empire towards the end of 16th Century; later tobacco seeds were brought in by European merchants.

There was no restriction on the imports, production and consumption of tobacco up to 1633, except for customs duties. The measures taken later to prohibit and restrict the practice of smoking failed and finally in late 17th Century the tobacco was freely produced but had tax on its marketing and consumption. Large areas of Thrace and

Anatolia were devoted to tobacco production and regulations were made about its method of cultivation. The customs duties were increased and production taxed. The imported seeds replaced by domestic varieties and consequently Turkey started to export tobacco.

The import of tobacco prohibited in 1861 and the concession for the administration of tobacco monopolies were handed over to a corporation called Reji in 1833 and run by the French.

The purchase and processing of tobacco and the manufacture and sale of cigarettes for domestic consumption were taken over by the Turkish government in 1923. Laws related to the administration of the State Tobacco Monopoly was issued in 1926. These have been amended several times since.

Since the prices and stocks did not fluctuate sharply, almost no state protection and support was need and made in tobacco cultivation up to and throughout Second World War. Although Turkey kept a large productive labour under arms during the Second World War, the production of tobacco increased with the rise of external demand, because the outputs of Turkey's competitors (Greece, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia) declined due to their participation in the War. Although the domestic prices increased, Turkey did not face difficulties of exporting its high production immediately after the War. But after 1945, the rapid increase of tobacco production in Greece, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia had adverse effects on Turkey's exports and the expanded domestic production resulted in increased stocks. In order

to regulate the tobacco market the State thus started to make support purchases in 1944. The companies established for this purpose proved to be unsuccessful and this responsibility was transferred to State Tobacco Monopoly in 1947 (Asena, 1981).

Since it was almost impossible to export the accumulated stocks in the hands of the private sector (tobacco merchants) in 1950s, the State purchased merchants' stocks of the 1955, 1956/7 and previous years.

Although with fluctuations, in the period between 1960 to 1976, except the years 1961 and 1962, the cultivated area, output and number of producer families increased (Table 1.1).

In 1961, the Blue Mould epidemic in tobacco broke out in Europe and spread also to Greece, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia destroying their 1960 and 1961 harvests. This resulted with a sudden increase in the external demand and prices for Turkish tobacco and stocks were liquidated. The desire of the private sector to replenish its depleted stocks to meet foreign demand and the Monopoly's domestic consumption needs caused domestic prices to rise sharply. But in 1962 tobacco production in Turkey was extensively damaged also by the Blue Mould epidemic and the output dropped from 139 million tons in 1960 to 90 million in 1962 (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1: Area Cultivated, Output, Yield and Number of Families in Tobacco Cultivation (Absolute and General Indexes)

Output Years	Area Cultivated (1000 Hectares)	Index	Output (million tons)	Index	Number of Producer Families (1000)	Index
1960	118	100	139	100	299	100
1961	141	75	101	73	240	80
1962	149	80	90	64	283	95
1963	236	125	132	95	394	132
1964	272	145	194	139	454	152
1965	222	118	132	95	379	127
1966	285	152	164	118	419	140
1967	297	158	189	136	453	142
1968	274	146	163	117	390	130
1969	315	168	147	105	346	116
1970	329	175	150	108	342	114
1971	336	179	174	125	351	117
1972	352	188	180	129	338	113
1973	323	172	149	107	305	102
1974	*		204	146	361	121
1975			200	144	438	146
1976			314	225	-	-

* Since the method of collection of data had been changed the figures are misleading.

Source: (DPT, 1977)

While the epidemic continued, the producers increased their their outputs. Thus despite the damage, in the years following the epidemic, the output of tobacco increased rapidly.

The output levels of tobacco production varied between 100 to 140 million tons between 1950 and 1960. After 1974, it continuously stayed above 200 million tons and 1976, reached 314 million. This rapid increase also accompanied the increases in the number of producers and the area cultivated. The increase in production compared to 1970 levels was 110 per cent in 1976 and 70 per cent in 1980. However, the world tobacco production increased only 18 per cent in this period and the rate of increase of world

tobacco exports was only 12 per cent. On the other hand, the exports of Turkey varied between 75 to 100 million tons and its domestic consumption was between 90 to 100 millions tons (Asena, 1981). This indicates that output levels above 200 million would cause serious problems of accumulation of stocks.

Tobacco exports had always occupied an important place within the total exports of Turkey and within the total world Oriental tobacco market. Export earnings from tobacco showed a decline in the total export earnings. It dropped from 29 per cent to 13 per cent between the years 1957 and 1976. But still tobacco exports occupy the second place after cotton exports (Ozet, 1978).

The level of exports increased above 100 million tons between 1971 and 1973. This was not due to the increased foreign demand but because the Monopoly liquidated the compiled stocks by selling at low prices, through installment and clearing which had negative effects on the public revenues. On the other hand, the very low exports of 1977 was mainly due to the low purchases of the private sector.

The domestic consumption was 45 million tons in 1970 and it increased to 95 million in 1980. Although doubled, it was not still sufficient to solve the accumulation of stocks. One other feature of the stocks was that the economic burden was usually on the Monopoly when the total stocks were high. The stocks of the private sector showed increases only when the total stocks were relatively low.

In Turkey, part of the annual tobacco output is used in

the manufacturing of cigarettes and the rest comprises the exports and stocks. In the tobacco market the State purchases tobacco for its domestic consumption needs and also makes support purchases. The private sector makes purchases only for export.

The purchase prices of both the State and the private sector fluctuated considerably in 1960-1970 period (DPT, 1977). As mentioned before, in 1961 and 1962, due to low world production and high external demand, the price increases were very high. After this period, until 1970, there was an overall trend of decline. However, the prices increased again very rapidly after 1972. Except for the years 1972 and 1975, the purchase prices of the private sector were lower than the prices of the Monopoly. One other feature was that the export prices, in this period, were higher than the internal prices. This indicated that the internal prices was not a bottleneck for exports.

The trend of the export prices indicated that in early 1960s they increased due to high external demand and low stocks. After 1964-1965 period, they declined due to accumulated stocks until 1974-1975 period. After this period, since the Monoploy liquidated its stocks, the prices started to increase.

About 2 million people (approximately one tenth of rural population) in 5800 villages and about 400 thousand families earn their living mainly from tobacco cultivation (ibid.). Thus the influence of the State subsidy policies on the income distribution and specifically on the incomes of tobacco producers is central. But its impact necessitates analysis on data related to the distribution of the size of

tobacco enterprises which are not available at national level. However, a calculation made by the Central Bank showed that in the period between 1968 and 1976, the per capita income of tobacco producers decreased in 1969 and 1970 but rapidly increased in 1973-1975 period. Another study (Güven, 1981) support this view and shows that the high prices paid for subsidy purchases between 1973-1977 meant an income transfer to the agricultural sector. But, after 1977 the purchase prices in real terms rapidly declined and they even stayed below the inflation rates. These changes were consistent with the internal terms of trade figures presented in the below Table 1.2.. It was in favour of agriculture until 1978 and then sharply turned towards industry.

Table 1.2: The Internal Terms of Trade
Between 1973-1979

Years	Index
1973	100
1974	113
1975	119
1976	124
1977	111
1978	76
1979	69

Source: Güven, 1981:303.

In addition to support purchases and price determination, the State also seeks to provide cheap agricultural credits. Since the sale of tobacco is made once in a year and the expenditures are distributed for the whole year and the savings of small peasants are limited, the provision of credits are indispensable. The tobacco producers take loans from the State owned Agricultural Bank and its affiliated

Agricultural Credit Cooperatives. Although there is a continuous increase in the credits given to tobacco producers, still the per capita credits are unsatisfactory, the interest rates are high. Only one fifth of tobacco producers use the loans of Agricultural Credit Cooperatives; the rest seek loans from the Agricultural Bank or take advances from the State Tobacco Monopoly.

Besides the price and credit policies, the State subsidises the basic inputs, mainly the fertilizers and insecticides. Furthermore, the State Tobacco Monopoly, in cooperation with other Ministries, makes and coordinates research to improve the quality of seeds and prevent tobacco diseases. The level of production and the distribution of quality tobacco seedlings that was organised by the State Tobacco Monopoly were not satisfactory. Most cultivators produce their own seedlings. This has a negative effect on the quality at national level and increases the producers' costs for fertilizers, insecticides and labour. The Monopoly also conducts training programmes in to the growth of quality seedlings and the proper use of fertilizers and insecticides. However, most of these services and programmes were not widely distributed to the tobacco regions; they have a minimal impact.

The major problems related to tobacco production seems to originate from the unsuccessful control of rapid increases of the area of tobacco cultivation by the State. This causes lower quality tobacco and overproduction. Consequently the State faces severe difficulties in exporting and takes expensive measures to liquidate its

stocks. On the other hand, the export capacity of Turkey is mainly determined by the conditions of the world tobacco market. The policy of subsidising prices adopted in general was not successful in overcoming the overproduction and bottlenecks in exports.

Although these policies extended the commoditisation of the simple reproduction structures of small tobacco enterprises, it did not have a significant impact on the return on their labour, nor increase the quality of their standard of living.

5. Petty Commodity Production and Gokceagac Village

I am not offering here a 'description' of the village in the usual sense. But the analysis presented in the following chapters requires that the reader should be aware of some of the basic facts about the village and therefore, I present a summary of these facts, deliberately couched in the theoretical language of the analysis that follows. Almost all the points made in this summary are expanded and discussed in the rest of the thesis.

In Gokceagac, household enterprises are both production units and consumption/reproduction units. As production units, they produce agricultural commodities and subsistence goods. As consumption units, they consume industrial commodities and the subsistence goods which they produce for their own productive and reproductive needs.

5.1. Labour

Household labour is expended for productive and reproductive purposes in non-commodity form and in commodity form, that is, for wages in and outside of agriculture in seasonal or permanent forms for non-enterprise economic activities. Household labour is also expended for the communal tasks of the village, such as constructing school buildings or the mosque, and so on.

In addition to their own household labour, PCP'ers also use non-enterprise labour in two forms: (1) when they hire seasonal wage-labourers (SWLs) in commodity form and (2) when they make reciprocal labour exchanges, in non-commodity form, with other households in the village.

The total labour capacity of a household varies with the below factors: (1) the size of the families; (2) the point in the cycle at which married sons form separate households; (3) aging; (4) composition of the household members in terms of sex and family status; (5) periods of schooling; (6) military service for men; and (7) children training for apprenticeship in workshops in the nearest town Bafra.

Actual labour expenditure depends basically on the characteristics of the labour process and conditions of simple reproduction. Children, elderly and even the handicap members of the household also contribute to the productive labour expenditure.

5.2. Land

Among the means of land ownership non-commodity forms dominate: legal and non-legal inheritance; use of land of absentee kin; use of state land; state distribution of land;

opening state forests; cleaning state or communal land; and opening and sharing communal meadows.

The first three means are still current; the others are no longer possible. It is legally possible to buy land, but purchase is not widely realised. In late 1940s, after the disintegration of the landlord structure (discussed in Chapter 4) some of the villagers purchased part of the land of the landlords. Since then, quite a number of households have purchased land in small quantities.

Although land distribution in the village is unequal, all households own land. Almost all cultivate their own land. Very few rent-out and/or sharecrop part of their land or leave their land idle.

In addition to their own land, some use more land by sharecropping and renting. Renting is more common than sharecropping. The latter two are more practiced than renting-out or sharecropping part of their own land. This is possible because they take on land from neighbouring villages. In addition to this, the absolute population increase and the fragmentation of land with little migration from the village are the factors which decrease the size of land ownership.

These tendencies have been overcome mainly by increases in land and labour productivity, changing crop combination (specifically producing more tobacco), decreases in the size of families and the use of seasonal wage-labour. All these complement each other in different degrees.

Labour intensive crops, like tobacco, need relatively small plots of land. Tobacco requires land of a specific quality. The quality of land is usually preserved by

technical (chemical) inputs purchased as commodities and by alternating the crops cultivated on one plot. The increases in land productivity are due to chemical fertilizers, ploughing and tilling with tractors.

The main crops are tobacco, wheat and maize. A few households cultivate sunflower and almost all grow vegetables for their own needs. Animal husbandry is mostly practiced only for subsistence.

5.3. Means of Production

The means of production can be grouped into four: (1) machinery (tractors with their accessory equipments and harvesters) and small spraying machines; (2) technical inputs (artificial fertilizers and insecticides); (3) implements for curing tobacco (which are made at home, but require purchasing wood, which is expensive); and (4) hoeing, planting and watering tools (these except for the water tank, which is trailed with tractors, are traditionally made of wood and small metal parts).

Many of the means of production are now commodities. The exceptions are listed below: natural fertilizer, water, tobacco seed; old houses and farm buildings that are inherited; the preparation of simple wooden curing implements; non-reciprocal sharing of simple spraying machines.

Since it is not possible to mechanise all phases of the annual cycle, the labour process is partly mechanised (especially in tobacco cultivation) through the application of tractors, harvesters and small sprayers. Electricity

has been recently installed in the village. Its use for lighting during threading of tobacco leaves extended the working-night. It also provides an opportunity to use domestic electrical appliances.

The commodity nature of the means of production is significantly enlarged by the use of new commodities.

During the second half of 1970s, PCP'ers faced a scarcity of commodity inputs both in the market and in cooperatives.

Among the means of production, the use of the tractor made an important impact on PCP. PCP'ers used various means of integrating tractors into their productive cycle: owning, sharing, hiring or partially hiring.¹⁹

More than half of households own or share a tractor in the village. Since most tractor owners do not own all of the accessory equipments for a tractor, these are widely shared. The formal hiring of tractors is not widespread in the village, because the majority of households own or share a tractor and cooperation is possible. The long productive season compared to capital intensive dominated crop combinations mainly limit tractor work outside of the village.

The State owned Agricultural Bank provides partial credits for purchasing tractors. Most of the tractors in the village were purchased before 1975. The first tractor was purchased in the early 1950s by one of the sons of the previous landlord family. In the early 1960s and again in the early 1970s, groups of villagers purchased tractors. These purchases followed the payments of unexpectedly high prices for the 1961 and 1973 tobacco harvests. Tractor purchasing almost stopped after those two specific periods.

Some of the less well-off villagers sold their tractors a few years after purchase. Indebtedness played an important role in these sales.

Only two households own harvesters. The rest hire them. The payment of harvester rent is mostly made in cash and rarely in kind. If the owner of the harvester is from the same village, payment in kind would be possible.

Almost all of the means of production are commodities; those that are still produced by the former are insignificant.

The technology used in the village could be roughly equated to the use of tractors, harvesters, artificial fertilizers and insecticides.

The ownership of tractor necessities expenditure on fixed capital and its use requires circulating capital in commodity form.

The technology introduced after the 1950s increased productivity and saved household labour in mechanised tasks. The further increase in productivity was achieved in 1960s mainly by the extensive use of artificial fertilizers. But the productivity increases levelled off soon after this and further productivity increases were not achieved in the village.

The introduction of tractors in agriculture is closely associated with increases in productivity, the area cultivated and the volume of output. Formal credits, indebtedness, urban and cyclical migration also increase. The introduction of tractors also leads to changes in land ownership. Small land holdings are consolidated, and land

and capital are concentrated and centralised. The use of tractors also results in a change in crop combinations, with a specialisation in export crops. These are regional changes of specialisation. This regional specialisation results in unequal returns on mechanisation within agriculture.

These changes should not be evaluated as separate phenomena, but linked within a framework that relates them to capitalist relations at national and international levels.

The commoditisation of the means of production (1) extended the ownership structure in the form of fixed and circulating capital; (2) increased both productive capacity and production by increasing household labour capacity, increased the use of household labour and seasonal wage-labour; and (4) provided the conditions for the state to intervene in agriculture through organising marketing, credit and price relations. All these further commoditised agricultural production and incorporated PCP'ers into the market.

5.4. Means of Life

Most of the means of life essential for reproductive needs have become commodities in Gokceagac. The exceptions which remain outside of the market are: (1) part or all wheat and maize production; food preparation; seasonal vegetable growing; sewing some bedding materials and clothes for women and children; mending old clothes; knitting woollen socks and pullovers; wood used for heating and cooking; and the inherited houses. Even the materials

necessary for the preparation of these non-market goods are themselves commodities.

The quantity, quality and composition of commodity consumption in the means of life diversified and increased in Gokceagac in close relation to (1) increases in production; (2) the development and specialization of markets and conditions of commodity exchange; (3) cash return to household labour and its expenditure between means of production and means of life; (4) changing consumption norms and values; and (5) standard of living.

5.5. Labour Process

Natural factors and the characteristics of labour demand are the basic elements of the labour process.

In relation to natural factors, I include:

(1) The gap between labour-time and production-time (mainly due to vegetation periods of crops) results in idle labour.

(2) The gap between production-time and the annual labour capacity of the household members in any one year. Multi-crop cultivation partially closes this gap, but causes the further problem of coincidence of labour processes. The crop combination adopted in Gokceagac does not wholly remove this gap. It is not possible to produce several harvest.

(3) Weather conditions influence vegetation periods, maintenance tasks and quality and quantity of output.

(4) The prevailing techniques used in the village have not yet solved the problems of storing and deterioration through decay.

The labour process also depends on the labour

requirements of different crops. For each crop, labour demand varies with the annual cycle. This usually necessitates the use of seasonal wage-labour in peak labour demanding (PLD) phases and certainly results in idle labour capacity at other times.

Non-household labour demand is mostly satisfied by hiring seasonal wage-labour and/or by reciprocal labour exchanges between households. The quality of labour required varies for different economic activities: children, the old, even handicap members of the households are productively employed in certain phases of the annual cycle.

The sexual division of labour within and outside of the household is patriarchal. The nature of this division explains important features of PCP in agriculture. Within this division of labour, men mainly expend labour in productive and organisational tasks.

Due to the increased cost of maintenance of household labour, PCP enterprises seek to maximise the expenditure of their household labour. This increases pressure for commodity production. In peak labour demanding (PLD) periods of the annual cycle, more of the household members work intensively and for longer hours. In the non-productive agricultural period, which is quite short for Gokceagac, the producers rarely seek non-enterprise work.

5.6. Capital and PCP

PCP'ers in Gokceagac are integrated into capitalist relations of production and its exchange relations by systematically producing commodities and consuming

commodities. Although non-commodity features of PCP, especially those related to household labour and land still continue and they are significant, PCP'ers cannot secure their simple reproduction outside of the generalised commodity relations of capitalism.

The main source of cash return to their productive labour is realised through exchanging their products at the market.

The conditions of integration of PCP'ers into capitalist relations of production are mediated directly or indirectly by capital and state forms of capital. Most of the relations between PCP and capital are manifested in the exchange relations between two commodity producing units.

The different forms of State intervention into exchange relations do not contradict the role and interests of commercial capital, on the contrary, they support it.

Commercial capital no longer acts as a source of credit for PCP'ers in form of cash advances, credit sale and usury credits. In transactions with merchants cash and/or installment purchases dominate.

20

Since there is a state monopoly on the production of cigarettes in Turkey, merchants who specialise in the tobacco trade purchase tobacco for export purposes, but they are only the intermediaries of big domestic merchants and/or international cigarette companies.

Although commercial capital and usury played important roles in the emergence and expansion of commodity relations in the region, they were not able to eradicate the surviving non-commodity features of PCP.

The State intervenes in the conditions of survival of PCP in four main ways. The State (1) monopolistically

determines the price of agricultural commodities; (2) acts as a major purchaser of agricultural produce; (3) monopolistically finances agricultural production through 'subsidised' credits and technical inputs; and (4) establishes the infra-structure in agriculture.

The State Tobacco Monopoly exercise control and influence on tobacco production: indirectly controls the amount produced; exercises direct control by issuing cultivation permissions; controls the quality and determines the purchase price. The State is legally obliged to purchase all tobacco produce.

5.7. The Limits of Simple Reproduction

The difficulties Gokceagac villagers as PCP enterprises face in securing their simple reproduction are embedded in their struggle to control the conditions of their productive and reproductive activities. The forms and mechanisms of the ownership of the means of production, the nature of the labour process and production of commodities and subsistence goods, the commodity market structure and the role of the State and capital are the domain that I inquire the conditions Gokceagac villagers face difficulties of survival.

In the specific case of Gokceagac, I consider the following interrelated and interdependent factors which contribute to the difficulties PCP'ers encounter in securing their survival. First, although they are integrated into capitalist market as producers and consumers of commodities

similar to capitalist commodity producers and are subject to dynamics of capitalist relations, they are not able to include all their production costs, specifically the costs related to household family labour and land into the price of commodities that they market. This is because land and labour are not commodities. Second, the monopolistic nature of the intervention of the State in the credit, commodity and price markets limit the competitive conditions in these markets. The mediating class position of the State within the contradictory interests of different classes (PCP'ers, large landowners and different forms of capital) does not guarantee PCP'ers survival. The internal terms of trade which significantly determine the cash income of PCP'ers are highly influenced by the monopolistic determination of the prices in the commodity market. Since PCP'ers are non-capital accumulating enterprises they cannot appropriate the surplus that they create, thus their saving capacity is almost absent. This situation not only limit the level of their investments but also make them vulnerable when internal terms of trade disfavour them. The continuation of this situation accompanied with the following factors create the conditions that make it difficult to secure their simple reproduction: (a) the unequal distribution of elements of production; (b) the small size of land ownership; (c) the low quality of land; (e) the parcellisation of land through inheritance; (f) the maintenance costs of household/family labour during idle periods in one year and the uncontrolled increases in the size of households which increase the cost of reproduction; (g) the unexpected but common characteristics of agricultural production such as bad

weather, and early death of household members, handicapness; and (h) the limited alternatives of non-household productive activities.

5.8. The External Relations

The commodity market, services and informal and personal relations comprise the majority of the direct relationships outside of the village. PCP'ers are related to the outside world mainly through the relationships that they form when they sell agricultural commodities and purchase commodities of the industry in satisfying their productive and reproductive needs.

The State and the tobacco merchants are the purchasers of tobacco and the villagers sell their surplus (above their households' needs) wheat and maize to private merchants. Few households in Gokceagac market sunflower and small amounts of animal products (mainly eggs, butter and yogurt) are sold, usually by women in the twice held open Bafra market.

The marketing of tobacco is under the monopolistic control of the State by law. The State Tobacco Monopoly issues permits where tobacco where tobacco can be produced, determines the quality of the produce, makes cash advances, opens the markets and buys tobacco for its domestic needs in the manufacturing of cigarettes and also makes support purchases. The Monopoly is obliged by law to purchase all tobacco produce of the villagers. The State tries to export whatever remains after its domestic consumption. On the other hand, tobacco merchants make purchases only for the

purpose of exports. Most of the tobacco merchants are small intermediate traders who generally collect tobacco for either big domestic tobacco merchants or for foreign cigarette companies. They function within the Law and under the regulations set by the Monopoly.

On the other hand, the increasing commoditisation of the simple reproduction structure of PCP intensified and extended their links with the commodity markets. PCP'ers purchase most of their productive commodities from the private sector with cash. The State Tobacco Monopoly provides tobacco seeds and seedlings, but it is insufficient and not widely distributed. The Agricultural Credit Cooperatives open quota accounts for agricultural inputs to its members but not all essential inputs are available in these cooperatives.

In relation to reproductive commodities, the producers are directly linked to the town merchants. There is only one small grocer with limited amount and variety of goods in the village. The town grocers and the town open market provide the food needs of the villagers. Majority of Gokceagac villagers purchase most of their grocery partly on credit from specific grocers. The cloth and clothing are purchased from the drapery and small household needs from the millinery. The latter two purchases are formalised. Since credit purchase in these items is hardly available, the relations are widely diffused to increased number of drapers and milliners.

Spare parts for tractors, diesel oil, shoes, vegetables, medicine, jewelry had always been purchased almost by cash.

The electrical appliances and household furniture are bought in installments.

The tractor repair workshops and the small manufacturing workshops provide services for the villagers. Usually the head of the households deal with different Bureaus of the State bureaucracy. Since villagers are not covered with medical insurance programmes they obtain private medical care and rarely use lawyers.

Agricultural credits are provided by the State institutions: Agricultural Bank, Agricultural Credit Cooperatives and State Tobacco Monopoly. The advances of the State Tobacco Monopoly are small and not wide distributed. Although the State credits are continuously increasing, the interest rates constitute a significant cost in their production.

The agricultural technical aid programmes (mainly aimed to increase agricultural productivity) provided by the State are not comprehensive and satisfactory. Few Gokceagac villagers currently use the already existing services.

The relationships of Gokceagac producers with the outside of the village intensified and its scope extended as their enterprises are more commoditised. They became more formal in both public and private services and in commodity markets.

Some of the issues related to the basic information about the village, specifically the nature and the conditions of the simple reproduction structure of PCP and its relation to capitalism are discussed in the rest of the chapters of the thesis in relation to the theories of capitalist transition presented in the next chapter.

Footnotes

1. Here I basically refer to writings of K. Marx in The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (1962), F. Engels in The Peasant Question in France and Germany (Marx and Engels, 1968), V.I. Lenin in The Development of Capitalism in Russia (1964) and K. Kautsky in La Cuestion Agraria (Banaji, 1976).
2. In addition to classical Marxist writers, see Hilton (1976) for the controversial debate of the 1950s on the transition from feudalism to capitalism where, except Paul Sweezy, the internal dynamics and the structural changes and development of feudalism were taken as the primary factors for transition.
3. In relation to strong emphasis of Marx on the progressive role of capitalism put forward in Communist Manifesto (Marx and Engels, 1967), Hobsbawn (1964) indicates that Marx had certain doubts about the progressive role of capitalism.
4. I discuss some of these criticisms in the Chapter Two where I review part of the related literature.
5. For the arguments related to K. Kautsky I use Banaji's (1976) 'Summary'. In Chapter Two, I take on further issues related to K. Kautsky.
6. Here G. Kay (1975) qualifies the progressive role of capital by focusing on the merchant capital being an agent of industrial capital during the integration phases of the pre-capitalist forms of production into the developing world market. For a criticism of Kay (1975), see Bernstein (1976).
7. For the rejection of the progressive role, see Baran (1957), Frank (1967, 1969) and Wallerstein (1974). And for the 'progressist' stand, see Brenner (1977).
8. The arguments of the Dependency School are presented in the section three of Chapter Two.
9. For the critical analysis of the informal sector, see Bromley and Gerry, ed. (1979). Bademli (1977), Mimarlar Odasi (1978), Dikerdem (1980) and Ayata (1982) offer analysis of the conditions of small-scale production in branches of industry in Turkey. For the analytical similarities between agriculture and industry, see Friedmann (1978).
10. For the discussions related to petty commodity production in agrarian structures of developed countries, see Friedmann (1980) and Goodman and Redclift (1985).

11. In the unedited chapter of Capital 'Results of the Immediate Process of Production', K. Marx makes a distinction between 'formal' and 'real' subsumption of labour into capital. The surplus labour is extracted in surplus value form in the latter two. The basic distinction between them is that in the formal subsumption, the appropriation is in the form of absolute surplus-value. This important distinction is used both by Banaji (1977b) and Bernstein (1977).
12. For the explanation of the traditional land tenure system, see Cavdar (1978), Inan (1983), Gursel (1983), Wallerstein et.al., (1983) and Aricanli (1984).
13. See Kurmus (1974) and Pamuk (1982) for the regional divergences, especially after the second half of the 19th Century.
14. Keyder (1976) makes an analysis of the integration the Ottoman social formation, which he considered as an Asiatic Mode of Production, into the world economy.
15. The formal change in the law did not directly affect land sales on a large scale. The effective commoditisation of land was gradual and is still far from complete.
16. For the review of the land reform trials and its significance, see Aktan (1971, 1973), Sener (1971) and TMMOB (1978).
17. See Isikli (1977), Somel (1979) and Erguder (1981) for conditions of intervention of the State in subsidising the prices of the agricultural inputs and the monopolistic determination of the agricultural prices.
18. The migration issue is widely discussed in Turkish literature: see Keles (1961, 1970), Tutengil (1966), Kiray (1973) and Kartal (1983).
19. In such cases, friends and kin simply supply the engine oil and the diesel oil, but pay no fee.
20. See Seyhan and Ozer (1971) for the explanation of the history and the function of State Tobacco Monopoly in Turkey.

CHAPTER 2
THE THEORIES OF CAPITALIST TRANSITION IN AGRICULTURE

1. Introduction

Since my purpose is to make a case study in terms of a body of theory, I cannot avoid presenting the history of that body of theory. But I recognise that the lack of summarising adequately a complex and indeed abstruse body of controversial theory with its own complex history is daunting ; indeed, beyond the limits of possibility in the space I can allow myself.

For this reason, I have compressed this account, and tried to confine it strictly to the minimum essential to rendering my analysis of Gokceagac comprehensible and lucid.

2. The 'Classical' Views

2.1. Lenin's Views on Development of Capitalism

Lenin discussed among other things the differentiation of peasantry; the relationship between conditions of increasing commodity production and exchange relations and the development of a 'home-market'; the link between dissolution of landlord structure and the establishment of small peasant farming; the class position of peasantry; the link between capitalist industry and capitalist agriculture within a perspective of the development of capitalist relations in

agriculture. He argued that the pre-capitalist relations constrain the penetration of capital into agriculture, and that merchant and money-lending capital hinder the development of agrarian capitalism. All these phases are relevant to the issues discussed in this study.

Lenin formulated an evolutionist theory of transformation and differentiation. He presents an analysis of a progressive development of agriculture. He argues that development in agriculture follows a path similar to that of capitalist industrial development. The means of production will be concentrated in a few capitalist farmers and the remaining majority of peasants will face difficulties in securing their subsistence under increasing commodity exchange and market expansion and will then join the urban proletariat to expand industrial production.

He considered factors such as bondage, usury, labour services as remnants of pre-capitalist Russia. He saw them as retarding the penetration of capitalism into agriculture and hindering the differentiation of peasantry. For the progressive development of agriculture, it was, in his view, essential to destroy non-capitalist relations. This destruction is considered by him as inevitable. Furthermore, he also recognized the great variety of production and labour relations which were 'not-capitalist'. These were partially impeding the complete dissolution of peasantry.

In his analysis of the development of capitalism in agriculture, it is important to notice that he formed a link between the dissolution/transformation of the landlord

structure and the differentiation of the peasantry. He emphasized that differentiation in agriculture will extend and develop the 'home-market' and commodity relations in agriculture which will give way to the formation of capitalist farming. Tribe (1979:6-7) points out that Lenin's theory of 'depeasantisation' was not simply a theory of 'dispossession', but was also related to the "organisation of the peasant household, where, diverse forces ... lead it to rent land out, hire labour and sell it, alter crop patterns and so on." He saw peasant household production as a transitional form historically between feudalism and capitalism. He tried to explain the relationships between the industrial proletariat and the various strata of peasantry in terms of the possible political alliances between them which was conceptualised within the general framework of the development of capitalist relations.

He emphasize the relationship between the dissolution of landlord structure and the development of small peasant commodity production and linked this to the development and extention of a home-market. But, he saw merchant/money-lending capital as a constraint on the development of agrarian capitalism.

It seems that his formulation had a larger scope that aimed to explain the development of capitalist relations at the social formation level, where he emphasized the relationship between capitalist industry, capitalist agriculture and landed proprietorship.

2.2. K. Kautsky's Views on Agrarian Transition

K. Kautsky published his book Die Agrarfrage in 1899. In³ it he analyses the processes of capitalist development by⁴ emphasizing the reasons of delay of capitalist transformation of agriculture. He does this by comparing the differences between capitalist development in agriculture and industry. He focuses on the specific role land plays in agriculture. He forms the link between small and large holdings in agriculture through labour exchanges between them and explain the conditions of their existence. So, he concludes that agriculture 'oscillates' between 'concentration/dissolution' under capitalism. He also distinguishes the conditions of survival of small and medium sized holdings and points out the role the state plays in subsidizing small holdings.

K. Kautsky analysed the process of capitalist development, specifically the capitalist transformation of agriculture and presented the reasons of delay of this transformation.

Kautsky modified the 'classical' thesis of Marx that small producers will be disposed from their means of production, specifically from their land and that land will be concentrated in the hands of agrarian bourgeoisie. Large enterprises will displace small ones. Although he made this modification he accepted Marx's view of the ultimate role of capital and his overall view of capitalist process of agrarian transformation.

In explaining the reasons for the delay of the

capitalist transformation, Kautsky, indicates that agriculture in several important aspects differs from industry: "Agriculture does not develop according to the same process as in industry; it follows laws of its own ... but ... regard them as elements of a single process" (Banaji, 1976:2). The first difference is that land is a major factor of production in agriculture, it is not reproducible. Thus limits concentration. So, in his view, rather than concentration, centralisation is the path for expansion and growth in agriculture. He argues that land is "a factor whose quality cannot be increased" (1976:1).

This leads him to analyse the relationship between large and small holdings in agriculture. Although he points out the incorrectness of comparing small and large holdings, he considers large holdings advantageous because of their

"bigger proportion of cultivated acreage, economies in the consumption of labour power, draught animals, and implements of labour, efficient utilisation of all resources, the possibility of using machinery, division of labour, specialist management, a superiority in the market, easier access to credit" (1976:26).

But he was less insistent on economies of scale than Marx, because these advantages hold only up to a certain limit beyond which, without technical advance, the advantages are low. If large holdings expand without technical support, they lose their superiority mainly due to extensive cultivation. So, given capital, he argues that it is easier to exploit intensively in small holdings. Goodman and Redclift (1981:10) point out that the level of mechanisation was low at the time Kautsky was writing, so the possibility of "large areas to be cultivated more effectively than

small" does not appear in his arguments.

Related to this, the shortage of labour was an important factor used by Kautsky in comparing large and small holdings. He argued that small holdings survived because they provided labour for the large ones. The workers in the large holdings were able to farm also their small holders, because productive labour on the family farm was integrated into the labour of the family.

Kautsky mentioned that as large holdings expand and "penetrate into the sector of small property the lower becomes the rate of reproduction of this labour power" (1976:34). Since concentration of large holdings dissolves small holdings, he argued that this will create a shortage of manpower and destroy the supply of labour for large holdings. So, small holdings survived not because of their efficiency, but because they ceased to compete with large holdings.

"The vast majority of the rural population no longer figures on the market as a seller of foodstuffs, but as a seller of labour power and purchaser of foodstuffs" (1976:36).

Kautsky considered that small holders were badly placed to face a labour-shortage because they "can neither import labour over long distances nor rent out land against share contracts" (1976:40).⁵ So, the land possessed by small holders, in his view, should not be equated to the survival of small landed property, but to wage-earning, and should be considered as a manifestation of capitalist relations. On the other hand, he argues that middle peasantry survives not because of their efficiency but because of their ability to intensify their labour in order to compete with technically

superior capitalist farms. But he sees this as a "serious obstacle to technical progress" (1976:26). The second factor for their survival was their ability to reduce their consumption levels which leads to undernourishment (1976:28)⁶. Thus, according to Kautsky, middle peasantry survives but suffers more than the agricultural proletariat: "of all the commodity producing strata of the peasantry, it is the medium peasantry, ..., suffers most from the burdens imposed on the peasantry" (1976:40).

The conditions of existence and survival of small and large holdings complement each other, despite their contradictory positions. This is the reason why in agriculture, in Kautsky's view, holdings 'oscillate' between concentration and disintegration under capitalism.

2.3. Chayanov's Views of Peasant Economy

The arguments of Chayanov and his work on peasant economy are important for several reasons: He gives an explanation for the viability of the peasantry and makes an economic analysis of its differentiation. He presents an economic explanation of resource allocation in peasant economy. He also forecasts the development of agriculture in terms of vertical concentration of capital and cooperative organisation of peasant labour. Harrison (1977a:329) points out that Chayanov's peasant economy is 'atomistic' and 'self determining' where production, distribution and exchange are linked with an 'utilitarian individualism'. He presents a theory of peasantry which excludes a long-term trend of

development and class formation and linked with larger capitalist economy.

His work is widely considered as source of insights and inspiration for those who seek to understand the specificity and distinctiveness of 'peasantry' independent of capitalist commodity relations and its antagonistic class structure. His influence on later works on peasant debate is beyond comparison.

Chayanov's view significantly differs from the evolutionist and progressive writings of classical Marxist writers. He is criticised widely, but many recent writers on agrarian debate are influenced in different degrees by his writings.

He presents an analysis of the conditions of survival of the peasant economy rather than explaining the processes of disintegration and differentiation in agriculture. He argues that the Russian peasant economy was viable because polarization and class consciousness was absent in the agrarian structure of Russia during late 19th-Century. He considers the peasant households (the farm) as units of production and consumption. He bases his arguments on subjectively calculated behaviour of peasant households in seeking to form a balance between consumption and labour. The basic subsistence needs of the peasant households (consumption) are balanced by the household labour (drudgery of work) in his ratio of consumer/worker. The latter is affected by the size of the family and depends on the ratio of working and non-working members of the household. So the labour capacity of the peasant household varies according to changes in the demographic stages of family. The labour

capacity is used up to the point where the subsistence needs (which varies both subjectively and according to demographic stages of family life cycle) are satisfied. Additional work above this level (balance) is not rewarded, because peasant production is not based on profit motive.

The validity of this subjectively determined balance is supported by the assumption that land is not a scarce resource (for the late 19th and early 20th-Century Russia). The amount of land cultivated is also decided according to the ratio of consumer to labour. Furthermore, any imbalance in this ratio, at any time, due to, for example, bad harvest could be balanced by reducing the level of consumption. So, the peasant household, in Chayanov's view, has the ability to accommodate changes by subjectively manipulating land, labour and consumption in such a way that polarization and class consciousness do not arise in peasant economy.

T. Shanin (1972), using Chayanov's model gives an explanation of the social mobility of peasant households by emphasizing those processes which counteract the tendencies of differentiation and reinforce the stability of peasant economy.

Shanin's formulation of the multidirectional social mobility of peasant households is criticised for its static analysis of social and economic inequalities which cannot be taken as a base for class analysis.

Chayanov's theory of the peasant economy which aims to explain its specificity and distinctiveness, have been criticised in its various aspects by numerous writers.

His theory is mostly considered as an ideal and static

formulation of the position of peasant economy mainly because it lacks long-term development trend of classes and it is not linked to the wider capitalist economy. Although he does mention certain links with the wider economy, these links are not part of his general theory (Raikes, 1978:290).¹⁰

Although most scholars acknowledge the significance of demographic factors as important elements in the internal dynamics of peasant households, he is criticised because he used these factors as independent and determinant. Most of his critics argue that these factors themselves are socially determined. So, his central argument that the lack of differentiation in the peasant economy is based on demographic factors that are taken as independent of the wider capitalist economy is widely criticised (Hunt, 1979:280) as well as his treatment of the peasantry as homogeneous, and of peasant households as isolated from the national economy. The mechanisms of resource allocation cannot be reduced to the changing demographic cycle of the family.

One other area of criticism was directed to his omission of wage-labour from his main arguments although he later remedied this omission. At this point Barnett (1977) argues that lack of manpower in peasant economies is central and a major cause of indebtedness.

Chayanov analyses the internal dynamics of peasant households and considers heads of the households as patriarchs, but he does not include the role of women and children in the household economy because he treats peasant household an indivisible unit.

One other central issue is that absence of accumulation in peasant economy cannot be simply equated to his formulation of a homogeneous peasantry who seeks constant level of well-being.

Finally, his theory lacks an explanation for the conditions of the political consolidation of peasantry.

3. Underdevelopment and Capitalist World Economy: Latin American Dependency View

11

Dependency studies of Latin America (LA) concern us to the degree they deal with capitalist transition and characterisation of underdevelopment. The emphasis on the capitalist world economy (CWE) and the analysis of the conditions and patterns of development of capitalism in peripheral societies made by Dependency School provide invaluable historical information. Dependency theorists evaluated, criticised and modified the arguments concerning the historical transition of capitalism in Europe and in peripheral societies.

The Dependency School considers social formations as integral but unequal social structures: the dominant developed (core/centre/metropolitan) and subordinate underdeveloped (periphery/satellite) countries. In this School, the nature and characteristics of underdevelopment is conceptualised as an exploitative process where peripheral societies are subordinated and maintained by the mechanisms of CWE.

In this section, first arguments of A. G. Frank (1967, 1969) are summarized, then I. Wallerstein's contribution to

these arguments is presented and finally, a short review of those arguments in dependency theory which slightly differ from Frank's and Wallerstein's are presented.

3.1. Dependency Theory of A. G. Frank

I discuss first Frank's criticism of progressive role of capitalist development; and secondly his major arguments and conceptual framework.

A.G. Frank (1969) strongly rejects views related to both the progressive role of capitalist development and the articulation of different forms of social relations of production. He conceptualises capitalism in such an abstract but descriptive way that from the 16th-Century onwards all social relations of production that are not formulated as pre-or non-capitalist relations are considered as part of capitalism.

On the other hand, Frank rightly criticised (1967) the structural-functionalist and dualist 'modernisation' understanding of development theories which explained capitalist development mainly as a change from traditional societies to modern ones. These theories, especially their neo-classical international trade and development perspective, was strongly criticised during the 1950s. In its place, a 'structuralist' analysis of the historical development of LA is provided with 'developmentist' ideologies and reformist policies. The latter formulations, which were supported by United Nations Economic Commission for LA (ECLA), argued the possibility of an independent

capitalist development through import-substituting industrialisation led by industrial bourgeoisie and technocratic state apparatus. Although Dependency writers and Frank rejected these development perspectives and its policies, Frank's views seem to have traces of these studies.¹²

A. G. Frank's main arguments were based on his definition and conceptualization of capitalism and structural exploitative relationships formed between underdeveloped peripheral and developed capitalist societies.

He argues (1969) that the transformation of pre-capitalist social relations were rapidly completed as peripheral societies are integrated to CWE through producing commodities and exchanging them in its market. The exchange of these commodities establishes a structural exploitative relationship between peripheral and metropolitan societies.

Frank (1967) viewed this exploitative structure as a contradictory process within a 'chain-like' vertical hierarchical structure of the capitalist world economy. The mechanisms of trade and specialisation, possessed the power to implant monopolistic structures in peripheral societies which established the required structural exploitative relationship. This structure imposed and distorted development in peripheral societies by inhibiting industrialisation and maintaining subordinated primary export economies. This is the reason why developed metropolises and underdeveloped satellites are considered as integral parts of a unitary process of the world capitalist system. As long as peripheral societies stay as integrated parts of this system, the established structural

exploitative relations will make sure that underdevelopment is kept as a continuous process. Such a conclusion is the main reason why he advocated that the progressive historical role of capitalism should be abandoned.

The way in which Frank conceptualises capitalism and capitalist relations, agrarian transition to capitalism ceases to be a problematic issue and all those pre-capitalist (or non-capitalist) features of peripheral societies are considered as instrumental elements within the dynamic structure of CWE.

The arguments of A. G. Frank and his formulation of dependency and underdevelopment were evaluated and widely criticised.¹³

As one expects from the scope of the issues he deals with, his theory is very abstract and general. But, the method he uses is mechanistic and his generalisations are mainly descriptive. The relationships he constructed are mostly reductionist. His conclusions necessitate comprehensive assumptions which themselves need detailed historical and concrete analysis.

One of the basic elements of his theory rests on his formulation of the exploitative structure in peripheral societies. He uses this central conceptual tool without explaining clearly the mechanisms of this structural exploitation, that is, how exploitation occurs and how this exploitative structure is maintained.

He gives undue emphasis to the utilisation of surplus, but he does not explain the precise conditions under which this surplus is created; through which mechanisms

expropriation of producers from their surplus is maintained; under what forms it is appropriated; and how their reproduction are secured. In other words, the social relations of production governing this exploitative structure is not clearly explained in his theory.

The abundant historical data that is indispensable for the analysis and understanding the relations of production specific to capitalist transition is compressed in a reductionist way by his use of a mechanistic periodisation of the emergence of capitalism.

Such a conceptualisation of capitalism and capitalist relations of production is considered by Laclau (1971) as 'un-Marxist' because it is not formulated as a mode of production. Frank's identification of capitalism with exchange relations and production for the world market, in Laclau's view, cannot be equated to the social relations of production and to the forms of exploitation and appropriation. Laclau, in his criticism, points out that, for capitalism, the conditions of free wage-labour and generalised commodity production where labour power and means of production are commodities must exist for the surplus labour to be appropriated in surplus-value form.

This conceptualization of Laclau led him to conclude that in LA the capitalist transition is incomplete, because the pre-capitalist nature of agriculture of LA lacks the formation of an expropriated agricultural proletariat at the enterprise level. This conclusion of Laclau prepared the ground for further studies which based their arguments on articulation between different forms of production.

3.2. The Views of I. Wallerstein

Like Frank, I. Wallerstein (1974) bases his arguments on the changes in the regional comparative advantages and specialisation and development in world trade and production. He argues that although changes ('movements') within and between parts of the world economic system occur, the market forces readjust and secure its hierarchical order: peripheral countries stay underdeveloped because of their low productivity levels and specialisation in agricultural products. He, like Frank, does not consider the predominance of wage-labour as an essential characteristic of capitalism and argues that after the establishment of the 'world economy' all modes of labour recruitment (wage-labour is considered as one of them) become capitalist.

Although in his 'class' analysis these forms of labour are controlled through market determined comparative advantages in the world division of labour, he also gives emphasis to the exploitation of peripheral societies, like Frank, by the strong political and military power of the centre. Wallerstein (1978) even dissociates himself from the classical orthodox analysis of the class struggle and class relations by arguing that the ruling class of weak nations are exploited by the ruling class of powerful nations.

3.3. Dualism of Internal Structures of Dependent Social Formations

Some scholars of LA, in the 1970s evaluating the post

1970s economic changes, especially in Argentina, Mexico and Brazil, took a more optimistic view of the penetration of industrial-financial capital in LA. But they still offered a class-reductionist interpretation of dependency. Cardoso and Faletto (1979) emphasized that the internal structure of peripheral societies are not as stagnant as Frank formulated, but respond dynamically to external impulses. That is, each expansive phase of capitalism created new forms of economic dependency, but each phase brought new class contradictions which required new class alliances and ended in new forms of state organisations. So, the central argument and emphasis of the Dependency School switched from 'dependency' to 'dependent' development.

Petras (1969) also accepts that some 'development' has occurred in LA, but he argues that this cannot lead to an autonomous industrial growth. He interprets this change as an 'enclave' development where islands of technologically advanced export oriented production are formed but these cannot spread and dominate the rest of the economy.

In his recent work (Frank, 1981:10), Frank no longer supports a stagnationist position but still argues that the developed new industrial sectors of LA are 'defective' and vulnerable because they depend on the support of foreign multi-national corporations, a strong government to restrain unions and expansion of the internal market.

Although these studies conform to dependency convention, they gave emphasis to the changes in different periods of the capitalist world economic development, as external changes that are redefined by internal structures, which

result with changes in class alignments and political alliances. However, their arguments are still based on the centre-periphery model of international trade and specialisation. They still lack the detailed analysis of the relations of production and the forms of exploitation in LA.

4. The 'Articulation' Argument

If more than one 'mode' of production exist, in any 'social totality' (world economy, social formation), then the relationships between these modes could be conceptualised as articulated with each other: one dominates and the other subordinate.

Marx used 'mode of production' as one of the basic conceptual tools in the analysis he made in Capital. This was later interpreted by Althusser and Balibar (1970) and an elaborated application is made by French Marxist anthropologists.¹⁴ These studies contributed in different forms to the articulation arguments and numerous studies directly or indirectly used this elaborated mode of production concept in their works.

It is important to note that the wide use of the idea of articulation in the agrarian debate originated from the need to conceptualise those social relations which differed from the 'capitalist' relations in the analysis of capitalist transition, more specifically the agrarian transition.

The different views on what capitalism, mode of production and its relations and forces of production are, became the primary sources of theoretical differences in the

application of articulation concept to agrarian transition.

In one extreme position, Hindess and Hirst (1977) argued¹⁵ that the mode of production debate should be abandoned. In the other extreme, it was even suggested that the analysis should be made only at the relations of production level by¹⁶ focusing only on the individual enterprises.

Foster-Carter (1978), one of the leading supporters of articulation, indicates P.P.Rey, sees articulation as a process of class struggle and as a transitional process of confrontations and alliances defined by different modes of production. Foster-Carter argues that Rey specifies a process of contradiction in which "a combat between two modes ... implies confrontations and alliances essentially between the classes which these modes of production define" (1978:56) and also considers the continuation of non-capitalist relations as structures that are 'blocking' the development of capitalist relations.

On the other hand, Roxborough (1976) does not share the transitional formulations of articulation and argue (1979) that analysis should be made at regional level as parts of a social formation.

Bettleheim (1973), drawing on Luxemburg's analysis of¹⁷ imperialist expansion argued that capitalism expands in such a way that while pre-capitalist modes of production change, they are also consolidated ('conservation and dissolution' formulation). Wallerstein (1974) as expected uses world system level for the conceptualisation of articulation.

Wolpe (1980) made a reformulation of the concept by

distinguishing between 'restricted' and 'extended' modes of production. He formulated social formations as "... coexistence of and inter-relation between a dominant extended mode and subordinated restricted modes". (1980:39). In his view, the 'laws of motion' of the extended mode governs and provides the conditions for the reproduction of both the social formation and also the relations and forces of production of the restricted modes of production. He, contrary to the Hindess and Hirst's (1977) formulation mentioned above, argued that the relations and forces of production cannot by themselves comprehend mode of production; the conditions of their existence and reproduction must be specified. He suggested a formulation which aimed to analyse the interrelated reproduction of both the capitalist economy and the units of production that are organised by pre-capitalist relations and forces of production. He also pointed out that the persistence of non-capitalist modes of production should be seen within the differentiated relations and forces of production.¹⁸

There exist a strong and widespread trend among articulationists to conceptualise the persistence of pre-capitalist structures in agriculture in terms of their 'functional' link to capitalism. In its very broad scope these structures (pre-capitalist) are considered functional for the reasons summarised below:

(a) In all stages of capitalist development, it is necessary to make exchanges with these structures (R. Luxemburg, 1971). Similarly, it is also argued to be essential in order to make 'primitive accumulation a continuous process' (O'Laughlin 1977).

(b) Lenin indicated that it is essential to export capital at a certain stage of capitalist development in order to overcome the falling rate of profit.

(c) These structures are considered as cheap-labour sources for capital (Meillassoux, 1972; Wolpe, 1972), particularly where seasonal migration is common, because the pre-capitalist modes subsidise the long-term reproduction of this labour. The prevalence of 'subsistence' agriculture "supplies cheap labour to commercial agriculture which, in turn, supplies cheap food to the urban sector where it sustains low wages" (Javry and Garramon, 1977:206, cited in Goodman and Redclift, 1981:63).

The conceptualisations of capitalism in these studies vary both in terms of their level and unit of analysis and their understanding of the functionality for capitalism. Here, Bradby (1975) states that "capitalism has different needs of pre-capitalist economies at different stages of development, which arise from specific historical circumstances, e.g., raw materials, land, labour-power, and at times of crisis, markets." And she makes a strong conclusion by indicating that "articulation will arise sporadically because of the needs of certain branches of capitalist production, and may under certain conditions, disappear again, since capital is continually seeking cheaper sources"(149).

Alavi (1975) refuses the possibility of coexistence of two distinct modes of production in one social formation, mainly because the development of one mode of production gets in conflict with the other mode and eventually

dissolves it. This is the reason why he argues that in articulation formulations it is not possible to make a class analysis. So, he proposes the concept of 'colonial mode of production' which is essentially capitalist but combines the colonial features related to world capitalism. Although Alavi dismisses the use of articulation formulations, his conceptualisation resembles Rey's understanding of articulation. Given the resemblances, he had a separate theoretical position which was critical of 'world capitalism' dependency views and the formulations of articulation of modes of production. He extended and specified his position in his later works. (See Banaji, 1977a).

Banaji pointed out two meanings of a mode of production: as 'labour process', and as an 'epoch of production' (or 'historical organisation of production' (Banaji, 1976b:4-5). He used this to argue that 'forms of exploitation' cannot be substituted or used instead of 'epochs of production': "As modes of production are only a definite totality of historical laws of motion, relations of production thus become a function of the given mode of production". (10)

There existed important sources in the diverging use of articulation concept. They mainly originated from the nature of the link formed between the mode of production and its superstructure; the formulation of the relationship between social formations; the interpretation of the role of capitalism at different levels and units of analysis of agrarian structures; and the way capitalism penetrated into social formations.

These differences in articulation studies had significant

influence on the transitional nature of forms/modes; the 'capacity' of capitalism to transform these forms/modes; the class struggle within and between these forms/modes; the functionality of these forms/modes to capitalism; the progressist view of capitalism; the tendencies of differentiation of peasantry; and underdevelopment.

5. The Penetration of Capital and the Differentiation of Peasantry: 'Penetration' and 'Differentiation' Model

One of the clearest and most detailed analysis of the relationship between capitalist relations and the forms of peasant production at social formation level is made by H. Bernstein (1977, 1979). He analyses the peasant simple commodity producers in terms of their relationship with capital and with the state (1981). In this relationship, capitalist production relations are analysed through the mediation of the peasant household forms of production. In his analysis of the social relations of production, emphasis is placed on the 'point of production'. This emphasis is not equated to the simple understanding of what these households produce, rather the emphasis is placed on the conditions of production. PCP'ers as household enterprises, produce commodities and consume commodities for their productive and consumption needs. So, the conditions of production for the peasantry meant a simple reproduction which not only included a productive cycle but also a reproductive cycle. Thus, his analysis takes into account the commoditisation of the whole reproductive structure of

the household enterprise.

Bernstein indicates that the initial phases of this commoditisation could necessitate some method of compulsion. But, as soon as the commodity consumption becomes essential for the simple reproduction structure of the enterprise, commodity production becomes an economic necessity. And, through the exchange of these commodities on the market, they become 'material elements of constant capital (raw materials) and variable capital' (Bernstein, 1977:63).

On the other hand, the reproductive structure, in his analysis, does not depend on the sale of labour-power in the wage-form. But the reproduction of producers and enterprises are partially secured by use-value production. The purpose of production in PCP is to meet the subsistence needs of their simple reproduction. They do not produce as capitalists do for capitalist profit.

In their simple reproduction, PCP'ers exercise control over their labour process. This is especially valid, in his view, for the control they exercise over their family labour. They intensify their labour and extend their productive labour time.

Such a productive process of PCP is subjugated to and subsumed by different forms and fractions of private and state forms of capital. Although capital does not directly organise the immediate labour process of PCP, Bernstein argues that it regulates the conditions of production and distribution of the commodity production of PCP'ers by determining the crops grown and the methods of cultivation used by enforcing monopolistic prices and market arrangements (1977:69-70).

The penetration of capital in this form, and the control it exercises over PCP provides the scope for the commercial and political agents of productive capital to intensify the commodity relations. Although PCP'ers could resist this control to a certain degree by partially withdrawing from commodity production and/or evading administered market prices, their surplus-labour is appropriated by capital. Although Bernstein does not exclude the extraction of real surplus-value, he argues that exploitation takes place in less determinate conditions than capitalist production. Due to the intensification of commodity relations and the use of more advanced techniques of production, Bernstein (1977:72) indicates that the appropriation of surplus-value is in the form of absolute-value (i.e., in the form of the lengthening of the working-day and the intensification of household labour) (1977:72-73).

In this way, Bernstein forms the link between production relations at the 'point of production' and social formation by characterizing peasant-capital relations as a class struggle to control the conditions of production. In this struggle, since the immediate labour process is not directly controlled by capital, PCP'ers are identified as 'wage-labour equivalents'. In exploitative relations, they face capital not as wage-labourers, nor as 'concealed proletariat' as Banaji (1977) characterized them, but as wage-labour equivalents. This distinction is used to indicate the limits of their subjugation and real subsumption of household labour to capital.

Although Bernstein accepts that the appropriation of

surplus labour of PCP'ers may take the form of exchange (as cheapness or relatively low exchange value of the commodities produced by peasants) he rejects strongly the 'unequal-exchange' theory and considers it inadequate in explaining the nature of subsumption and exploitation of PCP'ers by capital (1977:72). He argues that the mechanisms of exploitation should be analysed according to the nature of capital-peasant relations as a struggle to control the conditions of production.

He also indicates that use-value production partially meets the reproduction costs of PCP'ers, which has the effect of decreasing the exchange-value of the commodities marketed. Thus they manage to survive, in his view, with such low market prices (i.e., the devalorisation of their labour-time and hence the value of their commodities) when they compete with capitalist enterprises. He continues to explain that they accept such low prices because PCP is a commodity production which aims to secure the subsistence needs of its household enterprise. They do not seek capitalist profit. So, in that sense, they differ, in their rationale and economic calculation from the profit maximising capitalists.

6. The Capitalist Nature of PCP

In this last section, I discuss two recent trends of arguments in the debate, focusing on the works of Friedmann (1980) and Gibbon and Neocosmos (1985) which contributed to the focus of analysis. Their arguments are linked to the PCP debate either by rejecting most of the basic assumption and

19
arguments on by presenting and formulating a different view on the nature of small-scale commodity production under capitalism.

6.1. The Views of Harriet Friedmann

The views of H. Friedmann are presented in terms of her analysis of the place of PCP within capitalism and the specificity of small-scale commodity production under capitalism.

She uses a general definition of capitalism: "capitalist mode of production is characterised by generalised circulation of commodities, especially labour power" (Friedmann, 1980:160). She emphasizes the full commoditisation of all factors of production, allocated by price through the market. So small commodity production is defined according to capitalism and operationalized in terms of the degree of commoditisation. Such an application is central in her arguments: first, not all commodity production is defined in terms of capitalism. Those commodity productions which are not fully integrated to generalised commodity production, i.e., whose factors of production are not commodities, in her view, cannot be defined according to capitalism and thus they are not specific to capitalism. She calls them 'peasants' or 'household production' (Friedmann, 1978a).

On the other hand, simple commodity production (SCP) and capitalist commodity production (CCP) are the 'forms of production' which she considers specific to capitalism. In

simple commodity production, family labour is combined with fully commoditised factors of production and in capitalist commodity production the family labour of SCP is replaced by wage-labour.

This specification of commodity production in terms of capitalism includes basic elements and features of her arguments:

(1) It reflects not only the categories of commodity production, but also the 'stages' of development in terms of generalised commodity production.

(2) Commodity production does not exist only in capitalism or feudalism, thus she does not see any use in mode of production arguments.

(3) She excludes all production which cannot be defined by generalised commodity production. She points out the four common characteristics of capitalist commodity production summarized by Bernstein (1986): (a) the existence of generalised markets in all factors of production. (b) The changes in enterprises are caused by the changes in the conditions of competition and transmitted with relative prices. (c) The enterprises buy and sell commodities and (d) the market links them to each other.

(4) The key difference between SCP and CCP is the existence of family labour in the former. In other words, it is important to notice that in her arguments the enterprise as a reproductive structure and demographic changes in the family/household are constituted in terms of generalised commodity production. Capitalism provides the 'context' for the reproduction of the production unit. The specificity of SCP is that it consists of a different combination of

property-labour conflict, in the form of capital and family-labour. It is the contradictory unity of a specialised commodity production enterprise with a family organisation which supplies the necessary labour essential for the simple reproduction of SCP. She argues that this structure has competitive advantages over capitalist production, because (a) there is no 'structural constraint' for profit and (b) personal consumption is flexible. But these advantages are limited by 'technical requirements' combining the means of production with the availability of labour (Friedmann, 1978b). Such a formulation of competitive advantage resembles arguments of survival of peasants and raises the question of the compatibility of family labour with commodity production. She implies the existence of a contradiction between them, when she discusses in terms of self-exploitation within the enterprise due to patriarchy.

Since she conceptualises SCP as a 'capitalist' 'form of production' not basically different from capitalist commodity production, SCP'ers are considered as non-exploited commodity producers. This view of Friedmann combined with her emphasis on the competitive advantages of SCP'ers could imply accumulation. But Friedmann (1978b) claims that SCP'ers do not accumulate because (a) their simple reproduction lacks structural constraints of profits and (b) any 'saving' are used for the needs of the new households that will be established within the generational continuation of the household enterprise. SCP'ers thus do not accumulate capital and remain as simple reproducers and this corresponds to the low level of their forces of

production.

Although she includes the possibility of decomposition or transformation in her formulation, the survival of SCP is basically seen as the simple reproduction of the enterprise:

"The social formation provides the context for reproduction of units of production, and in combination with the internal structure of the unit, determines its conditions of reproduction, decomposition, or transformation" (Friedmann 1980:160).

Although they are vague and equivocal, the arguments of Friedmann are original and useful.

It is important that she defines commodity production, including, SCP according to capitalism. She also distinguishes those commodity productions specific to capitalism from those which stay outside.

However, I offer some critical comments.

(1) In her typology of 'forms of production', she uses the the degree of commoditisation of the factors of production as a criterion. But this criterion is not applied to family labour. She does not explain nor integrate non-commodity family labour into her argument. She argues back that the SCP and CCP share full market integration and the regulation of the enterprises by competition, and that SCP have a competitive advantage because family property and family labour, which are not commodities. So the link she formed between family labour and capitalism needs conceptual explanation.

(2) She distinguished those agricultural commodity producers as 'peasants' because of their non-market relations, specifically land and labour as factors of

production which are not fully integrated to the generalised commodity market. But it is a fact that the full commoditisation of land is very rare for most SCP'ers, especially in peripheral societies. So her distinction between 'peasants' and SCP is invalid.

(3) In Friedmann's formulation, apart land the nature of SCP are conceptualised directly or indirectly according to the characteristics of family labor: (a) the reproductive structure of SCP; (b) the position of SCP in generalised commodity production; (c) the non-exploited character of SCP; (d) the non-accumulation nature of SCP; (e) the transmitting of the conflict of capitalism (between capital and labour) to SCP in the form of the conflicting unity of property and labour; (f) the competitive advantage of SCP; and (g) the use of the criterion of family labour as limiting full commoditisation in the construction of the stages of commodity production.

Such a formulation has several important implications: Firstly, it reduces capitalism to commodity production, excluding the non-commodity family labour. Secondly, the proletarianisation seems to result from the loss of the competitive advantage. Thirdly, the class position and its economic character is also based on family labour.

Moreover, the contradictory unity of property (commodities) and labour (non-commodity item) in SCP is totally different from the contradiction of capital and labour. We cannot explain the contradictory nature of SCP as commodity production in terms of the logic of capitalism.

6.2. The 'Capitalist' Nature of PCP

The arguments of Gibbon and Neocosmos (1985) take this debate forward in important ways. I found their idea directly relevant to my own problems, and in my comments, I implicitly look forward to points which arise from my analysis of PCP in Gokceagac.

The focus in their writing is on the place of PCP under capitalism. They point out the specificity of PCP within capitalism and indicate the class position of PCP. They do this by criticising the 'peasantist' formulations²⁰ in the debate about PCP. They argue the necessity of using the materialist method, which distinguishes and relates the essential relations of production (that have essential categories) and the phenomenal categories of social formations, in their case, the capitalist mode of production. They reject the previously mentioned central issues of the debate and consider them as 'essentialist, empiricist and dualist' characterisation of middle peasants.

They argue that PCP, historically and structurally, exist only under conditions of capitalism and define capitalism as a "generalised commodity production founded upon the contradictory relation between capital and wage-labour ... among other things, individually represent functions, class places or class bases indispensable to capitalism" (1985:156). They consider PCP as a phenomenal category of capitalism. They argue that the place of PCP could only be 'explicable' by analysing their emergence and their

existence by the 'essential' relations of capitalism which is "the fundamental contradiction of the capitalist mode of production" (173) between capital and labour. In their formulation, the emergence, existence and decomposition of PCP should be linked, defined and analysed according to this fundamental contradiction.

In their conceptualisation of PCP, they use the distinction between the systematic and the occasional nature of commodity production. Any systematic commodity production which is integrated to the generalised commodity production, in their formulation, would be a PCP. All occasional commodity production and non-generalised commodity production would be part of a different mode of production, i.e., a non-capitalist mode of production.

They define PCP as "a phenomenal category of commodity producers who possess the means of production necessary to produce commodities, and who engage in production on the basis of unpaid household labour alone" (170). The distinctiveness originates from the combination of capital and unpaid household labour. Since PCP takes place within generalised commodity production, like all commodity production it shares the common features of generalised commodity production.

PCP'ers are not different from capitalist commodity producers. So the diversities of commodity production enterprises such as levels of capitalisation, productive forces, labour processes, amount of product, and so on and those more specific to PCP such as sexual division of labour, family structures, modes of economic calculation within processes of production and reproduction are the

common elements in the diversities and variations of capitalism.

All these diversities, in their view, remain as a matter of specific investigation. So, given the above mentioned conditions of PCP, they will exist to the degree that they are "capable of reproducing themselves as private producers of commodities without employing wage-labour and without selling (part of) their labour power... at the level socially determined by the law of value" (170). So as a phenomenal category PCP is generated by capitalism and it is specific to capitalism and it can be applied when are incorporated within the capitalist divisions of labour of a capitalist system. In this relationship, they argue that 'spaces' are continuously created in terms of the functioning of laws of value according to capitalist competition, accumulation and concentration (178-180). Within the functioning contradiction between capital and wage-labour and the laws of value PCP would have advantages in certain 'conjunctions'. In this sense, they argue that PCP would be continuously created/destroyed within capitalism and "divide systematically into capitalists and wage-labourers"(178).

In their formulation, the class position of PCP is based on their arguments that (1) PCP'ers are systematic rather than occasional commodity producers that are integrated into generalised commodity production, capitalism, and are regulated by its laws of competition like all commodity producing enterprises under capitalism. (2) This distinctiveness originate from their combination of capital

and 'unpaid household labour' which is a phenomenal characterisation. In essential designation PCP'ers combine contradictory class places:

"He/she is thus a capitalist who employs him/herself -a petty bourgeois and not a 'well-to-do proletarian'" (177-8).

In this class position, since PCP'ers are considered as capitalist, a petty bourgeois, they would not be exploited within capitalism but regulated by the laws of capitalism. However, there exists a conflict, in their view, within the enterprise between head of the household and women and children which could be formulated as a self-exploitation.

When they applied such a class position, its development and its struggle to Africa, they argued against Bernstein's view (1981) that the basic conflict in Tanzania is not between state and peasantry but between capital and labour. PCP'ers are an economically-defined class under capitalism having petty bourgeois ideologies and engage in petty bourgeois forms of political struggle.

Some Comments on Gibbon and Neocosmos's Work:

The work of Gibbon and Neocosmos, in my view, contributed in several aspects significantly not only to PCP debate, but also to the conceptualisation of capitalism and to its contradictory structure.

Firstly, the method that they used, specifically the distinction and the relation between essential categories and relations of production and their phenomenal categories is central and must be taken into account in conceptualising

social formations and specifically PCP.

Secondly, they insist on the central conflict of capital. They specify the conditions of existence of PCP according to this central contradiction. This focus enables us to understand the class nature and location of PCP. It is also very important because in the literature of PCP there are very few studies that conceptualise PCP outside the capitalist relations of production.

Thirdly, they distinguish 'enterprise' from 'producers'. These two terms are usually used interchangeably. Identification of characteristics originating from property relations with capital and the enterprise with the producer are usually explained in empirical terms and rarely their interrelationships are formed. And most importantly, the nature of their contradictory combination is not clearly identified. The specificity of PCP is mostly reduced to the characteristics of labour and its unpaid character.

In addition to the above mentioned aspects of their contribution, the exposition is clear and numerous insights exist in their work. This is especially true for their discussion of the class location of PCP. But, still, in my view, their work combines several important aspects of PCP which are contradictory to each other within the enterprise and when these are carried to and linked with capitalist relations of production, they should not be reduced and squeezed to their petty bourgeois class position. I mention a few issues that conflate the characterisation of PCP under capitalism.

(1) The commoditisation of land is very limited in PCP; nevertheless, land is usually bought and sold.

(2) Most labour in PCP enterprises is household/family labour. But while the middle peasantry do not sell part of their labour, they do employ wage-labour to supplement their family labour. This tendency must be conceptualised according to the conditions and nature of PCP's integration with generalised commodity production.

(3) Regardless of the level of technology used and the corresponding productivities, there is no reason to assume that in PCP, even as formulated by Gibbon and Neocosmos, surplus-labour is not created under the conditions of reproduction of middle peasants. Thus, both the creation of surplus-labour in different forms connected to commodity production under capitalism and its forms of appropriation needs to be conceptualised and integrated into their theoretical framework. It is difficult to incorporate the non-expropriated nature of PCP as a commodity producer with the very low degree of concentration and centralisation among PCP, even among middle peasantry.

(4) The differences between capitalist/bourgeois and PCP/petty bourgeois, even according to the criteria taken by Gibbon and Neocosmos, mostly originate in the difference between 'unpaid household labour' and the wage-labour. To the degree that the commodity nature of wage-labour in the capital-wage-labour contradiction is important, the non-commodity nature of the labour expenditure is also important for PCP'ers who are integrated to generalised commodity production. The conditions of existence and reproduction of these two forms of production under the same regulation and control of the laws of value must incorporate not only the

common elements but also the differences between them. This must be theoretically expressed.

(5) In their formulation, they did not clearly explain under what conditions and through which mechanisms systematic divisions towards proletarianisation and capitalist production occur.

(6) The prevalence of commodity labour expenditure in the competitive structure of capitalism provides a guide to understand the entry to and exit from the capitalist relation of production. The non-commodity nature of the labour expenditure in PCP make it very problematic to adopt the capitalist competitive mechanism in understanding the relations between two commodity producing enterprises: capitalist and PCP.

(7) The existence of a 'continuous' source of labour due to family organisation of PCP (at annual and generational basis) diverge in important aspects from the commodity purchase of labour in the wage-form. Thus rather than pointing out the 'unpaid' nature of the family labour, the continuous source of family labour, the conflicts of its existence must be conceptualised in terms of its integration to capitalism.

Thus, as long as household/family labour remains as an indispensable element of labour expenditure in non-commodity form (although its reproduction is highly commoditised), PCP will survive. generalised commodity production. The property and labour relations within the enterprise thus need to be theoretically linked to generalised commodity production.

Footnotes

1. Bernstein (1977) points out that Lenin's emphasis on concentration was not only horizontal but also vertical. Chayanov (1966) also draws attention to vertical concentration and Djurfeldt (1981) presents an analysis of vertical concentration of capital.
2. Goodman and Redclift (1981:7) point out that such a formulation in Lenin's view was not only feasible, but a necessity.
3. K. Kautsky's book *Die Agrarfrage* has not been yet translated into English, but Banaji (1976) translated parts of it.
4. In contrast to Chayanov (1966), Kautsky sees capitalist development as a single process where agriculture is dominated by industry.
5. K. Kautsky did not include the possibility of labour exchange between households.
6. This observation is similar to Chayanov (1966), but contrary to him, Kautsky gives negative values to these means of survival.
7. These processes are partitioning, merger, extinction and emigration of households and changes in the family life cycle Shanin (1972).
8. See Littlejohn (1973), Harrison (1977b) and Cox (1979) for criticism of Shanin.
9. Not only for the shortcoming of Chayanov's model, but also for its positive and important arguments, see Harrison (1975, 1979), Ennew, Hirst and Tribe (1977), Littlejohn (1977) and Patnaik (1979).
10. Djurfeldt (1981) explains and makes a detailed analysis of these links.
11. This study centres on a village, the economy of which is centred on tobacco production. Tobacco is certainly linked to world market, that is, to the capitalist world economy. It is not possible to incorporate this link in this theses; but at least I offer here a critical summary of some of the arguments elucidated by Dependency Theory.
12. For the relationship between Frank and ECLA, see Palma (1978) and O'Brien (1975).
13. For the critical interpretation of dependency and underdevelopment theories see Laclau (1971), Taylor (1974) and O'Brien (1975).

14. See Godellier (1977), Dupre and Rey (1978), Meillassoux (1972, 1981) and Terray (1972) for a wide range of discussions made on articulation. For the review of the literature, see Foster-Carter (1978) and Wolpe (1980).
15. Hindess and Hirst (1975) formulated mode of production as 'an articulated combination of relations and forces of production' (10).
16. Compare how Frank (1973:36-37) criticises Patnaik (1972) on this point.
17. R. Luxemburg (1971) argued that in both primitive accumulation stage and for a solution to capitalism's 'realisation' problem, non-capitalist social organisations are essential for the accumulation of capital.
18. See also Bradby (1975) for her emphasis on the differentiation of pre-capitalist modes of production.
19. The basic assumptions and arguments related to PCP are summarised by H. Bernstein (1986) in six points: (1) PCP being a transitional category; (2) the 'linear proletarianisation' thesis; (3) possibilities of assimilating non-wage character of PCP to capitalism; (4) explanations in terms of 'functionality' of PCP to capital; (5) the assumption of exploitation of PCP'ers by capital; and (6) the association of PCP with 'subsistence' production.
20. Specifically taking H. Bernstein's characterisation of PCP and his views on 'African Socialism' specific to Tanzania and consider Bernstein's arguments as a 'limiting' case within the 'peasantist' formulations.

CHAPTER 3
SOURCE, FIELDWORK AND TOBACCO PRODUCTION

1. The Fieldwork

All kinds of first hand data at all levels, national, regional and village on Turkish agriculture are scarce.

At national level, the State is the major source of data in the form of aggregate statistics. The Agricultural Censuses carried by the State Institute of Statistics are the primary source.¹ The second important source is the two major Village Inventories (1969 and 1981) of Ministry of Agriculture. The State Planning Organisation carried out one major research (DPT, 1970) where first hand information is collected at national level.

The Turkish Universities also did not provide first hand data at national level.² Most of the graduate theses carried in Turkish Universities and abroad also do not provide first hand data at national level.

The first hand data on subjects related to agriculture are also limited and compiled mainly by the related Ministries and the State institutions.

It is possible to find numerous studies that include first hand data at regional level. And most of the studies at village level are conducted as village monographs.³ These studies vary significantly in terms of method of inquiry, research techniques and data.

The data compiled at national level in the Censuses and



Inventories are not published at village level. The 'ordinary' researcher faces severe difficulties of obtaining such data. The data is published at district and province levels. Furthermore, the comparison between Censuses is very difficult due to changes in content and method of collected data. The reliability and validity of such data is even questioned publicly by the institution that carry the Agricultural Censuses. Moreover, the content of data is insufficient, not inclusive; and often poorly presented.

The limitations of first hand data at national level and the apparent difficulties of conducting empirical research at national level as a doctoral study was the primary 'technical' reason of making a village study. The second and more important one was related to the belief that at all levels of conceptual formulations the analysis must be substantiated by or at least linked to concrete and empirical information, preferably with first hand data. The latter was one of the major aims of this study.

1.1. The Selection of the Crop, the Region and the Village

After I have decided to make a study at village level, I was faced with decisions in selecting (a) the type of crop combination, (b) the region and (c) the village in which I will carry out the research.

1.1.1. The Selection of the Type of Crop Combination

At the beginning of my study I was thinking of making a

case study to cover hazelnut, wheat and tobacco cultivation in three different regions of Turkish agriculture. I decided on the provinces of Ordu for hazelnut, Samsun for tobacco and Sivas for wheat production. Before making the field trips to these cities, I found migrants in Ankara from these provinces, who were previously producers of these crops. I recorded interviews with them about the conditions of production of these crops in their regions. This provided me with certain specific features beyond the 'technical' stages of the labour process of the cultivation of these crops. Using personal contacts, I stayed one week in each of these three cities. I gathered information about the general features of the agricultural structure and specifically the crops. I went to few villages and talked with the producers about the conditions of cultivation of these three crops. Then I returned to Ankara and after consulting with scholars of rural sociology and agricultural economy,⁵ I decided to confine myself to tobacco production in one region for the following reasons:

- (a) It seemed that it would be very difficult to organise and conduct a study based on three villages in different provinces.
- (b) In tobacco dominated cultivations wheat is also produced in almost all villages.
- (c) The tobacco cultivation had a long history that went back even to the Ottoman Empire and played a significant role in the agrarian structure as a cash and export crop.
- (d) Tobacco is the most labour intensive crop that cultivated in Turkish agriculture. It is a cash crop and always part of the national harvest is exported. In the

history of tobacco cultivation, although in different forms, there existed a 'monopoly' on its production and consumption. These features of tobacco cultivation was appropriate for my desire to inquire (a) the significance of household labour, (b) the conditions of commodity exchange, (c) the degree of mechanisation of the labour process (including the effects also on cereal cultivation), (d) the role of the State (including its direct role due to the existence of a State monopoly on tobacco), and (e) conditions of integration to international markets.

1.1.2. The Choice of the Tobacco Region

Tobacco cultivation is widely practiced in different regions of Turkey. It is mainly produced on the coastal regions of Aegean, Marmara and Black Sea and also in eastern Turkey (DPT, 1977). Among them Black Sea and Aegean regions are predominant and had long history of tobacco cultivation. The tobacco cultivation in Aegean coast is widely distributed to the whole region and usually combined with cotton and other industrial crop cultivation. On the other hand, in Black Sea, it is more concentrated and combined with cereal cultivation.

Samsun province is the centre of tobacco production in Black Sea region; Bafra town among other districts is a traditional tobacco producing town.

The district is mainly occupied with agriculture and primarily produces tobacco, wheat, maize, sunflower in its interior parts and produces rice, vegetables and fruits in

its coast. The trade is the dominant activity of the town and it is the second highly developed commercial centre after the Samsun province. The long history of relatively developed agriculture and trade was the primary reason of the choice of Bafra region.⁶

1.1.3. The Selection of the Village

Almost all villages of Bafra produce tobacco and combine wheat and maize production at least for their own subsistence needs. Since tobacco cultivation is totally a small scale cultivation, the differences in the scale of production would always exist in all villages. I excluded villages that are located very close and remote to Bafra. In addition to the above mentioned general characteristics of all villages, I wanted to select a village that had a long history of tobacco production and experienced a landlord structure in its past. The analysis of the conditions of both the disintegration of landlord structure and the establishment of small-scale tobacco production would have provided important features of the present structure of the village. This aim helped to reduce the possible alternatives. The available information at village level in both published and documentary form are very limited and rarely available to researchers. They do not provide the essential information for the selection of villages. The people who had direct knowledge about specific villages, that is those people who (a) still live in the village, (b) migrated from the village, or (c) in past or currently have a formal link with the village are the best

sources of information at the selection phase. The latter people, in my specific case mainly consisted of the government officials: (i) the agricultural 'technicians', (ii) the State Tobacco Monopoly experts, and (iii) the primary school teachers.

After consulting and discussing with the above mentioned people, I prepared a list of five possible villages. I went and stayed two days in the villages and made my decision after the third one in my list which was Gokceagac. In addition to the basic features of the village that I was able to learn at that time, I was influenced by the 'positive' attitudes of the headman and the majority of those that I have talked. I was convinced that I could start my research in Gokceagac.

1.2. The First Phase of the Fieldwork

After selecting the village I made a plan to carry out two further stages of the research: (1) the collection of the basic and essential information about the commercial and agricultural structure of Bafra town and (2) the application of interviews to a sample of households in Gokceagac.

1.2.1. The Research on Bafra Town

In order to realise the first stage, I gathered information basically from the following official sources in Bafra:

(1) The Directorate of Tobacco Monopoly:

I collected data on tobacco production for the Bafra region in general and compiled from the old registry books the size, amount and sale price of each Gokceagac producer for the period between 1964-1976. I also went to the Directorate in Samsun and gathered information at the provincial level.

(2) The Directorate of Agriculture:

Although the Directorate does not keep systematic information at village level, it was the major source on the agricultural structure of the region. The agricultural technicians who provide different kinds of technical help and advice have direct links with the villages. I have talked with them about the past and present agrarian structure of Bafra and felt that their knowledge about the region is the most reliable source of information at both village and regional level. I worked ten days in their office and visited the same Directorate in Samsun.

(3) The Agricultural Bank:

The Agricultural Bank organises and provides almost all formal credits to producers. Although I was not able to collect information on individual level for Gokceagac producers, I have made several interviews with the officials on the changes and the prevailing system of agricultural credits in the region. Although private banks are not specialised on agricultural credits, I have visited one of them and inquired the conditions under which producers resort to private banks.

(4) The Chamber of Commerce and Industry:

This Chamber is the only official source of information about the commercial life of the town. All merchants are

obliged to register and few standard information are kept for each enterprise. I worked for several weeks in the chamber and compiled information about the commercial structure of the town and documented from their old registry notebooks and their newspaper collections all those tobacco merchants who entered and left the trade in Bafra. I also prepared a sample of names of merchants (tobacco and others) for the future interviews.

(5) I also talked with officials and collected information at the following offices in Bafra: (a) The Directorate of Population, (b) The Directorate of Education, (c) The Chamber of Agriculture, (d) The Association of Teachers, (e) The Association of Village Headmen, (f) Bafra library, (g) and The Political Parties.

(6) I shared the guesthouse of the Monopoly with the tobacco experts of the Monopoly during my stay in the town. The experts are the crucial officials who organise all the official issues related to the marketing of tobacco at national and international levels (including the trade of private tobacco merchants). They work in all purchasing stations of the Monopoly throughout the country. They determine the price of tobacco produce of villagers by evaluating the quality of their produce at the village. Thus they possess invaluable information about almost all aspects of tobacco production. After getting acquainted with several of them I gathered detailed and very important information about tobacco production not only at village and regional level but also at national level.

On the other hand, in order to understand the commercial

structure of the town, I made interviews with merchants and other people who had direct contact with the producers. I interviewed: (1) four past and three current important tobacco merchants in Bafra and Samsun; (2) two merchants who are specialised in the purchasing of agricultural products and four in marketing of industrial commodities; (3) two merchants who sell spare parts for tractors; (4) one merchant who sells tractors; (5) two medical doctors, one chemist and one lawyer.

Furthermore, I made several visits to small artisan shops and repair workshops (specifically the tractor repair workshops) and made observations at town market held twice a week. At the market, I specifically talked with those women who bring few subsistence goods (eggs, chicken, butter, cheese and butter) to sell at the market. And I also made several visits to the two quarters of the town who are one of the main sources of seasonal wage-labour of the region.

1.2.2. The Preliminary Interviews in the Village

The preliminary interviews at this stage consisted of two schedules: an household interview schedule and village questionnaire.

I have reformulated the two schedules in the light of the information that I have gathered about the agricultural and commercial structure of the town. I went to the village and read and discussed both schedules with different groups of people (young villagers, head of households and the primary school teacher) in the village. I have considered their comments and revised the schedules.

I have applied the village questionnaire, first to the same group that I have discussed the schedules and secondly to two elderly members of the village and to the headmen.

I made 36 household interviews with the head of households without using a systematic sampling plan. The interviews were carried out at their houses and lasted about two to three hours each.

The preliminary phase of the fieldwork carried out both in the village and town provided the essential information for the research. It also furnished the necessary information for the preparation of the main fieldwork that is carried out in the summer months of 1978.

1.3. The Second Part of the Fieldwork

After evaluating all information that I have collected during the three months of my first fieldwork in 1977, I went again to Gokceagac in the following summer and stayed three more months in the village.⁷

During this period, I made interviews (1) with all head of households and (2) studied the history of the village.

There were 131 households in 1978. I made interviews with 127 of the head of the households. One of them refused to make the interview and I was not able to do with the three of the remaining households. Each interview lasted at least three hours and almost all carried at their houses. Since I stayed three months in the village, I made additional visits to some of the households and collected further information after I had read the first interview

schedules. I eliminated six of the schedules due to reasons of reliability and validity and processed 121 of them.

The second major task of the this fieldwork was to learn as much as I can about the history of the village which went back to the establishment of the village, the formation of a landlord structure, the disintegration of it in late 1940s and the emergence of the small land holding. The information about the early decades of the village was based on folk memory and the period afterwards was based on the personal life experiences of the elderly and middle aged residents of Gokceagac. I have made several interviews with the oldest four men in the village and one who was living in Bafra.

In addition to their recollections, I have collected information from various other sources: (a) the descendants of landlords who lived in the village, in Bafra and in Samsun Province; and (b) the merchants, in particular old tobacco merchants who knew Gokceagac and its famous landlords.

Aware of the limitations of such sources of information, I was cautious in assessing the period from 1850 to 1910 and avoided reaching general conclusions.

Almost all of the information related to the history of the village was recorded on tape, if not, detailed notes were written down either during or after the interviews.

1.4. Few Comments on the Fieldwork

Among several shortcomings of the fieldwork I will mention some of those that I think important. First, I was not able to conduct special interviews about the position of

women in the village. I relied on the answers and evaluations of the head of the households. I had few occasions where I had the chance to talk to the wives of my best informants. Under rare conditions the wives participated in the household interviews.

Second, I did not have the chance to compare Gokceagac village with other villages in the region. The following features of Gokceagac needed comparison:

(1) Although in the past history of the village landlessness prevailed, in its current structure it is absent.

(2) The village did not experience a significant internal or external migration nor a massive emigration in the recent history.

(3) In its present structure, the villagers do not systematically work as agricultural seasonal workers.

Although all above three conditions are interrelated very closely with each other, the study would have furnished better information if I could have the chance to compare these aspects with other villages of the region. Furthermore, the existence of a landlord structure in its past history and the conditions under which it dissolved influenced the establishment of small holdings in the village. It would have been better if I could have the chance to compare Gokceagac with a village where the landlord structure did not exist.

2. The Technical Characteristics and the Stages of Tobacco Production

The producers generally recall very marked changes in the

history of the village, such as disintegration of the landlord structure; the change from the demet system of piling to the denk system; the change from black seed to yellow seed; the introduction of tractors, agricultural credits, artificial fertilizers, insecticides, agricultural machinery; the starting of the sale of their produce to the State Tobacco Monopoly rather than to the landlord; and the major fluctuations in the price of tobacco.

The technical characteristics of tobacco production have changed in certain aspects, but its intensive labour requirements remained the same throughout the 150 years of its history in the village. Among them, the technical changes related to the seed, system of piling and technical inputs and machinery were the predominant ones which significantly influenced the labour requirements and thus the pattern of household labour expenditure.

The general characteristics of tobacco production are explained below in terms of its consecutively interrelated stages. In the first part, the characteristics of tobacco production in terms of the required climate, soil, type of seed and the use of fertilizers are explained. In the second part, emphasis is placed on the five stages of tobacco production. Although tobacco growing differs in the various provinces in Turkey, the methods employed by farmers show similarities (DPT, 1977).

2.1. The Characteristics of Tobacco Production

Climate Requirements:

Tobacco is a subtropical plant. Its growth, depending on

the temperature, takes between 80 to 120 days. If spring arrives early, the top leaves of the plant do not form properly. Spring and autumn frosts and heavy winds are harmful to the plant during both its growing and curing stages. The plant requires moderate rainfall distributed evenly through the plant's maturation months. Rainfall has positive effects while the plant is growing, but delays maturation during harvesting. Excessive rainfall causes diseases.

Changes and variations in the climate affect land productivity; the duration and method of curing; the size of the leaves; the frequency of necessary watering; and the frequency of occurrence of diseases. It also affects quality, labour-time, amount of capital outlay especially related to curing installations and plant diseases. The effects of variations in the climate are important both in the preparation of seedlings and growth of plants.

Soil Requirements:

The type of land and the properties of the soil are important in terms of the variety and the quality of the tobacco grown.

The location and the type of land affects the amount of chemical fertilizers, insecticides, chemical sprays and the type of seed used. They also affect the amount of labour required in tasks such as tilling, watering and transportation.

The Type of Seed:

There is no universally accepted classification of the

various varieties of tobacco grown in Turkey. The classifications usually take into account both climate and soil in terms of geographical regions in Turkey. The tobacco grown in Turkey is usually separated into different classes according to: the shape of the leaves; the variety to which the plant belongs; methods of manipulation; and its fermentation characteristics. The type of seed used also depends on both the type of soil and the characteristics of the climate in the region.

Producers do not pay for the seed. This is obtained from either the Monopoly or from their own crop.

The Use of Fertilizers:

If there is no decrease in the productivity of land and the quality of tobacco plants do not need chemical fertilizers. If, however, tobacco is produced on the same fields consecutively for 4-5 years, natural (farm) fertilizer must be used. The use of chemical fertilizers produces controversial results. They augment land productivity but reduce the quality of tobacco. The desire to increase the yields per decare, tempts some producers to use chemical fertilizers, even though they know that it reduces the quality of the produce. But chemical fertilizers cannot be used in seedling growing. For the latter, farm fertilizer must be used. Despite such general knowledge, most farmers now use chemical fertilizers. There are several reasons for this: animal husbandry has declined in tobacco producing regions in the last few decades, leading to a shortage of farm fertilizer.

The purchase of farm fertilizer is expensive and its preparation is very time consuming. On the other hand, the application of chemical fertilizers is easier.

2.2. The Stages of Tobacco Production

2.2.1. Seedling Growing

The first major stage of tobacco cultivation is seedling growing. Tobacco plants are grown from seeds in nurseries.

Seedling growing consists of three stages: (a) preparation of the nurseries; (b) sowing of the seeds; and (c) maintaining the nurseries until transplantation.

The Preparation of Nurseries:

The location of nurseries is important. The producer tries to choose a place which is not windy and away from vegetable gardens and barns but near to a water source. Provided these conditions can be met, the producer also prefers the nurseries to be as close to the house as possible in order to be able to maintain the seedlings while they grow.

If the location of the nurseries is not changed each year then the soil could be disinfected. In the Black Sea region, starting from the first week of March, the place of seedlings is tilled. It is usually tilled twice or three times. Tilling can be done by a tractor, depending on the size of the seed beds. In the next stage the place is harrowed and later, the beds are hoed and levelled with a harrow.

Sowing:

In the stage of sowing, one part tobacco seed, usually kept from the previous year's harvest, is mixed with 5-6 parts of ash or fine soil and scattered on the prepared nursery beds. Farm fertilizer is sifted and taken to the nursery where it is mixed with soil, in a ratio of one to three, and spread on the beds to a thickness of 1-1.5 cm. Finally, it is pressed firmly either by bare foot or a wooden pestle and lightly watered with a watering can.

Maintenance of Nursery-Beds:

Insecticide spraying, watering, weeding and seedling pulling are the four basic tasks in maintaining the nursery-beds.

Insecticide Spraying:

Insecticide spraying is a general remedy for tobacco diseases and other harmful agents. In order to prevent tobacco diseases, spraying is done after sowing. It must also be done after watering and before thinning the seedlings.

Watering:

The nursery beds are watered for 1.5-2 months, depending on the level of rainfalls. Watering must be adjusted to the weather conditions and must be delayed for a few days if the weather is not warm enough. The surface of the beds must not be left dry until the seeds appear above the ground. The watering can gradually be decreased as the seedlings cover the surface of the beds. Excessive watering decreases the capacity of the plants to endure drought and thrive in

the fields. It may also cause other diseases and seedling decay.

Weeding:

The beds must be cleaned of weeds. This is usually done three times. Watering must be done before and after weeding.

If sowing has been dense, either thinning or harrowing is necessary. Excessive seedlings are removed 1-2 weeks before transplantation in order to obtain uniformity among the seedlings. The soil around the roots of the seedlings saturate as they watered; therefore, these spaces left by thinning are filled with capping fertilizer and watered again. If the seedlings weaken because of late sowing or a bad soil mixture, the liquid mixture prepared from either farm or chemical fertilizers is applied.

Seedling Pulling:

Seedlings grow up in about 2.5 months and mature usually in the second week of May in the village. The producer starts selecting the strongest and the most matured ones first for transplanting.

2.2.2. Planting

Planting is one of the most labour-intensive stages of tobacco cultivation. The producer prepares the field to which he will transplant the tobacco seedlings during the seedling growing period. Normally the fields are tilled three times, but the villagers usually make two ploughing.

Planting time depends on the climate of the region and the vegetation period. In the Black Sea region, the

temperature is cool, which allows the transplanting in early May.

Before planting, a worker opens furrows with a hoe. The seedlings are selected, carried to the field and distributed in the rows at set intervals. 2-3 planters do the planting and one other supplies plenty of water to the roots of every seedling. One or two days after transplanting, the fields are checked in order to remove any damaged seedlings and replacements are planted. Planting requires team work. Most stages of planting follow each other in consecutive order. The specific division of labour and its timing are important and therefore workers' pace must be adjusted to suit each other. The head of the household controls all the stages and his control is crucial, for the efficiency and the quality of work.

2.2.3. Field Maintenance

Maintenance of the planted fields varies depending on the different varieties of tobacco grown. Two hoeings which is done with a small hand hoe should be undertaken between transplanting and picking. Normally, the first hoeing is done 12-15 days after planting and the second follows it after 15-20 days. But most of the producers only do one hoeing. In addition, hoeing as a rule should be made after every rainfall.

Approximately 25-30 days after planting, tobacco leaves start becoming pale. They must be stripped off and destroyed. Otherwise, they can prevent the plant breathing

and may cause disease.

Depending on the variety and to the soil insecticide spraying is done during the maturation period.

Good quality plants usually do not need watering. However, in recent years, especially in periods of drought, even the high quality tobacco is watered in plateau fields.

2.2.4. Harvesting

Picking, threading and curing are the three main stages of harvesting tobacco.

The proper maturity of the leaves is crucial for both the quality of tobacco and the consecutive stages of production. Thus the time of picking is very important. Curing lasts longer if the leaves are picked before maturity and the colour darkens; the tips of the leaves dry up if picked after maturity.

The leaves are generally picked 2-2.5 months after transplanting. Picking is done in 'hands'. That is a group of leaves on one plant which grow and mature at the same time are called a hand. The leaves of a hand are very close to one another and usually there are 3-5 leaves in one hand. Picking starts from the bottom of the stem and goes to the top. The leaves of the bottom hand are worthless, they are therefore either left on the stem or stripped off. The first, second and third hands constitute the main produce. The top hands and the hands just below them form the best quality leaves. The leaves are picked by hand one at a time, are gathered into bundles, and are then piled into deep baskets and carried to the house for threading.

Producers make two pickings in a day; one in the early morning and the other late in the afternoon. The best time for picking is between 4-9 a.m. in the morning. The only disadvantage of early picking is that in insufficient light, immature leaves may be picked by mistake. In dewy and rainy weather picking is postponed. The time of picking and the weather conditions affect the quality of tobacco and may cause diseases. Leaves picked in the early morning are threaded until afternoon and the afternoon picking is threaded until midnight.

The leaves are threaded hand by hand in the same order as they are picked. So that leaves of the same quality are threaded together. Leaves are threaded on strings and hung out on specially prepared square wooden frames or racks. Eight to ten rows of strings are suspended on each of these frames. These frames are first left to dry in the shade for 3-4 days for fading or paling. Later they are left out in the sun until the leaves are thoroughly dried. Each night these movable frames are carried to a covered shelter.

The leaves dry out in 15-26 days. Then they are taken off the frames and 18-20 strings are gathered together and hung in places which are sunny but not windy. After 3-4 days, the strings are gathered together and transferred to a suitable room where they are hung close to the ceiling. These wreaths are known in Turkish as hevenks. They are left until the baling season which starts usually towards the end of December or early January.

2.2.5. Dampness, Handling and Baling

The final stages are related with the control of the dampness, handling, baling and transportation.

The leaves must be kept at the required level of dampness before handling and baling. The handling process involves the selection according to quality and classification in terms of tobacco hands, colour and size. The final stage is the transportation of the baled tobacco to the State Tobacco Monopoly's ware-houses in the town.

Footnotes

1. Although the State is obliged by law to carry out Agricultural Censuses in five year intervals, only five made in the period between 1927 and 1980.
2. May be the only exception is the data that was compiled by the Institute of Population Research of Hacettepe University which is partly related to Turkish agriculture.
3. Among the very few bibliographies compiled, Beeley (1969) and Ergil (1971) are useful.
4. The first two, Ordu and Samsun are located on the Northern coast of Turkey and the latter, Sivas is a central Anatolian province.
5. Here I take the opportunity to thank K. Boratav and M. B. Kiray for their advice on the selection of the type of crop combination.
6. Two major studies were carried out in the region on tobacco cultivation: Acil (1953) and Bulbul (1979). For a comparison, see Boesen and Mohele (1979).
7. I went to Turkey with a right hand drive and British plated car. This removed most of the doubts about me and the villagers were convinced that I was actually a student studying abroad.
8. Piling techniques changed from demet (bunch) system to denk (bale) which significantly reduced the labour demand in tobacco cultivation. In the customary demet system the tobacco leaves had been divided into eight different qualities after they had been sun-cured. Such a sorting was not required by the State Tobacco Monopoly that was established after the French Reji. For the history of the Reji, see Quataert (1984). The villagers also changed the black tobacco seed in the late 1950s which necessitated specific type of soil.

CHAPTER 4
HISTORICAL INFORMATION ABOUT GOKCEAGAC VILLAGE

1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a general historical background information about Gokceagac village and to describe significant periods and events during which crucial changes shaped the contemporary characteristics of the village. The analysis in this chapter focuses mainly on the means and conditions of organising the land and labour of peasant families in order to produce and to reproduce.¹

Information about its foundation and changes in its structure contribute in many respects to the analysis of the present structure of the village.

The information used in this chapter is based on folk memory and the personal life experiences of the elderly and middle aged residents of Gokceagac.² The older villagers recall the first residents of the village in their collective memory which goes back to the 1850s. They have lived through and experienced the major events since 1900.

I have divided the history of the village, from 1870 to 1945, into four periods. The first period covers the years from 1870 to 1885; the second, from 1886 to 1910; the third, from 1911 to 1925; and the fourth, from 1926 to 1945.

This periodisation is rather arbitrary, because it has not been based on detailed historical data; yet, it is relevant to and consistent with accessible information. The

periods are linked to each other by emphasizing both persisting as well as changing characteristics. The ages of the living descendants of the first village residents are used as the basis for the periodisation. I have gone backwards, allowing 20 years on the average between generations to the beginning of the first period. These dates have been compared and correlated with the dates given by the villagers. I have based my conclusions on the growth in the number of families and households in the village and changes in the patterns of labour expenditure: farm-labouring, sharecropping and family-labour.

The major shortcoming of this arbitrary periodisation is that important changes, at both national and international levels, have not been taken as the main criteria for the periodisation. There are several reasons for this: firstly, the analysis of the effects of such changes on a single village requires detailed historical information. Secondly, the degree of commoditisation was so low before the 1950s that market changes did not directly influence village structure. The landlord controlled any possible developments in relation to the market.

The Kocabaso family and its descendants dominated Gokceagac in the first four periods from 1870 to 1945. The first two periods correspond to the early establishment of Gokceagac as a village community. A strong landlord structure was established during the third period which covers the Balkan Wars, the general mobilisation for the First World War and the Turkish War of Independence.³ The fourth period witnessed the development of contradictions in

the landlord structure and the disintegration of this structure at the end of the period.

2. The First Period: The Formation of Gokceagac Village and the First Settlers (1870-1885)

This period is marked mainly by the relationship between the Kocabaso and Erzade families. Kocabaso came to Gokceagac as a sharecropper, became a peasant farmer and later in the third period he became a landlord. He and his family were rooted in the village so deeply that their influence has been felt even on the present structure of the village.

The Erzade family were the first residents of Gokceagac. The Kocabaso family came later followed by the Memeco family.

The informants do not know from where and when Erzade came to Gokceagac. Since his family had the only settled household within the village territory, he possessed and controlled the entire village lands. He was fond of hunting and more occupied with it than with cultivation. The villagers recall that when his provisions ran out, he traded a parcel of land for a sack of grain. I was also told that almost all the land in the central section of the present village were taken from him and he finally became very poor, moved his house twice and gradually settled in the poorest part of the village. At present, there are only two households in the village who are descended from his family.

He did not organise or use the productive capacity of the

village by organising production, arranging sharecropping, taking measures to increase the size of his household, or forming contacts with the surrounding Greek and Turkish villages. There were structural limitations to finding sharecroppers and he was apparently unable to provide the necessary elements of production and consumption in order to attract and bring them to settle in the village.

The villagers say that Kocabaso came from the mountainous areas of the region and became a farm-servant to Bediro, a Greek ⁴ Aga of Azay, a village which borders Gokceagac.

Bediro Aga gave Kocabaso a place which was presumably a woodland and told him to "cut the trees and build a house, uproot the ground and make a field." The Aga also arranged his marriage.

Kocabaso lived and worked at Bediro Aga's farm for several years. He had four sons and a daughter, all born on the farm. Later, he moved to the present central section of Gokceagac. The following reasons may account for why he decided to settle in Gokceagac: (a) After Bediro Aga died, Greeks living in Azay village took over Bediro's farm. This would obviously have affected Kocabaso's future in Azay village, as a sharecropper and/or farm-servant who was from a different ethnic minority. (b) He might also have felt insecure because of the settlement in the region of Circassians who emigrated from Georgia, probably around 1867-1868. (c) He must have seen a better future in Gokceagac, where Erzade kept most of his lands idle. Since Kocabaso had four sons and a daughter, he commanded more fighting and labouring power than Erzade and he must have made plans to marry his children in a Turkish community and

use the labour of his growing family more productively in Gokceagac.

The Kocabaso family were the second family to settle in Gokceagac. Kocabaso came to Gokceagac not as a bachelor farm-labourer without property, but with a decade of experience and the knowledge of a farm-labourer and/or sharecropper. He learned the significance of ethnic differences during his ten year stay within a Greek community. He had had the chance to observe how an Aga organised production by incorporating all available sources of labour: farm-labouring, sharecropping, and imece.⁵ He had learned what land meant for an Aga and for a sharecropper and how it could be extended and appropriated through landlord and sharecropper relations. He had also had the chance to combine these with knowledge of animal husbandry. He knew the significance of the role of cattle and sheep in the subsistence maintenance of the household members. He was able to compare and combine the organisation of production in mountainous regions with open field cereal production. He had had the opportunity to extend his household production on this strong subsistence base. Since the youngest child of Kocabaso had been born in Azay village, he had managed to maintain his family of six for a decade in Azay. This was done mainly by utilizing his family labour in farm-labouring and/or sharecropping.

He brought to Gokceagac most of the means necessary for production. He had a pair of oxen, the necessary wooden tools required for tilling land and harvesting wheat, maize, barley and oats. He dismantled his old wooden house and

used the material to rebuild and extended it for the increased needs of his family. Thus, Kocabaso was furnished with almost all of the basic elements of production, except land.

What he found in Gokceagac was promising: The lands of the village were relatively large and mostly idle. The village lands were composed of pasture, meadow, forest and arable land, and Erzade was the only person who had control over these land.

The size of Erzade's family was very small and compared with other households, was not growing. This hindered the expansion and growth of his farm. Villagers do not recall any family sharecropping for Erzade long enough to be remembered. He may have had a few sharecroppers from time to time, for short periods, who were not permanently settled in the village.

It seems that the small size of his farm, probably run by a few farm servants, was satisfactory for Erzade: it secured the basic consumption needs of his small family. In the region, the labour/land ratio was very low; labour was very scarce and land was abundant; technology was primitive; and the production process was labour intensive. The purpose of production was subsistence and the productivity of land was very low. Household labour, farm-labouring and sharecropping were the main patterns of labour use. Not only was labour scarce in relation to the available amount of land, but the absolute size of the population was very small. This made it difficult to find the necessary labour. This regional feature was less acute for the neighbouring Greek villages because their demographic structure had not

been disturbed by the intense military demands of the warring Ottoman Empire. This provided these Greek villages firstly with a firmer and better productive capacity and secondly, with a more secure community life which could attract sharecroppers and farm servants to their villages. In addition, a strong landlord was always favoured for overall security: economic and social. Another reason for the scarcity of labour was that while interregional mobility of peasants was not legally prohibited, it was not common in this period.

These factors could be some of the reasons why the Erzade family was alone in Gokceagac. So, there was no reason for Erzade to resist Kocabaso's decision to settle permanently in Gokceagac.

It is reasonable to assume that Kocabaso wanted to remain neither a farm-labourer nor a sharecropper. What he needed most was possession and/or ownership of land. The size and composition of his family was adequate: a family of five male and two females. By the second half of this period (around the 1870s), his children had become young adult labourers and half a dozen labourers represented a significant labour force at this time. Towards the end of this period, Kocabaso further enlarged his household: he married his only daughter to Humo, the fourth settler in Gokceagac after Erzade, Kocabaso and Memeco. He also arranged the marriage of his eldest son, Haci Tombul, with the daughter of Memeco, the third resident after Erzade and Kocabaso.

These two marriages and the others that followed, helped

Kocabaso to establish kinship relations with all the families in Gokceagac. It seems that he was determined to increase his overall power through these marriages by minimizing potential competition and conflict among families until he secured domination in the village.

On the other hand, Kocabaso had owned a flock of sheep and some cattle long before he came to Gokceagac. He knew how to breed animals. His cattle provided indispensable animal energy for cultivation and were a major source of subsistence: meat; dairy by-products, such as, butter, yogurt and ayran⁷ for eating; wool and sheepskin for clothing. The hide was used to make shoes and tools; the dung was used as fuel and fertilizer. These were the essential elements of production and consumption. Possessing them increased his household's status and attracted sharecroppers and farm-labourers to the village.

There was plenty of pasture land in the village. In addition, there were large areas of both uncultivable land (forests, woods, rocks, marshes, thorns) and unoccupied arable land which belonged to the State, but which were far away from the village centre and not in Erzade's immediate domain of interest in the early years of the village's foundation.

I assume that the Kocabaso family sought all available means to use land: farm-labouring to Erzade, sharecropping Erzade's land or neighbouring village land; continuing animal husbandry on the Gokceagac pastures; cultivating any unoccupied state land; clearing forests for cultivation and seeking possibilities to transfer the ownership rights of parts of Erzade's land in exchange for provisions. In order

to establish a well-developed household enterprise, Kocabaso must have used a combination of these means to acquire land in the village.

Kocabaso, in a relatively short period of time, changed from a farm-servant and/or a sharecropper to an owner cultivator. The other residents, namely Memeco and Humo, basically remained sharecroppers.

The period between 1870 to 1885 was mainly marked by the ascendancy of the Kocabaso family. The other two settler families of Memeco and Humo must have tried the same means but were not as successful as Kocabaso. This inequality was not crucial in the early years of this period, because most came as small families or even as single bachelors and it took several decades for them to enlarge their families to the point where they began to feel the pressure for land. By that time, however Kocabaso and his sons had established control over the basic elements of village structure.

Fifteen years of conscious struggle proved rewarding for Kocabaso's household. He was able to acquire enough land to satisfy his household labour needs. The acquisition of land by relatively easy means accelerated the dominance of his household in the village and, most probably, at the end of this period he held more land than his household labour could fully use. This provided the conditions necessary for the settlement of new residents in Gokceagac. The relations established with these new-comers formed the basic features of the next period.

3. The Second Period: Kocabaso, From a Small Peasant to a 'Landlord' (1886-1910)

This period sees the struggle of Kocabaso and his eldest son H. Tombul to control the land of Gokceagac and to prevent the acquisition of land by the other villagers, especially the new settlers. Each new settler in the village needed (a) a place to build a house, (b) the necessary tools and materials (basically wood) for building a house, (c) tools for production (mainly made of wood and iron with leather and hide parts, (d) animal energy (oxen and later horses), (e) the means of consumption and (f) arable land for cultivation.

In the early period, the landlord was the main source of these necessary elements. Landlords provided these elements and in return appropriated the surplus produce of the producers. The region was so sparsely populated that any labour in the form of farm-labour and/or sharecropper was indispensable for a landlord.

The Kocabaso family during this period owned most of the arable and pasture land in Gokceagac and almost all the families, except Erzade's, became their sharecroppers.

The Kocabaso family further extended its kinship ties in order to increase its overall power. He created a strong and homogeneous household which would have impressed potential new settlers. Kocabaso attracted new residents to the village, but he did not provide them with the conditions necessary for them to be independent producers. He sometimes gave them very small pieces of land to decrease their

reproduction costs. The Kocabaso household thus organised production and controlled the village in order to appropriate the other residents' possible surplus produce, mainly through sharecropping relations and providing them with the means to reproduce for their families at subsistence levels.

At the beginning of this period, it seems that there were only five families in the four households of the village. During this period 4-6 new families were formed and the number of families in these four households reached 9-10. The Kocabaso's household, the largest, consisted of four families and Erzade's and Memeco's were composed of only two or three families. Humo's household had only one single family. It was not accidental that Kocabaco's was the strongest household. A large household meant strong political and economic power, capable of producing and controlling production in the village and provided the political strength to exercise authority.

The material conditions of production in this period were almost the same as the previous period in terms of land (arable, pasture, meadow, woodland and forest) and techniques of cultivation.

The production of tobacco was very labour intensive. The scale of production was still small mainly due to high labour intensity and the scarcity of labour. Wheat was produced on a smaller scale than maize while barley and oat production depended on animal husbandry which was also practiced in small-scales. Tobacco production was the only means of allowing the purchase of the few goods necessary from Bafra market and the region's landlords organised and

controlled the tobacco production and acted as 'intermediary' tobacco traders.

At the beginning of this period it was not possible to further increase the surplus product by intensifying exploitative relations with the early residents of the village. Given the above mentioned conditions of production and the capacity and power of the Kocabaso household, relations in the village took two distinct forms. The first was the prevalence of relations formed with the early residents and the second was the establishment of new relations with the new settlers in the village. The mechanisms used by Kocabaso family to integrate these two different sets of relations determined the village structure in this period.

3.1. The Early Residents and New Settlers of Gokceagac

All Gokceagac's early residents could be called the 'losers' in the struggle against the increasing power of the Kocabaso family. Kocabaso controlled the traditional communal land (pastures, meadows and forests) as well as the arable land which belonged to the State. While Erzade was losing his land, Memeco and Humo almost lost their relative independence that they had established through their kinship ties with the Kocabaso family. Erzade thus became an independent peasant farmer and the other two families became sharecroppers for Kocabaso.

One of the most common labour mobility patterns, in this and subsequent periods was the movement of peasants from

the mountainous areas to the lower-lying parts of the region. Landlords were the only agents who would employ them as farm-labourers and/or sharecroppers.

In this period, between 6 and 9 villagers who came as bachelors, presumably at a young age, settled and started families in Gokceagac. Kocabaso further increased his control and power by incorporating these new residents into the village. The new settlers came to the village as his farm-labourers and/or sharecroppers.

3.2. The Limits of Farm-Labouring

The use of farm-labourers depends basically on both the organisation of production on the landlord's farm and on the conditions of sharecropping. In farm-labouring arrangements, labourers were contracted for several years and their yearly subsistence consumption were provided in return for their yearly labour. In addition, an agreement was usually made to pay a small amount of 'money'. If it was ever paid, it was either paid after the labourer had given up his job, or it was set against any unexpected expenditure. Through such practices, farm-labourers were kept at the farm. Another way of retaining labourers on a long-term basis at the farm was to arrange their marriage. Farm-labourers were usually employed as young bachelors. If their work was highly valued and if they wanted to stay on the farm, a marriage was arranged by the landlord. The wife then carried out the domestic tasks of the farm. These families became the most reliable sharecroppers when their labour was no longer needed at the farm.

In Gokceagac there was a limit to the amount of land that could be cultivated by using only farm-labour. The total labour demand on the farm of the landlord depends on the area of land cultivated. As the landlord increased the scale of production on the land he controlled by using only farm labourers, he would have been faced with serious limitations and problems regarding (a) labour supply; (b) the nature of agricultural production; and (c) the conditions of exploitation.

There was a shortage of farm-labourers. They were usually employed as bachelors, not as whole families. As the scale of cultivation expanded their number should have been augmented in line with increased labour demand. Even if required numbers had been attained, the process would have not been continuous because the labour supply was not based on the family structure. The farm-labourers would have pressed for marriage -something that could not be denied forever- had they stayed at the farm. Because each crop required different volumes of labour at different times in the annual cycle and because, when the scale of production rose and the necessary labour at periods of peak labour demand was supplied totally by farm-labourers, they were bound to be idle in the non-peak labour demand periods in the annual cycle. Therefore the problem of idle labour limited development in the scale of production. Tasks at the landlord's demesne farm could create labour demand in household tasks, such as different kinds of repairs, the production of subsistence goods and non-agricultural tasks involving security, recreation, and ceremonies. But such

labour demand would still not absorb the idle labour. So idle labour capacity would grow alongside any increase in the scale of production. The absolute volume of output would multiply, but the rate of surplus-labour appropriated would also decline. This was due to increases in the cost of reproduction over longer idle periods. In other words, the annual value of total labour power would be greater than the annual value created by any additional farm-labourers: there would therefore be no incentive to employ them. Thus, extension of cultivation would be impossible if only farm-labourers were used. This problem must be evaluated in terms of the total available labour capacity of the village: that is, the household labour capacity of the Kocabaso family, the labour of the early residents and the labour of the new settlers.

The control Kocabaso established over both the early residents and the new settlers gave him new possibilities in exploiting the increased total labour capacity of both his own household and of the other villagers. The augmented labour capacity could only be absorbed by extending sharecropping relations.

I do not argue that in Gokceagac sharecropping followed farm-labouring in a fixed pattern, rather that farm-labouring reached its limits in this period. Thus farm-labouring and sharecropping had to be combined.

3.3. The Emergence and Extension of Sharecropping

8

The integration of sharecropping relations into the economy of Gokceagac is the dominant feature of this

period. Erzade was unable to organise sharecropping relations but Kocabaso did.

Sharecropping arrangements varied in Gokceagac. It was practiced mainly for the right to use a piece of land in return for sharing the produce (in a set ratio) between land owner and cultivator.

Any analysis of sharecropping relations must take into account the following issues: (a) the amount of land that could be cultivated by the producers and the actual amount of land provided for sharecropping; (b) the amount of labour needed and the amount of labour supplied for sharecropping; (c) the mechanisms whereby the necessary means of production are supplied and in return for a specific ratio of sharing; (d) the degree to which producers show submissiveness and/or resistance (this depends on the degree to which they were able to control their immediate production and the degree to which the landlord controls total production at village level); (e) the factors which determine the productivity of land and labour; (f) the methods used by the landlord in monopolising control of village land; and (g) the factors which influence consumption norms, i.e., how total consumption was spread between productive and immediate consumption goods and also between subsistence goods and the few commodities consumed.

In the first period, Kocabaso had used his large family labour force to acquire land to produce maize, wheat, tobacco, barley and oats and to maintain his herds and flocks. This continued into the second period. Moreover, the settlement of new residents in Gokceagac gave him

the means to appropriate their labour. The process of taking over village land was so rapid that he had difficulty in finding labourers to cultivate this land. So he laid down the conditions for sharecropping relations. The neighbouring villages were controlled mainly by Greek landlords and cultivated by Greek peasants. To solve the labour problem, the best alternative was to attract new residents to the village as sharecroppers.

Kocabaso gave these new settlers the land he was unable to cultivate. He provided their food from the surplus of his own household enterprise. He gave them animals from his herds of cattle. He allowed them to cut wood to build their houses. He provided: all the necessary means for the repair or replacement (due either to depreciation or loss) of all the means of production; wedding expenses; cash for the few goods bought from Bafra market (such as salt and gasoline); building materials necessary for houses and other farm buildings; cash for unexpected health expenditure; birth, death and other miscellaneous expenses. In short, he directly or indirectly provided almost all the elements of production (except labour) and consumption needs (except those subsistence goods produced at home). He made the new settlers indebted for all these which in turn made them dependent on him. The producers' area of control was so minimal and insignificant that it made it difficult to overcome the established cycle of indebtedness to Kocabaso. Firstly, sharecroppers could only secure their subsistence. Secondly, the actual material level of any reproduction was determined by Kocabaso. The absolute size of the household was important in terms of the total reproduction needs and

the total labour capacity. This varied according to: the age and sex of the members of the household; the age of the sons at marriage; and the time when they established separate households. Thus, the difference in total reproduction needs and total labour capacity determined the degree of indebtedness between households and landlord. Moreover, both the amount of and the composition of the ownership of the means of production affected the degree of indebtedness. In sharecropping relations, ownership varied from the mere ownership of available labour to the ownership of 'everything' except the land. Furthermore, the reproduction costs of the household changed with unexpected and/or additional circumstances such as weddings; sicknesses; births and deaths; the loss, repair or replacement of the means of production; the formation of a new household; military service; legal problems; the building of a house or farm buildings; or the extension of certain means of production (e.g. curing implements used in tobacco production). On the other hand, the degree of dependency of new settlers on Kocabaso increased as the size of their households grew. Although the scale of production rose with a growth of the sharecropper household, there would always have been some members unable to contribute their labour productively because they would be young, old, sick, mentally or physically handicapped, at military service or pregnant. However their livelihood had to be provided for by the productive labour of the other household members. This would have created pressure to reduce the household's standard of living or would have enhanced the household's

vulnerability by the landlord, even in normal circumstances. In unexpected situations the degree of the indebtedness would have been greater. Unexpected events did occur and landlords did, from time to time, rely on 'unconventional' practices.⁹ Since a constant amount of labour was not required at different periods in the annual cycle, the total amount of idle labour in the household would be increased as labour capacity increased. Under the given conditions of production it was not possible to use these slack periods productively. The idle labour capacity could be used only in domestic tasks producing consumption goods, repairing tools and machinery, preparing bridal goods and other subsistence goods which subsidised the households' reproduction costs.

With reference to these conditions of reproduction, the main features of the productive structure which had developed by the end of this period are discussed in the following sections by focusing on what was produced, the scale of production and the type of labour required.

3.4. What Was Produced in Gokceagac?

Production in the village consisted of animal husbandry and the cultivation of maize, wheat, barley, oats, flax, hemp and tobacco.

Animal husbandry was small scale and practiced only by the Kocabaso family. The other households owned a pair of oxen and a few cows and water buffaloes to provide animal energy and products for their subsistence food needs. The new settlers acquired animals with loans from Kocabaso.

Kocabaso did not specialise in animal husbandry; he had become a landlord by concentrating on crop cultivation. The number of livestock in the village was small. Most of the pasture and meadow land were unoccupied.

In cereal production, maize was the most important subsistence crop cultivated. Wheat was also cultivated, but the yield was low and depended heavily on weather conditions. Barley and oats were produced as animal fodder. Flax and hemp were produced for cloth. Tobacco was produced on a much smaller scale than both maize and wheat. Since it was not a subsistence crop, it required specific marketing arrangements. In the region, landlords generally acted as 'tobacco merchants' and around Gokceagac, especially the Greek landlords were specialised in this trade. At this time, small-scale tobacco produced was sold for cash to a Greek landlord under the supervision of the Kocabaso family. Tobacco production was extremely labour intensive and labour needs were distributed over a longer period than for the other crops cultivated. But the average amount of land needed was small, that is, the land/labour ratio was low in comparison with other crops. This feature of tobacco production, exerted relatively less pressure on the land. Furthermore, its cultivation required certain extra production elements in addition to those used in cereal cultivation.

3.4.1. The Scale of Production

The scale of production in all crops was small. It was

mainly determined by the following features:

- (a) The village economy was organised to secure subsistence reproduction. This in turn meant mere existence for the producers; relatively 'luxurious' consumption for the landlord; and minimal taxes for the State. Therefore, within the prevailing production relations, the value of the produce was distributed among the peasants, the landlord and the State. Depending on the needs of all three groups and the way in which they controlled and organised the conditions of production, the produce was shared among them.
- (b) Total available labour was limited. The number of households was small and they were composed of only one or two families. This limited the actual size of production.
- (c) Technology in the region was basically composed of the animal energy and wooden tools used in the preparation of the fields, planting and harvesting. The low levels of land and labour productivity limited the scale of production.
- (d) The cultivated land was small compared with the total land in the village. The pastures and meadows were larger than the needs of the available animal stock. This was also true of the forest and woodland. Therefore it was not the availability of land but rather its ownership and control by Erzade and Kocabaso that was the limiting factor in determining the scale of production.

Towards the end of this period it became more difficult for the sharecropper households to rely only on a share of the produce for their reproduction. This made pressures to seek means to till some of the more remote land in the village.

3.4.2. The Forms of Labour Expenditure

The dominant form of labour expenditure at the end of this period was sharecropping. Farm-labouring was diminishing and the family-labour was emerging.

(a) Farm-labouring was a full-time annual job which satisfied all the labour needs of the landlord's farm. The number of farm-labourers dwindled in this period as sharecropping became more productive. The growing number of sharecropping families also supplied the landlord's own labour needs in the form of imece labour.

(b) Sharecropping became dominant. Except for the Erzade family, almost all the villagers were Kocabaso's sharecroppers. All the new settlers in Gokceagac were deeply indebted to Kocabaso for all their productive and reproductive needs. The debts were always brought forward the following year as half their produce was not sufficient for the mere subsistence reproduction. Unexpected needs and extra costs in reproduction were common and these increased debts. Their needs mounted in absolute terms especially as new elements of production and consumption were added to total expenditure and as the size of the households expanded during this 25-year period.

The prevailing sharecropping relations denied the producers ownership and/or possession of small plots of land. This restricted household labour expenditure. Household labour expenditure on small plots of land became essential to subsidise reproduction. Thus, in order to prevent a decline in the amount of surplus appropriated, the

landlord was forced to ease sharecropping conditions to enable them to own/or possess small pieces of land outside the landlord's main domain of interest. The use of family labour on owned and/or occupied land would both augment overall output and diminish the cost of the producers reproduction and so minimise risks in the repayment of debts to the landlord.

(c) Family-labour is productive labour expenditure on land owned and/or possessed. Ownership and/or possession of land was only possible for the households of Erzade, and Kocabaso and, on a small scale, for Memeco and Humo. It was rare for the new settlers to own and/or possess land. The only possibility was to clear-up land for cultivation (in very small plots) in the remote parts of the village. Kocabaso had to give his approval. In addition, it was necessary that the scale of cultivation on such land should not decrease the labour supplied to the landlord.

All households expend in different degrees family-labour on domestic tasks, such as, the preparation of food; the rearing of children; looking after the old, sick and handicapped; the preparation of winter food and animal products; looking after poultry; the repair of tools; making additional tools; extending the house to include other farm buildings such as barns, warehouses and others; cutting wood, etc. Such labour, mainly done by women, had always been a major contribution to the households' reproduction.

At the end of this period, Kocabaso was the landlord of the village. He had amassed large areas of land. He possessed the overall power in the village. He organised the productive activities on his farm and sharecropping

relations on the land he owned/or possessed. At the end of this period, the number of households increased to 13 and the first established ones consisted of more than one family. This provided the basis for further population increase in the following periods. The contradictions which arose from the relations which developed around indebtedness, limited access to ownership of land, and the increases in family size of sharecroppers and extended needs of production and reproduction led to important consequences which had to be resolved in the following period.

The basic structure of the relations of production established by the end of this period (1910), continued into the second half of the fourth period (1926-1945).

In the examination of the next two periods (1911-1945), the focus of emphasis is given on the elements which changed and on those which were newly introduced and integrated into the village structure.

4. The Third Period: A Sharecropping Village (1911-1925)

The village structure was fully established in this period. Sharecropping was the basic form of labour expenditure and family-labour expenditure subsidised the reproduction costs of the household enterprises.

The households sought to use their family labour on very small land. The use of family labour was essential because the prevailing sharecropping relations had limitations: sharecropping on its own was unable to maintain the simple

reproduction (SR) of the peasant households, nor did sharecropping guarantee the landlord's desired level of consumption.

I make the following general assumptions in analysing the form of production in Gokceagac that continued until 1945. Firstly, under constant techniques of production and productivity, an 'average' amount of family labour cultivates an 'average' plot of land. Absolute increases in the ownership of land and labour would add to the volume of output; but vary according to both the type of crop cultivated and the total labour demand. Secondly, with the given productivity level, more value can be created over longer periods of household labour expenditure. Thirdly, the shared produce (the return to household labour) was the only source of reproduction for the sharecropper, its specific level determined by prevailing relations of production. In order to increase the surplus product, the landlord must therefore provide conditions which (a) multiply total output and/or (b) change the weight of the crop combination.

Total output could have been enlarged if more land was sharecropped. Since there was ample land under the landlord's control, the value of the land to the landlord was less than the value of the share of the output appropriated by him.

In terms of crop combination, the landlord had to reallocate the land he controlled in favour of crops that required more labour-time. The landlord was thus under pressure to increase the scale of production of all crops cultivated, especially tobacco. The crucial question

relating to this period is whether this was possible under prevailing sharecropping relations.

In this period, sharecropping remained the basic form of labour expenditure but it varied with the conditions available for the producers to (a) maximise their scale of production; (b) cultivate maize with sharecropping relations and breed a few animals to secure subsistence needs; (c) possess land (even in very small plots) and where possible, produce labour-intensive crops like tobacco on such land; (d) increase the share of cereal cultivation and decrease the share of tobacco cultivation on the sharecropped land; and (e) seek opportunities to enlarge their possession of land, so that they could free themselves from dependent sharecropping relations.

4.1. The Elements of Production

The type and quality of the elements of production and the production techniques adopted remained basically the same and did not significantly change during this period. But the amount of elements of production increased due to expansion in the scale of production. The means of production (excluding land, labour and animals used for their energy) mainly consisted of wood with some iron and leather parts. These included a plough (wooden), ox-carts, yokes, reaping hooks, scythes, hoes, axes, shovels, water barrels (wooden), tobacco planting and curing tools (wooden), the house and storage-places (mainly constructed from wood).

The iron parts of these tools were obtained from the ironmonger in the village and the leather parts were purchased from Bafra market. The construction of houses and farm-buildings required specialised skills, especially carpentry. The latter was also provided from the village. The provision of all these means of production necessitated direct (in case where money was involved) or indirect (payment using household provisions) indebtedness to the landlord.

Animal energy was supplied mostly by oxen, water buffaloes and sometimes by horses. Along with land and labour, these were the main means of production in tilling, planting, harvesting, curing (tobacco) and storage. Initially, the producer usually purchased a pair of oxen with a loan from landlord. Later he bred them.

Since there was a limit to possible indebtedness to the landlord, producers were unable to make decisions about the quality and quantity of the means of production without the consent of the landlord. This gave him control over the use of the means of production. Replacement of any one of them because of depreciation, stealing or conscious destruction (setting the house and farm buildings on fire, killing animals, etc.) meant further indebtedness. The most important element of production was ownership of land. Kocabaso knew this well, so he denied any ownership or possession of land to the producers even on state or communal lands.

The struggle for the possession of land became more acute and is one of the determining features of this period. The denial of land ownership became a contradiction in the

prevailing sharecropping relations and to some extent it gave way to the partial possession of very small plots by the end of the period.

The landlord provided all the necessary conditions for possible extension of the use of land as much as possible so that he could appropriate even larger amounts of surplus product. He organised the allocation of sharecropped land in accordance with the labour capacity of each peasant household. Since there was more land than the total available labour, Kocabaso ensured that no one had the right to use any land outside that for sharecropping. On the other hand, the prevalent organisation of production in the village was supported by the low maintenance of the household members. The level of consumption was kept at the minimum possible level by keeping the amounts absolute and not incorporating new elements into overall consumption.

Most of the reproductive needs of the households such as food, clothing, bedding, cleaning and shelter were largely produced as subsistence goods.

A little poultry was kept for meat and eggs. Tea was obtained from wild flowers. Flax and hemp provided the cloth for bedding and clothing. Sheep's wool was used to fill quilts and pillows. There was virtually no furniture, except a wooden, circular board served as a table top. They used a few copper kitchen utensils. Wooden forks and spoons were bought during weddings and seldom renewed. Producers usually did not resort to cash except to purchase soap for cleaning, kerosene for lighting or carik (a type of hide sandal). The landlord controlled all cash expenditure,

especially for wedding goods.

Food requirements were satisfied by processing maize and milk (mainly cow's milk). Maize was used to make maize soup, corn bread and was mixed into almost every food prepared. Yogurt, ayran and butter were the main by-products of milk. The wheat yield was low so food made with wheat flour such as borek (pastry) and hedik (boiled wheat) was prepared only on special occasions.

4.2. The Labour of the Sharecropper Households

The labour power of the sharecropping families was the main source of their simple reproduction. Given the static productivity of both land and labour, increased labour capacity expanded productive power but also enlarged the households' reproductive costs. The land in Gokceagac was not scarce and the production process was dominated by labour intensive techniques so any increases in labour capacity had the possibility of being used productively. Although the infant mortality rate was high, the family size increased with larger numbers of children. The normal life span did not change, but the adult male population declined drastically due to the wars of the time (the Balkan War, the First World War and the Turkish War of Independence). At a regional level, the confrontation between Greeks and Turks during the Turkish War of Independence negatively affected the male population of the village. These factors also limited the possible immigration to the village during this period.

Villagers told me that the number of households increased

from 13 at the beginning of the period to around 20-25 towards the end. On average, one family from each household separated and established a new household.

The households did not restrict themselves in the size of their families. Early marriage for girls, the women's health in general, the frequency of pregnancy, intervals between pregnancies, miscarriages, primitive birth control techniques and death of the mother during labour were the main factors in the fertility of women.

In terms of the infant and child mortality rate, the most important reason reported was insufficient care of children at an early age. Villagers stated that lack of knowledge, medicine and the season (particularly periods of peak labour-demand) were the factors which increased the infant mortality rate.

The enterprises were organised to maximise their available labour capacity (a) within the prevailing social and technical division of labour and (b) in terms of the marked differences in production of tobacco and cereal crops.

The social division of labour in terms of age and sex within and outside the home was influential on the absolute size, the degree and the possibility of the contribution of child, adult and elderly labour to the total labour requirements of the household.

In addition, the age of household members became more significant when combined with the characteristics of the sexual division of labour: First of all patriarchal divisions were dominant within and outside the home.

Secondly, tasks and duties within the home were the responsibility of the female members and included customary tasks like housework, child-care and rearing, and the preparation of daily and long-term food. They also laboured disproportionately in most tasks performed outside the family. The division of labour among female members of the household was determined by age and marital status. Thirdly, the dangerous tasks which required more physical strength were done by the male members. The monopoly on these tasks was a factor which guaranteed and legitimised their patriarchal interests.

The women's shorter life-span, death in pregnancy and birth; polygamy; lack of divorce; denial of inheritance and legal rights; limited participation in household decisions (in terms of the organisation of production, consumption, marriage, health, etc.); restricted social life (in terms of contacts within the village and virtually no contact outside the village) were among the features of the subordinate role of women in agriculture.

Patrilineal inheritance, ownership of the means of production and the control of the organisation of production helped to create the inequality between men and women.

Gender difference between household members was important in several aspects: the customary inheritance of land was patrilineal; control of the organisation of production was patriarchal and sons were regarded as security for old age. The age of household members was a factor which effected the labour capacity of different age groups: children, adults and the elderly contributed to the economic activities of the households.

Children started contributing to the household economy at around the age of ten (girls started earlier than boys) and they were usually considered to be full adult labourers just before the age of fifteen. Since very few children attended the formal religious schools, they were able to expend their labour throughout the whole annual production cycle. Although elderly members did not participate directly in production, their labour was nevertheless valuable as domestic labour. Old women took part in many areas of domestic labour, especially the raising of children and the preparation of food. Sometimes old men looked after animals.

The marriage of children and the time of separation of married sons were the two most important factors which influenced labour capacity at the household level.

The girls laboured in the parents' household until they married. Their space was usually filled by a daughter-in-law. Marriage of a daughter did not usually necessitate a large expenditure for the father. The practice of bride price was not common, mainly due to the existence of the landlord structure in the village. The marriage of daughters did not therefore result in a shortage of labour capacity in the household.

Married sons tended to stay in their parent's household until their own children reached adulthood. This practice increased both the size of families and the potential number of future households.

4.3. The Impact of War on the Adult Male Population

The adult male population was significantly decreased during the wars in which the Ottoman Empire took part: the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) and the First World War (1914-1918). The villagers said that few of the soldiers ever came back. They also told me that half of those who fought in the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1923) were killed. The remaining population in the village (children, old men and women), became the target of Greek raids during the Turkish War of Independence. These raids lasted between 1920-1923, the resulting aggravation increasing towards the end of this period. It was a time of insecurity for both life and production. Death in wars directly reduced the adult male population of the village. The effects of this loss lasted for about a decade (1912-1922). One generation of the male adult population of the village was virtually wiped out. The implications of this were significant for the structure which evolved in later periods.

4.4. The Relations of Production

There were several important issues which concerned the prevailing conditions of sharecropping relations in the third period of Gokceagac's history. Those which challenged and later in the following period contradicted the survival of sharecropping relations are focused on here.

First of all, almost all the labour used in sharecropping relations was provided by the residents of Gokceagac. The

neighbouring Greek villages were not a labour source as they also sharecropped for their landlords. The likelihood of increasing total output depended on growth in the total adult labour capacity of the village.

When the number of children rose, the size of the households expanded. However, the number of old and handicapped was also growing. The labour capacity therefore did not increase proportionately with gains in the total return to their household labour. This increased indebtedness to the landlord but did not allow equivalent productive labour to be used in sharecropping. This would have decreased the surplus appropriated by the landlord.

On the other hand, the consumption of the landlord's family increased if only because of its growth in size. The members of the landlord's household through contact with different products, changed their understanding of essential and luxurious consumption. Luxurious consumption was not only a status symbol, but it was also used as a symbol of power. The rising of the consumption of the landlord's family created pressure to extend both the level and degree of appropriation. However this contradicted the above-mentioned conditions for increasing the sharecroppers reproductive costs under prevailing static productivity.

The second issue was related to land ownership. As pointed out earlier, the Kocabaso family was the only large scale owner of land in the village. The descendants of the Erzade family and a few of the close descendants of the Kocabaso family owned small amounts of land. The other villagers had none. When Kocabaso died, his wealth was

transferred to his son H. Tombul and hence to his two grandsons M.Aga and Y. Aga. In the first half of this period control was in the hands of H. Tombul (the eldest son of Kocabaso). In the second half it was taken over by M. and Y. Aga, the former was the more influential.

The Kocabaso family's control of village land also covered the use of communal (pastures, meadows, forests and woods) land and idle state land. Access to land was thus only possible through sharecropping for the landlord.

The third issue was related to the crops sharecropped. The first residents of Gokceagac started sharecropping maize and a little wheat. The scale of tobacco production was extremely low and not widely produced.

In the previous period, the need for both a large household size and additional means of production had limited the scale of tobacco production. However, in the second period, the size of the households of the first residents increased and the total labour capacity of the village was increased by the further immigration. The Kocabaso family wanted to use the village's already enlarged labour capacity for tobacco cultivation. They assumed that the tobacco cultivation would raise the total labour expenditure of the sharecropper families simply by its larger labour demand and longer cultivation season. Its exchange would further increase cash return.

On the other hand, since sharecroppers would still continue to produce maize, their cost of reproduction would continue to be sustained by this subsistence maize production. The additional means of production for tobacco cultivation (mainly the preparation of wooden curing tools

which were subsistently prepared with free wood from around the village and the provision of the water necessary for planting) would not create an additional burden for the landlord. The expansion into tobacco production would thus have increased the surplus appropriation by the landlord.

At the beginning of this period, the economic activities of the Kocabaso family were not concentrated on tobacco production. This was not because of reluctance or inexperience. It was mainly due to: (a) the necessity to fully establish sharecropping relations in the village (fully in the sense that organisation of productive activity in the village would secure the SR of the sharecropper families and also would create enough surplus for appropriation by the Kocabaso family); and (b) tobacco's higher labour demand compared to other crops. Finally, around Gokceagac the exchange of tobacco had been monopolised by the Greek landlords and the Kocabaso family was exchanging the village's small produce not directly with the Tobacco Reji,¹⁰ but with Greek landlords in the neighbouring village of Azay.

The fourth issue was the role of overall control and authority exercised in the village. The lack of the State authority over land and civil life enhanced the landlord's power and the sharecroppers' dependence on him. The landlord was able to exercise almost full control over the utilisation of land and agricultural production. In relation to civil life, the State was not a source of security and provided no administrative, health or educational services. The villagers had almost no contact

with the outside world, except for visiting a few relatives on important occasions or going to weddings in neighbouring villages. There were no roads; horse riding or walking were the means of commuting to Bafra town.

The power and authority of the landlord covered almost every aspect of the producers lives. In the economic domain, the landlord: (a) provided land, (b) gave loans for the purchase of the necessary means of production; (c) shared the produce, (d) purchased the producers' share, (e) had full control over the right to use the forest and the woods of the village, (f) ensured that all villagers worked (forced labour-imece) on his farm; and (g) controlled both the nature and level of all expenditure.

In relation to social life the landlord had the final word in almost all disputes; he regulated, arranged and gave consent for marriages.

The exercise of control and authority by the landlord was limited to the conditions of the economic and social structure of the village and to the degree of resistance shown in the acceptance and legitimisation of this power.

The fifth issue concerns differentiation among the villagers. They were not composed of a single homogeneous group of producers. The degree of differentiation was determined by prevailing patterns in the division of labour. These were limited. The technical division of labour was dictated mainly by primitive techniques in the labour process. The social division of labour in the village was limited to the requirements of the different skills used in cultivation and animal husbandry. To give a few examples: skills necessary for constructing houses, carpentry, making

ox-carts, sickles, tying cut straw, bundling tobacco and, later, smithing. Households engaged in these tasks did not lay aside their agricultural activities.

The degree of differentiation between villagers was determined by their power and ability to convert their differing possessions into productive labour expenditure. In one sense, this was a struggle against limitations put on the production process by the landlord and against the prevailing conditions of sharecropping which had differential effects on the sharecropping families.

The specific historical conditions under which production was organised changed according to the above mentioned dynamics, but the basic form of sharecropping relations remained the same during this period: (a) peasant producers did not own or possess land; (b) they shared all produce with the landlord; (c) they sold their share to the landlord if tobacco was produced; (d) the landlord provided the necessary elements of production in kind or in cash, kept each household's accounts separately and balanced their debt by their share of the products that they produced, ensured that each household remained indebted to him at the end of each year; (e) the landlord secured a share of the produce by providing the land and guaranteed the continuation of indebtedness by lending cash or provisions. The only means of paying back debts was through the shares of what produced. This share was basically assumed to provide only the simple reproduction (subsistence reproduction) of the households.

As long as the landlord continued to be the sole agent

organising production, he exercised overall control and authority over social life and production in the village, given the contradictions that existed in the form of production and the conflict between the producers and landlord in their struggle to control the immediate conditions of production.

The whole period was actually a period of struggle for control of the conditions of production and reproduction. The degree of resistance shown by the producers and the pressures exercised by landlords increased as the contradictions and problems specific to the sharecropping relations became increasingly overt and visible in the following period where it became difficult to sustain the sharecropping structure.

5. Fourth Period: The Disintegration of the Landlord Structure and the Emergence of Small Peasant Production (1926-1945)

The Kocabaso family continued to rule the village in this period. Yet changes and the contradictions in the structure of the village persisted and accelerated; the landlord structure disintegrated and small peasant production emerged by the end of the period.

It becomes more significant for this period to understand: Firstly, how the total labour capacity of the households was used; and how it was divided between sharecropping and family-labour in terms of the different crops cultivated. Secondly, how land ownership, the other means of production, the conditions of tobacco, maize, and wheat production, and the productivity of land and labour

changed. And thirdly, how households sustained their subsistence with simple reproduction (SR) which involved both the prevailing relations of production and the mechanisms of surplus appropriation.

The answers to the above central questions are explained by the following changes: (1) The producers owned and/or possessed small amounts of land; the productive capacity, especially the labour capacity, of the producers increased; and labour demand in tobacco cultivation decreased because
11
of changes in piling techniques.

(2) The producers began to produce tobacco more on the land they owned/possessed. This decreased the percentage tobacco sharecropping for the landlord. However, the producers continued to sharecrop maize and wheat for the landlord.

(3) M. Aga, the landlord, divided his lands among his three sons, moved to the town and concentrated his economic activities on the tobacco trade.

(4) The State began providing credit to the producers and purchased their tobacco alongside the small tobacco merchants in Bafra.

(5) The relative size of the surplus appropriation by the three sons of the landlord decreased; but their consumption (especially luxurious consumption) increased. The sons attempted to compensate for it by arbitrary use of their authority and power.

After the adverse effects which the wars of the last period on the adult male population had been stabilised, the villagers enlarged the size of their households by (a)

early marriage; (b) polygamy and (c) maximising of the number of children.

Changes in the technique for piling tobacco saved a considerable amount of labour. This change lessened labour demand and influenced the productive capacity of the households positively allowing them to expand the scale of their tobacco cultivation.

Changes in quality and type of means of production were insignificant. Animals were still the main source of energy. Artificial fertilizers and insecticides were not available. The natural state of the land still determined fertility.

On the other hand, the scale of the means of production was raised because of changes in productive capacity and the opportunities to expend family-labour on possessed land increased. The latter affected both the absolute amount of labour expenditure in labour-intensive tobacco cultivation and labour productivity by intensifying and extending the time of family-labour on possessed land.

All these augmented the scale of production. Ownership of the means of production and especially the possibilities of ownership of land independent of the landlords became a central area of struggle in this period. The producers sought alternative ways to own the means of production beyond dependence on the landlords.

Before the presentation of the fundamental change in land ownership/possession in the village, the major prevailing sources and the limits of surplus appropriation are briefly indicated. This provides a base to explain the significance of changes in the land ownership structure

and reasons for the disintegration of the landlord structure by the end of the period.

5.1. The Sources and the Means of Surplus Appropriation

In order to understand why and how the structure of the village disintegrated the main sources and the limits of appropriation of the surplus product are briefly indicated.

(a) Sharecropping:

The landlord's private ownership of most of the village land was the main reason of sharecropping. The provision of land to the producers in exchange for a share of the produce was the basic source for the subsistence maintenance of both landlord and producer.

(b) Indebtedness:

The landlord was the only person who would provide both the necessary means of production and the means of immediate consumption. The landlord either provided money to purchase necessary commodities or provided goods in kind. This provision covered only the producers' simple reproduction needs. The landlord set and controlled the limits of provision in detail. The producers' indebtedness was not only used to appropriate surplus product. It was also the basic mechanism for bonding the producer to the land and guaranteeing that the peasants would exchange their produce (grains or tobacco) only with the landlord.

(c) Exchange:

The landlord controlled the exchange relations. The terms of the exchange, i.e. the setting of the quality of

tobacco, its price and interest on the loan, were all monopolistically controlled. The landlord, now as a tobacco merchant, was able to control tobacco production through his control of both the sharecropping relations and the cycle of indebtedness.

(d) Forced-labour (imece):

The landlord used the labour of the producers free in imece: Every household in the village contributed to the major stages of production of the landlord's crops free of charge. For maize and wheat, imece was used in land preparation, planting and harvesting. In tobacco production, the villagers prepared the landlord's fields, provided the seedlings, planted them using their own instruments and picked and threaded the leaves. The landlord, during this work provided only food. Since all the households worked together, the imece usually lasted no more than a few days.

This form of appropriation became common and more widely practiced as the scale and profitability of tobacco production increased.

(e) Farm-Labouring:

Another form of appropriation was the limited use of farm-labour in annual tasks on the landlord's demesne.

In addition to these forms of appropriation, the labour of his own household in the form of family-labour both within and outside the home was a significant factor in completing unavoidable domestic tasks and the productive work itself. The landlord's household was quite large because of polygamy; most had at least five wives.

5.2. The Limits of Appropriation

The limits of these forms of appropriation are instructive in understanding the causes and the reasons for the disintegration of the landlord structure.

Firstly, the basic aim of appropriation was to secure subsistence reproduction for the landlord's family; it was not an organisation which aimed to accumulate.

Secondly, there were almost no changes in technology which would have increased overall productivity and so affected the volume of output.

Thirdly, total labour capacity was limited to the productive household members in the village. Increases in total labour expenditure would only be possible by increasing the production of more labour-intensive crops, i.e. tobacco.

Fourthly, the total village land was not exploited to its maximum limits: there was uncultivated land and communal and state land (forest, pasture, meadow, woodland) which could be opened to cultivation.

Fifthly, the producers' capacity to resist the prevailing conditions of appropriation was limited.

5.3. The Disintegration of the Landlord Structure

5.3..1. Land Ownership

The land ownership structure of the village was altered significantly by two major changes: (a) the land of the

Greeks were left vacant after the Turkish War of Independence; and (b) the landlord M. Aga legally divided his lands among his three sons.

(i) The Land Evacuated by the Greeks

At national level, the land evacuated by Greeks was intended to be allocated to Turkish emigrants from Balkan countries with easy terms of possession and purchasing right after a few years of cultivation. However, not all of these land were used in this way. This period coincided with the establishment of the Turkish Republic: the State had minimum control over this land. The villagers were able to cultivate them without restraint for several years. This opportunity for land possession was a turning point in the history of the village. The villagers took possession of the land in varying sizes and obviously a determining factor in this appropriation was their power within the village. The Kocabaso family seized the largest portion of this land.

It was the first time producers had had the chance to possess land to expend the excess family labour in the village. Although the likelihood of land ownership was still curtailed by the power and control of the landlord's household, they managed, possessed and used every opportunity to obtain the legal rights to small pieces (one to two decares at a time) of land.

The following are some of the reasons why the Kocabaso family could not prevent this possession: (a) the Kocabaso family was unable to give an acceptable reason for denying such possession while his family possessed even greater

areas. (b) During the War years, the villagers had experienced the deadly confrontation with the Greek gangs and had seen their landlord did almost nothing to protect their lives and possessions. (c) The landlord family was not in a position to know how the newly established Turkish state would act in terms of the future of this land. (d) The cultivation of the evacuated land by the producers was one solution to the increasing demand for land and the accumulating problems in sharecropping relations.

The possession of land, in small amounts, continued in the uncertain years after the independence of Turkey. Some villagers obtained the rights of Turkish immigrants who did not wish to farm. Others possessed and later purchased land far from the centre of the village which was outside the area of the landlords' interests.

Such changes had many important implications. Labour expenditure in sharecropping decreased in both absolute and relative terms. The landlords' land was sharecropped in increasing ratios for maize and wheat. Family-labour expenditure therefore increased noticeably within the total labour expenditure of the household. It also had drastic effects on the households' reproduction. The villagers were able to appropriate increasingly the products of their own labour but while they continued to sharecrop for the Kocabaso family, the cycle of indebtedness and exchange of crops (i.e. the sale of tobacco) continued.

The landlord foresaw two tendencies arising from this new situation: Firstly land possession would ease the previously developed dependency ties between himself and the villagers because the villagers' repayment capacity would be

extended. Secondly, the total production in the village would increase. However, it would be more difficult for him to appropriate this increase because the dependency tie had become looser and the villagers' consumption had been augmented.

A way out of this conflicting situation was to alter the composition of crop cultivation in such a way as to ensure the cycle of indebtedness and increase the production on the land given over to sharecropping. This meant making radical expansion in the scale of tobacco production. So the landlord gave priority to tobacco production mainly because (a) his household's subsistence food needs could easily be produced by a combination of a few farm-labourers, sharecropping and imece labour; (b) tobacco could be marketed; (c) in tobacco production more peasant labour would be used, and so the surplus would be large.

The monopoly of the Greek landlords as tobacco merchants in the region had ended and the monopoly of the French Reji had been transferred to the Turkish State Monopolies. The gap created by these changes was filled at national level by international companies and at regional level by Turkish tobacco merchants who were at the same time landlords. Kocabaso rapidly became an important landlord in the tobacco trade. His trade was not restricted to Gokceagac, but covered at least half a dozen neighbouring villages. He increased the scale of tobacco production at his own farm and encouraged the Gokceagac villagers to produce tobacco on a larger scale. Tobacco production with sharecropping relations was more profitable for the landlord. The type of

tobacco seed used in this period, the black seed, required specific soil. The landlords used their control over village land to force producers to sharecrop on land suitable for black tobacco seed.

But as land owned and/or possessed by the producers increased, the villagers wanted to maximise their household labour on the new land and decrease sharecropping for the landlords. That is, their first priority was to produce tobacco on the land they possessed and continue sharecropping maize and wheat for the landlord for their subsistence consumption.

In tobacco cultivation, the return to labour was high compared to other crops even though the produce was exchanged with the landlord through a dependency link.

This conflict centered round the form of tobacco cultivation; while the landlord's sons wanted tobacco to be produced on their land by sharecropping, the villagers wanted to produce it on their own land.

On the other hand, M.Aga's power in the village decreased after he legally distributed most of his land to his three sons. Moreover since he specialised in the tobacco trade, he was more concerned with the volume of output than with the above conflict, as long as the tobacco produced was traded with him.

(ii) The Division of Landlord's Land

The division of M.Aga's land between his sons had important implications for the structure of the village. It was not common practice in the landlord structure to divide the land to form separate household enterprises, even after

the death of a landlord. But there were several reasons why he decided to do this: (a) His sons wanted very much to form separate households; so they pushed their father in this direction. (b) The value of the land used or sharecropping was decreasing, because the sharecroppers were gaining opportunities to possess land. Their demand for sharecropping land thus decreased, especially for tobacco cultivation. (c) M. Aga had extended his economic activities beyond sharecropping in Gokceagac. He had become a tobacco merchant; as long as tobacco was produced on the land given to his sons, he would still be able to exercise monopolistic control over the exchange relations; (d) M. Aga owned some land and real estate in Bafra. He had an office for his business in the tobacco trade and lived in the town. He came to the village from time to time usually to collect the tobacco produce after it was baled and ready for sale.

M. Aga's decision to make an early division of his land between his sons was necessary in terms of the family's direct control of the sharecropping relations. What was not customary was to split it into three separate enterprises. This decentralised control and authority in the village and increased the possibility of conflicting decisions being made by his sons and the possibility of the arbitrary exercise of power.

The conflict between the producers and the the landlord's three sons continued. The producers sought every means to maximise their household labour in tobacco production on their land and sharecropped maize and wheat with the three

landlords.

While the total amount of surplus product appropriated through sharecropping relations decreased, the total costs of landlord families increased in both absolute and relative terms: (a) the splitting of the families from M.Aga's household and the formation of separate household enterprises increased costs because of the separate provision of all the necessary means of production; (b) the son's consumption levels were high due their social position as the sons of M.Aga. They wanted to act as landlords.

As surplus appropriation decreased, the sons resorted more to imece labour to increase their tobacco production. Obviously this was limited by the total labour capacity of the village, by the conditions of the villagers' dependence on the landlords and by the nature of the authority exercised in the village.

The villagers' resistance to this type of forced labour increased as the power of the three sons decreased.

The alternatives available to the sons of M. Aga, as landlord's in pursuing different economic activities were limited. The only other economic activity, except sharecropping, was the tobacco trade. That was monopolised in Gokceagac by their father and it was very competitive in the town. They were not strong enough economically to enter this activity.

However, they still considered themselves landlords. They acted like landlords and consumed accordingly, without having the means to secure the necessary funds for such expenditure. This was an important factor in the disintegration of the landlord structure in the village. In

this context, the following examples are illuminating. Each son had at least five wives and wanted even more. It was said that in one instance, one of the landlords broke up an engagement and took the engaged girl. In another instance, a landlord bribed a doctor to tell a married woman that she ought not to have sex with her husband, although there was no medical reason to do so. These endeavours continued and resulted in the murder of a man whose wife attracted the landlord.

The landlords' authority and control became a source of fear for the producers. Some of the means to which these three young landlords resorted could be grouped as follows: (a) the destruction of villagers' property: killing or stealing animal stock; destroying mature tobacco plants; and setting storehouses on fire; (b) threatening their lives: shooting to threaten or even murdering; (c) beating: beating by the gendarme without a real cause which would usually result in bodily harm; (d) confiscation of savings. These show the arbitrary way in which the landlords exercised their authority. Such arbitrariness was manifest in the productive activities: (a) The forced labour, imece was used to extreme limits. (b) In one instance one of the sons hired a dozen reapers. At the end of the work, rather than paying their wages, he beat them arguing that they had not reaped properly. (c) The villagers got almost no access to communal woodland without making some concessions to the landlords. (d) They obtained credit using the names of producers and did not pay them back. The peasants then had to repay loans they did not make.

The peasants' reaction to these arbitrary measures varied from passive resistance to killing. One of the three sons was shot and killed by a villager while playing cards in the coffee shop. Another son, referred to above, who arranged the murder of a man in order to have his wife, went to prison for two years. His father, M. Aga, it is said, immediately after this incident, started to bribe everyone involved in the case: villagers, authorities in the town, even people in the Capital and spent a considerable amount of his wealth to get his son out of prison.

This incident was the final blow to the Kocabaso family before the complete disintegration of the landlord structure: The sons were in some sense 'lost'. One died, the other was imprisoned and the third moved out of the village.

5.3.2. The Involvement of the State

There are two further major factors which provided the conditions for and hastened the disintegration of the landlord structure: (a) the extension of official state credit; and (b) increases in tobacco purchase by the State Tobacco Monopoly.

5.3.3. The State Credits

Agricultural credit from the State had been extended and became available to Gokceagac villagers in the early 1940s. The introduction of this credit dates back to the Ottoman period, but landlords in Gokceagac successfully

prevented the producers having access to them. For several years, the producers had received credit from the State and had given them to M. Aga, who guaranteed them. In return, the villagers could request money from him whenever they needed cash. This was a different form of the continuation of the former indebtedness which was based on sharecropping relations. Even then M. Aga had limited the amount which the producers could request, arguing they would not be able to pay it back.

At a later stage, rather than M. Aga acting as the guarantor, the villagers guaranteed each other but still gave the loan to M. Aga. This application however was short-lived because, the producers had difficulties in repayment and so the guarantor peasant was forced to repay the loan, (which he had given to M. Aga) pay the debt and at the same time give his tobacco to M. Aga without receiving money. This triple burden proved impossible for the producers and they abandoned the practice. Instead, they began to form direct contacts with the Agricultural Bank.

5.3.4. State Purchases

Another change was the entry of the Turkish State Tobacco Monopoly into the tobacco market as an important buyer. Beside the Gokceagac landlords, other merchants also began buying and collecting tobacco. Branches of international tobacco firms began to act as tobacco merchants in addition to the intermediary collectors of tobacco for the large national and international firms.

As the number of purchasers increased, the monopoly of the landlord over the tobacco trade inevitably declined.

The implications of these changes were instructive in discussing the structure of petty commodity tobacco production that subsequently developed in Gokceagac.

The conditions of the disintegration of the landlord structure and the emergence of small holdings are further taken in Chapter Eight where the integration of PCP with the developing commodity relations are discussed.

Footnotes

1. I have attempted a historical account. In this, I have concentrated in economic processes, interpreted in a theoretical framework. On reflection, I have perhaps paid too little attention to small scale politics. First, was related to the organisation of violence in the village. Kocabaso could at any point after his establishment in the village have called on for more able bodied fighters than anyone else; but this advantage would have declined in the later periods. Secondly, Kocabaso would have been the best equipped with contacts in the local towns. This would give him access to police and officials; and to merchants and economic networks. Almost certainly, he exercised a monopoly on village external relations, both economic and political as long as and as far as he could. Internal resistance and urban 'order' would decrease this monopoly over time.
2. Documents and written material about the history of villages are very rare in Turkey and those that are available are mostly not in Latin script.
3. The Balkan Wars that Ottoman Empire engaged in this period took place between 1912 and 1913 and the Turkish War of Independence lasted five years between 1919 and 1923.
4. Aga is the Turkish term for a landlord.
5. Imece is the unpaid cooperated labour expended for all tasks of the farm of the landlord.
6. Keyder (1983a) uses the high land/labour ratio in his historical analysis of the small peasant ownership in Turkish context.
7. Ayran is a drink made by diluting yogurt.
8. For the role of sharecropping in the history of Turkish social formation, see Keyder (1983a, 1983b).
9. Some of these 'unconventional' practices are discussed in the following sections of this Chapter.
10. During the third period (1911-1925) of the history of Gokceagac the tobacco trade at national level was monopolistically controlled by the French Reji.
11. See the second part of Chapter Two for the change in the piling techniques.

CHAPTER 5
THE OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE AND PCP

I argue that the nature, and the tendencies of change and differentiation related to PCP cannot be grasped without analysing the ownership structure of PCP.

With this consideration in mind, in the first part of this chapter I discuss the significance of property relations by focusing on (a) the composition of goods and commodities owned; (b) the means of ownership; and (c) the changes in the ownership structure and its implications for the survival of PCP. In the second and third parts, I present the means of production and the means of life owned and possessed by Gokceagac villagers. Among the means of production, land is discussed in the following Chapter Six and household labour in Chapter Seven.

1. The Significance of Ownership Structure

The PCP'ers are owner producers. They possess an inclusive ownership structure, that is, they own the elements of their simple reproduction (SR). The PCP'ers own and/or possess land, family-household labour, capital in the form of money, house and farm-storage buildings, animals, productive inputs, immediate consumption goods (subsistence goods produced) and commodities. These are the elements of the ownership structure which constitute the elements of production and/or reproduction. A part of this ownership

structure is the elements of production which are composed of the means of labour, the objects of labour, the labour and the means of life.¹

The PCP'ers own 'small' pieces of land, a small house and a storage-shed. They keep a few animals for their subsistence products, and own the agricultural tools and the instruments except the harvester. Most of the households either own or share a tractor. They possess money to purchase productive inputs (as fixed and circulating capital), rent land, hire machinery and seasonal wage-labour, and purchase reproductive commodities. The PCP enterprise 'owns' and controls the labour of the members of the household.

With the exception of the labour of the household members, all elements of production are in the form of commodities. The different forms of hiring and/or renting are part of the commodity ownership.

In the analysis of PCP the way the ownership structure is conceptualised plays a central role. The ownership structure or the property relations serve to explain the material content or the basis of the SR structure of the PCP enterprise; the ways and the means of ownership; and the relations under which the surplus products of the PCP'ers are appropriated.

This general framework when used together with the specific characteristics of PCP gives greater play to the explanatory power of the ownership structure. First of all, and at the risk of being repetitious, PCP is a producing and reproducing enterprise. This basic characteristic of PCP is often omitted or mishandled in analysis. The organisation

of PCP is only possible through an ownership structure; PCP'ers cannot produce or reproduce without such a structure.

The second important issue is related to the commodity and non-commodity characteristics of the elements of the ownership structure. In this issue, two basic features of PCP which in particular resist the commoditisation of the SR structure of PCP are the non-commodity nature of the household labour expenditure and the inheritance of land. While these two non-commodity forms continue, the PCP'ers rent machinery and additional land and hire seasonal wage-labour in commodity forms.

The third issue is related to the circulating or fixed nature of the 'capital' assets owned. It is interesting to note that the non-commodity elements of the ownership structure form the basis of the fixed capital assets of the PCP, such as land, labour and the house, while commodity elements constitute almost all circulating assets of PCP. I argue that this composition harbours both the stability and the disintegration characteristics of PCP. The continuation of the non-commodity forms of ownership is a factor which contributes to the survival of PCP'ers. On the other hand, the circulating elements of ownership (especially the commodities that are consumed on an annual basis) are sources of differentiation and disintegration of PCP, because first, the share of circulating commodities relative to fixed ones is increasing; second, the consumption of the former is unavoidable; and third, capital and the State directly control the prices of these commodities. So the

circulating elements of the ownership structure constitute the weak side of PCP within the developing commodity relations. Since the circulating content of the ownership structure is increasing, PCP becomes more vulnerable to the adverse effects of changes in the commodity relations on an annual basis. Moreover, the expansion of hiring (machinery and labour) and rental (land) enlarge the circulating nature of the ownership structure.

The fourth issue is concerned with the magnitude of owned assets. PCP'ers are under pressure to increase the volume of output of the crops that they produce. Since the overall productivity in Gokceagac has levelled off, the scale of production must be extended in order to increase the volume of output. This necessitates increase in the magnitude of the owned assets, which are mostly provided in circulating rather than in fixed capital forms. The PCP'ers are obliged to rent land and machinery, hire seasonal wage-labour and purchase more of the productive inputs. The growth in the ownership structure is a quantitative extension of the forces of production on an annual basis. Such an ownership structure does not guarantee the continuation of the SR of the PCP for several annual cycles. Any decreases in the return to labour in one annual cycle would endanger the purchase of the extended circulating commodities. If the adverse conditions of return to labour continue for several years, the PCP'ers will be forced to decrease the scale of their production. This would increase the idle labour capacity of household labour and increase the cost of production. Thus, the PCP'ers survival would be endangered and the conditions for disintegration would take root.

The fifth issue is the non-capital-accumulating character of PCP, which restricts what is owned in qualitative and in quantitative terms. It restricts the fixed assets of the ownership structure more than it does the circulating ones. This character of PCP should not suggest that the ownership structure remains constant. Although the subsistence nature of PCP continues, as mentioned above, the elements of the ownership structure must be extended in order to secure SR by increasing the scale of production.

1.2. The Means of Ownership

Inheritance, possession, purchase, and absentee ownership are the basic means of ownership. Elements of ownership are the land, labour, and elements of production and reproduction. Of these, land and labour have special characteristics: land is mainly inherited, while the family is the major source of labour expenditure. They are mostly commodities purchased from the market or produced as subsistence goods. Commodities are also used for production of the latter.

1.2.1. The Land

The ownership of land is central, but its significance should not be exaggerated, because first, the size of holdings required for most labour-intensive crops is small; the amount of land already owned in the village is usually sufficient for the cultivation of these crops, but not for

those which are capital-intensive. The second point is that renting small parcels of land is possible even in the region where small land ownership is dominant.

Most of the land now owned in Gokceagac has been inherited. Even if the size of a particular holding is small, tobacco production is still feasible. Small plots of land, if available, can be purchased by well-off producers. The purchase of land has not been an alternative to inheritance, although after 1945 part of the land of the landlords were purchased by the small peasants.

Inheritance is the basic avenue to land ownership; purchasing is rare, but there is some rental of land. Generally, when the villagers, leave off agricultural production and move to the nearest town of Bafra they do not sell their land or homes. These families still have connections with the village and their land is usually tilled by close relatives. This is one form of absentee possession but there are very few such families in Gokceagac. One other means of possessing land occurs when the married son leaves his father's household to set up his own. In such instances, the father distributes the land among his sons, but usually does not give them title to the land. So until the death of the father, the sons use but do not own the land that they cultivate. Daughters do not inherit land from their fathers. They mostly transfer their legal inheritance rights to their brothers, with almost no compensation. The logic behind this practice is that when daughters marry, their husbands will be inheriting land from their own fathers. It is thus among the male population of the village that land changes hands. This is an important

element of the subordination of women in rural communities,² and, additionally, serves to concentrate economic wealth in the hands of well-off households. The traditional inheritance system, thus serves to regulate and adjust the ownership structure. The sons know the size of holdings that they will inherit as soon as the number of sons in the family is definitely established. With the separation of the married sons from the household, the economic assets of the father's enterprise (except the land) are not divided among the sons; rather, the father tries to provide sons the most vital means of production in accordance with his economic power.

Although the ownership structure expands during the life cycle of the household enterprise, the magnitude of the owned assets declines when a new household is established. The father loses part of his land, house, curing implements and all of the labour of his son's family. Obviously, the consent of the head of the household plays an important role in the composition of the elements of production that will be given to the new family, because the married son does not have any legal right (except the inheritance right on land) over the economic assets of his father's enterprise. The legal owner and the person responsible for all the liabilities of the elements of production is the head of the household.

1.2.2. Labour

The labour of the household members constitutes the basis

of the non-commodity ownership structure. It is important to note, however, that we do not have here individual labourers as in the industrial factory; that is, the expenditure of the labour of the individual household members is possible only within a division of labour in the household.

Household labour and seasonal wage-labour are the two basic forms of labour expended in Gokceagac. The family unit is the source of household labour.

The changes in household labour capacity owing to the maturing of household members are not of great importance for the actual labour expenditure of household enterprises, especially in the long-term life cycles of the enterprises. The child/adult ratio usually stays constant if the married sons remain for several years in their parents' household before establishing a separate household. The labour of PCP is organised on the basis of the family unit. The continuation of families provides a continuous source of labour for the PCP'ers.

The ownership of household labour is not an automatic process. The continuation of this source depends on the conditions of the organisation of production and reproduction of the household members.

On the other hand, ownership of household labour is directly linked to the commodity relations. In this context, household members can no longer reproduce themselves by subsistence goods production alone. Part of the reproductive needs are met through purchasing commodities and the others are produced by the use of commodities. Thus the reproduction of household labour is

highly commoditised.

The remaining elements of production (beside the land and labour) are today no longer produced as subsistence goods; almost all are purchased from the market. Among them, the house (or part of it) may be inherited. The breeding of animals also necessitate the consumption of commodities. On the other hand, the commodity content of services, particularly of those related to health, is increasing. The annual (circulating) nature of commodity ownership is broadening in the SR structure of PCP.

The provision of the elements of production are important at marriage. Most of the durable household goods and clothing are supposed to be prepared before the wedding by the bride's family as part of her trousseau, whereas the bridegroom's family provides a separate house or an annex with a few rooms. Therefore, the married son can leave home if his parent gives him sufficient tobacco land to absorb most of the labour capacity of the family he takes with him. The remaining essential elements of production are expected to be purchased as circulating commodities mainly through annual indebtedness. In case of shortage, wheat may be borrowed from the father or from a close relative. The share of the circulating costs must be calculated with care, because loans for the hiring of machinery, land and seasonal wage-labour might overload the capacity of the newly established household to repay the debts.

1.3. The Alternatives to Ownership: Land, Labour, Machinery

The renting of land and machinery, and the hiring of SWL are alternatives to the ownership of these elements of production. First, since the demand for land is small in labour-intensive cultivation, the need for small parcels of land can be met by renting. Second, the majority of the labour demand is provided by household labour, so the additional labour demand at peak labour-demanding periods is provided through the hiring of seasonal wage-workers. Third, if a tractor is neither owned nor shared, one can be hired. Hence, rental does not replace the prevailing ownership structure, but rather supplements it.

Renting and hiring extend both commoditisation of PCP and cash expenditure. So the enterprises try not to practice them excessively, unless this is unavoidable. But hiring and rental is increasing.

PCP'ers can use large amounts of land with machinery in capital-intensive crop cultivation. In that sense, the demand for land always exists, but the cost of rental and the availability of land limits extensive cultivation.

The option of using absentee land is not a guarantee for PCP, because such land are available for very few households in the village. Besides, land use by sharecropping is no longer an alternative to owner cultivation in Gokceagac.

On the other hand, indebtedness extends the ownership structure, depending on the capacity of households to repay their debts, the duration of the loan and the type of

commodities purchased. In the case of major expenditures, such as building a house, or purchasing a tractor or small piece of land, since long-term borrowing is difficult and its interest rates are high, indebtedness could not be considered as a means of extending the ownership structure. Otherwise, indebtedness is used to satisfy the circulating elements of the ownership structure.

In summary, the inheritance of land, household labour, the renting of land, machinery and seasonal wage-labour, the use of absentee land and the production of subsistence goods all serve to ease the pressures of extending the ownership structure; but in part they increase the commodity consumption of households.

1.4. Changes in the Ownership Structure with Their Implications

The changes in the ownership structure should not be interpreted merely as factors of the organisation of production; they are related to the reproductive sphere as well.

The following changes in ownership structure are of central importance in understanding the nature of PCP.

The commodity structure is changing and broadening its scope: more commodities are produced and consumed either through using new commodities or by substituting for the old subsistence goods; the scale of production is increasing, which forces an enlargement of the ownership structure; renting and hiring are increasing and becoming indispensable elements of the ownership structure; the

decrease in the size of households raises the number of per capita elements owned.

Does the extension of the ownership structure strengthen PCP? If these producers can survive and continue to adapt themselves to the externally determined and developing market relations and the laws of capital, the answer is yes. They will become more competitive as their labour process becomes more commoditised. But, as the ownership structure extends, survival becomes more difficult given the non-accumulating nature of PCP. The land and labour are not concentrated, but the commodity content is increasing. The lack of concentration of land and labour is an obstacle in transforming to capitalist farming. Increases in the scale of production with 'constant' land ownership and the increases in productivity, which is mainly achieved through the use of technical inputs, the integration of seasonal wage-labour and the process of devalorisation (the enterprises decrease their costs by working intensively and for longer hours) are the basic means used to resist the adverse effects of intersectoral prices in addition to freezing and even lowering their standard of living. The increases in scale of production and the reductions in the size of household labour have their limitations. The major tendency is to maximise the use of household labour in labour-intensive crops together with the use agricultural machinery and seasonal wage-labour.

It is important to note that an increase in the extent of ownership does not give PCP'ers the power to use what they own in alternative crop combinations. Moreover, if

overproduction occurs, it can be a major setback.

The conditions which force PCP'ers to produce more in order to secure their simple reproduction serve more the interests of the urban industrial capitalist classes. The extension of the ownership structure in agriculture, which increases the scale of production, does not change the crop network or the overall structure of agriculture in Gokceagac. The position of PCP'ers within the class structure continues to be unorganized. They continue to depend more on the subsidies of the State. The subsidy policies of the State put itself into a mediating and sometimes a conflicting position in its relations with capital and unorganised peasantry. The resistance and protest of the peasantry can not yield results unless they participate directly in politics, pursuing their own interests as an organised group.

In the future, the small structure (land and scale of production) of PCP will continue, unless capital is accumulated and land is concentrated in the producers' hands. Family size will continue to decrease; seasonal wage-labour will be increasingly integrated; PCP'ers will use more commodities and the share of circulating capital will increase; and the scale of production will increase in both absolute and relative terms.

It is difficult to forecast the demographic changes in PCP. One trend that I foresee is on absolute decrease in family sizes. The number of children is decreasing although the number of those born is still higher than the families desire (Household Interviews). In the near future, not the family as a whole, but individual members will seek more

non-enterprise areas of expending their labour. This will become more common among those children who acquire a skill in repair workshops and in small commodity 'industries' in town.

Although household labour is the most significant element of PCP, an uncontrolled increase in the size of households will endanger the stability of PCP, because parallel to the increase in the family size, the cost of reproduction of household members will rise.

The changes in the ownership structure, with all their implications, must be understood in relation to the purpose of PCP. The subsistence nature of PCP is a limitation on the extension of the ownership structure. Although the ownership structure extends, the subsistence nature of PCP continues. The main purpose of owning in PCP is to maintain a subsistence life for the members of the household, who nevertheless still continue to be a significant source of surplus for the non-agricultural classes. It is vital to note that as the ownership structure extends, so does the size of the surplus created, but it is not appropriated by the PCP'ers, because (a) they cannot control the conditions of the realisation of their products; (b) they do not have alternative means of expending their household labour; (c) the labour expended is not in commodity form; (d) they cannot alter their crop combinations; (e) they are confronted with state and capital which are organised economically and politically.

One last point is that the ownership structure of PCP'ers accommodates features of differentiation. The changes in

the ownership structure have dissimilar implications for PCP'ers, in general, the productive capacity of PCP'ers increases, but the limited commoditisation of land and household labour restrict the development of productive forces in terms of commodity ownership. This determines their subordinated class position in their relations with capital and the State.

PCP'ers increase their capacity to produce in order to survive, but they become dependent on the laws of capitalism as they integrate themselves more and more with the capitalist relations.

Both the adaptation of PCP'ers to the extending commodity relations and the conditions of their survival as PCP'ers will persist as long as PCP'ers find the means to expend their household labour in agriculture, under conditions of commoditisation of their means of production and means of life within capitalist commodity relations.

In the following two sections of this chapter, the composition of the means of production and means of life are presented.

2. Means of Production

As a producing and reproducing enterprise, the means of production and the means of life are interrelated with and interdependent on each other in the simple reproduction structure of PCP enterprises.

The means of production are the material factor of the production process, while the labour power is the personal factor. The means of production consist of the objects of

labour and the means of labour.

The objects of labour include raw materials and intermediary products which are not directly consumed by the household members, used in the labour process. And the means of labour are all the products and instruments used to change the objects of labour.

Land and labour are the basic means of production. These are discussed in detail in the following chapters.

The means of production in Gokceagac are presented with particular emphasis on tobacco cultivation. The significance of the means of production is described with reference to the changing characteristics of the organisation of production and their implications for PCP enterprises. This presentation basically includes the composition of means of production, thus it is brief and condensed, because the theoretical issues related to them are taken again and analysed in detail in the following chapters.

2.1. Objects of Labour

The objects of labour used in tobacco production consist of (1) engine and diesel oil, filters and other spare parts for tractors; (2) threading, baling string and canvas for baling; (3) farm fertilizer, soil fertilizer and tobacco fertilizer; (4) chemical sprays; (5) water; (6) electricity and (7) seed.

With the exception of water and tobacco seed all of these objects of labour were not used until a few decades ago.

Some of the above objects replaced those used previously: for instance, diesel oil replaced fodder for oxen and electricity replaced kerosene. The rest are new objects added recently.

The products of the chemical and the petroleum industries (artificial fertilizers, insecticides, diesel and engine oils) along with spare parts for agricultural machinery (basically spare parts related to tractors) are new objects of labour.⁴

At present, with the exception of natural fertilizer, water and tobacco seed, all the objects of labour are commodities. The villagers sometimes even pay for these objects. Water consumption is very important during the growing of seedlings and the planting of tobacco. A small water reservoir was therefore constructed and the villagers pay a small amount of money to fetch water from it. The rearing of animals for subsistence needs usually do not meet the demand for natural fertilizer; so, farm fertilizer is often purchased. If the last year's seed has low quality, seed purchase becomes essential.

Some of the objects (mostly the artificial fertilizers and the insecticide sprays) are provided by the State owned Agricultural Credit Cooperatives. The producers who are members of this cooperative have a quota for those products which are available in the stocks of the cooperatives. The rest are obtained from the Bafra market. Electricity is supplied by the State at subsidy rates to rural areas.

The objects are not only specific to tobacco production, they are also used for other crops cultivated. And almost all of them are indispensable; it is no longer possible to

omit or replace them. The amount consumed depends on technical requirements and economies of scale are not applicable as the scale of production is increased.

The objects are elements of circulating capital; they are consumed in bulk in one annual cycle.

2.2. Means of Labour

All the products and instruments (tools) that are used on the objects of labour in the production process by man-labour are called the means of labour.

They consist of (1) land; (2) tractor and its farm attachments; (3) spray machines; (4) curing implements; (5) planting implements (buckets and sprayheads, water barrels, hoses, digging forks, hoes, and planting tool); (6) the house⁵; and (8) roads.

Not all households own a tractor: sometimes it is shared. Families which have or share a tractor may not have all of its attachments. Some households do not have spray machines or a storing place. The other means of labour are owned by all tobacco producing households.

All these are essential; if they are not owned, producers hire (the tractor and its attachments) or borrow (the spray machines) from relatives and/or friends. Some of them (planting and curing tools) are essential for only tobacco production while others (land, tractor, house) are used for other agricultural activities.

Tobacco curing implements are prepared by the producers and almost all are made of wood. The wood had previously

been obtained 'illegally' at no cost or at a minimum price from the closest state forests. It is no longer possible, so producers purchase it from the market. Wood is also used for the construction of houses and storage places.

Almost all the means of labour are commodities and among them, the tractor and its attachments and the spray machines are new. The means of labour are the elements of fixed capital.

If all the means of production are considered, specifically machinery, the products of chemical industry and electricity are new commodities which have been added to the bundle of means of production of Gokceagac villagers.

The curing implements, although prepared by the producers, require large amounts of money due to the high costs of wood. The hoeing, planting and watering tools are traditionally made of wood and metal parts which do not require a large cash outlay.

Even the natural fertilizer used in seedling growing has in part become a commodity; it is no longer possible to obtain all natural fertilizers through subsistence means; because, on the one hand the scale of tobacco production has increased while on the other the size of animal stocks has decreased. Although its use in seedling growing is indispensable, because of its high cost, producers sometimes cannot use the required amount which decreases both the quantity and the quality of seedling plants.

The SR structure of PCP has not changed but the content of the means of production has changed considerably. They are no longer produced as subsistence goods. The commoditisation of the means of production is one of the

basic changes to which PCP was obliged to adapt itself. Commoditisation is an indicator of the PCP'ers' ability to adapt to changing agricultural technology (mainly the application of agricultural machinery and technical inputs like artificial fertilizers and insecticides). The use of the latter has significantly improved land and labour productivity and influenced the conditions of household labour expenditure.

The commodity content of the means of production has extended the ownership structure in the form of circulating and fixed capital. The productive capacity of PCP'ers has grown and the scale of production in Gokceagac has increased not only in tobacco cultivation but also in wheat and maize. The latter has required the maximisation of household labour and also the use of seasonal wage-labour which has further commoditised the labour process.

All these created the conditions for the State to intervene into the SR structure of PCP with subsidy policies and a direct role in the marketing of agricultural commodities. Furthermore, PCP'ers have integrated more with credit and commodity markets.

The overall impact of extended ownership of the means of production and consequently the productive capacity has continued to provide a subsistence SR to the PCP'ers and funds which could be saved only in a few favorable years have been used primarily for the means of production and for the delayed essential means of life.

3. Means of Life

The means of life consist of all subsistence goods, commodities and services which are essential for the reproduction (maintenance) of the household members.

I have divided the means of life into four major groups:

- (1) immediate consumption goods;
- (2) household durables;
- (3) services; and
- (4) the remaining means of life.

The means of life are important in terms of (a) their subsistence and commodity content, specifically, the commoditisation of the SR structure; (b) the changing nature of the composition of reproductive consumption and its costs; and (c) standards of living in PCP.

3.1. Immediate Consumption Goods

Goods for immediate consumption are made up of goods related to food and immediate (non-durable) household needs.

3.1.1. Food

The food needs of the peasant households are satisfied both by commodities purchased from the market and the actual subsistence goods produced by the household enterprises.

Wheat, maize, milk, poultry, and seasonal fresh vegetables are the main subsistence goods produced by the household enterprises. These goods are processed at home

and most have by-products: cracked wheat, wheat flour, corn flour, corn, home-made macaroni, eggs, poultry meat, home-made bread and buns, desert pastries, home-made starch (made from wheat or corn), tomato paste, marmalades and jams, yogurt and butter.

In addition to these commodities, household enterprises also directly consume food commodities. These commodities are either substitutes for the subsistence goods produced or are different food which are not produced at home.

They can be grouped as dehydrated vegetables, rice, ready made nodles, macaroni and vermicelli, dried fruit, fresh fruit, meat, cooking oil (vegetable and olive oil), margarine, olives, sugar, spices and tea.

Satisfaction of food needs provides maximum possibility for subsistence goods production and home processing. Subsistence goods production enables devalorisation of the value of household labour as it uses not only domestic labour but also productive household labour. It therefore links productive activities with domestic labour expenditure. In both of these activities, commodities purchased from the market are used to produce and process subsistence food goods.

The food needs satisfied by subsistence production is the strongest factor resisting the commoditisation of food needs, because PCP provides opportunities for the use of household labour in both domestic tasks and the production of subsistence goods related to food. Furthermore, the ideology of subsistence maintenance is still strong and subsistence goods production lowers the SR costs of household members. The subsistence food production exists

alongside the enlarged and indispensable use of commodities. On the other hand, direct commodity food consumption depends more on the overall returns for household labour, the prevailing norms of consumption and the level of standard of living.

The content and composition of food commodities purchased from the market vary more than the relatively standard consumption of subsistence food goods. PCP'ers usually decrease, delay or omit the consumption of food commodities under conditions of adverse labour returns. Obviously, such changes in consumption patterns are only possible within the limits of biological necessity and the norms and values of social and cultural life.

3.1.2. Immediate Household Goods

In addition to food, both subsistence goods and commodities in the areas of cooking, heating, lighting and cleaning are used to satisfy the immediate household needs. Except for personal hygiene, all the goods in this group satisfy needs at household level. They are not individual consumption items. They are non-durable household goods which are consumed daily in one annual cycle. The size of the household considerably increases their consumption especially in the areas of cooking and individual cleaning.

The wood used for heating and cooking is a subsistence good. The capacity of village woodland fails to satisfy the wood needs of the villagers because of population increases and decreases in the supply of the woodland. So

electricity and bottled gas are used as substitute commodities for wood.

Electricity is a state provided and subsidized commodity used for lighting and rarely for cooking. It has replaced all kinds of kerosene lamps. The installation of electricity made possible the use of electrical appliances which have increased the consumption of electricity.

The various goods used for washing up, individual and house cleaning are all commodities. Each household consumes at least a minimum amount of cleaning commodities. Among them soap and detergents are basic; the rest are secondary. The consumption of these commodities has the potential to increase in the future. Cleaning norms are influenced by religious ideas. Daily water consumption is obtained either from wells in the village or from the village water reservoir.

3.2. Household Durable Goods

Household durables are the second major group which comprise the means of life. They can be divided into six groups: bedding; clothing; kitchen utensils; furniture; electrical appliances; and other durables. Carpets, rugs, oil-cloth and wood as floor coverings; the installation of electricity; wood stoves; and sewing machine are some of the items in this latter group.

The quality, composition and time of purchase of durables depend on (a) the economic position of the families (i.e., availability of saved funds for this purpose); (b) the interpretation of what is essential; (c) the influence of

the commodity market and the mass media; (d) the time and the number of potential weddings (e) the time of establishment of new households for married sons; and (f) the conditions for credit purchasing.

Almost all household durables are potential wedding goods. The common understanding is that at marriage, since a separate family is established, its basic needs must be met for the success of the marriage and the continuation of the enterprise. This understanding is appropriate to the simple reproduction character of PCP, because PCP'ers have few chances of saving funds for future expenditure. Commodities purchased for weddings constitute an important guarantee and contribute to the stability of PCP.

The time of marriage does not always correspond to the time of establishment of a separate household. In other words, not all families form a separate household at marriage. The time it takes to prepare the household durable goods is often used as an excuse for delaying the separation of a household. The young couple use the parents' household durables when they live together and their own durables are bought and acquired in due course before their departure. Sometimes this is used by the head of the household to increase control over his son's family and so delay their departure time in order to use their labour. Bedding, clothing and some kitchen utensils are essential family durables and must be provided immediately after marriage. This situation can therefore apply to other durables such as furniture and the electrical appliances which will be needed when a separate household is

established. The composition of durables purchased at marriage, assuming that the family's economic position does not permit the purchase of all of them, depends on the time of departure and the requests made by the bride's father before the wedding.

Kitchen utensils, clothing and bedding goods constitute the household durables which may be labelled as essential wedding durables.

3.2.1. Bedding Durables

The bedding goods are basically comprised of mattresses, quilts, quilt covers, pillows (for sleeping and sitting) and pillow covers, sheets and pillow cases; and sometimes, blankets and a sofa (usually made of wood or metal).

Except for the blankets and the sofa, bedding goods are prepared at home using cloth and fillings (wool and/or cotton) as commodities. A wooden stable sofa would be made at home. But a metal sofa, blanket and all the inputs of the bedding goods are commodities. These are prepared as wedding goods.

Bedding goods are essential regardless of the time of departure from the parental home and are prepared not only for the husband and wife but for the needs of a family of at least 4 or 5. Possible increases in the size of the family are taken into account (not to mention potential visitors) and very seldom are new bedding sets prepared until the next wedding in the family. Until very recently, seasonal wage-labourers were used to stay with the households and when bedding sets were being prepared this

situation had to be taken into account. However, they no longer stay in the village.

Although sleeping is a private matter, the quality of bedding goods is also an indication of status, because all wedding goods including the bedding goods, which are embroidered by the bride, are shown to the village community. Moreover, on special occasions, such as during sickness, child-birth and circumcision ceremonies, the bedding sets show the family's status.

Bedding goods are not specially prepared for children. They use adult sizes. Few sleeping goods are prepared for infants and they are made at home.

Usually all the children sleep in the same bed using the same quilt until they reach puberty. After puberty all the girls sleep together in one place and all the boys in another. These practices allow maximum use of bedding sets.

Insufficiencies in bedding sets occur as children reach their marriage ages. But after weddings, an excess capacity occurs.

Bedding goods are durables in the sense that once they are prepared for weddings, the enterprises very rarely make any outlay on the necessary materials until another wedding in the household approaches. The inputs used in bedding goods have been changing recently: the fillings of beds and mattresses are changing from wool to cotton. Even sponge beds are being purchased and synthetic quilts are available. The quilts are usually covered by sheets; but recently quilt-covers have come into use. Status, comfort and price are the factors which change the consumption norms in

bedding.

The floor-mattres habit, as opposed to using bedsteads, is more practical. Floor-mattresses are movable; they can be folded: several of them can be stored in the corner of a room and this then allows a multi-functional use of the room.

3.2.2. Clothing Durables

6

Clothing forms the second group of household durables. The nature, changing aspects and implications of clothing in relation to the SR structure of PCP is closely related both to the economic organisation of the peasant enterprises and to their social and cultural relations.

The subsistence nature of PCP'ers; the nature of commoditisation; the development of markets; the form and the purpose of satisfaction of the means of life; the norms of consumption: and its share in the total cash expenditure are all factors which influence PCP'ers' consumption of clothing.

The basic elements of clothing are shoes, socks, shirts, jackets, trousers, dresses, overcoats, children's and baby clothes, accessories, underwear and some embroidered items. Clothing goods differ in terms of weather conditions, age and the sex of household members, and quality and the quantity consumed. The commodity content of clothing is rapidly increasing while subsistence aspect of clothing has decreased significantly. Before the 1930s, the traditional peasant shoe, the hide-sandal, was the only clothing commodity item purchased from the market. Basic fabrics

(cloth) were woven in the village and most clothing needs were met from this cloth. Winter socks and pullovers were knitted from subsistence wool.

Subsistence production in clothing is now reduced to the preparation of embroidered items; the mending of old clothes; the knitting of woolen socks and pullovers; the preparation of simple infant clothing; the preparation of some bedding materials, usually covers; and the sewing of some dresses and blouses for women. Current subsistence production satisfies only a small part of the clothing needs and, except for the labour involved, all other clothing inputs are commoditised.

The meeting of most of the clothing needs at weddings used to subsidise the reproductive costs of household enterprises by minimising annual expenditure on clothing. This was even more important when a married son established a separate household.

Clothing goods prepared at weddings were made specifically to meet the needs of the husband, wife and soon expected baby; but not necessarily for school-age children. Some of the clothes of small children were made at home, especially for girls. Children often use hand-down clothes or the old clothes of older family members were altered to children sizes. Although these measures are still practiced, clothing prepared at weddings no longer satisfy the needs of household members for the whole life span of their household.

Although the basic and the immediate clothing needs are purchased for weddings, it is no longer possible to purchase

all of them. The rest are purchased whenever the need occurs. There are important reasons for this change. First, the consumption in clothing has increased in absolute and relative terms. Second, the commodity share in clothing has increased significantly.

Clothing is no longer considered a simple basic need. The household members' demand for clothing has increased beyond basic traditional needs. Specialisation in clothing according to age, sex, weather conditions, social and formal activities; the development of the clothing industry in terms of quality, style and colour; direct contact with the outside world (mainly with the town of Bafra); and the indirect impact of television programmes have significantly changed values and norms about clothing. The role of clothing as a symbol of status and a form of expression in formal and informal social relations has increased.

In cities, although there are significant differences between the clothing of the working class and the middle class, the separation of the work-place from home and the diversification of social life outside the home in urban industrial life determine the basic patterns of clothing in terms of type, quality and style. Contrary to this, the work-place and the home are not separated in this way in villages; the working conditions and social life outside the home differ considerably from urban-life.

Such differences have significant implications for (a) the PCP'ers' conceptualisation of what is essential and basic in clothing; (b) the degree of specialisation in the clothing industry for rural customers; and (c) the peasants' understanding of cleaning. Since the specialisations of the

clothing industry in terms of colour, wearing-time, washing, drying and ironing qualities is directed more towards urban-industrial norms of consumption, the peasants are influenced by urban values and norms. Although rural working conditions differ considerably from those prevalent in towns, rural consumption patterns are highly influenced by urban clothing norms.

In addition, the clothing industry's exploitation of sexuality in general and gender differences in particular increases the amount of clothing consumed by peasants. Increased contact with the outside world, reaching adulthood and being married are factors which reinforce the significance of clothing as a symbol of status. Even personal and private aspects of clothing such as underwear are influenced by changing consumption norms; at least by the traditional display of personal clothing at weddings as part of the 'embroidered work' are used by the clothing industry.

The characteristics of clothing and ideas about cleanliness are closely related and are influenced by religious ideas, working and weather conditions, and the frequency of bathing and washing clothes.

Clothing norms are changing from dark to light colours; from heavy to light wear; and from traditional and essential clothes to modern designs invested with status. Previously the peasants did not keep separate clothes but wore the most clean clothing available for special social and cultural occasions. This is changing and they now try to keep separate clothing to wear for important social events.

All these changes in the clothing consumption have increased the link between household enterprises and the commodity market. This, in turn, has reduced the amount of subsistence clothing and at the same time increased commodity purchases, and so the cost of reproduction has significantly increased.

On the other hand, the impossibility of supplying all clothing needs at weddings decreases the stability of the SR of PCP'ers to the degree additional expenditures are made on clothing in each annual cycle. Once the previously existing norms of clothing have been eradicated, the clothing industry has influentially integrated PCP'ers into its market.

Since subsistence clothing has decreased and the alternative means of satisfying the increased demand are not comprehensive (i.e. multi-generational use is limited and a second-hand clothes market is not developed) increased demand in clothing has been controlled and curtailed in the expense of decreasing their standard of living.

3.2.3. Kitchen-Utensil Durables

Kitchen-utensils are the third group of household durables and include pots, pans, crockery, cutlery, glassware, cookers (including bottled-gas, bread-iron plate, oven) and tea-pots.

The pattern of PCP'ers eating habits, the material content of cooking utensils, the means of washing-up and the means of storing food have changed considerably.

The material content has changed from sand, wood, and

copper to aluminum, steel, plastic and glass. The energy used in cooking has changed from wood to bottled-gas and electricity. Instead of eating from the same dish and using a circular wooden-top as a floor-table, some households now use dining tables and separate plates for each individual. They now use washing-up detergents instead of washing the dishes with fine sand. The use of refrigerators has increased and so has changed food storage patterns.

These changes have linked PCP'ers more to the capitalist market. The daily maintenance of household members shows increasing similarity to the reproductive norms of urban-industrial workers. These changes not only increase the quality, the quantity and the variety of consumption of market commodities but also paves the way for further increases in the purchase of commodities.

3.2.4. Furniture

Furniture basically serves the needs of sitting, sleeping, eating and storage. Considerable number of households do not have living room furniture suites. And those who have them, rarely use these sets. Cushions, floor-beds, a circular wood-top, a wedding chest, a few chairs and a small wardrobe satisfy all the furniture needs of most households.

Sleeping materials are kept in the corner of the room covered with a cloth; embroidered goods, new and infrequently used clothing are kept in the wedding chest; daily used clothes are hung on the backs of doors or on the

walls.

The floors of the rooms are made of wood. Usually the bed-room floors are covered with oil-cloth, rugs or carpets.

A large circular piece of wood is used as a table top for eating on the floor. Since it can be moved, it has the practical advantages that it allows economic use of space during and after meals and is more suitable for the habit of eating from the same dish.

3.2.5. Electrical Appliances

Almost all households want to purchase television sets, fridges, washing machines, small cookers and cassette players as soon as they can save the necessary money. All these commodities are novel for PCP'ers and some replace previous needs. Radios, electric irons and vacuum cleaners are of secondary importance.

Since electricity is only newly installed in the village, there is no fixed tradition of purchasing these appliances as wedding presents. It is certain however that some of them will be demanded and it will considerably increase the wedding costs.

The use of these appliances will have a comprehensive influence on prevailing consumption norms. The complementary aspect of the consumption of these appliances requires the consumption of other commodities: For example, cassette players necessitate cassette tapes and washing machines need special washing powder. The use of washing machines will change not only the type of clothing but also the values relating to cleaning. The use of fridge will

influence food consumption and eating norms. It could also increase the subsistence food production; add new food goods that were not continuously consumed due to the decay of some foods; and it could also save labour.

These appliances are expensive items; in addition, they depreciate and need servicing and repair. The electrical goods market is one of the most dynamic commodity markets. The reproductive structure of PCP'ers will be influenced extensively by the way in which they integrate into this market.

3.2.6. Other Household Durables

Sewing machines, wood stoves, the installment of electricity, floor coverings (oil cloths, rugs, carpets) and household accessories (wall-clocks, mirrors, lamps, etc.) are some of the other household durables.

A sewing machine is usually purchased by the bridegroom's father as a wedding present. It is widely used for mending clothes, preparing infant's and children's clothes and wedding goods. It is used for tailoring some adult female clothes. It is also an element of status and an item used in the socialisation of girls into their gender roles.

A wood stove is used for heating and cooking and consumes subsistence wood. In addition, in most households, bottled-gas and small electrical ovens are used for cooking. Dung is also used as fuel.

The installation of electricity has made possible the use of a wide range of electrical appliances. It is used in

both the productive and the reproductive activities of the enterprises.

The floors are usually made of wood. Coverings such as oil-cloth, rugs and carpets are mostly used in the sleeping-rooms. Oil-cloth is very useful as it can easily be cleaned and is essential for the room where tobacco threading is done. Rugs and especially carpets are status elements and are often hung on the walls. They are not woven in the village.

3.3. Services

The household members are increasingly making payments to the medical, educational, administrative, legal and recreational services as part of their means of life. Among these, the most important are medical services.

3.3.1. Medical Services

The changes in the medical services and the way household members use them influence the conditions of their reproduction. Medical services, at national level, have developed and become specialised in the last few decades.⁸ These services are more available and widespread in cities and towns than in villages.

The villagers' understanding and attitudes towards medical services and the use of medicine have changed positively. Although they are still under the influence of traditional religious and cultural values and social practices, they accept the benefits of these services and

seek medical treatment. However, PCP'ers cannot afford available services because they are not covered by medical insurance.⁹ Most of PCP'ers therefore resort to private medicine only if it is 'unavoidable'. They consequently spend large amounts of money.

In PCP, the labour of the household members is the main source of their survival. The health of any member of the household is central to the enterprise. The death of a member is a significant loss of labour capacity and a considerable cost of reproduction for the enterprise. Moreover, the tendency towards decreasing household-sizes increased the value of the labour of the individual members. Basic medical treatment has become crucially essential for PCP'ers' survival. Household members have therefore started to take more health precautions; they seek more often early medical care and diagnosis in order to reduce later costs and possible risks to life.

Although women contribute to both the productive and reproductive tasks of the enterprise more than men, the advantages of the limited use of medical services are unequally distributed within the household. Women work within an organisation of production and division of labour dominated by patriarchal ideology. When a woman's labour capacity declines in old age, her survival depends on male members of the family (her husband and her sons). In contrast, her husband even in old age, still controls and owns enough economic wealth to secure his own reproduction. These differences are clearly reflected in the nature and the degree to which female members benefit from medical

services.

The value attached to individual members, disregarding sexual and patriarchal differences, correspond to their labouring capacities. On the other hand, while the value attached to each individual peasant labourer is increasing, still peasants seek every possible means to avoid medical expenses. Traditional, cultural and religious ideas are proposed and financial reasons are given for delaying care and treatment. Such rationalisation is also reinforced by neglect of health precautions.

Usually, traditional, informal and religious methods are tried before resorting to formal private medical care. Since the material returns to medical care are not always direct and observable, use of medicine (except perhaps in surgery) is low. Medical services thus are not always used in every small case of illness.

The religious interpretation of ideas about life and death, women and children all influence the patterns of use of medical services. Pregnancy, birth, carelessness, accidents, nutrition, water supply, and excessive work in peak labour demanding periods are among the causes of illness in Gokceagac.

Since most of the serious medical needs arise through unexpected events and producers usually have not saved funds specifically for this purpose, usually the required money is obtained by borrowing.

Despite these adverse conditions and interpretations of producers the use of medical services is increasing. They are increasingly taking up bigger shares of the total expenditure of household enterprises.

3.3.2. Educational Services

Although primary school education has been compulsory by law for five decades, only very recently did all village children start to attend. Primary school expenses are few but not small; especially, if more than one child from the family attends school. The most important expenses are stationary, books and pinafores. All households have to meet these expenses regardless of their economic position. Tuition is free; institutional expenses (teachers' salaries, equipment, maintenance of buildings and other necessary durable goods) are paid for by the State. Often villagers contribute their labour to the construction and extension of school buildings. Fewer students attend the secondary schools. As there is no secondary school in the village, they have to go to neighbouring villages or to the town of Bafra. Usually, two or three pupils rent a flat in Bafra and one relative stays with them. These students come to the village at weekends and during vacations. The families of these students have positive ideas about the material and social benefits of institutional education and, more importantly, they can usually afford the related costs. Some of the families in Gokceagac prefer their children to be trained as apprentices in repair workshops in the town rather than send them to secondary school. Secondary school degrees are regarded as something of a status symbol especially for the daughters of the better-off families, but even so very few girls have secondary school diplomas.

3.3.3. Administrative Services

The administrative unit at village level is composed of the Headman and the Council of Village Elders. They are responsible from the administration of the village. Other personal administrative issues are privately dealt with by individual peasants in town. These issues are usually related to vehicle licensing office; the population office; the military recruiting office; the land registry office; various credit institutions; the post office; and the secondary school. As relations with the market and town life increase so too do administrative issues increase and intensify.

3.3.4. Legal Services

Legal cases and issues stem mainly from land disputes, conflicts with the State Tobacco Monopoly and individual problems such as quarreling, stealing and fire. Peasants seek their rights through court cases only as a last resort, because they believe that the people they will confront are usually more powerful (the State or rich local worthies), and therefore there is little point in confronting them and spending large amounts of money on lawyers' fees. Moreover they have no formal organisation to defend their rights as villagers or to provide free or subsidised legal services.

These considerations guide and influence their behaviour in not seeking legal solutions so long as the problem is not critical or unavoidable.

3.3.5. Recreational Services

The recreational and vacation expenditure of PCP'ers is small. Traveling on vacation is not common. Any travel costs are usually related to other occasions: seeking medical services in Bafra or in other big cities; seeking or applying for a non-agricultural job; or pursuing an administrative or legal issue.

Sometimes villagers go to the seaside on their tractors which is a few kilometers from the village. Very few go to other villages or towns for personal recreational reasons. The most common recreational activities outside the village are the participation in the wedding ceremonies of relatives and daily visits to Bafra.

3.3.6. Communal Village Services

Communal village needs are provided mainly by the State and the villagers often contribute their labour and their tractors in the construction of public works in order to speed up such activity. The construction of: public buildings (school, mosque, health centre); the water reservoir, and internal village roads; the installation of electricity; and the protection of communal village lands and estates form the basic communal issues related to the village.

The cash expenditure for constructing, extending and maintaining the village's communal facilities is small, as it is usually covered by the State. Also, the salaries of

the school teachers, the clerical official and the village guard are paid by the State. In cases where necessary appointments are delayed, villagers privately pay people who undertake these tasks in the village until someone else is appointed by the State.

Public services are not equally used or of equal benefit, so some households do not want to share the costs equally, particularly the services that involve cash expenditure.

One last point is the fact that the political affiliation of the village influences the priority given to the provision of public services.

3.4. The Other Expenditures

Interest on loans; specific tax payments; the cost of wedding ceremonies and the payment of the bride price; support for sons during their two years of compulsory military service; and the hoarding of gold are the other important main areas of cash expenditure. Some of these are made on an annual basis, the others when they are due.

Footnotes

1. Among the means of life, I included the immediate consumption or reproductive goods and commodities.
2. The subordination of women due to the non-inheritance of land is a common theme discussed in most writings on Turkish agriculture. See Ozbay (1984) and Balaman (1984).
3. Here I assume that the age intervals between children are small and that their sex ratio approximates one. For the conditions under which married sons separate from their parents' households, see Berkes (1942) and Stirling (1965).
4. The objects of labour related to tractors are relevant for those households who either own or share a tractor.
5. House is considered as a means of production as long as it is partially used in certain phases of the production process.
6. Clothing considered as a durable good because a large amount of clothing, especially for women, is purchased at the wedding and it is worn for several years. The wearing time is extended by frequent mending.
7. Living room furniture comprises two to four arm-chairs, a sofa, a sideboard and side tables.
8. Although there are very few studies on the conditions of health in agriculture, Baykaner (1961) and Konak (1977) indicate some features about the health services in agriculture.
9. Very recently, a pilot social insurance programme is initiated in ten provinces that specifically covers agricultural labourers.

CHAPTER 6
LAND AND PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION

1. Introduction

The significance of land in the conditions of Gokceagac village is discussed in two parts: the first part deals with the land ownership structure while the second part deals with the pattern of land use.

In the first part, emphasis is given to the distribution of the absolute size of land owned and the means of land ownership. The second part, deals with the prevailing types of agricultural holding and the production of different crops cultivated in Gokceagac.

In this section, production in Gokceagac is presented in terms of the scale of production and its volume of output.

1.1. Land and Household Labour

The maximisation of household labour expenditure in PCP is the central factor in the relationship between land and household labour.

Firstly; all forms of land use provide conditions for household members to expend their labour. They select crop combinations which absorb most of the household labour capacity.

Secondly: in labour-intensive crop cultivations, such as tobacco production, maximisation of household labour

expenditure is possible with small units of land.

Thirdly; expansion in labour productivity increases the demand for land, even in labour-intensive crops, and thus saved labour, increases household labour capacity.

Fourthly, the absolute increases in household labour capacity increase the demand for land.

Finally; increases in land productivity, when constant output levels are achieved, decrease the demand for land.

1.2. Land as an Element of Nature

Land, as an element of nature, possesses certain characteristics which influence not only the ownership structure, but also the labour process.

Firstly; the quality of land differs from one place to another and the location of land is an important factor in the returns for labour. Secondly; the productivity of land is highly influenced by weather conditions. Thirdly, crop combination is influenced by the natural properties of land. Fourthly, it is possible to increase the productivity of land by using external elements, such as, technical knowledge, and natural and artificial fertilizers. Fifthly, the possibility of reclaiming cultivable land (from forests, meadows and so on) no longer exist for Gokceagac villagers. Sixthly; land cannot be recreated; so, there exists a monopoly on land for those who already own and control the land.

Ownership of land gives private monopoly rights on the 'limited' and non-reproducible means of production: namely land. This ownership gives the PCP'ers a monopoly right

over the land which they own. However, such ownership does not result in absolute rent, because of the non-accumulating nature of PCP. In fact, the capitalist farmer pays rent to the landowner for the right to use land.

Widespread small land ownership is a factor which hinders the development of capitalist renting.

As there are differences in the fertility and location of land of PCP'ers, differences are also inevitable in their expenditure of labour and resources. PCP'ers sell part of their produce on the market at a single price so that a surplus is formed in the price of produce from the richest and better-situated holdings, in comparison with the poorest ones. This part of the price constitutes a differential rent for those who work under more favourable natural and transportation conditions. But it is difficult for PCP'ers to realise and appropriate differential rent. Because their expenditure of labour and resources are higher on the poorest land worked by big capitalist farmers. The small peasant, moreover, is compelled to sell his produce at extremely low prices to merchants and the agents of monopolies. Absolute rent does not exist for small peasant holdings. Owning a small patch of land, PCP'ers try to maximise their household labour to provide their family with a meagre existence. On the other hand, for the PCP'ers, the price paid for renting land is a significant cost that is included in the subsistence reproduction of the enterprises. And this cost is not directly reflected in the price of the agricultural products marketed by PCP'ers.

If part of the land owned by PCP'ers is given to rent,

then price received is a revenue for the peasant enterprise. But the simple reproduction (SR) structure and the survival of PCP enterprises are not based on such rental revenues.

1.3. Land and Conditions of Extention of Production

The extent of land ownership and the total amount of land-use are closely related to the different types of crops cultivated by the PCP'ers.

The cultivation of labour-intensive crops creates more expenditure of the household labour on small areas of land. So the producers in Gokceagac, first maximise their labour expenditure by allocating their land to the production of tobacco and then use their remaining land in the cultivation of capital-intensive crops, such as wheat, maize and sunflower. And if they possess the necessary household labour, they rent any land available to them to extend the cultivation of capital-intensive crops.

This pattern of land use is maintained when the scale of production is increased, in other words, the scale of tobacco production on the owned land is extended and the scale of capital-intensive crops on rented land is increased. This pattern of land use with the given crop combination influences the decisions of the PCP'ers in relation to the purchase and renting of land. The pressure to purchase land for tobacco cultivation is high and the pressure to renting land for capital-intensive crops is higher still.

1.4. Land and Volume of Output

I argue that PCP'ers survive if they can increase the volume of their agricultural output without distorting the maximisation of their household labour expenditure. Given the conditions prevailing in Gokceagac, this is achieved mainly by increases in scale of production. Relative increases in productivity is no longer possible. Land and labour productivity increases have levelled off because most enterprises use technical inputs and agricultural machinery; and the mechanisation of the labour process in tobacco cultivation has reached its present limits, because of the level of technology at national level. Increases in the scale of tobacco cultivation are made possible through hiring seasonal wage-labour and extending the cultivation of capital-intensive crops by renting land.

This is supported under conditions where deliberate decreases take place in the family sizes in the long-run life-span of the enterprises. That is to say, with smaller households, lower scales of production would have lower SR costs. The amount of idle labour will be low because of the maximisation of decreased household labour capacity in labour intensive crops and also because the demand for land will be low. Even so, under these conditions annual costs due to the increased commoditisation of the reproduction of the household members would be difficult to curtail.

In this analysis, it is assumed, that (1) enterprises are able to use the available technical inputs and agricultural machinery (mainly harvesters and tractors); (2) at any level

of production the magnitude of the idle labour is not so large as to jeopardise the SR of the enterprises; and (3) small areas of land are available for cultivation in addition to land which is actually owned.

If the enterprises were to face severe shortcomings in these issues, increases in the volume of output and the scale of production would be limited.

The volume of output in Gokceagac, irrespective of the crops cultivated, is increased by changes in productivity and the scale of cultivation.

Increases in the productivity of land has a direct positive effect on the volume of output. On the other hand, increases in labour productivity indirectly increase the volume of output if saved labour is used to extend the scale of production. And, at constant productivity, increases in the volume of output is only possible by extending the scale of production.

This interdependence varies significantly with different crops. A unit of increase in the scale of production in labour intensive crops (that is, tobacco) creates a greater capacity for household labour expenditure than in capital-intensive crops. Therefore, the demand for land is less when tobacco cultivation is extended when capital-intensive production is extended. In the history of Gokceagac, after the 1940s, increase of total agricultural output was achieved, firstly by increases in the land and labour productivity for all crops cultivated; and secondly, by absolute increases in the household labour capacity. These increases, increased the per capita output and the latter

was further increased by increases in the scale of production.

Increases in the scale of tobacco production were usually limited by the amount of land owned by the enterprises. And increases in the scale of capital-intensive cultivation are made through renting rather than through sharecropping if the land owned is insufficient.

This pattern is adhered to when married sons separate from their father's household to establish a new enterprise. But, such division of land among the sons (at least two) creates pressure to increase the scale of tobacco production in newly established enterprises in order to maximise household labour and creates further pressure to rent land for capital-intensive cultivation, given the constant size of land owned by the father.

Because increases in land and labour productivity has levelled off, it is important to understand that in the current organisation of production it is no longer possible to increase levels of output through changes in productivity. Therefore, in order to increase the level of output, (a) the absolute scale of production must be increased; or (b) the shares of labour-intensive crops have to be increased.

The first alternative increases the demand for land; and the second has limitations, because the maximisation of household labour expenditure depends upon 'average' tobacco cultivation. Further increases in tobacco cultivation would undermine the petty commodity nature of such enterprises by creating idle labour in the non-peak labour-demanding phases of tobacco production.

In this analysis, the decisions taken by the enterprises are guided by the primary aim of maximising household labour expenditure. The use of seasonal wage-labour is one of the most important dynamic factors which allow increases in the scale of tobacco production without distorting the basic element of PCP: that is to say, maximisation of household labour expenditure without the creation of unbearable idle labour in the annual cycle of agricultural production.

2. The Land Ownership Structure

The distribution of all the available land (both inside and outside the village) and also the way in which that land is divided is dealt with in the first part of this section. This part aims to present the current land ownership structure, while the second to discuss the means adopted in the ownership and possession of land in Gokceagac mainly by indicating inheritance patterns and prevailing conditions in the commoditisation of land.

The distribution of land at present, the means used in the past and the means available now define the changes in the land ownership structure in Gokceagac.

2.1. Distribution of the Land Owned

In this part, firstly, the total distribution of land owned by the households is given. Then the distribution of land owned within and outside the village are compared both

with each other and also in terms of the total land owned. Secondly, the parcellisation of land both within and outside the village is described.

The individual amounts of land owned range from 4 to 185 decares. The distribution of these lands in the below Table 6.1 shows that land ownership in Gokceagac is small, unequal and concentrated in the middle ownership groups: 51 per cent of the households own land up to 40 decares while possessing only 26 per cent of all the land. The other 49 per cent own 74 per cent of all the land in the village. The majority (71 per cent) of households own land between 21-80 decares and a considerable number of households own very small and very large amounts of land at either ends of the land distribution scale.

Table 6.1: The Distribution of Total Land Ownership In Terms of Number of Household Enterprises

Land Size (Decares)	Households	
	Number	%
1-20	16	13
21-40	46	38
41-60	21	17
61-80	19	16
Over 80	19	16
Total	121	100

2.1.1. Land Owned Within and Outside the Village

The distribution of land owned inside and outside the village is given in the below Table 6.2. Forty-three out of

the 121 households, own land outside the village in addition to the land which they own in Gokceagac itself.

Land ownership outside the village is related to the history of the land ownership structure in Gokceagac. This land is located in the villages which neighbour Gokceagac.

Table 6.2: The Distribution of Owned Land Sizes Within and Outside the Village in Terms of the Number of Households

Land Sizes (Decares)	Owned Land Within Village		Owned Land Outside Village	
	Number	%	Number	%
1-15	12	10	25	59
16-35	49	41	11	26
36-55	26	22	6	14
56-75	16	13	1	2
76-95	6	5	-	-
Over 95	12	10	-	-
Total	121	101	43	101

History of Gokceagac's land ownership structure largely explains the present ownership of land outside the village. In order to evade landlord control, villagers sought means to own/possess land outside of the main domain of the landlords' interests. This forced them to use land distant from the centre of Gokceagac village. After the dissolution of the landlord structure they established legal rights over this land. In 1950 the administrative boundaries of the village changed and so some of the land remained outside what is now Gokceagac village territory.

Table 6.3: The Distribution of Land Within and Outside the Village In Terms of Number of Households

Land Sizes outside Village (Decares)	Land Sizes Within Village (Decares)					Total
	1-15	16-35	36-55	56-75	Over 75	
1-15	3	15	1	4	2	25
16-35	-	4	3	1	3	11
36-55	-	-	3	1	2	6
56-75	-	1	-	-	-	1
Total	3	20	7	6	7	43
All House- holds Within Village	12	49	26	16	18	121

Tables 6.2 and 6.3 show some characteristics of land ownership outside the village. Firstly, about a third of households (36 per cent) in Gokceagac own land outside the village. Secondly, ownership sizes are smaller than those of land within the village. The majority (59 per cent) of these land are below or up to 15 decares while only a few households (six) own medium-sized (36-55 decares) areas of land outside the village (Table 6.2). Thirdly, only one household among the 43, owns more land outside the village than inside; ten of the households own similar amounts both within and outside the village; while the rest (74 per cent) own more land in the village than outside it (Table 6.3). In addition, when the distribution of land outside the village is compared with the total land owned, as below in Table 6.4, it is apparent that both the number of households which own land outside of the village and the amount of land

which they own outside the village increases in relation to the overall amount of land owned; among the 16 small land owners (1-20 decares) only one (6 per cent) of them owns land between 1-15 decares outside on the village; but, in the 21-40 decare group that percentage increases to 35; while in the large ownership group (41-80 decares) the percentage is 43.

The second point to make is that not only do the number of households increase as the total land ownership figure increases, but also that the large land owners have relatively larger amounts of land outside the village.

Table 6.4: The Distribution of Land Owned Outside the Village by Total Land Owned in Terms of the Number of Households

Total Land Sizes (Decares)	Land Sizes Outside the Village				Total	All Households
	1-15	16-35	36-55	Over 55		
1-20	1	-	-	-	1	16
21-40	16	-	-	-	16	46
41-80	6	6	2	-	14	40
Over 80	2	5	4	1	12	21
Total	25	11	6	1	43	121

2.1.2. The Number of Parcels of Land Owned Within and Outside the Village

The factors which contributed for the continuation of parcellisation of land were mainly due to (a) the widespread small land ownership from the 1950s onwards; (b) the

division of land through patrilineal inheritance; and (c) the purchases and sale of land in small amounts.

On the other hand, the reasons for the low degree of land parcellisation outside the village are as follows: (1) not all households own land outside the village; (2) the relatively large land owners own large areas of land outside the village; (3) purchases of land are made in larger amounts than sales of land; and (4) land within the village is more desirable.

Table 6.5: The Distribution of the Number of Parcels of Land Within and Outside the Village in Terms of the Number of Households

Number of Parcels	Number and Percentage of Households Which Own Land			
	Outside Village		Within Village	
	Number	%	Number	%
1-2	33	79	18	15
3-4	8	19	44	37
5-6	1	2	27	22
7-8	-	-	18	15
9-10	-	-	11	9
Over 10	-	-	2	2
Total*	42	100	120	100

* One Respondent did not answer.

The absolute number of plots vary between 1 and 13 within the village and 1 to 5 outside the village. The majority of those with land outside the village own 1 to 2 plots of land. Land within the village is divided into more parcels than the land outside the village: only 15 per cent of land inside the village are composed of 1 to 2 plots; 59 per cent

are composed of 3-6 plots; while the rest (26 per cent) are composed of more than 7 parcels. That is, almost half of the land within the village is composed of more than five parcels of land (Table 6.5).

The number of parcels, however increases as the size of land ownership increases. This is more apparent in the land owned within the village than in the land owned outside the village.

The degree of parcellisation influences the way in which the land is used. Although tobacco cultivation requires small plots of land, the cost of production increases if tobacco is produced on several pieces of land located in different places.

The predominance of the small-scale ownership is the reason for the smallness of the individual pieces of land. The small size of the pieces of land and their location at diverse places in the village are factors which both increase the cost of production and hinder greater concentration of land ownership.

Because of the nature of PCP's structure and patrilineal inheritance patterns, the division of land into small plots is inevitable.

2.2. The Means of Ownership of Land

Ownership and acquisition of land in Gokceagac takes three forms: inheritance, purchase and possession. The households in the study acquired or owned their land by one or a combination of these means.

Purchase and inheritance are the two basic means of ownership in the village. In fact, 95 per cent of the households came to own their land through inheritance or purchase. 34 households (28 per cent of the total) did not use purchase as a means of acquiring land; only six households neither bought nor inherited, but had the right to possess the land that they use now. In short: 86 households purchased land; 93 households inherited land; and 114 households (excluding the only possessed group) inherited and/or purchased part of their land in the village. (Table 6.6).

Table 6.6: The Basic Means of Ownership in Terms of the Number and Percentage of Households

Means of Ownership		Households	
		N	%
Single Means	Purchase	20	17
	Inheritance	23	19
	Possession	6	5
Combined Means	Purchase/Inheritance	65	54
	Purchase/Possession	1	1
	Inheritance/Possession	5	4
	Total*	120	100

*No answer from one respondent.

2.2.1. Land Distribution and Forms of Land Ownership

Comparison of prevailing land distribution and the basic means of land ownership implicitly give clues about the nature of changes in the land ownership structure of the village.

Table 6.7: Basic Forms of Land Ownership According to Total Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households

Forms of Ownership	Land Sizes				Total
	1-20	21-40	41-80	Over 80	
Only Purchase	-	7	9	4	20
Only Inheritance	7	6	7	3	23
Purchase/Inheritance	8	25	20	12	46
Only Usefruct	1	5	-	-	6
Usefruct/Inheritance	-	2	3	-	5
Usefruct/Purchase	-	1	-	-	1
Total*	16	46	39	19	120
All Households	16	46	40	21	121

*No answer from one respondent.

Firstly, it is instructive to observe that a considerable number of households (17 per cent) acquired their land only through purchase. It is clear that households in this group did not inherit their land from their parents. It would be more reliable to interpret this reply in this way: they did not inherit significant amounts of land from their parents. The distribution of this group in terms of present land ownership indicate that they now own relatively large areas of land: 13 of them (65 per cent) own more than 40 decares. This is an important factor in the commoditisation of land in the village (Table 6.7).

The second point is that there are 23 households (19 per cent of all households) who acquired their land only through inheritance. One immediate inference might be that they did not have the capacity and/or power to resort to other means of extending the size of their land. This is partially true, in as much that the distribution of these 23 households indicates that almost half (43 per cent) seemed

to be content with the relatively large amounts of land (more than 40 decares) which they inherited. I suggest that the remaining 13 households were not able to increase the size of their land.

The third point is that more than half (54 per cent) of the households in Gokceagac, acquired their land through a combination of inheritance and purchase. Of these 65 households, although they used both means of ownership, only half owned more than 40 decares.

The fourth point is related to the possession form of ownership. There are only 12 households who acquired all or part of their land in this way. Half of them possess wholly in this way while the other half possess only part of their land in this way. It is clear that the households in this group are small land owners; 9 out of the 12 own less than 40 decares. In general, it can be said that in Gokceagac, inheritance and/or purchase are the predominant forms of land ownership. It would be more informative if the absolute ownership figures were compared with the total land presently owned.

2.2.2. The Sizes of the Inherited Land

Table 6.8: The Distribution of the Sizes of Land Inherited According to Total Land Owned In Terms of Number of Households

Sizes of Total Lands Owned (Decares)	Sizes of Lands Purchased			Total	All House- holds
	1-20	21-40	Over 40		
1-20	15	-	-	15	16
21-40	18	15	-	33	46
41-80	8	5	17	30	40
Over 80	1	6	8	15	19
Total	42	26	25	93	121

93 households (77 per cent of the total) inherited different amounts of land. Almost half of these households (42 of them) inherited small amounts of land (less than 20 decares); a third of them (26 households) inherited between 21-40 decares (medium-sized amounts) of land; while the remaining 25 households inherited large amounts of land (over 40 decares). Table 6.8 indicates that the amounts of land inherited increase as the size of land owned increases.

2.2.3. The Size and the Time of Purchase of Land

In Gokceagac, a considerable number of households (86 out of 121) purchased land in different amounts and at different periods. Most of them (61 households) purchased up to 40 decares (small-to-medium sized holdings). It is also important to notice that only half of the small land owners (8 out of 16) in the village were able to purchase even a small amount of land. However as the size of ownership of land increases, so too does the amount of land purchased (Table 6.9). This indicates that relatively large land owners purchased large amounts of land.

Table 6.9: The Distribution of the Amounts of Purchased Land in Relation to Total Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households

Sizes of Total Land Owned (Decares)	Sizes of Lands Purchased			Total	All Households
	1-20	21-40	Over 40		
1-20	7	1	-	8	16
21-40	18	13	2	33	46
41-80	10	8	11	29	40
Over 80	2	2	12	16	19
Total	37	24	25	86	121

On the other hand, most of the purchases (75 per cent) were realised in the last 20 years. Most of the land was purchased during the 1960s (43 per cent) and 1970s (32 per cent).

The periods of purchase did not vary in terms of the size of land owned. Seventy-six per cent of land owners with up to 40 decares of land and 74 per cent of land owners with over 40 decares of land, purchased their land after 1958 (Table 6.10).

Table 6.10: The Distribution of the Period of Purchase of Land According to Total Land Owned In Terms of the Number of Households

Sizes of Total Lands Owned (Decares)	Periods of Purchase				Total	All Households
	Before 1943	1943-1958	1959-1968	1969-1979		
1-20	-	2	1	3	6	16
21-40	2	5	13	11	31	46
41-80	1	5	15	5	26	40
Over 80	2	2	3	5	12	19
Total	5	14	32	24	75*	121

*No answer from 11 respondents.

2.2.4. The Sale of Land

The PCP'ers, unless they are expropriated from the means of production, do not sell their land. This tendency is most strong in regions where small land ownership and labour-intensive cultivation is widespread. It is also true for Gokceagac: only 17 households (14 per cent of the total) sold part of their land. Among those households, only small sizes of land were sold: 63 per cent of them sold less than

5 decares while there is only one household which sold more than 25 decares of land. Large land owners were the households which sold relatively large areas of land; but they sold small pieces of land also (Table 6.11). All three households which sold more than 10 decares owned at least 40 decares of land and the household which sold more than 25 decares owned more than 100 decares of land (Household Interviews) but they sold small pieces of land also.

Table 6.11: The Distribution of Sizes of Land Sold in Relation to Total Land Owned In Terms of Number of Households

Sizes of Total Lands Owned (Decares)	Sizes of Lands Sold				Total	All House- holds
	1-5	6-10	11-15	Over 26		
1-20	3	-	-	-	3	16
21-40	3	2	-	-	5	46
41-80	3	-	2	-	5	40
Over 80	1	1	-	1	3	19
Total	10	3	2	1	16*	121

*No answer from one respondent.

Ownership of land is one of the basic elements of production. There must be an important reason for its sale. The reasons given for the sale of land were: low quality and remoteness of the land (32 per cent); unexpected large cash need (32 per cent); cash for the purchase of a tractor (19 per cent). The remaining reasons were related to large expenditure on health, construction of a house or purchase of land in the town. The sale of land in Gokceagac is a recent phenomenon. Almost all sales of land (15 out of 16) took place in the last 10 years (Household Interviews).

3. The Use of Owned Land in Gokceagac

Owner cultivation dominates the use of owned land in Gokceagac. Most of the households (94 per cent) within the village and (88 per cent) outside the village cultivate the lands that they own without renting-out or sharecropping any of their land (Table 6.12).

Table 6.12: The Agricultural Holding Types Within and Outside the Village In Terms of Number of Households

Holding Types	Within Village	Outside Village
Owner Cultivator	114	38
Only Rent-out	2	1
Mixed Holdings	2	2
Relatives Cultivate	3	2
Total	121	43

Two households which own land within the village and the two other who own outside the village rent-out and/or sharecrop part of their land. There are only two households which own land within the village and one household which owns land outside the village rent-out all of their land. And the lands of the three households which own land within the village and two others which own lands outside the village are cultivated by their close relatives.

3.1. Renting-out Owned Land

In Gokceagac, very few households (8 out of 121) rent-out part of their land and the amounts which they rent-out are

small. It is usually land owned inside the village which is rented-out and it is composed of 1-2 parcels. Very few households in Gokceagac rented-out their land in the past. Renting-out is more common among the medium-to-large land owners. This was also the case in the past.

3.2. Sharecropping Owned Land

It is interesting to notice that about two-thirds (63 per cent) of the heads of the households indicated that they have sufficient land. The remaining one-third said that they do not own enough (Table 6.13).

Table 6.13: Opinions Regarding the Size of Land Owned In Terms of Number of Households

Sizes of Total Land Owned (Decares)	Do Own Enough Land Now				All Households
	Yes		No		
	N	%	N	N	
1-20	6	38	10	62	46
21-40	19	42	26	58	40
41-80	34	85	6	15	19
Over 80	17	90	2	10	19
Total	76	63	44	37	120*

*No answer from one respondent.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that the desire to own more land (basically by purchasing) and the desire to use more land are not the same. In other words, satisfaction with the existing amount of land does not mean that the enterprise does not require more land for extending its scale of production.

The household labour capacity of most PCP'ers is usually

sufficient to increase the scale of production by extending the size of their cultivation, given possession of the necessary means of production and a subsistence return for labour. This is even more valid for the cultivation of capital-intensive crops.

PCP'ers try to own firstly: enough land to satisfy their capacity for tobacco production and secondly, if possible, sufficient extra land for the cultivation of cereals to meet the subsistence needs of the household members. The demand for land beyond this crop combination is usually met by other land owners. It can be seen therefore that demand for ownership and demand for the extension of cultivation, mainly through renting land (very rarely by sharecropping), is principally determined by the basic crop combination of tobacco and subsistence cereal cultivation.

Ownership of land provides the conditions for the simple reproduction of PCP'ers by subsidising their simple reproduction and devalorising the value of their household labour. However, in purchasing land, cost is the major obstacle in extending land owned under prevailing conditions of non accumulation of capital. Therefore, depending on the conditions of production, any demand for land beyond the amount of land already owned is usually satisfied by renting in order to minimise the cost of production. The opinions summarised in Table 6.13 demonstrably support this argument. The majority of households in the small and small-to-medium ownership groups are not satisfied with the amount of land which they own. On the other hand, the reverse is true for medium and large land owners: 85 per cent of medium size owners and 90 per cent of large owners are satisfied with

the amount of land they own.

3.2.1. Use of Land by Renting

Renting additional land is increasing. The practice of renting land must be analysed alongside the pattern of use of owned land. Patterns of renting land in Gokceagac are partially summarised in Table 6.14. These patterns are similar to the patterns of use of owned land.

Table 6.14: The Distribution of the Amounts of Land Rented in Terms of the Number of Households

Sizes of Land Rented (Decares)	Households	
	Number	%
1-10	21	53
11-20	10	25
21-30	3	7
Over 70	5	13
Conditional	1	2
Total	40*	100

*No answer from one respondent.

Firstly, a substantial number of households (34 per cent) rent land in Gokceagac. Most of these (78 per cent) rent small areas (up to 20 decares) of land; but, still there are five households who rent more than 70 decares of land.

If the sizes of land rented are compared with the sizes of land owned (Table 6.15), it can be seen that about a quarter (24 per cent) of the renting producers are small land owners. The majority (54 per cent) own small-to-medium areas of land. But there are quite a number of large land

owners who also rent land in Gokceagac.

Table 6.15: Renting Land With Regard to Size of Land Owned in Terms of Number of Households

Sizes of Total Land Owned (Decares)	Households		All Households	
	Number	%	Number	%
1-20	10	24	16	13
21-40	22*	54	46	38
41-80	3	7	40	33
Over 80	6	15	19	16
Total	41	100	121	100

*Three households in this category rent sometimes.

The comparison of the number of households who rent land with the total number of households in each land ownership sizes indicate that the majority (10 out of 16) of small land owners rent land in Gokceagac. Almost half (22 out of 46) of the small-to-medium land owners also rent land. These high ratios sharply decrease in medium land ownership. But one third of the relatively large land owners of Gokceagac also rent land.

This distribution can be considered an indicator for the interpretation that, firstly, households with up to 40 decares of land are under pressure to rent land in order to maintain their simple reproduction; secondly, medium-sized land owners (between 40-80 decares) can avoid renting land; and thirdly, renting land is a means of saving funds for the relatively big land owners in Gokceagac. This must be interpreted with the fact that the amount of land rented increases as the scale of ownership increases. One other important fact is that about two-thirds (64 per cent) of those households which rent land have been doing so for the

last 15 years (Household Interviews).

3.2.2. Sharecropping: The Use of Land

Table 6.16: The Distribution of Sharecropped Land In Terms of the Number of Households

Amount of Total Sharecropped Land (Decares)	Households	
	N	%
1-10	2	17
11-20	4	33
21-50	4	33
Over 75	2	17
Total	12*	100

*No answer from two respondents.

Sharecropping is no longer widely practiced in Gokceagac. There are only 14 households (12 per cent of all households) who still practise sharecropping. Half sharecrop small areas of land (up to 20 decares) while the others sharecrop medium-sized areas of land.

Of those households which still practice sharecropping, the majority are small-to-medium land owners (9 out of 14).

In Gokceagac, sharecropping was more widely practised in the past. About one-third (31 per cent) of the present households of Gokceagac village indicated that they have practiced sharecropping before. And most of these households (81 per cent) sharecropped until the late 1960s. And half (53 per cent) of these households who practiced sharecropping before, now own land of up to 40 decares while the remaining half (47 per cent) own more than 40 decares of land (Table 6.17).

Table 6.17: The Distribution of Households which Sharecropped in the past in Terms of Total Land Owned Now

Sizes of Total Land Owned (Decares)	Households		All Households
	N	%	N
1-20	4	11	16
21-40	15	42	46
41-80	13	36	40
Over 80	4	11	19
Total	36*	100	121

*No answer from two respondents.

3.3. The Production of Different Crops

In this section, the crop combination adopted in the village are discussed in two parts by concentrating on scale of production and volume of output. Each is further analysed in terms of the distribution of land owned.

Table 6.18: The Distribution of Agricultural Holdings in Terms of the Number of Households

Crops Cultivated	Crop Holdings		Percentage of All Households
	N	%	
Tobacco	120	37	100
Wheat	117	36	98
Maize	75	23	63
Sunflower	11	4	9
Total	323	100	269

In Gokceagac, four different crops are produced by 120 households in differing combinations of tobacco (T), wheat (W), maize (M) and sunflower (S). One household indicated that it rents out all its land. As shown in Table 6.18, all 120 households produce tobacco; and only 3 do not

cultivate wheat; while 75 (63 per cent) produce maize. On the other hand, only 11 households (9 per cent) produce sunflower.

3.3.1. Crop Combination in Gokceagac

The distribution of crop combination as given in Table 6.19 shows that there are only three households in Gokceagac who produce only tobacco and nothing else. The other 117 households adapt different crop combinations. The two most widely practiced combinations are tobacco-wheat-maize and tobacco-wheat (TWM and TW). They form 89 per cent of all crop combinations; 8 households (7 per cent of all households) produce all four crops; and only three households produce all crops except maize. Since 89 per cent of all households adapt either TWM or TW crop combinations, any comparison of crop combination in terms of land ownership area (Table 6.19), reflects the predominance of these combinations in all sizes of land ownership.

Table 6.19: Crop Combinations in Relation to Total Land Owned in Terms of the Number of Households

Crop Combinations*	Sizes of Total Lands				Total	
	1-20	21-40	41-80	Over 80	N	%
TWM	5	30	25	7	67	56
TW	8	14	14	3	39	33
TWMS	-	2	1	5	8	7
TWS	-	-	-	3	3	2
T	2	-	-	1	3	2
Total	15	46	40	19	120	100

* T=tobacco; W=wheat; M=maize; S=sunflower

Firstly, among small land owners, with the exception of

the two households who produce only tobacco, all adapt the predominant (TWM or TW) crop combinations. Secondly, among the small-to-medium land owners, only two households produce all four crops while the rest (44) use the dominant crop combinations. TWM, as a combination, is more dominant in the small-to-medium land ownership sized holding. Thirdly, the medium land owners very closely resemble the small-to-medium land owners. Finally, while the dominant crop combinations are also prevalent in large land ownership, cultivation of sunflower is still an important productive activity.

3.3.2. The Scale of Production

In this section, the production of crops is discussed in terms of the size of cultivation. Firstly, the distribution of all crop holdings is given and then each crop is separately analysed in terms of the absolute areas cultivated. After that, the distribution of both cultivated areas and land owned are compared.

The distribution of all crop holdings, with and without tobacco holdings, according to the size of land cultivated is given in Table 6.20. If all four major crops cultivated are taken together there are 323 crop holdings in Gokceagac.

Table 6.20: Distribution of All Crop Holdings According to Areas of Cultivated Land

Sizes of Cultivated Land (Decares)	All Crop Holdings			
	With Tobacco		Without Tobacco	
	N*	%	N	%
1-10	110	34	77	38
11-20	119	37	60	30
21-30	56	18	31	15
31-40	22	7	19	9
41-50	8	2	8	4
60-80	4	1	4	2
150-200	4	1	4	2
Total	323	100	203	100

*N refers to Number.

This distribution indicates that small-scale production dominates crop cultivation in Gokceagac. 71 per cent of all crop holdings have only up to 20 decares of land and only 4 per cent of all holdings cultivate areas of more than 40 decares.

Since tobacco cultivation is very labour intensive, its scale of production is small under PCP conditions. This obviously influences the distribution of holdings but, the scale of production is still small even when tobacco is excluded from the distribution scheme; 68 per cent of all holdings cultivate land up to 20 decares; the percentage for 20-40 decare of cultivation remains almost the same as for those with tobacco and the percentage of large-scale cultivation doubles from 4 to 8 per cent.

The distribution of all four crops cultivated in the village in terms of cultivated areas of land is presented in the below Table 6.21.

Firstly, excluding the production of sunflower, small-scale production dominates all three crops in Gokceagac: 77

per cent of all tobacco holdings, 59 per cent of all wheat holdings and 84 per cent of all maize holdings cultivate areas of land up to 20 decares.

Table 6.21: The Distribution of All Crop Holdings According to the Size of Areas Cultivated In Terms of the Number and Percentage of Households and Crop Holdings

Sizes Cultivated (Decares)	Households In Terms of Crops								All Crop Holdings			
	T		W		M		S		With T		Without T	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	33	28	28	24	47	63	2	18	110	34	77	38
11-20	59	49	42	35	16	21	2	18	119	37	60	30
21-30	25	21	23	20	6	8	2	18	56	18	31	15
31-40	3	2	13	12	4	6	2	18	22	7	19	9
41-50			7	6	1	1			8	2	8	4
60-80			2	1.5	1	1	1	9	4	1	4	2
150-200			2	1.5			2	18	4	1	4	2
Total	120	100	117	100	75	100	11	99	323	100	203	100

It is interesting to notice that maize production in this land size (i.e. up to 20 decares) is higher (84 per cent) than even tobacco cultivation (77 per cent). This clearly indicates that maize is the traditional subsistence crop for Gokceagac villagers.

Secondly, in the village, 23 per cent of all tobacco holdings (28 holdings), 32 per cent of all wheat holdings, 14 per cent of all maize holdings and 36 per cent of all sunflower holdings make up the small-to-medium (21-40 decares) area of cultivation. In this size of cultivation,

there are a considerable number of tobacco and wheat holdings (28 and 36 respectively) and relatively few maize and sunflower holdings (4 and 10 respectively).

Thirdly, in the medium-sized (41-80 decare) areas of cultivation, there are only 12 holdings in Gokceagac: 9 in wheat, 2 in maize and 1 in sunflower. There are no tobacco holdings in this size division: the maximum size of tobacco cultivation in the village is 35 decares. Wheat cultivation dominates this size division, but it accounts for only 7.5 per cent of all wheat holdings. And of all the maize holdings, only 2 per cent are cultivated in this size division.

Fourthly, there are only four households in Gokceagac which cultivate large-scale areas, between 150-200 decares: two of them produce wheat and the other two sunflower.

Therefore, small-scale cultivation dominates the village: 71 per cent of all holdings cultivate only up to 20 decares of land; a quarter produce in the small-to-medium divisions and only by 4 percent of all households in the village carry out medium and large scale cultivation.

3.3.3. The Scale of Production in the Four Crops Cultivated and the Sizes of Lands Owned

In Gokceagac the distribution of the scale of production in the four major crops cultivated in terms of the distribution of the sizes of land owned is given in Table 6.22. The comparison is made firstly for the four crops separately and secondly for all of them together.

Table 6.22: Distribution of Scales of Production in All Crops Cultivated According to the Size of Land Owned in Terms of the Number (N) of Households

Cultivated Sizes (Decares)	Cultivated Crops and Land Ownership Sizes															
	Tobacco				Wheat				Maize				Sunflower			
	S	S-M	M	L	S	S-M	M	L	S	S-M	M	L	S	S-M	M	L
2-10	9	16	5	3	8	17	3	-	4	28	13	2	-	2	-	-
11-20	6	23	23	7	5	23	12	2	-	2	10	4	-	-	-	2
21-30	-	7	10	8	-	5	16	2	1	2	1	2	-	-	1	1
31-40	-	-	2	1	-	1	6	6	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-
60-80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
180-200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Total	15	46	40	19	13	46	40	18	5	32	26	12	-	2	1	8

(i) Tobacco Production:

Firstly, among the 15 small land owners, most (60 per cent) produce less than 10 decares of tobacco and none produce more than 20. Secondly, a considerable number of small-to-medium size land owners (35 per cent) also only produce up to 10 decares of tobacco; half of them produce between 11-20 decares and the other 7 households produce between 21 and 30 decares. Thirdly, of the medium-sized land owners (40 households), only five carry out small-scale tobacco cultivation; most of them (58 per cent) produce between 11-20 decares of tobacco while the remaining 12 households (29 per cent) produce more than 20 decares. Fourthly, the scale of tobacco cultivation remains medium-sized among the large land owners: 53 per cent (10 out of 19) produce up to 20 decares and the rest more than 20

decares.

It can be said therefore that tobacco cultivation is mostly dominated by small scale cultivation. Although the scale of tobacco cultivation increases as the size of land ownership extends, the majority of households use up to 20 decares of land for tobacco production in each of the land ownership size areas.

(ii) Wheat Production:

In the cultivation of wheat, the influence of the size of land ownership is more apparent. None of the small land owners produce more than 20 decares of wheat; only 13 per cent (6 households) in the small-to-medium ownership group produce more than 20 decares of wheat; and these percentages increase to 63 per cent and 89 per cent respectively, in the medium and large land ownership groups. As expected, small-scale wheat production is dominant among the small and small-to-medium land owners while large-scale production is common among the large land owners.

(iii) Maize Production:

As with tobacco, small-scale production dominate maize growing and the scale of cultivation is not strongly influenced by the size of land ownership. Only 16 per cent (12 households) of the maize-producing households produce more than 20 decares of maize; only 12 per cent of medium-sized land owners and only half the large land owners produce more than 20 decares of maize.

(iv) Sunflower Production:

The production of sunflower is chiefly the activity of large land owners: only two households (in the small-to-medium land ownership group) produce less than 10 decares of sunflower; the other nine households produce more than 20 decares. There are two households in Gokceagac which produce between 180-200 decares of sunflower.

(v) The Production of All Crops Excluding Tobacco:

The scale of production of all crops cultivated is given in terms of land ownership sizes in Table 6.23.

Table 6.23: The Distribution of Cultivated Areas of All Crop Holdings Except Tobacco According to the Sizes of the Area of the Owned Land in Terms of the Number (N) of Households

Cultivated Decares)	Land Ownership Sizes and Cultivated Crops												Total N %	
	1-20			21-40			41-80			Over 80				
	W	M	S	W	M	S	W	M	S	W	M	S		
2-10	8	4	-	17	28	2	3	13	-	-	2	-	77	38
11-20	5	-	-	23	2	-	12	10	-	2	4	2	60	30
21-30	-	1	-	5	2	-	16	1	1	2	2	1	31	15
31-40	-	-	-	1	-	-	6	1	-	6	3	2	19	9
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	4	-	-	8	4
60-80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	4	2
150-200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	4	2
Total	13	5	-	46	32	2	40	26	1	18	12	8	203	100

Wheat and maize cultivation predominate in all the land ownership sizes. Furthermore, large scale cultivation (above 20 decares) increases radically with medium and large

land ownership: it exists only in 4 and 10 per cent respectively of small and small-to-medium holdings but increases to 43 per cent and 74 per cent respectively in medium and large ownership.

3.3.4. The Volume of Output in the Four Crops Cultivated

In this section, the absolute sizes of volume of output are presented. Then output levels are compared in terms of the sizes of land owned.

Volume of output is another indicator of the position of PCP'ers. The factors which influence the volume of output are mainly related to the productivity of the land and labour; the scale of cultivation; the labour intensity of production; weather conditions; and the type of seed used.

Most of the producers were disinclined to disclose the level of their output largely through the fear of taxation.

Since the sale prices differ among the different crops cultivated, any comparison made between output levels must always be qualified by the overall return to labour in the cultivation of different crops.

Since the scale of production in tobacco cultivation is small, its inclusion in the distribution of all crop holdings has a tendency to increase the percentage of holdings producing a small volume of output. So if tobacco holdings are excluded, there remain 203 wheat, maize and sunflower holdings. Among them, as shown in Table 6.24, 17 per cent (35 households), produce only up to one ton; 26 per cent (53 households) produce between one to three tons: 46 per cent (92 households) produce between three to nine tons

and 11 per cent (23 households) produce more than nine tons.

Table 6.24: The Distribution of All Crop Holdings According to Volume of Output In Terms of the Number and Percentage of Households

Volume of Output (Kilograms)	Households In Terms of Crops								All Crop Holdings			
	T		W		M		S		With T		Without T	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
500 or Less	8	7	-	-	10	13	-	-	18	6	10	5
501-1000	36	30	1	1	23	31	1	9	61	19	25	12
1001-2000	65	54	12	10	14	19	3	27	94	29	29	14
2001-3000	10	8	11	9	12	16	1	9	34	11	24	12
3001-5000	1	1	45	39	11	15	1	9	58	18	57	28
5001-7000	-	-	23	20	3	4	2	18	28	9	28	14
7001-9000	-	-	6	5	1	1	-	-	7	2	7	4
Over 9000	-	-	19	16	1	1	3	27	23	7	23	11
Total	120	100	117	100	75	100	11	99	323	101	203	100

Table 6.24 also gives the absolute output levels for each crop separately. In the case of tobacco cultivation, small output levels dominate and very few households have a large tobacco produce. Output levels range from 0.3 tons to 3.5 tons: few households (only 7 per cent) produce less than a half ton of tobacco; only 11 households (9 per cent) produce between 2-3.5 tons while the other 101 households (84 per cent) produce between 0.5 and 2 tons of tobacco.

In wheat cultivation, medium levels of output dominate and there are a considerable number of households which produce wheat in relatively large amounts. The volumes of

wheat output range from one to 40 tons: the distribution of output is concentrated mainly (59 per cent) between 3 and 7 tons: 21 per cent of all wheat producers have output levels above 7 tons; and only 19 per cent of them produce less than three tons.

Output levels in maize production vary between 0.2 and 15 tons and its distribution is generally within the small output sizes: 44 per cent of all maize holdings have maize outputs of less than one ton; 79 per cent produce less than three tons; while only 6 per cent (five households) produce more than five tons of maize.

Finally, sunflower production is not widely practiced in Gokceagac. It is produced in amounts which range from 0.7 to 25 tons: 5 of the 11 households (45 per cent) produce between 1 and 5 tons while the remaining 5 households produce more than five tons. About 80 tons of sunflower are produced in the village; the total share of the three big producers is 69 per cent (Household Interviews).

3.3.5. Volume of Output and Land Ownership

The distribution of; volume of output in the four crops produced; and land owned are given in Table 6.25.

Table 6.25: The Distribution of Volume of Output of All Crops Cultivated According to the Sizes of Owned Land in Terms of the Number (N) of Households

Volume of Output (Tons)	Cultivated Crops and Land Ownership Sizes															
	Tobacco				Wheat				Maize				Sunflower			
	S	S-M	M	L	S	S-M	M	L	S	S-M	M	L	S	S-M	M	L
1.001-2	3	26	26	10	6	4	2	-	-	6	7	1	-	1	-	2
2.001-3	1	-	4	5	-	8	3	-	-	3	7	2	-	-	-	-
3.001-5	-	-	-	1	7	25	11	2	1	2	3	5	-	-	1	1
5.001-7	-	-	-	-	-	7	13	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
7.001-9	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-
Over 9	-	-	-	-	-	1	6	12	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
Total	15	46	40	19	13	46	40	18	5	32	26	12	-	2	1	8

In tobacco production, among small land owners, although the output levels are concentrated in the small volume groups, there are few households who produce medium size tobacco outputs.

In both the small-to-medium and medium land ownership areas output is generally between 0.5 to 2 tons. On the other hand, large land owners produce large amounts of tobacco.

Although in wheat production small output levels are common among the small land owners, half of them produce between 3 to 5 tons of wheat. Among the small-to-medium land ownership, the output levels are concentrated in the centre: 70 per cent of them produce between 3 to 7 tons of wheat; only one household produces more than nine tons. The output levels of medium size land owners are also

concentrated in the centre; but, a large number of them (28 per cent) produce more than 7 tons of wheat. Output levels increase among large land owners. None of the big land owners produce less than three tons of wheat and 67 per cent of them produce more than nine tons.

Output levels in maize production are small among the small and small-to-medium land owners and large among the middle and big land owners.

Finally, sunflower is produced with large volumes of output mainly by medium and large land owners.

Footnotes

1. The data used in this Chapter is mainly drawn from the fieldwork. For the significance of the distribution of land ownership and size of holdings at national level, see Varlier (1978), Caglar (1984) and Erdost (1987).
2. All tables in this Chapter are prepared from the Household Interviews.
3. Small or large land ownership as terms of magnitude are not explanatory unless they are analysed together with the issues to which land is related: crops cultivated, their labour processes, the means of ownership of land, the conditions of household labour expenditure, and so on. For the exposition of the data, in the tables, I used land sizes up to 20 decares as small; between 21-40 as small-to-medium; between 41-80 as medium; and over 80 as large.
4. Almost all households (90 per cent) inherited land from their fathers; only 10 per cent inherited from their grand-parents.
5. This finding does not contradict the fact that a considerable number of households purchased small sizes of land during the disintegration of the landlord structure in the village. First, most of the head of the households of the 1940s are not living today. Second, the villagers are less inclined to mention the very small sizes of land transactions.

CHAPTER 7
THE HOUSEHOLD LABOUR AND PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION

1. Introduction

The analysis of household labour in PCP will cover (a) the labour requirements; (b) the capacity of household labour; (c) the possible areas of labour expenditure; (d) the conditions of making reciprocal labour exchanges; and (e) the use of seasonal wage-labour (SWL) and the implications of the combined use of household labour and SWL.

Household labour is the main source of labour in Gokceagac. But the use of seasonal wage-labour is becoming more and more indispensable for the survival of PCP. Households still practice reciprocal labour exchanges, but these exchanges do not establish a systematic and structural source of labour for the household enterprises. The pattern of combining SWL and/or exchange labour with household family labour is central and explained by significant features of small peasant tobacco production in the village. These are:

- (1) The specific characteristics of agricultural production;
- (2) The technical and sexual division of labour;
- (3) The ownership structure;
- (4) The demographic structure;
- (5) The prevailing level of land and labour productivity;
- (6) The cost of production and reproduction;

- (7) The return to labour;
- (8) The possible sources of non-enterprise incomes;
- (9) The nature of integration to generalised commodity relations;
- (10) The conditions for the appropriation of surplus labour;
- (11) The role of the state;
- (12) The prevailing standards of living in rural areas; and
- (13) The conditions of stability and/or differentiation.

2. The Labour Requirements and the Technical Division of Labour in Tobacco Cultivation

The labour requirements in PCP originate from the productive and domestic (reproductive) activities of the enterprises. In the productive sphere, the specific characteristics of agricultural production, the labour processes of the crops cultivated and the conditions of animal husbandry practiced are the main factors which determine labour demand. Similarly, the conditions of reproduction determine labour demand in the domestic sphere.

In the productive sphere, the labour requirements differ during the annual cycle according to the different crops cultivated and the technical division of labour. The technical division of labour is the separation of tasks for different labourers in the same labour process. Furthermore, the labour demand depend also on the labour intensiveness of the crops cultivated and the degree of mechanisation of the labour process.

The natural conditions of agricultural production,

particularly the vegetation periods of crops cultivated, create unequal labour demand and cause peak labour demand¹ (PLD) periods. These in turn create both idle labour and shortages of labour. The idle labour created in capital-intensive cultivation is large and increasing production does not reduce it mainly due to the almost exclusive mechanisation of its labour process. On the contrary, in labour-intensive cultivation, such as tobacco production, the increases in productivity and the scale of production raise the labour demand, particularly at PLD. So the tobacco producers seek means to maximise their labour expenditure by extending the size of their tobacco cultivation. However, they are confronted with a problem when the labour demand is higher than the labour capacity of the households in PLD periods. Such a shortage exerts pressure to enlarge household sizes; but in that case, the already present idle labour capacity would further expand in non-PLD periods. This would necessitate reproducing a larger idle labour capacity for the whole annual cycle, which would significantly add to the maintenance costs of the household members. The reproduction costs are further increased, in relative terms, due to the growing commoditisation of the reproductive needs of the household members.

Under these conditions, the PCP'ers could try to use their idle labour outside of their enterprises, but there are only limited opportunities for non-household labour expenditure. The possible means of non-enterprise labour expenditure is discussed in the following sections, but, in general, there are very little or no opportunities for

permanent or seasonal wage-work and/or marginal jobs in towns. In addition, they hardly provide jobs for a family of tobacco producers. Moreover, in labour intensive crop cultivation, such as tobacco, household members do not have spare time to work in permanent jobs because the PLD periods are fairly long. These features of labour demand also restrict villagers to work as seasonal labourers in agriculture.

The labour requirements change in parallel with the changes in the scale of production and productivity. On the other hand, one distinguishing feature of labour demand is that not all labour needs in tobacco production require adult labour. The labour of children and the elderly members of the household are important sources of productive labour and they also contribute significantly to the reproductive tasks in the domestic sphere.

One other feature of the labour demand is that the changes in the labour requirements do not significantly alter the traditional sexual division of labour and do not undermine the basic source of labour in PCP, i.e. the family.

The features of the technical division of labour determine the possible changes and the limits of labour needs and, in turn, they influence the conditions of labour expenditure. It is closely related to (i) the general characteristics of agricultural production, specifically its natural aspects; (ii) the availability and use of agricultural machinery; (iii) the labour intensity of the crops cultivated; and (iv) the variable labour requirements

at different stages of all crops cultivated.

The labour demand is widely distributed to cover almost the whole agricultural cycle in tobacco production.² In this cycle, planting and threading are the peak labour demanding phases.

The producers make plans to supply the labour requirements by combining all possible available sources of labour: household labour, seasonal wage-labour and exchange labour. In this plan, households seek all means to maximise the expenditure of their own labour especially in planting and threading stages. The labour requirements in these peak labour demanding stages vary not only between them but also according to changes in the scales of production. A unit of change in the size of tobacco planted does not create an equal increase in labour demand in the remaining stages. In addition to this, each phase of the labour process possesses different features of organisation of labour. The possibilities of intensification of labour, extension of labour time, the productivity of labour, and the natural limitations on the expenditure of labour such as daylight and weather conditions differ in these two peak labour demanding phases.

The amount of tobacco seedlings grown is an important factor for the realisation of the planned scale of production. It is very difficult to find seedlings at the beginning of the planting season because all households grow their own seedlings and thus the purchase of seedlings would be of significant cost to the enterprise, unless they were provided from those households which had grown more than they could plant. One other problem of purchase of

seedlings would be the possible low quality.

The labour capacity of most households is sufficient for all stages of tobacco production, except planting and threading. Few households manage without extra labour in either planting or threading. Most of the households are under strong pressures to increase the scale of their tobacco production. But as the scale of production increases, the household labour becomes insufficient for the PLD phases. The enterprises usually first try to arrange labour exchange within the village. After that they resort to seasonal wage-labour. The latter two forms of labour use are discussed in the following sections of this chapter.

The labour requirements in the planting and threading stages differ in several important aspects. For planting, first, a team of 4-5 adult labourers is essential. Such a team can plant one decare of tobacco in a day. Secondly, the hours of the working day are limited by day-light and weather.

Thirdly, the seasonal wage labourers are paid on a daily basis and most of them do not work more than the formal 8-10 hour working day which is shorter than the conventional working-day in planting, which is almost 16 hours.

Fourthly, planting is predominantly an adult task; but child-labour is used only in certain areas. Child labour is however useful in threading.

Fifthly, the planting season is short; it lasts not more than 20-25 days.

Sixthly, the organisation, control and coordination of work is very important in terms of the efficiency of the

work, because planting is done with a team of workers who depend on each other.

Finally it is more difficult to organise labour cooperation in planting than in threading.

On the other hand, threading, first does not require a team-work. Individual labour expenditure is possible. The threading of a decare of tobacco output necessitates around 8-10 working-day, as against 4-5 in planting.

Secondly, the working-day is not limited by day-light and weather. Threading indoors continues after dark and most of the household members work around 18-20 hours per day.

Thirdly, when SWL is used, they are paid by the string, ³ not by the day. The working-day of seasonal workers is thus longer, especially for those who residing in the village.

Fourthly, excluding the very young (below seven) and the very old (above 70), all household members work 'full-time' productively in threading. Even the very old members contribute to threading, but do not pick tobacco.

Fifthly, the threading lasts about 60 days.

Finally, the intensification and the efficiency of the work depends on the individual control of the household members. The only interdependence is between picking and threading. The producers pick tobacco once very early (around 4 a.m.) in the morning and a second time in the late afternoon (around 5 p.m.). The picked leaves are threaded after each picking.

The differences in the labour requirements between these two phases of tobacco production, which are the most labour intensive, have significant implications for the pattern of

labour expenditure. First of all, a unit (decare) of increase in the scale of production creates twice as much labour demand for threading as it does for planting. But this is partly compensated by (a) the longer working season in threading (60 days in threading compared to 20-25 in planting) and (b) the possibility of more household members contributing productively in threading. In the latter case, the quantity of child and elderly labour available plays an important role not only in the maximisation of the household labour, but also in structural balancing and adjustment role between planting and threading phases.

Secondly, the longer working-day in threading provides the necessary conditions for the extension of the labour-time. It is more possible to intensify labour because threading is mainly an individual task.

Thirdly, the seasonal workers also can work beyond the formal 8-10 hours in threading.

Fourthly, the necessity of a team of 4-5 adult labourers is centrally important both (a) for maximising the household labour expenditure and also (b) for increasing the scale of production. It is a rare coincidence for households to have exactly the required number of adult labourers, so that neither a shortage or a surplus of labour occurs especially in planting. This can be seen in the Table 7.1 below. The full maximisation of household labour thus necessitate the use of SWL to fill the shortage of adult labourers in planting. The other alternative is to use, if possible, reciprocal labour exchange. On the other hand, if household labour is already maximised in planting,

further increases in the scale of tobacco production can only be achieved by using SWL.

Table 7.1: The Distribution of the Number of Households in Terms of the Number of Household Members

Number of Household Member	Number of Households				
	Adults	Adult Children	Children	Small Children	Elderly
1	7	19	29	31	15
2	78	41	28	17	16
3	21	14	14	16	
4	11	3	4	2	
5	1	2	2	1	
6	1	2	1	1	
7				1	
Total Households	119	81	78	69	31
Total Members	281	177	159	139	47

3. The Household Labour Capacity

The absolute size of the households constitutes the source of labour capacity. It is determined by the number of people who live in the same household and by their labouring capacity. The absolute changes in the size of households depend on (a) basic demographic factors (birth, infant and child mortality rates, the life-span of adults); (b) the marriage age of children; and (c) the time of separation of the married sons to establish new households.

The relative labour capacity of the households changes according to the age and sex of the household members. The duration of schooling, two years of military service for

adult males, handicap and early death are the remaining impediments to work, and they decrease the labour capacity of the households. Furthermore, the changes in the productivity of labour also alter the relative capacity of the household members.

In Gokceagac, the traditional belief that the 'strength' of the enterprise depends on the size of the household still prevails. However, the largest households are no longer the most advantageously placed. Today, many factors exert pressure on households to reduce their sizes. The most important of these factors are (1) the presence and increases of idle labour, due to increases in labour productivity; and (2) the multiplying costs of reproduction of the household members, due to the increasing commoditisation of the SR structure and the oscillating subsistence return on labour in PCP. But it is not always easy to control the size of families in both the short and long terms. Even the minimum number of children result in quite large sizes of household enterprises. An average of two sons would double the number of households in approximately 30-35 years. This is reinforced by the current low rate of emigration.

In the remaining part of this section, some of the characteristics of village households are presented in order to link the labour capacity with actual labour expenditure, which is discussed in the following section.

3.1. The Size of Households

The household members in the village are labelled in

terms of their kinship relation to the head of the household: spouse, mother, father, daughter-in-law, children and grand-children. In addition to these members, there are 11 people in the village who are defined as 'others'.)

In the village, all head of the households (HHs), except one, are male. There are 114 spouses in 121 households; four of the HHs are bachelors and three of them are widowed. The HHs and their spouses make up the group of parents, which consists of 235 persons.

The distribution of the household members are presented in the below Table 7.2.

Table 7.2: The Distribution of Household Members According to Their Numbers in Terms of the Number of Households

Household Members	Number of Household Members									Number of Households	Total		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Over8		N	%	
Parents													
Head/Household	121										121	121	15.1
Spouse	114										114	114	14.2
Elder Parents													
Only Mother	13										13	13	1.6
Only Father	2										2	2	0.2
Mother/Father	9										9	18	2.2
Children	11	28	32	20	12	5	3	1			112	362	45.1
Grand-children	7	4	3	10	3	2				2	31	110	13.7
Daughters-in-law	25	10	1	1							37	52	6.5
Others	6	1	1								8	11	1.4
Total												803	100

There are 24 households (20 % of all households) in which mothers and/or fathers (the elder parents) live in their sons' household. In 13 of these households, there are only mothers, in two of them only fathers, and, in 9 of them, both the fathers and the mothers live in their sons' household. This elderly parents group consist of 33

persons. In these households, the elderly parents are not the head of the households. At a very old age, the leadership of the households becomes a difficult task. Let alone the physical and mental capacity, the actual control of the extended family would be very difficult and thus the elder married son becomes the HH. At this stage, the sons would have accumulated 'wealth' in the form of means of production. The assets owned by the elderly parents would still be important for the enterprise. The two parents group form about one-third of the total population of the village.

There are 52 daughters-in-law (6.5 % of the total village population) in 37 households (31 % of all households). 26 of these households have only one daughter-in-law (DIL), 10 of them have two, and one of them has three DIL in the household.

In the 112 households of the village there are ⁴ children. More than one third (39 households) of these households have 1-2 children, almost half (52 households) have 3-4, 17 of them (15 % of all households) have 5-6, and the remaining 4 households (4 % of all households) have 7-8 children (Household Interviews). There are 362 children and they form 45 % of the total village population.

In 31 households (26 % of all households) there are grand-children. Eleven of these households (36 %) have 1-2, 13 of them (42 %) have 3-4, 5 of them (16 %) have 5-6, and two households (7 %) have more than 8 grand-children (Household Interviews). There are 110 grand-children and they make 14 % of all village population.

8 households in the village have 'other' people living with them. The 'others' group is composed of a second-wife,

a domestic-helper, an uncle, a brother's wife, a friend, a friend's wife, a wife's brother, a shepherd and three cousins. Six of these households have only one, one has two, and the last one has three 'other' people. They are 11 people altogether and they compose only 1.3 % of the total village population.

3.2. The Ages of Household Members

The distribution of the ages of all household members is presented in the following Table 7.3.

Table 7.3: The Distribution of the Number of Household Members* In Terms of Their Age Groups

Age Groups	All Parents			Elder		All	DIL	Children			Others	Total Population	
	HH	SPO	All	MOT	FAT			CD	GCD	All		N	%
0-6								75	62	137	2	139	17
7-14								136	41	177	1	178	22
15-22	2	4	6			6	21	109	6	115	2	144	18
23-30	12	18	30			30	24	34	1	35	1	90	11
31-38	23	25	48	1		49	5	5		5		59	7
39-46	34	36	70	1		71	2	3		3		76	10
47-54	29	19	48	2		50						50	6
55-62	10	6	16	2	1	19					1	20	3
63-70	9	5	14	11	6	31					1	32	4
Over70	2	1	3	5	4	12					3	15	2
Total	121	114	235	22	11	268	52	362	110	472	11	803	100

* HH: Head of the Household; SPO: Spouse; MOT: Mother; FAT: Father; DIL: Daughters-in-Law; CD: Children; GCD: Grand-children

Parents:

There are only two HHs who are under 23, only 11 over 63. The rest of the 108 HHs are between the ages of 23-62. Among the latter, the 23-46 age group dominates (57 % of all HHs) the distribution.

The distribution of the spouses also show a similar pattern. This is mainly due to early marriage and the similar ages of husbands and wives.

Elderly Parents:

The ages of the 33 mothers and fathers are instructive in understanding their status. In this group there are 9 couples. The remaining 15 are single (either mothers or fathers). Very old age is dominant among those 9 couples regardless of sex. Among the single elderly parents, mothers are dominant. There are only two old widows who live with their sons' household.

The ages of the widowed mothers vary. Among them old age is also common. But four of the single mothers in this group have ages between 31-54. They are widowed due to early death of their husbands. The widowed women usually do not pursue or claim their rights to land. The difficulty of re-marriage and the presence of young sons in the household deny them the leadership of the household and force them to stay in their sons' households. On the other hand, men usually marry a second time.

Conversely, the very old age (over 62) of some seems to be the main reason why fathers in this group live with their sons without being the head of the household. This is also the case for the 9 couples who live with their sons.

Daughters-in-Law:

There are 52 daughters-in-law (DIL) in the village and they are, relatively, very young. 21 of them (40 %) are

between the ages of 15-22; 24 of them (46 %) between 23-30 and the rest 7 of them (13 %) are above 30.

Children:

There are 362 children in the village. 75 of them (21 %) are very small (between the ages of 0-6), 136 of them (38 %) are small children (between 7-14), and the rest 151 of them (41 %) are adult children.

Grand-children:

There are 110 grand-children. More than half (56 %) of them are very young, more than one-third (37 %) of them are small children and only 7 % of them are above the age of 14.

When the children and grand-children are considered together, only one third of them are above the age of 14. When the married sons are excluded from the distribution, the structure of young children becomes more apparent: only about a quarter of all children are above the age of 14 (Household Interviews).

'Others' Group:

The distribution of the ages of this group is skewed either in young or old age groups.

The age distribution of the whole village shows that 17 per cent of the household members are very small children, 22 per cent of them are small children, 55 per cent of them are adults, and 6 per cent of them are elderly (Table 7.3).

3.3. The Sex of Household Members

The below Table 7.4 gives a summary distribution of the sex of household members in the village.

Table 7.4: The Distribution of the Number and Percentage of Household Members* In Terms of Their Sex

Sex	Parents		All Parents Elder			DIL	Children		Ot- hers	Total Popula- tion		
	HHD	SPO	All	MOT	FAT		All	CD			GCD	
Male	120		120		11	131		228	56	284	7	422
%	99		51		100	49		63	51	54	64	53
Female	1	114	115	22		137	52	134	54	240	4	381
%	1	100	49	100		51	100	37	49	46	36	47
Total	121	114	235	22	11	268	52	362	110	524	11	803

* HH: Head of the Household; SPO: Spouse; MOT: Mother; FAT: Father; DIL: Daughters-in-Law; CD: Children; GCD: Grand-children

In the parents group, except one, all 120 HHs are male and their spouses are female. On the other hand, only one third of the elder parents are male. If all parents are considered together, the percentage of males increase to 49.

If all children and DIL are included in one group, 54 per cent of them are male. This minor high percentage originate from the relatively high ratio of males in the 15-22 age group, due to the late marriage of sons relative to daughters.

In the 'others' group, 7 of them are male and 4 of them are female.

If the whole village population is considered, 53 per cent are male.

3.4. The Marital Status of Household Members

In the parents group, 114 HHs are married, 4 of them are bachelors and 3 of them are widowed. On the other hand, among the 33 elder parents, 18 of them (55 %) are married and the rest are widowed. In the 'others' group, 8 of them are above the age of 14 and 5 of these are married (Household Interviews).

In the following Table 7.5, the marital status and sex of all children above the age of 14 are given in terms of their age groups.

Table 7.5: The Marital Status and Sex of All Children Above the Age of 14 In Terms of Their Age Groups

Age Groups	Bachelors		All	Married Sons and DIL			All Children		
	Male	Female		Male	Female	All	Male	Female	Total
	1	2							
15-22	58	41	99	16	21	37	74	62	136
23-30	10		10	25 ³	24	49	35	24	59
31-38				5	5	10	5	5	10
39-46				3	2	5	3	2	5
Total	68	41	109	49	52	101 ⁴	117	93	210
%	62	38	100	49	51	48	56	44	100

1 Two are grand-children; 2 Four are grand-children; 3 One is grand-child;
4 The husband of one of the DIL was not in the village, so he is not counted.

There are 109 bachelors (52 % of all children) and 68 of them (62 per cent of all bachelors) are male. Among these 68 bachelors, 58 are in the age group 15-22 and the remaining ten are in the 23-30 age group. On the other

hand, there are only 41 unmarried women and all are in the 15-22 age group. All those who are above the age of 30 are married.

Among the youngest age group (15-22), only 37 (27 %) are married. There are more married females than males in this age group. In the 23-30 age group, 83 % are married and the number of married men and women are almost similar. In the remaining age groups all are married.

If the whole village is considered, 72 % are married, 24 % are bachelor and 4 % are widowed. 39 % of the village population is under the age of 15, which is considered as ineligible for marriage (Household Interviews).

3.5. The Level of Education of Household Members

5

The educational levels of the household members are given in the below Table 7.6.

Table 7.6: The Distribution of the Number and Percentage of Household Members* In Terms of Their Status of Education

Formal Education	All Parents										Total Population	
	Parents		Elder			Children			Ot- hers			
	HHD	SPO	All	MOT	FAT	All	DIL	CD	GCD	All		
Yes	61	14	75			75	22	260	38	298	3	398
%	50	12	32			28	42	95	93	95	33	62
No	60	100	160	22	11	193	30	14	3	17	6	246
%	50	88	68	100	100	72	58	5	7	5	67	38
Total	121	114	235	22	11	268	52	274	41	315	9	644

*Children below age seven are excluded.

HH: Head of the Household; SPO: Spouse; MOT: Mother; FAT: Father; DIL: Daughters-in-Law; CD: Children; GCD: Grand-children

Out of the 803 people who live in the village, 644 are within school age. 62 per cent of them are either

continuing or have had a formal education. The remaining 38 per cent have had no formal education.

In the parents group, only 14 spouses (12 %) had a formal education; 4 of them left primary school and only 10 have primary school diplomas. On the other hand, 61 HHs (50 %) had a formal education. Among these 61 HHs, one of them is a university graduate, 3 are secondary school graduates, 47 of them are primary school graduates and 10 of them have left primary school (Household Interviews). In the elderly parents group, none of them have had a formal education. Only 21 % know how to read and write.

Among the 52 DIL, 22 (42 % of all) have had a formal education. Only one completed secondary school, two left primary school and 19 have primary school diplomas (Household Interviews).

95 % of all children have a formal education. 88 % of them either completed or continue at primary school. Within the remaining 12 per cent (31 children), 16 have completed secondary school, 7 of them have graduated from a Lycee, 3 of them have left primary school, 4 of them are continuing at a secondary school and one of them is at a university (Household Interviews).

Among the 398 villagers in Gokceagac who have received formal education, 66 per cent of them are primary school graduates, 21 per cent are continuing at primary school, 5 per cent have left primary school, and 5 per cent are secondary school graduates. Among the remaining 13 (3 per cent) 4 of them are continuing at a secondary school, 7 of them are Lycee graduates, one attends a university and one is a graduate of university (Household Interviews).

3.6. The Type of Households

As seen in Table 7.7 below, I have divided the 121 households in the village into two main types: nuclear and extended. 6 households did not basically fit the classification and they are labelled as 'others' type. There are 61 nuclear (50 % of all households) and 54 extended (45 %) households. Almost all (56 out of 61) nuclear households have children.

Table 7.7: The Distribution of Types of Households in Terms of their Numbers

Type of Households			
Nuclear			
With Children	54	1	
Without Children		5	
One Parent-Family with Children	2		
Nuclear Total			61
Extended			
With Elder Parents and Children Mother and Father	9		
Only Mother	7	2	
Only Father	2		
Extended Sub Total			18
With Daughters-in-Law and Children			
With Grand-children	27	3	
Without Grand-children	6	4	
With Mother and Grand-children	3	5	
Extended Sub Total			36
Extended Total			54
Others			6

Grand Total			121

- 1 There is a brother-in-law in one of the households.
- 2 There is a child (the shepherd) in one of the households.
- 3 In one of them there is no child and in the other two, there are two elderly members.
- 4 There is a farm-servant in one of the households.
- 5 In one of them there are two wives and in the other the brother's wife is counted as a DIL.
- 6 The six households in this category are composed of the following household members: only one HH; HH and mother; HH, mother and brother's children; HH, his uncle, children and grand-children; husband, wife and grand-children.

I have sub-divided the extended households into two: with elderly parents or with DIL. 18 households (33 %) formed their extended structure with parents and 36 of them (66 %) with DIL. Children also exist in all extended households. Most of the extended households with DIL (30 out of 36) have grand-children.

3.7. The Size of Household Labour

The distribution of the absolute sizes of households, that is disregarding the ages of the household members is given in Table 7.8 below.

Table 7.8: The Distribution of the Size of Households In Terms of Number and Percentage

Size of Households	Households		Total Population	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less 4	11	9	25	3.1
4	13	11	52	6.5
5	18	15	90	11.2
6	24	29	144	17.9
7	17	14	119	14.8
8	14	12	112	14.0
9	10	8	90	11.2
Over 9	14	12	171	21.3
Total	121	101	803	100.0

Almost half (45%) of the households have between 5-7 members in their households. 20 per cent of the households have less than 5 members and the remaining 32 per cent have more than 7 members in their households.

In the following Table 7.9, I have only excluded children below seven from the working population of the village. I have divided the household labour mainly into four: adults, adult children, children and elderly in terms of age groups.

Table 7.9: The Distribution of Labour Capacity* of Households In Terms of the Number and Percentage of Households and Members

Households and all Members	Productive Members				Total	Small Children (Less 7)
	Adults (14-62)	Adult Children (Over 14)	Children (7-13)	Elderly (Over 62)		
Number	119	81	78	31	121	69
All Members	281	177	159	47	664	139
%	42	27	24	7	100	

* Small children are included in the Table for comparison.

According to this distribution, there are 664 household members (83 per cent of the village population) who are above the age of six who are considered as the labour capacity (working population) of the village.

Among these 664 members, 7 per cent are elderly (above the age of 62); 24 per cent are children (between the ages 7-13); and 69 per cent are adults (between the ages of 14-62). In the latter group, 42 per cent are adults and 27 per cent are adult children.

Except for the two households, almost all households have adults (98 percent). 81 households (67 %) have adult

children; 78 households (64 %) have children and 31 households (26 %) have elderly members in their households. In other words, in 33 % of all households, there are no adult children; in 36 %, there are no children (that is, children between the ages of 7-13) and in 74 %, there are no elderly people who would contribute to the household labour.

4. The Forms of Actual Labour Expenditure

The capacity and the actual labour expenditure are closely related to one another. The PCP'ers seek means by which to maximise the use of their labour capacity productively within and outside their household enterprises.

I will concentrate more on the labour expenditure within the agricultural household enterprise and indicate that limited opportunities exist for expending labour outside the tobacco producing PCP enterprise. Although it could be a factor in subsidising the cost of simple reproduction, I will not analyse in detail the possible sources of 'earnings' that are outside the agricultural activities of household enterprise.

As mentioned before, the nature of the labour process of the crops cultivated determines the labour demand. The expenditure of household labour is closely related to the conditions of organisation of production. So (a) the scale of production; (b) the productivity of labour, more precisely, the mechanisation of the labour process, the intensification of the household labour, and the extension of the labour-time; (c) the productivity of land, mainly the

application of technical inputs, such as artificial fertilizers and insecticides; (d) the labour-intensiveness of the combination of crops cultivated; and (e) the possibilities of multi-harvest are the basic elements that determine the actual labour expenditure in PCP.

The expenditure of household labour together with the use of SWL is the most common combination employed to satisfy the labour requirements in Gokceagac. The other forms of labour use are the labour of absentee relatives who live outside of the village, and labour exchange between households. Household labour is seldom used for sharecropping and very rarely in non-enterprise work.

The household labour in PCP is divided, first, into child labour, adult labour and the labour of the elderly; second, into male and female labour; and third, into labour expended within and outside the enterprise.

The household members expend their labour in crop cultivation, subsistence animal rearing and domestic tasks in the village. It is also used in preparing and repairing some of the elements of production. Most of these areas of labour expenditure require systematic forms of labour use and they are repeated in each annual cycle. In addition, the household members spend time in recreation, weddings and other ceremonies and on administrative and medical problems.

The different crops cultivated and their labour intensivities are the determining factors in labour expenditure. Among the crops cultivated in the village the share of tobacco is the largest in the total household labour expenditure. Although some phases of the other crops overlap with the labour process of tobacco, this does not

necessitate the saving of household labour from tobacco production, because of the mechanisation of the rest of the crops.

Subsistence animal rearing is limited to the immediate food needs of households. A few households own some sheep, and most keep a few cows for their milk. The scale of animal husbandry practiced in the village does not require a systematic organisation for pasturing animals. The animals of neighbouring households are usually pastured by small children or the elderly.

4.1. Child Labour

In PCP, the use of child labour⁶ is integral and indispensable. Enterprises try to maximise their use in different spheres of agricultural activity. Even before children reach a productive age, their labour is useful in many ways. Along with the elderly, they engage in many of the secondary tasks, like fetching water, carrying the food for lunch to the field, looking after the younger children, and tending the animals, all of which are time-consuming but do not require physical strength. As children take over these tasks, the adult labourers can devote their full capacity to the primary tasks. The children's contribution is more important in the PLD phases of tobacco production.

The number of children in the household is therefore economically important. It influences the household labour capacity, the ratio of non-productive to productive member, wedding costs, the reproductive costs and the magnitude of the productive labour capacity.

The sex of children is also important because of the sexual division of labour, the inheritance of land, the age of separation of married sons and the size of the households prior to separation.

The children are socialised in a patriarchal enterprise and they learn their roles according to the sexual division of labour in the household. The girls get married earlier than the boys. The labour of daughters is lost with marriage, but sons bring brides to the household. All such changes in the labour capacity of the households must take into account the reproduction costs of individual members and the return on their labour.

Besides marriage, the household may lose the labour of children through other circumstances; military service, and education after primary school.

The time lost in schooling is mainly due to compulsory primary education which starts at the age of seven and lasts for five years. In rural areas the time-tables of primary schools are slightly adjusted so as not to cause significant loss of child labour especially in early summer. Although there is no secondary school in the village, it is possible to attend secondary schools either in the neighbouring villages or in the town. But very few children continue their education after primary school. The girls at home spend part of their time in preparing their trousseau. Although such activities are secondary to their productive and domestic tasks, the preparation of the trousseau does significantly subsidise the wedding costs.

Using the technical meaning of 'exploitation' children

are not exploited by their parents in PCP, for the simple reason that there is no capital accumulation in these enterprises. In return for their productive labour, children are maintained and they acquire the legal right of inheritance.

But this is not the case when they expend their labour in the town. Quite a number of boys from the village 'work' in Bafra, mainly as apprentices in various small workshops: for car and tractor repairs, electricians, plumbing, carpentry, turnery, painting, welding and so on. They are very low paid and they work under very tough conditions while learning the skills. However, the learning of a skill does not guarantee that they will be able to practice a trade, mainly because almost all of them do not have the necessary capital to establish a workshop. This limitation also applies to those adult villagers who possess a specific skill.

4.2. Female Labour

The basic features of female labour expenditure are⁷ determined by the following characteristics of PCP: the patriarchal nature of PCP; the traditional sexual division of labour; the inheritance pattern of land; and the socialisation of girls and boys. The labour of Gokceagac women is indispensable for the continuation of PCP. They expend labour in most productive activities and are responsible for domestic tasks.

Labour expenditure in domestic tasks is a continuous⁸ process. It is highly segregated and include the following

basic responsibilities and duties: child rearing and caring; cooking, washing, cleaning, washing-up, carrying and cutting wood, heating, fetching water, and looking after animals; preparing winter food; mending clothes and preparing trousseau; caring of the old, sick and handicapped members of the household; and so on.

Although all female members work hard, the young girls and the daughters-in-law carry out most of the domestic tasks. It is usually the age and the marital status of the female population which determine the division of labour in domestic tasks.

Men are engaged in most of the productive activities and are responsible for the enterprise as a whole, except for the domestic sphere. Men usually concentrate on traditional male tasks and are often involved in organisational tasks, which have proliferated due to the integration of PCP with market relations. Men are also responsible for the preparation, repair and maintenance of some of the means of production, especially those related to houses, farm-buildings, curing implements and machinery. Women are direct producers in their own enterprises. PCP creates the conditions by which the female population may expend its labour productively. Otherwise, they would be obliged to work as seasonal agricultural workers. Female labour expenditure in carpet-weaving is an alternative in places where capital-intensive cultivation dominates agricultural production; it is not practiced in Gokceagac.

The expenditure of female labour in productive activities is sometimes reduced in capital-intensive cultivation, but

this is not the case for labour-intensive crop combinations.⁹ The increasing degree of commoditisation of the labour process will lower the productive labour expenditure of women in capital-intensive crop cultivation, but women's productive expenditure will continue as long as household labour remains as the major element of the total labour expenditure. Regardless of the unfavorable conditions, women continue to work intensively under difficult conditions, to the extent that they even endanger their health. This applies to almost all females, except the very young and the very old.

On the other hand, the socialisation of domestic tasks due to the commoditisation of reproductive needs, partly reduces the number of domestic tasks and frees women to work in the productive sphere.

As the household size diminishes, each individual member takes more responsibility for productive and domestic tasks. In both spheres, the women's responsibility increases.

The return on women's labour is controlled by the head of the household. This is one of the factors which hinder women's participation in the important decisions related to the household.¹⁰ Since PCP is a subsistence enterprise, after SR costs, there remains a very small 'surplus' to be shared between men and women. But men always benefit more from any very rare favorable return on labour. Women in Gokceagac do not receive any part of their labour return individually. They do not have an independent source of income. It is either directly spent by men or controlled by the patriarch.

Moreover, the traditional non-inheritance pattern of land

ownership lowers women's status and put them in a subordinate position. ¹¹ This practice limits their right to have private ownership; they are reduced to non-property-owning members of the enterprise, which in turn further entrenches their subordinate position and their vulnerability. They are perceived as the daughters of their fathers, the wives of their husbands and the mothers of their children.

Women's exclusion from the inheritance of land is related to the patriarchal continuation of property relations in PCP. A complex situation would arise if the economic assets of two families were combined at marriage. If a woman inherited land, then her husband's share would decrease because her husband's sister would also inherit land.

The legal inheritance rights of daughters are customarily appropriated by their brothers, with only small symbolic compensation. Sometimes the inheritance right can be legally claimed if the female heir migrates from the village. In that case, the kinship relations will become more formal.

The status hierarchy among women within the household is based on patriarchy. The wife of the head of the household has the highest status. She is followed by her daughters, wives of the married sons (i.e. brides) and finally the female grandchildren. The status differences between the daughter and the bride depend on the position of the married son within the power structure of the household. Thus, patriarchal norms, values, age and marriage are important elements of status and division of labour within the

household and in the productive activities. Higher education is also a means to attain high status, but few are in this position in the village. On the other hand, the status acquired due to economic wealth is monopolised by men.

In Gokceagac, female labour is not replaced by the use of SWL and mechanisation has even increased their productive expenditure of labour. They continue to maximise their labour in both spheres of the SR structure of PCP.

4.3. Non-Enterprise Labour

Although the village is located at a 15 minutes driving distance from Bafra and daily commuting is possible, any alternative expenditure of household labour in town, outside the enterprise is almost absent. Bafra is dominantly a commercial town. Neither its private, nor its public manufacturing industry, nor its service sector or state bureaucracy provide sufficient jobs or opportunities for the local agricultural producers.

On the other hand, the town currently has a large population of unemployed residents who seek every opportunity to find the means to earn a living in its limited 'marginal' sector. This is the main reason why the economy of the town thus does not provide continuous and stable alternative expenditure of household labour to Gokceagac villagers even for individual members, let alone for a whole family.

Some of the villagers occasionally work on construction jobs, or do tractor work. However very few villagers worked

outside Bafra. Three young villagers worked in Libya for about two years.

On the other hand, two households own harvesters in the village. One of them uses it professionally in different parts of Turkey and the other uses it at a regional level. One other young villager owns a minibus and works not only between the village and the town, but also between the town and its province Samsun. Two more households own trucks and are they are engaged in transportation in the region. All these villagers, including the owner of the only shop in the village are the grandsons of the previous landlords of the village. They constitute the well-off households of the village.

There are two carpenters and two blacksmiths, who learned their skills within the family, but who no longer work, even in the village. There are also several young welders who usually learned their skills during their military service. They are not able to open shops in Bafra, mainly due to lack of financial sources and the risks involved in the trade.

In addition to these skills, there exist quite a number of skilled 'constructors' who do not work outside the village and who occasionally construct the few houses built in the village. Moreover, one of the villagers works in the fire-brigade and an other as a janitor in the town. Finally one of the two villagers who had grocery shops in Bafra recently closed his shop, largely due to the financial burden of credit sale to his villagers.¹²

Thus, due to the conditions of the labour process and the limited opportunities outside the enterprise, the productive

expenditure of idle labour has serious structural limitations. The PCP'ers facing these conditions have two adaptive strategies, which are highly interrelated and are usually adopted together: the first is to decrease the size of the family, and the second to use labour cooperation and/or seasonal wage-labour (SWL) in PLD periods of tobacco production.

4.4. Labour Cooperation

13

The different forms of labour cooperation exercised in the village do not constitute a systematic and continuous source of labour for all households in the village. It is still practiced under certain specific conditions.

The practice of labour cooperation at village level takes different forms. Here, we are more interested in the reciprocal exchanges of labour between households. In the history of the village, during the landlord structure, the labour needs of the landlord's farm were collectively done by the rest of the villages. Such a compulsory form of labour cooperation was called imece. Its current form is practiced for the communal tasks of the village, where one or two adult labourers from each household are gathered to fulfill a communal task, which is also known now imece. Another form of imece type of cooperation is done whenever the labour demand is beyond the capacity of any household under certain specific conditions, such as fire, flood, or preparations for weddings or other ceremonies. Most of these kinds of labour expenditure are seen as reciprocal in the long term.

The reciprocal exchange of labour practiced in the village is called kesikleme (rotation). A group of families work in one enterprise for one day and the other day they all work for an another enterprise. If the sizes of the labour exchanged between the households are equal, the major benefit, besides social cooperation, is the accomplishment of a task that necessitates a large number of labourers or a task that must be done in a short period of time. In varying degrees, the latter two conditions are important characteristics of the labour process of tobacco cultivation. These needs arise more in planting than in threading. As pointed out earlier, planting of tobacco seedlings necessitates a team of labourers and must be done in a 20-25 days period, in threading, the picking has to be done when the leaves mature and they must be threaded immediately.

The reciprocal cooperation of labour was more widely practiced and it used to be a structural element of the pattern of labour expenditure before 1960s in the village. At that time, the differences between the productive capacities of the enterprises were small. That is, the scale of tobacco cultivation did not differ significantly between the households. Almost all households used the same techniques of cultivation, and had the same labour requirements. Even the size of households was similar, mainly due to the late separation of married sons from their parents' households. These conditions, in addition to the low degree of commoditisation of their simple reproduction and integration to capitalist relations, provided the basic

conditions for the wide practice of labour cooperation in the village.

On the contrary, in the current structure of the village the following significant characteristics of the household enterprises limit the wide practice of reciprocal labour cooperation between the households.

First of all, early marriage and the early separation of married sons from their parents' households and different interpretations of the necessity of large household sizes result in different sizes of families.

Secondly, there is a marked tendency towards a decrease in the sizes of families.

Although partial, the mechanisation of the labour process, especially in the cultivation of capital-intensive crops and its differential application of machinery and technical inputs in the village resulted in unequal labour requirements between the enterprises in the village. A similar effect is caused by the unequal distribution of land ownership.

Thirdly, all household enterprises at all levels of production aimed to maximise the expenditure of their household labour. Together with the above factors this increased the 'individual' nature of the household enterprises. The integration to the generalised commodity relations made most of the enterprises more 'conscious' about both the cost of reproduction of household members and the return to their labour expenditure. These also had an influence on the reduced intensity of kinship relations, which was one of the bases of labour cooperation.

Fourthly, among these factors, the pressures which

increased the scale of tobacco production were the most important aspect that made labour cooperation very difficult to practice. The increases in the scale of production necessitated a more detailed and organised labour expenditure pattern especially in the peak labour demanding phases which made it almost impossible to rely on the limited and 'loose' organisation of labour cooperation.

The same factors that limited labour cooperation, the differences among the enterprises in terms of their productive capacities (mentioned above) also provided the conditions for the continuation of labour cooperation under certain specific conditions.

First of all, whenever it is practiced, it is no longer operated as an exchange of the labour of the whole family, but as an exchange of a specific number of adult and/or child labourers. This change played an important mediating role in the balancing of the excess and shortage of labour, especially for those households (a) that have similar family sizes and produce small scales of tobacco production; (b) that separated from their parents' households but still have important interdependence between them; and (c) still share strong family ties.

Secondly, whenever households reduce their scale of tobacco production, the conditions for labour cooperation become more feasible.

Thirdly, those households which have limited productive capacities and produce less tobacco find the means to expend their surplus labour within the village in a different form. For example, instead of making cash payments for the hiring

of agricultural machinery, such households pay with their labour.

The practice of labour cooperation has showed important changes in the history of the village. Due to the reasons given above, it is not currently widely practiced in the village. Its practice takes different forms and its use oscillates and depends very much on the differences between the household enterprises in terms of their (a) productive capacities, (b) the conditions of their simple reproduction and (c) the degree of integration to the generalised commodity relations.

5. Seasonal Wage-Labour and PCP

The use of seasonal wage-labour (SWL) in agriculture¹⁴ is a significant element of simple reproduction of PCP and a factor of commoditisation.

Although the use of SWL is a new phenomena for a considerable number of households in Gokceagac, currently most of the households (73 per cent) use SWL. About 29 per cent of the households indicated that they have started using it in the last five years and this percentage is 80¹⁵ for the last fifteen years (Household Interviews).

The use of SWL subsidises the simple reproduction of PCP and contributes to the maximisation of the productive use of household labour by increasing the scale of cultivation.

Its use indicates that given the conditions of PCP, the household labour and possible labour cooperation between households cannot satisfy the labour requirements of the enterprise. Furthermore, it also indicates that the

enterprise is under pressure to increase its scale of tobacco cultivation.

On the other hand, the use of SWL extends the commodity nature of PCP. The household enterprises produce more tobacco and consume more commodities as productive inputs and consumption commodities. Thus, on the one hand, the productive capacity is enlarged and, on the other hand, integration into capitalist relations is intensified.

The significance of the use of SWL is explained in the following sections by discussing (1) the reasons for using SWL, (2) the conditions of its use, (3) the characteristics of SWL in tobacco production, and (4) tendencies towards change and the implications of the use of SWL.

5.1. The Reasons for the Use of Seasonal Wage-labour

There are two interrelated reasons for using seasonal wage-labour. The first one is to 'maximise' the total productive expenditure of household labour and the second one is to increase the scale of tobacco cultivation.

The use of SWL creates conditions for increasing the amount of household labour expenditure. Since all household members are maintained for the whole year, household labour does not incur any labour costs to the enterprise, but contributes to an increase in the scale of tobacco production and provides the conditions for the devalorisation of household labour.

It is important to note that the enterprises seek all possible means by which they may maximise their labour expenditure even when they do not use SWL. At this level of

maximum use of household labour, idle labour exists and there are almost no other alternative economic non-enterprise spheres where this idle labour can be productively expended. The use of SWL thus creates opportunities to increase the expenditure of household labour and further maximises the use of household labour.

First of all, the use of SWL in the planting stage of tobacco (refer to chapter 3 and first part of this chapter) cultivation increases the use of household labour because of the necessity of 'team-work' at this stage. That is, the optimum labour combination is formed by including the required number of seasonal wage-workers.

Secondly, since labour requirements in tobacco cultivation are unequally distributed in the annual cycle, the increases in the size of planting creates conditions for more labour to be expended in the threading phase.

Thirdly, the increased scale of production provides more labour to be expended in the non-peak labour demanding phases of production.

Fourthly, more members of the household (specifically the children, elderly, even the handicapped) find opportunities to expend their labour productively when the scale of production is increased through the use of SWL.

Fifthly, the household members not only work longer hours but also work harder (i.e., intensify their labour).

5.2. The Conditions of Use of Seasonal Wage-Labour

The possibility of incorporation of SWL originates from, but is also limited by, the technical nature of tobacco

cultivation. Not all stages require an equal amount of labour and the working periods of each stage are not equal. This is especially important in the PLD stages. And the productive contribution of each member of the household (children, adults and the elderly) varies in different stages.

The use of SWL not only depends on the characteristics of the labour process, but also on the demographic conditions of the household labour: (a) the size of the household; and (b) the composition of the family members in terms of age and sex. In the long-term life span of the household enterprise, these factors change due to aging, marriages, separation of married sons and other unexpected demographic changes (disability, imprisonment, early death, and so on).

Given the above characteristics of the labour process and household labour, the PCP enterprises seek all the means at their disposal to increase their scale of tobacco production before resorting to the use of SWL. They (a) maximise the productive use of all household members by intensifying and extending their labour time; (b) make all possible reciprocal labour cooperation; (c) use the absentee-labour of kin living outside the village; (d) and make use of available agricultural machinery and technical inputs to increase the land and labour productivity. The further increases in the scale of production create a labour demand above the capacity of an 'average' household size. Under these conditions, PCP'ers provide the necessary labour by hiring SWL in PLD phases instead of seeking means to extend the size of their households in the long-run.

The SWL is basically used at the two most labour intensive planting and threading stages of tobacco production.

First, the size of planting is increased by using SWL to a level where the use of household labour is maximised at threading phase. The possibility to use household labour in threading is higher than planting mainly because the threading season is longer and more of the household members can use their labour at this phase. On the second level, if the enterprise further increases the scale of production, it uses SWL in both planting and threading phases. On both of these levels, the share of household labour expenditure is greater than SWL. This is central because the conditions of survival of PCP depend basically on the ability of PCP'ers to devalorise their labour. If this capacity to devalorise is eliminated by excessive use of SWL, the structure of PCP would be undermined.

It is important to note that those households which do not use SWL adopt a strategy to make reciprocal labour exchanges in the planting phase (to the degree that it is possible) and rely on their own labour at threading phase. Some other enterprises cooperate in planting and use SWL to compensate for the labour need in threading.

The excessive use of SWL at planting or threading phases is 'risky' within the subsistence understanding of PCP. It is almost impossible to forecast the level of price increases (a) in agricultural wages, (b) the productive inputs, and (c) in tobacco sales.

On the other hand, the risks with regard to the return on labour are lower at the stage of threading than planting.

The plans made at the planting phase are not fully realised, because the quality and the volume of output could vary. But, since threading is the last major labour intensive stage, it is easier to calculate the possible risks of using SWL. This is the main reason why producers never leave a good crop on the field due to labour shortage. One other tendency of using SWL at threading phase is related to the practice of planting more tobacco than their capacity to thread. This is done in order to guarantee a specific level of output, but it usually creates a labour demand above the capacity of the households and puts pressures upon them to use SWL.

In addition to the cost of wages, the use of SWL is usually limited by the lack of funds, essential for the further purchase of productive inputs (including the possibility of renting land).

5.3. The Sources and Characteristics of Seasonal Wage-Work

In tobacco cultivation, since producers all need workers at the same time it is difficult to find them. This difficulty does not result from a scarcity of labour, but from the nature of the labour demand and the non-organisation of the labourers. There is no well-established organisation to which agricultural workers belong, nor is there an organised labour market. Most of the seasonal workers are not permanent agricultural wage-labourers. Those who still live in agriculture usually have small holdings and some members of the household might have

seasonal or permanent jobs in town. These rural families do seasonal agricultural work to subsidise or secure the reproduction of their families.

The permanent place of residence of SWL'ers is important in terms of the conditions of subsidising their maintenance: in rural areas, rearing of few animals for their subsistence needs; a small garden for seasonal vegetables, cereal cultivation and the very low cost of housing would contribute to their maintenance. In urban centres, the unemployed town residents (including women and children) form the major source of labour for agricultural work. Among them, those people who emigrated to Bafra town from Bulgaria and Yugoslavia also do agricultural work. They mostly live of income producing activities in the marginal sector of the town.

The level of agricultural wages is always taken into account by PCP'ers as an important part of the cost of production. The level of agricultural wages is largely influenced by the following factors: the nature and level of the SR of the PCP'ers; the minimal maintenance of an agricultural worker; the disorganised nature of SWL; the supply and demand of seasonal wage work; and the conditions of seasonal wage work (whether they work as a whole family or individually, whether they come from outside the region or from the nearest town, Bafra, whether they commute to the village daily or stay in the village, whether they work at planting or threading phases of tobacco cultivation).

5.4. Changes Related to Seasonal Wage-Work

Certain important changes happened in the history of seasonal wage-work in tobacco cultivation. The quality of the labour required differs in the two phases where SWL is used. In the planting phase, workers used to start at daybreak and work with few and short breaks until sunset. Currently, if they do not stay in the village, they come early in the morning and work for 8-10 hours a day.

In the threading phase, the workers used to pick and thread the tobacco leaves. The tendency now is that they mainly concentrate on threading. The second important change in threading started in 1978, while I was doing the fieldwork. Instead of workers coming to the village, several villagers took the picked leaves to Bafra and distributed them to several families in specific quarters of the town, where mostly women and children thread these leaves at their homes. This method was expensive and usually decreased the quality of tobacco and not all households practiced it. But it was an important indicator of how producers adopt and integrate themselves further within the commodity relations under pressures of increased labour demand caused by increases in the scale of production.

Thirdly, in general, the town residents are becoming the main source of agricultural wage-labour, rather than the migrant labourers who used to come from the mountainous parts of the region or from the neighbouring villages. Fourthly, the work-force now is mainly composed of individual workers, in contrast to the families in the past.

Fifthly, seasonal wage-work is becoming more formal in several respects. The previous tendency of coming to the village as families and staying in the village until the end of a job is no longer practiced, except by the very few families who migrate specifically for seasonal work from the mountainous villages of the region. The majority of the agricultural workers commute daily between the town and the villages. This significantly decreased the traditional very long working hours each day. Furthermore, the working conditions also became more formal.

5.5. The Implications of the Use of Seasonal Wage-Workers

The use of seasonal wage-labour (SWL) does not undermine the significance of household labour; instead, it provides the conditions for enlarging the expenditure of household labour. This is more apparent in labour-intensive cultivation and under conditions of diminishing family size. Moreover, this furnishes the enterprises with the power to resist adverse conditions of return on their labour. But the degree of use of SWL and the possibilities of devalorisation have their limits. In general, the demand for the use of SWL increases as (1) the household sizes decrease, (2) the scale of production increases, (3) the level of mechanisation increases and (4) the PCP's integrate more with commodity relations. In addition, the crop combination, and the labour-intensiveness of the crops cultivated, and the economic capacity of PCP's to produce also influence the extent to which SWL is used.

The tendency to use SWL has been increasing and becoming

a permanent feature of PCP in Gokceagac during recent decades. It conforms to their primary purpose of securing the subsistence maintenance of their household enterprise.

The producers do not use SWL to accumulate capital. The relations between PCP'ers and the agricultural workers is not an exploitative one. Yet, the surplus created in this relationship is appropriated at the social formation level, within the relations between PCP and capital.

The use of SWL is an indicator of the development of capitalist relations. It is an aspect of differentiation for the PCP'ers, and is one of the dynamic features of PCP which embodies change and tendencies toward capitalist relations.

The major limitations on the development of wage-labour in agriculture derive from (1) the nature of the development of capitalist relations in agriculture, (2) the survival of PCP; (3) the migration from rural to urban centres; (4) the scarce opportunities for wage-work in rural areas; and (5) the low degree of the present use of SWL in small intensive agricultural production.

It must be emphasised that the continuation of expenditure of household labour does not give PCP an independent character and that the existing pattern of labour expenditure is not contrary to the interests of capital and the State.

On the other hand, the full commoditisation of the labour process is limited by the survival of household labour in the non-commodity form and by the subsistence nature of the enterprise. The cost of agricultural products increases

with the rise in price of commodities purchased, and they are not usually reflected in full in the price of the commodities marketed by PCP'ers. This is also the case for the cost of SWL. Thus the amount marketed and the surplus appropriated grows in parallel with the increase in the scale of production. So the increases in scale of production of PCP'ers by combining household labour with SWL are not contrary, but serve the interests of capital and the State.

The PCP'ers continue to be the major sources of cheap labour, raw materials, food and provide foreign exchange earnings by producing export commodities. They continue to survive with low standards of living, devalorise their household labour by extending and intensifying it, they adopt and use the improved technical inputs and agricultural machinery to maintain the possible productivity and increase the scale of production. Women work intensively in agriculture and contribute significantly to the creation of surplus; and children and elderly household members, even the handicapped, work productively in certain phases of the productive activities in agriculture. Far from conflicting with the interests of capital and the State, all these provide suitable conditions for them to appropriate the surplus of PCP'ers.

On the other hand, under conditions of 'constant' return to labour, the increases in the scale of production can affect the level of reproduction of PCP'ers positively because the increased amount of household labour expenditure does not incur proportional additional costs to the enterprise. Furthermore, if 'unexpected' higher prices are

paid for their produce, those households which increased their scale of production could end up with extra funds. Most of the households, even under favorable conditions only manage to pay their accrued debts or spend the money on one of the several urgent needs of the household. However, the 'unproductive' expenditure of these funds mainly on the 'deferred' immediate consumption, usually expand the financial burdens of the enterprise if the unexpected high returns do not continue in the next annual cycle. This indicates the delicate relationship of, and perhaps a contradiction between, the options of increasing the standard of living and investing in the means of production to widen the productive capacity of the enterprise. Nevertheless, in few favorable cycles some of the households save funds.

Although the scale of tobacco production increases, the area of land allocated for tobacco is still small. The households tend to decrease in size, but they increase the scale of their production by integrating SWL. Outside the household enterprise, the unavoidable idle labour capacity in PCP cannot be realised in a secure permanent job without hindering the labour needs of the agricultural enterprise. The PCP'ers seek any and all means to maximise their labour in order to secure their simple reproduction. On the other hand, the commodity content of the labour expenditure of households is increasing. PCP'ers produce and consume more commodities and thus they are integrated more to capitalist relations. Although enterprises extend their capacity to produce, they become more vulnerable to the conditions of

generalised commodity relations.

The use of SWL is becoming an indispensable structural element of PCP, but the extent of its use has limits. Its use not only provides the conditions for decreasing household sizes, but also maximises the expenditure of household labour. Thus, the PCP'ers find the means to increase the scale of their production without the full commoditisation of their labour process.

Footnotes

1. Kazgan (1964) and Hamitogullari (1968) discuss the significance of idle labour in relation to the development of agriculture in Turkey.
2. Threading phase in tobacco includes also the tasks of picking and sun-curing. See Talim (1974) for the conditions of change of labour demand in the cultivation of tobacco.
3. Tobacco leaves are threaded on three metres long strings. See the technical stages of tobacco cultivation in second part of Chapter Three.
4. In these calculations, the married sons are considered as children due to the classification used according to the head of the household.
5. Eserpek (1977), Balamir (1981) and Ozbay (1982b) discuss the role of education in agriculture by giving more emphasis on the position of women.
6. For the 'value' of the child, see Kagitcibasi (1981) and for the conditions of expenditure of child-labour also see Ozbay (1984) and Balaman (1984).
7. I could not find a study which is specifically made on the position of women in Turkish agriculture. The works of Ozbay (1982a, 1982b, 1984) and Balamir (1983) include analysis of the labour expenditure patterns of women in agriculture.
8. For a detailed description of the division of labour, see Eserpek (1978) and Balaman (1984) and Pierce (1964) for the internal hierarchy among women at home.
9. For the impact of penetration of capital in agriculture on the sexual division of labour and the conditions of family labour expenditure, see studies on India by Sharma (1985), on Sri Lanka by Schrijvers (1983), on Mexico by Young (1978), on Peru by Deere (1979) and Redclift (1985).
10. The conditions of the participation of women in the important issues of the household and the limited control over the expenditure of family income are discussed in Kiray (1978), Terzioglu (1981) and Ozbay (1984).
11. Starr (1982) discusses the increased conditions and possibilities for women to inherit land in the Aegean coast of Turkey.
12. Kiray (1964) discusses the significant role the grocer plays in the commercial relations.

13. There are almost no studies on the labour cooperation in Turkish agriculture. Yasa's (1962) work is the only exception.
14. Most of the studies on seasonal wage-work, Kazgan (1963), Aksoy (1969, 1982), Gurgun (1982), and Seker (1986) focus on the description of the conditions of work, legal status, social security and wages. And they are mostly specific to capitalist farms.
15. Note that the survey was conducted in 1978.

CHAPTER 8 CAPITAL-PEASANT RELATIONS

The aim of this chapter is to outline the main issues involved in capital-peasant (c-p) relations and to use them to analyse the nature of PCP.

The discussions in this chapter are developed in four parts: (1) a general introduction to c-p relations; (2) the origins of commercialisation in the history of Gokceagac village; (3) the commodity nature of PCP: and (4) the role of capital in c-p relations.

1. Introduction

The term 'capital' is used at two interrelated levels of abstraction: (a) the social formation level and (b) the role of different concrete forms of capital in relation to the simple reproduction (SR) structure of PCP.

While conceptualising and analysing PCP, the primary issue is to explain why PCP'ers do not evolve into capitalist farmers or agrarian petty capitalists. Such a transformation is possible through full differentiation of peasantry in class terms: either PCP'ers are expropriated fully from the means of production and become members of the wage-labouring class, or they fully commoditise their enterprises and become members of the bourgeoisie.

Transformation of this sort obviously can have different versions and forms depending on the historical and specific conditions of the social formations involved.

The analysis of tobacco producing PCP'ers specific to my study shows that PCP enterprises have not yet fully transformed; they have survived as PCP'ers. The nature and the characteristics of PCP cannot be used to identify them as a separate or specific mode of production. One should not conceptualise PCP external to or articulated with capitalist relations of production. *

The PCP in agriculture necessitates a thorough and detailed analysis of the conditions of its SR structure. The PCP'ers survive in agriculture mainly because they (1) own the means of production that they use, especially the labour and the land; (2) they have the ability to devalorise their household labour; and (3) they can adopt and integrate themselves into commodity relations. But, such survival does not exclude the conditions of differentiation and expropriation. At both the abstract/conceptual and concrete/material levels, PCP'ers can differentiate and expropriate fully; and at national level during the period in question peasant producers did differentiate and expropriate, especially during the establishment periods of small peasant enterprises and rapid technological changes due to the mechanisation of agricultural production. These processes are witnessed more in agrarian structures in which capital-intensive crop combination is dominant. Besides, the conditions and the tendencies of differentiation and expropriation still prevail. Moreover, there are currently structural elements that hinder and limit the full transformation and/or expropriation of PCP'ers. They mainly originate either from the nature of PCP and/or from the role *

of capital in c-p relations.

These structural limitations are related to (a) the non-commodity form of household labour; (b) the family structure being the source of household labour; and (c) the natural aspects and characteristics of the labour process of agricultural production.

On the other hand, the limitations related to capital mainly originate from the lack of direct control of the immediate labour process by the pertinent capital.

These features of the relations of production specific to the conditions of survival and/or expropriation of PCP should not be reduced to market relations and/or to the theories of unequal exchange. On the contrary, the relations of production and the nature of exploitation of the PCP'ers should be analysed according to the conditions of SR of PCP and the relationship between capital and the peasantry. And the c-p relations should not be reduced to the role of commercial capital.

Although PCP'ers are being increasingly integrated into commodity relations (i.e., the commoditisation of their SR structure) and the commercial and commodity markets are growing and extending with the relations culminating in the circulation of capital, nevertheless the expropriation of the PCP'ers is possible, being determined according to the conditions of production.

The capital involved in c-p relations is not homogeneous; rather, it is composed of different forms of capital: circulating, industrial, finance, various forms of state-capital.

The penetration of capital should be interpreted with

regard to the struggle between PCP and capital to control the conditions of SR of PCP'ers. This struggle is the locus of the class relationships and it is directly related to the nature of the exploitation of PCP'ers.

In this struggle, PCP'ers seek means to (a) continue production; (b) increase the scale of their production; and (c) decrease the cost of both production and reproduction. The resistance of the PCP'ers to their subsumption by capital is limited and partial, because they are not an organised group. They concentrate more on the organisation of their production and try to adapt their enterprises to the changing features of the commodity relations as these extend.

Resistance, in the form of withdrawing from the commodity production by retreating more to use-value production (subsistence goods production) and evading the monopolistically determined prices, is only partial; because the commoditisation of the SR cycle of PCP has become a necessary condition for their survival.

It is important to note that the development of commodity relations or the commoditisation of the SR structure is not simply the exchange and the circulation of commodities; it also embraces the way commodities are produced. It would be simplistic and reductionist to reduce c-p relations to market relations.

Moreover, PCP is not only specific to agriculture, it also exists in industry, yet, its nature in agriculture has several different features from that in industry. Furthermore, it harbours elements of change, transformation

and differentiation and incorporates different types and forms of agricultural production.

The analysis of the penetration of different forms of capital into agriculture, and of the role they play, is based on the historical conditions of the establishment of PCP in Gokceagac village. Some of the features discussed in Chapter Four on the disintegration of the landlord structure, are repeated in the next section, with a perspective to understand the role of the emerging commercial structure in the establishment and the continuation of c-p relations.

2. Capital-Peasant Relations: The Historical Past of Gokceagac Village

2.1. Structure of the Closed Economy¹ and the Restricted Commercial Relations

The nature of the closed economy of Gokceagac and the SR structure of the its households depended basically on (a) the ownership and/or possession of the means of production (including the land and the labour); (b) the conditions of sharecropping relations; and (c) the appropriation of the surplus.

The dependent sharecropping households in Gokceagac secured their SR in an economy where productive and reproductive needs were met with almost no consumption of market-purchased commodities.

The land, household labour and a handful of simple means of production were the basic elements of production. The size of the holdings was small and the productivity low.

Land was abundant, but controlled and owned by the landlord, with sharecropping as the form of use.

The source of labour was the family, whose size was small and dependent upon (a) population increases; (b) the dividing of families to establish new households; and (c) the migration of individuals or families into and out of the village.

The productivity of labour depended on the degree of intensification of labour and the extention of the labour-time. The primitive level of the agrarian technology kept labour productivity at a minimal level.

The remaining means of production were obtained through subsistence production. Agricultural tools and the house and farm buildings were made of wood from the forests. Oxen and other animals were home bred.

Very few commodities, salt, gasoline, sugar, were purchased from the market. Even clothing was largely home produced. Consumption norms were very low, and determined by the landlord, through his control of cash loans. Almost all reproductive needs were provided by subsistence.

The return to their labour as a share of their produce was the basic source of their reproduction. As long as the producers obtained their food from maize and milk (and from its by-products) and could replace the means of production whenever necessary, they survived outside of the cycle of commercial and commodity relations.

Although tobacco was a cash crop, the Gokceagac villagers were not able to exchange their produce in the market; * because the landlord monopolised and exercised control over

the market relations.

The landlord was powerful. He controlled the SR of the producers through monopolising the ownership of land, credit and debt. Moreover, only he had the essential social relations and transport. So all tobacco was sold through * the landlord.

The landlord's responsibility in the reproductive sphere was not substantial because PCP'ers produced subsistence cereals, specifically maize and later wheat, under sharecropping relations. The subsistence production of maize, along with the products of the few animals kept, were the producers' source for their food consumption. Thus, the combination of the production of subsistence food and tobacco, both of these through sharecropping, complemented each other to decrease the cost of SR which in turn expanded the surplus appropriated by the landlord.

The first important challenge to sharecropping relations originated from the enlargement in the labour capacity of the families, which resulted in an increase in the production power of the households.

On the other hand, an enlarged labour capacity stimulated the demand for land and for other means of production. There was an increase in sharecropped land, and in possession of means of production, even where this meant becoming indebted to the landlord.

It is noteworthy that the two basic elements of this extended capacity, i.e. labour and the means of production, excluding the land, were owned by the producers. Obviously this situation created potential power for the producers; nevertheless, it was not sufficient for the producers to

challenge the prevailing relations of production, mainly due to the lack of ownership/possession of land.

The establishment of agricultural production independent of the landlord necessitated the ownership of land. If the producers had owned small pieces of land, it would have weakened their dependency on the landlord to the degree that they would have been able to expend their household labour outside of the sharecropping relations. But the landlord was very keen on not loosening his total control over the labour, land and means of production. He exerted control not only over the land and the means of production but also over usury and the 'exchange' of tobacco. The means of production already owned by the producers did not guarantee their replacement or repair. The producers continued to incur debt to meet these needs. Both the cultivated and idle land of the village was in his hands. His grip on the means of production was indirect; that is, he controlled the sources: the cash and the wood. Despite all this, the producers extended their ownership of the means of production gradually, coming to possess a yoke of oxen, a house, plus wooden and metal tools. Some of the producers even owned very small plots of land.

On the other hand, landlord's monopoly control over the exchange of tobacco was an essential drag on the development of commercial relations.

The landlord, M. Aga, collected the tobacco produce not only of Gokceagac village but also of half a dozen other villages around it.

The landlord did not make cash payments to the producers.

He used to count the tobacco shares of the producers against the accumulated debts, which always managed to exceed the annual 'value' of the produce. The appropriated surplus formed the necessary source of money used in usury, which was wielded by landlords as an additional weapon to force the direct producers deeper into debt and to quicken the rate of surplus appropriation.

The level of exploitation was so high that sharecroppers achieved bare subsistence reproduction under 'normal' conditions, managing to provide no more than the annual circulating needs of their families. Almost no funds were saved for 'additional' needs, even for the replacement and repair of the means of production. The level of their simple reproduction failed to cover the increased costs of reproduction due to (a) crop failures; (b) other natural disasters; (c) the unexpected death of family members or animals; (d) the depreciation and loss of means of production; and (e) the extension of the means of production, in particular the dwelling.

The occurrence of various combinations of the above was frequent. This added up to a significant contribution to furthering indebtedness.

The appropriation of the surplus of the producers assumed various forms, in combination: sharing of the produce, the imece labour, indebtedness and usury and even 'forced' appropriation during the disintegration phase of the landlord structure. The landlord employed a range of means to ensure that sharecropper families did not accumulate funds to create a core of economic power which could break the cycle of indebtedness.

The landlord's control of the total cash expenditure, through monopoly control over exchange of the tobacco produce, restricted the composition and the level of consumption of commodities. Such control was essential for the continuation of the landlord structure. First, it forced producers to satisfy most of their productive and reproductive needs through subsistence production. Second, the minimum cash expenditure maximised the amount of surplus appropriated. Third, it did not provide funds for alternative means of ownership of the means of production, particularly land.

All this resulted in minimum contact with the markets, an effect which was augmented further by the prevailing traditional values of subsistence reproduction. The villagers had been socialised to produce by subsistence means almost everything they consumed.

So the landlords in Gokceagac appropriated the surplus of the producers mainly because they monopolistically owned land, means of production and the means of life; not because they had monopolised the 'exchange' of tobacco produce. The monopoly power in marketing was mainly an outcome of the landlord's direct control over the organisation of production and life in the village.

The landlords, in order to guarantee the continuation of the prevailing relations of production, even resorted to various means of direct force: bribing, using the local gendarme, setting fire to crops, killing and rustling livestock, and threatening the lives of the villagers. These means were widespread, especially during the

disintegration phases of the landlord structure in the 1940's, where the power of the sons of the landlords was diminished.

In short, the landlords of Gokceagac had the necessary means and the power to ensure the continuation of prevailing relations of production by providing (a) the land to be sharecropped; (b) the cash for the few commodities to be purchased from the market; (c) the essential means of production; (d) security and social life and order in the village. This structure in Gokceagac started to disintegrate from early 1940s onwards.

2.2. Disintegration of the Landlord Structure and Establishment of Small Peasant Production

The disintegration of the landlord structure in Gokceagac paved the way for the emergence of small peasant production which created the conditions for the commercial relations to become an important and integral part of the village.

The changes did not originate from the conditions of the landlord structure alone; there was also penetration by capital and the State to influence the prevailing relations of production.

A discussion follows of the conditions and features of the disintegration according to the changing and developing relations between the four social groups: the landlords, the sharecropper families, the State and capital.

2.2.1. The Landlords

The comprehensive power of landlord M.Aga was decreasing: First, he moved to Bafra, and set up a tobacco trading office, investing money for this trade and purchasing land and real estate in the town. This siphoned off money formerly used in sharecropping relations in the village, thus weakening his overall control over the village. Second, because of (a) his advanced age, (b) his decreased zeal in the village and (c) the ambition of his three sons to become separate landlords, M. Aga divided his lands among his sons, contrary to the logic and the tradition of the landlord structure. However, he did not totally break his link with Gokceagac. He kept his house and continued to own large land in the village, sharecropped his land to the villagers and collected their tobacco.

M. Aga's three sons were competed for power and control of the village among themselves. All three used the privileges of landlords without the corresponding duties. In one sense, they just inherited large land from their fathers. Obviously, they used these land in sharecropping. But, instead of using the appropriated surplus for the widening of sharecropping relations, they used most of it for their personal consumption. The nature and the scope of the control of the production and the magnitude of the surplus were, however, not in accordance with their unrealistically inflated status consumption as landlords. Very soon they started to use means alien and external to landlord structure in order to expand their surplus appropriation

without taking into account the essential conditions of survival of the landlord structure.

2.2.2. The Sharecroppers

The factors which contributed to the disintegration of the structure in Gokceagac were not only specific to the landlords, but also originated from the culminating changes in the conditions of survival of Gokceagac villagers. These changes were primarily related to (a) the ownership/possession of the means of production, specifically the land; (b) the increased capacity of the families to expend their labour in productive activities; and (c) the intervention of capital and the State into both agricultural production and the exchange of agricultural products. The State and capital provided alternative means to the producers, particularly in credit and commodity markets.

The increases in the size of households increased the productive labour capacity. The immediate implication was an increased demand for land. The villagers struggled to own/possess land by (a) simply occupying and tilling state-owned and remote land; (b) clearing woodland for farming; (c) sharing meadows; and (d) appropriating the land of emigrated Greeks. During the late 1940s they also purchased holdings from the landlords.

In addition, a small number of families inherited land from others who had previously occupied small plots of land, and from those who acquired land through marriage with the daughters of landlords.

The increased capacity to labour, and the increased use of land independent of the landlord's sons, extended the scale of cultivation and required an increase in the means of production.

The decreased power of the landlords also loosened their control over the sources of wood, which contributed significantly to the subsistence production of important means of production, specifically the preparation of the curing implements for tobacco and the construction of houses and outbuildings. Other elements of production were obtained through increased state credit.

The landlords obviously tried to prevent or at least control these changes; but their success was limited to the degree of their deteriorated control over the village.

2.2.3. Capital and the State

During the 1940s, the State and capital became important sources of credit and purchasers of tobacco. These two alternatives were the most important factors in breaking the dependency link between the landlords and the sharecropper families, and contributed significantly to the disintegration of the landlord structure and concomitant emergence of small peasant production in the village.

The Agricultural Bank of the Turkish State had been providing agricultural credit in late 1920s. But the amount of the loans was small and the power of landlord M. Aga was strong enough to prevent the use of state loans by his sharecroppers.

In the late 1940s, as the landlords' power was gradually declining, the Agricultural Bank extended agricultural credits. The landlords resorted to various methods to prevent the producers' borrowing from the formal sources, but their attempts failed.

The second factor was the emergence of the State and of commercial capital as alternative purchasers in tobacco trading, which eliminated the landlords' monopoly. The State, after establishing a monopoly on tobacco, legally guaranteed to purchase all tobacco that was produced. As a result, the State became the most important purchaser of tobacco.

As the Gokceagac villagers started to sell their tobacco to the State or to tobacco merchants, and began to receive loans from formal sources, they started forming commercial and commodity links with the Bafra market. As the cash economy gradually grew through bank loans and the marketing of agricultural crops, commercial capital began to market industrial products to the direct producers as productive and reproductive commodities.

Thus, the conditions for capital to enter agriculture were ripening in various forms: First, commercial capital specialised in the marketing of agricultural crops. Some participants acted as intermediary tobacco merchants. These intermediary tobacco merchants purchased tobacco for commercial capital outside of the region. Second, capital in the form of credits provided the circulating capital essential for the continuation of agricultural production, and served to extend commodity exchanges. Third, capital in the form of commodities supplied the necessary productive

and reproductive needs of the producers.

These interrelated processes and the changes related to (a) the decreasing power of the landlords; (b) the increase in the economic capacity of the producers due to population increase and the growing alternatives of owning and/or possessing the basic means of production, specifically the land and wood; and (c) the role of the state and of capital in purchasing agricultural produce (specifically tobacco) and providing credits, taken together, were the basic factors in the dissolution of the landlord structure and the emergence of small peasant producers.

These changes provided the ground for the strengthening of the small peasant producers in the village and accelerated the changes and developments in (a) the productivity of land and labour; (b) the application of technical inputs and agricultural machinery; (c) the use of SWL; (d) the purchase of land from the landlords; (e) the infra-structural investments in the region (specifically, the construction of village roads); and (f) the further commoditisation of the simple reproduction of the producers for the establishment of PCP in Gokceagac. These also provided the conditions of differentiated survival of household enterprises.

3. PCP and Capital-Peasant Relations

3.1. Introduction

The changes and developments in the commercial and

commodity relations in agriculture, together with monetisation and commoditisation of the simple reproduction structure of PCP'ers, are central in understanding capitalist relations in agriculture. These processes have two interrelated dimensions for PCP: the SR structure of PCP'ers and the commercial and commodity markets.

This section concentrates on the characteristics and the changing features of commodity and the monetary aspects of the SR structure of PCP'ers. The prevailing relations and forces of production and the conditions of expropriation and landlessness in PCP are discussed in relation to (1) the commodity nature of PCP; (2) the subsistence goods production; (3) the commoditisation of the SR structure; (4) the limits of commoditisation; and (5) the impact of commoditisation on the ownership structure, specifically on land, labour and agricultural machinery.

3.2. The Commodity Nature of PCP

PCP'ers, under prevailing relations of production, organise their enterprises to expend labour in order to maintain their livelihood by producing and reproducing with a subsistence aim that corresponds to a relative standard of living. In conformity to this standard, the needs of the household members and the PCP enterprise are satisfied by consuming commodities and subsistence goods. In consuming them, they expend labour to produce subsistence goods and commodities. When PCP'ers consume commodities and subsistence goods for production, this is productive consumption; when the goods are directly consumed for

reproduction, it is immediate or reproductive consumption. The SR structure of PCP consists of these two spheres of activities.

Household enterprises are integrated with capitalist relations as their productive and reproductive cycles are monetised and commoditised;² and thus capital penetrates into agriculture.

Individual consumption secures the reproduction of household members; and total consumption, which is both productive and individual, secures the simple reproduction of household enterprises. On the other hand, individual consumption includes both the consumption of subsistence goods produced by PCP enterprises and the commodities purchased from the market, which provides the conditions for the expenditure of household labour to produce subsistence goods and commodities. Thus, the SR structure combines production (commodities and subsistence goods), consumption (productive and individual), reproduction (household members and the enterprise) and commoditisation (PCP enterprises and economic activities at large) as interrelated phases of the SR cycle of PCP enterprises.

One important point that must be mentioned here is that the expenditure of household labour is considered as either productive or domestic according to the sphere in which the labour is expended: production or reproduction. Household labour is not a commodity; it is similar to subsistence goods produced; but its reproduction is highly commoditised.

The development of commodity relations is the most dynamic feature of change in agriculture. PCP'ers adapt and *

reorganise their enterprises according to these changes, and they also show resistance with regard to conditions of commoditisation of their production process.

PCP is integrated with commodity relations through the processes of introduction of new seeds, technical inputs and machinery; changes in methods of cultivation; implementation of different kinds of state subsidies and incentives; the involvement of the State in marketing, pricing and taxation systems; the building of infrastructure; and the development of different markets.

On the other hand, the commoditisation of the SR structure of PCP'ers is an important factor in the growth of the commodity market. PCP'ers extend markets as indispensable consumers and producers of commodities.

3.3 Subsistence Goods Production

The production of goods which are consumed directly by PCP'ers is considered as subsistence goods production. Household labour for production and food for reproduction are the two major areas of subsistence goods production. Wheat and maize, fresh vegetables, poultry and milk and all their by products are produced for subsistence needs and almost nothing remains for sale. A few households do produce them, specifically wheat and maize, as commodities beyond their own needs.

The perpetuation of subsistence goods production should not be understood as a contradiction to the tendencies of commoditisation. Subsistence goods production is not possible and household labour cannot be reproduced without

the consumption of commodities. Its reproduction is partially and directly effected via commodity consumption as immediate consumption commodities and indirectly facilitated by the production which also uses commodities. The commodity nature of reproduction of household labour should not be reduced simply to commodities used in reproduction, but must incorporate productive spheres which involve the production of both commodities and subsistence goods.

Seasonal wage-labour (SWL) as a commodity is not used in the production of subsistence goods; but its use extends the productive sphere and hence contributes to the reproduction of household labour.

PCP'ers continue to produce subsistence goods in order to decrease the cost of their simple reproduction. Subsistence goods are used to produce other subsistence goods for direct final consumption and are also used to produce agricultural commodities for sale. The cost of SR is decreased to the degree that it is possible to devalorise the household labour in both the productive and reproductive phases of PCP. Due to the nature of agricultural production, the sexual division of labour and the patriarchal organisation of PCP enterprise, all means and conditions that increase the labour expenditure of household members increase the capacity to devalorise their labour and thus decrease the cost of their SR.

Changes in PCP which result with saved labour should not be simply interpreted as decreasing the labour expenditure and thus decreasing the devalorisation capacity of the enterprise. It can be increased if the saved labour finds

means to be expended in productive activities, given the structural and organisational constraints that pertain.

On the other hand, the price of agricultural crops in general is consciously controlled and kept low through the intervention of the State and capital in order to transform surplus from agriculture to industry and keep industrial wages low. This policy is more widely practiced where cereals and agricultural raw materials are concerned. Although faced with such policies PCP'ers tend to renounce increases in their scale of production. They nevertheless continue to produce for their subsistence needs.

Furthermore, the State subsidises the price of important inputs, the most important of which are artificial fertilizers⁵ in order to keep the price of agricultural commodities at low levels, but no such policies are adopted for industrial production, with a consequent increase in the relative price of industrial commodities. Thus, in order to evade the possible negative effects of terms of trade, it is rational for PCP'ers to continue to produce subsistence goods, especially those specific to their food needs.

In addition, compared to urban-industrial conditions, some of the subsistence goods, such as wood and natural fertilizers, can be provided relatively cheaply in agriculture, a fact which contribute significantly to decrease their cost of SR.

Since subsistence goods are not exchanged in the market, the appropriated surplus of PCP'ers increases equivalent to the amount of the share of commercial capital. This also contributes to their simple reproduction.

The subsistence goods enter into the production cycle as

elements of production and the production of subsistence goods also necessitates the use of commodities. Thus, it is impossible to understand subsistence goods production in isolation from the expanding commodity relations.

It is important to note here that household labour is also a subsistence good. That is, it is not expended in the form of commodity. The subsistence nature of PCP is usually reduced to the reproductive sphere and to direct consumption of food products. But the productive expenditure of household labour as a subsistence good is usually neglected, whereas it is the central element in the survival of PCP. In agricultural production, due to the characteristics of the production process, part of household labour, regardless of sex and age, become idle in certain periods of the annual cycle. This labour finds the means and the conditions to be used in subsistence goods production as domestic labour and productive labour, thereby significantly subsidising and decreasing the cost of SR. The female labour in such an agricultural activity contributes significantly both to productive agricultural activities and to domestic tasks. To a lesser degree, this also holds true for the labour of elder members of the household and of children (non-adult) between the ages of 8 and 14. The position of women in general, and the prevailing division of labour together with the patriarchal organisation of production, support the stability of PCP by continuing to contribute in a major way to the perpetuation of subsistence goods production. But it is centrally important to repeat that both the subsistence goods production and the

reproduction of household labour are not possible without the consumption of commodities. The subsistence aspect of household labour is thus related both to its productive expenditure and also to the reproduction of household members. Its expenditure in the production of commodities does not make PCP a capitalist enterprise, nor does its non-commodity form place PCP outside the sphere of commercial and commodity relations. The continuation of subsistence goods production, therefore has an effect that is both hindering and fostering of commodity relations. It hinders because it produces use-values; but fosters in that during its production, commodities are consumed. The subsistence goods production and the production for exchange both serve for the SR of the PCP'ers.

The relationship between the development of commodity relations and the continuation of subsistence goods production must be recognised: First, as long as opportunities continue to exist for household labour expenditure, the complete commoditisation of the SR structure is not possible. Second, if some part of productive labour is used for direct consumption needs, subsistence goods production will continue. Third, as long as the labour expenditure of PCP'ers is based on family structures, domestic labour expenditure will continue as a subsistence element. Subsistence goods production continues, but its nature has altered and been modified in several important respects.

First, the commodity content (the use of industrial commodities for such production) has increased. Second, the share of subsistence goods production, except in household

labour, in the productive sphere has decreased. This increases the labour capacity of household members, to be used both in the productive and reproductive spheres. The reproductive sphere naturally lends itself to the consumption of subsistence goods, whose expenditure is in fact more heavily concentrated there. Third, certain subsistence goods are no longer cheaply available, wood and natural fertilizers for example. Fourth, the consumption bundle of goods is growing: new needs originate; previous needs are satisfied by different goods; some consumption necessitates other supplementary and complementary goods, and so on. All these changes influence the nature, magnitude and share of subsistence goods in the total consumption of household enterprises. But nevertheless, as commoditisation becomes an economic necessity for PCP'ers, the scope of the subsistence goods production will be limited to areas such as animal husbandry, vegetable gardening, cereal production and domestic labour. However, non-commodity labour expenditure will still continue to be the basic subsistence element for the survival of PCP.

3.4. The Commoditisation of the Simple Reproduction Structure of PCP

Commoditisation from the perspective of PCP includes all processes of commodity production and commodity consumption which aim to secure the SR of PCP'ers.

The use of subsistence goods and commodities necessitate the consumption of other commodities and services. Some of

the commodities have multiple functions and PCP'ers consume a considerable number of new commodities: part of them complement and others supplement the old commodities. The consumption of commodities could save labour or raise the standard of living.

The total consumption of PCP'ers is not static: its norms⁶ change with time. The satisfaction of needs corresponds to a specific standard of living which is determined by the position of PCP'ers in the class structure.

Factors which may affect consumption are: the standard of living; ideas about essentiality and indispensability; degree of contact with the market; influence of mass media; and status. In addition, patriarchal control is also influential on the nature of consumption: it is capable of restricting the demands of household members and may create inequalities among the members of the household in their consumption. Consumption in general depends on and is limited by the return to labour; specifically, commodity expenditure depends on the cash return on labour and on the conditions and 'accepted' levels of standard of living. Moreover, the size of the household and the degree of satisfaction of needs influence the magnitude of consumption. On the other hand, the imbalances between actual cash income and cash expenditure lead to indebtedness.

In the productive sphere, the share of commodity production within the total production of PCP'ers is rising. The crop combination is widening and the quality of crops is changing according to the demands of internal and

international markets. In addition, share of commodity consumption is increasing in the production of subsistence goods as well as in total consumption. Almost all means of production used in PCP, except household labour and land, are commodities; and except for some of the food needs, all reproductive needs are satisfied by commodities. Furthermore, in increasing ratios, agricultural machinery (mainly harvesters and tractors) and wage-labour are hired as commodities. Although inheritance is still the major ownership pattern, enterprises rent small sizes of land. Capital in its general form occupies a central role in the developing and extending commercial and commodity relations of PCP'ers: industrial and small manufacturing capital produce commodities that are widely used by PCP'ers, and all kinds of repair workshops provide services for the productive and the reproductive needs of PCP'ers.

Commercial capital, on the other hand, acts as an important agent in the exchange of both agricultural and industrial commodities. The sphere of commodity exchange is extending and growing in Bafra town. Among the services, the cash expenditure made for private medical care takes up a large share of the cash expenditure of PCP'ers.

The State also actively intervenes and participates in the commercial and commodity relations specific to PCP in agriculture: The State (1) is the main supplier of agricultural credits; (2) determines the price of agricultural commodities; (3) purchases agricultural commodities; (4) implements projects related to the establishment of rural infra-structure, especially rural

electrification, communication network and transportation system; and (5) provides administrative and technical services. These contribute significantly to the integration of PCP'ers into extending commoditisation and monetisation of the SR of PCP'ers, and to the development of the market.

PCP'ers produce more commodities not only because of increases in the scale of production, but also more commodities are used in the production of commodities and subsistence goods and more commodities are used in the reproduction of the household members. In their total consumption, the commodity consumption is greater in production than in reproduction. Most of the the means of production are commoditised, but the commodity level is low in the consumption of means of life and it is lowest in the area of food consumption. However, further commoditisation is more possible in the means of life than in the means of production. This is due to the fact that commoditisation in the means of production depends (a) on the development, availability and possibilities for using advanced agricultural technology; (b) on limitations due to the nature of agricultural production; and (c) on the specific characteristics of the labour processes of cultivated crops. On the contrary, the number, variety, and quality of means of life are increasing rapidly; the already available means of life on the market are more than the purchasing power of PCP'ers can match. In one sense, the market presents an unlimited supply for PCP'ers; thus, the changing norms in consumption are more influential on the consumption of means of life.

Although commodity purchase in general dominates the

satisfaction of needs, the consumption of commodities related to means of production are indispensable for production. And among the latter the most essential and indispensable part is the least commoditised: food. The consumption of commodities as productive inputs usually increases the scale and productivity, thus saves labour and decreases the cost of SR. On the other hand, the use of commodities in the reproductive sphere usually changes the quality of life and saves labour in domestic tasks. Increases in the commodity consumption in the sphere of means of life would decrease productive commodity consumption to the degree that the means of life are considered essential and indispensable. But the withdrawal from the use of means of life is easier and more widely practiced than from the means of production. This is the path followed by most of the PCP'ers. On the other hand, the degree of commoditisation in the means of life is rapidly increasing among the better-off PCP'ers and this reduces the productive expenditure of saved funds in agriculture. This tendency is less pronounced among the poorer PCP'ers because they seek to increase their productive capacities; but still they are responding to the influences of the market on the means of life.

Pauperisation and even disintegration of poor PCP'ers may occur as they are forced to be integrated more to the commodity markets. But, the most important factor which weakens the stability of PCP'ers is the decreases in the commodity consumption in the means of production which decreases the capacity of households to produce. This in

turn decreases the consumption in means of life to levels far below the average standard of living among PCP'ers. This tendency is much more pronounced if the conditions of commoditisation are established and it is no longer possible to produce them as subsistence goods. Therefore, irreversible elimination of subsistence goods production by commoditisation limits the alternatives of PCP'ers in mediating under adverse conditions of return to their labour.

One other feature of commoditisation, although it has contradictory effects, strengthens the stability of PCP: on the one hand, while the commodity content of consumption and commodity production is increasing, subsistence goods production still continues to be an important element of PCP; at least, commoditisation saves labour to be used in both commodity production and also in subsistence goods production. Furthermore, bearing in mind all these possible fluctuations in commoditisation, there still exist important features of PCP which limit the full commoditisation of their SR.

3.5. The Limits of Commoditisation of PCP ✕

Although the commodity and commercial markets into which ✕ PCP'ers are integrated are developing, the commoditisation of PCP has structural limitations. In this section, I indicate four areas of limitations with their derivatives. The first limitation originates from the household form of labour expenditure in PCP; its derivatives are as follows:

- (i) PCP is based on the family unit, which provides a

continuous source of labour. The labour expenditure in PCP is not organised as separate individual labourers, but as family/household units. Early marriages increase the labour of young children and the elderly; meanwhile the brief formal education of children, and extensive participation of women in productive activities, are factors which enlarge household labour capacity.

(ii) PCP'ers can intensify their labour, extend their labour-time and continue producing subsistence goods, all of which acts to subsidise the cost of their SR and devalorise their household labour.

(iii) The integration of SWL in tobacco cultivation maximises the expenditure of household labour. Its use then, is not only a factor of commoditisation of the labour process, but also extends the use of household labour. The practice of labour cooperation between PCP'ers, which at one time had fallen off, is again reviving.

(iv) Economic growth and diversification at regional and national levels, and even at the international level, have so far not provided the same possibilities of labour expenditure in the non-household economic sphere which they have in other parts of rural Turkey. This is one of the reasons why migration from the village, as a family, is at present almost non-existent.

(v) The level of prevailing technology and the degree of mechanisation seems, at least temporally stabilised. Currently, its substitution of household labour in Gokceagac is no longer increasing. In addition, there is a tendency toward rental rather than ownership of tractors, a factor

which has a negative effect on the volume of machinery use.

(vi) The use of commodities in the production of subsistence goods could be considered as a factor which slows down commoditisation, because non-commodity household labour is reproduced and used for non-accumulating productive activities.

The second limitation is the continuation of inheritance as the major land ownership pattern. The derivatives are the following:

(i) Private ownership of land creates a monopoly on land which restricts its use by PCP'ers.

(ii) The existence of small ownership in Gokceagac and the region limits available land for rent.

(iii) The high labour intensivity of tobacco production means that small scale tobacco cultivation can absorb large amounts of household labour, thus increasing the labour expenditure which would otherwise create pressures for the commoditisation of land.

(iv) Some of the households in Gokceagac cultivate small holdings of their kin who no longer produce in the village. This also decreases the demand for commoditisation of land.

The natural characteristics of agricultural production are the third limitation which determine the conditions of the labour process. The derivatives are as follows:

(i) The high labour intensivity and the long active season in tobacco cultivation increase household labour expenditure and withhold Gokceagac villagers from working as seasonal wage-labourers.

(ii) The conditions of agricultural production limit multi-harvesting: thus, idle labour created is large and

the turnover rate of 'capital' is very slow.

(iii) The capital intensivity in cereal cultivation is high; but scale of production of the latter is relatively small and most of the produce is consumed as subsistence goods.

The weak class position of PCP'ers is the fourth limitation. The following derivatives limit commoditisation:

(i) PCP'ers are non-organised producer enterprises and are geographically widely diffused. They do not act as a class in struggling to control the conditions of capitalist relations in which they are involved. PCP'ers react as individual enterprises, rather than pursuing their interests in class terms.

(ii) The SR structure of PCP is not fully capitalised. They are not capitalists in the sense that they do not own all necessary means of production in commodity form. The purpose in PCP is to secure subsistence maintenance of household members, so they are non-capital accumulating enterprises. This is a structural limitation on the commoditisation of their productive and reproductive spheres. In PCP, the interdependence between productive and reproductive spheres is stronger than elsewhere and depends highly on the concrete conditions of production. Industrial wage-workers and PCP'ers both expend labour: PCP'ers expend their labour in enterprises that they themselves organise. The wage-workers directly confront capital, whereas PCP'ers confront capital as individual producers at the social formation level.

In this context, the hiring of seasonal wage-labourers by PCP'ers is not a direct confrontation between the 'capital' used by PCP'ers and seasonal wage-labourers. Let alone exploiting seasonal wage-labourers, PCP'ers always face difficulties in sustaining their own SR. The surplus created by seasonal wage-labourers is not appropriated by PCP'ers, but by capital in general (capital at the social formation level).

In addition, the low level of seasonal agricultural wages, although subsidising the SR costs of PCP'ers, in reality substantially increases the magnitude of surplus appropriated from agricultural activities specific to PCP.

(iii) The market that PCP'ers are integrated into is not competitive, mainly due to the monopolistic power of capital and the State in the market.

(iv) The lack of direct organisation of the immediate labour process of PCP by capital and the concentration of it (capital) in circulation also hinder commoditisation.

3.6.1. The Commoditisation and the Use of SWL

The hiring of seasonal wage-labour (SWL) is an important aspect of commoditisation in the form of commodity consumption. It is used if the household labour does not supply sufficient labour in peak labour-demanding (PLD) phases. This is a central factor for the stability and the continuity of PCP. Since the planning of the size of the households/families cannot be made in the short-run, SWL is used to meet the necessary labour demand. It can be used to

regulate the size of household labour, and reducing the magnitude of idle labour in the long-term life-cycle of the households. The hiring of SWL should not be understood as a reduction in the significance of household labour in PCP. On the contrary, the use of SWL can increase and maximise the actual labour expenditure with smaller families/households. The use of SWL increases the scale of production and thus both increases household labour expenditure in absolute amounts and creates labour demand during the rest of the annual cycle. It also maximises household labour, especially under the conditions of limited expenditure of household labour outside of the productive activities of the household enterprise. Obviously, both the reduction of family size and the use of SWL have their limits.

Under the conditions of PCP in Gokceagac, it is not possible to increase the use of SWL to a level at which the role of household labour would be undermined. This is especially true if the crop combination is a labour-intensive cultivation, such as tobacco production.

Since capital-intensive cultivation means a reduced need for labour, compared to that required for such crops as tobacco, SWL could become the dominant form of the total labour expenditure as capital moves into farming.

The non-commodity form of household labour and the low levels of use of SWL are structural limitations which hinder the transformation of PCP into capitalist farming.

The reason SWL was not used before the 1960s lies in the following: first, sharecropping relations predominated; second, a boost in the scale of production raised labour

demand; and third, improved mechanisation increased the labour capacity available for tobacco cultivation.

The relationship between PCP'ers and the seasonal wage-workers, as mentioned before, is not an exploitative one simply due to the non-capital-accumulating nature of PCP. What SWL contributes to the PCP enterprise is that it devalorises the labour of the PCP'ers. Both groups are exploited within the capitalist relations of production. The limitations of commoditisation of household labour bonds PCP'ers to their own labour in a way reminiscent of their tie to the land which they inherit.

3.7. Commoditisation and Land Ownership

The ownership of land is a monopolistic right which restricts others from use. Conditions of absolute rent do not exist for the land owned by PCP'ers, because of the non-commodity nature of PCP. Absolute rent is not directly reflected in the price of agricultural products. The conditions of differential rent result in advantages which may act to subsidise the cost of SR of PCP'ers. The conditions of non-realisation of absolute rent by the PCP'ers are another factor towards the devalorisation of household labour. If production is carried out through the payment of rent, this becomes an element of cost. When the capitalist farmer rents land, he includes the cost of rent into the cost of production, so the development of capitalist farming in the country-side would create pressures to increase the price of agricultural products.

In Gokceagac, those who rent land also own holdings of different sizes. If landless peasants, under conditions of PCP, rent land, the cost of using land significantly deteriorates the return on labour, because not all costs can be included in the sale price of agricultural commodities marketed. It is a common practice in Gokceagac to rent small plots in order to secure subsistence reproduction, and some rich peasants rent large tracts of land, primarily for profit.

Although there are structural limitations in the commoditisation of land in the village, the purchase of small holdings is still possible.

In tobacco cultivation, small-scale production absorbs large quantities of household labour. Since most households have holdings beyond the land they put out to tobacco, the pressure to acquire more land for tobacco cultivation is low. In addition due to the switch in tobacco seed used, it is possible to cultivate tobacco on most land around Gokceagac. This is one of the reasons that land rental is not widely practiced for tobacco cultivation. But there is always a high demand for land in the production of capital-intensive crops (cereals). The crop combination is therefore becoming more commodity-biased (that is, tobacco-biased) due to the limits of ownership and rental of land. This even acts to diminish the subsistence production of cereals, which in turn increases the dependency of producers on the consumption of food commodities.

3.8. Commodity Ownership and Farm Machinery

The tendency of renting rather than owning farm machinery is important in terms of commoditisation and the ownership structure of PCP. Harvesters and tractors (with their implements) are the two most important items of farm machinery used in Gokceagac village. Only two households own harvesters, whereas many households do own tractors. In the last few years, a considerable number of households have sold their tractors and started renting in season, mainly due to the increased cost of ownership.

The capital essential for purchasing a tractor; maintenance and repair; interest on loans; and depreciation plus running costs are significant elements of the cost of owning a tractor. Most of these costs cannot be transferred by PCP'ers into the sale price of the agricultural commodities that they market.

On the other hand, since PCP'ers are non-capital-accumulating enterprises, they cannot purchase tractors as an investment good purchased with accumulated capital. So almost all producers purchase tractors by incurring debt for several consecutive years. Most face difficulties in the payment of these loans, because continuously positive terms of trade are very rare in agriculture. Second, decisions to increase the scale of production in order to increase the absolute return on labour would be difficult to achieve because the increased consumption of commodities would necessitate additional cash expenditure under heavy indebtedness and limited ability to save funds. Third, the purchase of tractor implements necessitates further cash

expenditure and extends the period of indebtedness together with the size of the loan. Fourth, the cost of maintenance and repair is an additional annual cost. Lack of skill, knowledge and experience in running and maintaining the tractors; their use in non-agricultural areas, the unsuitable condition of the village roads, and other factors all increase the maintenance and repair costs. Furthermore, the machines are not insured against theft, fire or accident.

In the case where the return to labour does not cover these costs, the producers have to decrease their cash expenditure in both the productive and reproductive spheres in order to run their tractors. But this results in decreased capacity for production, directly counter to the purpose of buying a tractor to begin with, which was to extend the agricultural cultivation.

One other factor related to ownership of tractor is that, although the operation of machines necessitates an adult labourer, it does not reduce the household labour capacity in capital intensive phases (such as tilling and preparing the fields for planting), because at those phases the labour demand is not above the average labour capacity of the households. So the alternative of hiring a tractor with its operator does not save labour. In contrast, in the labour intensive phases, such as carrying seedlings and water to the planting field, or carrying picked leaves to the house for threading, a tractor saves a considerable amount of labour. Those households which do not own tractors do not hire them for these phases. Their labour capacity is therefore reduced in these phases.

Under the prevailing conditions of production, the use of machinery (tractors and harvesters) whether owned or hired, is unavoidable. Such use generally increases the household labour expenditure by increasing the scope and the scale of economic activities, and also increases labour productivity.

A tractor is rarely used to full capacity in PCP; as the scale of cultivation is extended, ownership of a tractor becomes more economical than rental, because it both saves labour and at the same time minimises the correspondence of the labour processes of different crops cultivated.

Shared ownership was widely practiced during the first periods of the introduction of tractors to the village in the 1960s, and by the end of 1970 about 75 per cent of all households in Gokceagac had purchased tractors (Household Interviews). The sources of funds for these purchases were mainly the several consecutive years of unexpected high prices paid for the tobacco produce. All obviously tried to save funds and also became indebted in order to purchase tractors.

The issues thus outlined concerning ownership structure and commoditisation of the SR of PCP are closely related to the conceptualisation of relations of production (property relations); the conditions of exploitation; the development of productive forces; and the conditions of differentiation and expropriation.

3.9. The Relations of Production

The conditions under which PCP'ers are integrated into commodity relations evolved according to the relations of

production specific to PCP. The relations of production cannot be equated to the relations of exploitation. The analysis must incorporate the link between the ownership structure and the general laws of motion of capital at the social formation level.

The views which minimise the significance of the ownership structure maintains that, although PCP'ers own the means of production which they use, they nevertheless cannot appropriate their own surplus. Thus ownership does not explain the relations of production, whence the relations of production can only be grasped with regard to the specific forms of exploitation of PCP'ers. The exploitation of PCP'ers is explained at the level of circulation, with the unequal exchange theory usually invoked for support. The assertion is that the outcome of activities of PCP'ers is limited to the commodities that they produce, so that the conditions of realisation (marketing) of these commodities (conditions of exchange) can fully explain the nature of PCP.

The explanatory power of theories that confine themselves to the circulation of commodities are limited. First, the significance and role of the non-commodity form of labour expenditure must be theoretically integrated into any analysis of PCP. Second, the analysis must be made at the level of production. Such an analysis is essential, and is closely related to the nature of the ownership structure: what is owned and how it is owned. The market relations that PCP'ers are involved in cannot explain the conditions of production. This does not imply that PCP'ers do not

respond to changes at the market level, but their response does not resemble that given in the case of fully developed capitalist relations. They respond with regards to the conditions of their productive and reproductive cycles and according to their position in the class structure, which is unorganised at the levels of both politics and economics.

Furthermore, the following basic structural elements of PCP limit their organisation in the political and economic spheres: (1) the dependent integration to capitalist relations; (2) the continuation of subsistence goods production; (3) the non-wage form of labour expenditure; (4) the non-accumulating nature of the enterprise; (5) the patriarchal organisation of the enterprise; and (6) the 'conservative' attachment to the ownership of the means of production.

It is important to note here that PCP'ers in Gokceagac do not form cooperative organisations; particularly notable is the absence of production and marketing cooperatives.

The unequal representation of tobacco-producing villages in cooperatives, due to inequality of wealth, is the main factor informing their reluctance to establish cooperatives. Also, there is no guarantee that production cooperatives would save labour and capital in order to decrease the cost of production. In my view, as long as PCP'ers own the labour they use, and private ownership of land and means of production continue, the common ownership of a few means of production will not drastically change the nature of the SR of PCP'ers. Even if it is successful in certain spheres of the organisation of PCP, benefits will be unequally distributed according to the differentiation among the

cooperative members. On the other hand, the members be sharing the possible risks in the activities of the cooperative.

Another reason for their reluctance in establishing cooperatives is that the State is usually involved in agricultural cooperatives and its general subsidy policies favor the better-off among the differentiated peasants.

On the other hand, the marketing cooperatives must be powerful enough in economic terms to be able to pay their members and bear the costs when they face difficulties in marketing their produce. Without such a powerful organisation, the benefits of a marketing cooperative would be limited.

In contrast to their own unorganised position, PCP'ers face organised groups in the class structure. The different forms of capital have their formal organisations which can exercise control over PCP'ers and influence state policies.

The unorganised position of PCP'ers should not suggest that they are passive receivers of all kinds of changes and can adopt to every external force. As capital penetrates into PCP, producers become more conscious of the changing conditions of capitalist relations and of their own organisation of production. But, their reaction to and confrontation with related organised groups are significantly determined by their non-organised position, and their flexibility of response is restricted to the degree that the conditions of their production are outside their control. In this struggle they tend more to retreat and reorganise their productive and reproductive spheres in

an attempt to secure the survival of their enterprises by switching from (1) subsistence to cash crop production; (2) traditional inputs and tools to improved tools and productive technology; (3) monoculture to polyculture production. Furthermore, they gain a heightened awareness of the cost of idle labour capacity created in agriculture; the benefits of using SWL; the costs of interest paid on loans; and the adverse affects of the monopolistic price and marketing systems.

The reactions and the responses of PCP'ers are predominantly influenced by their subsistence goals and the impossibility of capital accumulation. In order for decisions to be made related to the withdrawal from prevailing economic activities, alternative spheres of productive expenditure of their household labour must exist. In addition, PCP'ers do not assess the return to their labour in terms of profit. They assess the quality and scale of production mainly according to their capacity to produce.

3.10. The Forces of Production

In the analysis of PCP the conceptualisation of the changing features of forces of production specific to PCP is important. The development of productive forces fundamentally means the expansion in the capacity and conditions of production in which labour productivity is raised by implementing qualitative and quantitative changes in the expenditure of labour and means of production.

The effects of the prevailing peasant-capital relations on productive forces depend on the nature of the penetration

of capital into agriculture. In the increasing commoditisation of the SR of PCP, capital does not take the responsibility of developing productive forces, but rather creates the conditions and provides the means, together with the State, which force PCP to increase their productive capacities by curtailing their reproductive needs. Capital provides the conditions through the commodity markets and creates the conditions in which PCP'ers feel constrained to become more productive and increase their scale of production. So more productive labour expenditure and more highly developed means of production are brought to bear in the form of both instruments of labour and raw materials.

The forces of production develop, then, through an increase in quantity of the elements of production. Development is limited by the subsistence nature (non-accumulating) of PCP enterprises. Such an expenditure cannot therefore be considered as a reinvestment for capital accumulation. It is true that enterprises give priority and allocate most of their cash expenditure to the purchase of productive commodities at the expense of reducing their standard of living, which leads to a relative increase in the magnitude and in certain qualitative factors of the productive forces, but does not thereby eradicate the basic non-commodity and non-accumulating aspects of PCP.

3.11. The Differentiation of Peasantry

At the social formation level, production relations are capitalist. This means that there is a link between the

point of production at village level and social formation. In terms of PCP'ers, the focus is on the struggle to control the conditions of production, which is precisely the locus of capital-peasant relations. In other words, two production processes, the PCP and capitalist production at the social formation level are linked in the process of controlling the conditions of PCP.

The reason capital is used at a general abstract level lies in the fact that it incorporates the capitalist laws of motion at the social formation level and because different forms of capital function within and according to the laws of capitalism.

Capital forms one side of the interaction; the other side is the peasantry differentiated as: capitalist farmer, PCP'ers, landless peasantry and agricultural wage-workers. The PCP'ers are further differentiated among themselves at village level according to differences relating to (1) ownership of means of production and land; (2) share of household labour vs. SWL within the total labour expenditure; (3) crop combination; (4) conditions and possibilities of saving funds; (5) level of mechanisation of the production process; (6) degree of commoditisation of SR structure; (7) possibilities of expenditure of household labour in seasonal wage-form; (8) the size of the household; (9) share of subsistence goods vs. commodity production in the total production; (10) degree of dependence on formal and informal loans: and (11) degree of involvement with the commercial and commodity markets.

The PCP'ers are not a homogeneous group of peasant producers. The features of differentiation are central in

terms of the possibilities and conditions of (a) stability of PCP'ers and (b) the transformation of PCP'ers into either capitalist farmers or into expropriated landless peasants. Such features of differentiation should not be considered as a dichotomous process, because they exhibit characteristics specific to both stability and transformation.

The PCP can survive while the differentiation continues * provided that the relations of production allow the expenditure of household labour to have a subsistence return.

The process of capitalist transformation in agriculture takes divergent paths.⁹ In its general form, it would be constituted from poor, middle and rich peasants. In this differentiation, the role of commoditisation is central, but this does not mean that differentiated peasants are poorly, moderately or wholly integrated into market relations. The poor, middle and rich are usually differentiated according * to the ownership of the means of production, and the relations of production in which they are involved.

In relation to PCP, capital may serve to preserve rather * than destroy the survival conditions of PCP. Such a contradictory position is elucidative. The possibilities of eventual proletarianisation or of the concentration of holdings of capitalist farming remain implicit.

In this general perspective, I argue that the degree and nature of differentiation are closely related to changes in the commoditisation of the SR structure of PCP, which, provided PCP'ers find means to expend their labour in non-commodity form, do not lead to expropriation from the means

of production and land in labour-intensive dominated cultivation such as that in Gokceagac village.

3.12. The Expropriation and Landlessness

Analysis of how the development of commodity relations affects the tendencies of disintegration or stability of PCP is central to understanding the nature of PCP. Capital in general, does not directly organise the immediate labour process, and in that sense is not necessary to increase the pressures to expropriate the direct producers from the ownership of the means of production.

The expropriation from means of production is not * restricted to the land alone. Expropriation should therefore not be totally equated with landlessness. The landless peasant, if he owns the means of production, may sharecrop and rent land; if fully expropriated, seek seasonal agricultural work or migrate to the urban centres. Second, although the commoditisation of the production process exacerbates indebtedness, the latter does not directly cause landlessness among PCP'ers. Under the prevailing petty-commodity relations in agriculture, the functioning of formal agricultural credit institutions, the lenders of the pre-capitalist period the usurers, the landlords and merchants, do not directly cause expropriation of the PCP'ers. Third, the significance of landlessness must be interpreted according to the demand for land in Gokceagac, which is mainly determined by the labour process of the crops cultivated. Fourth, the path to ownership of land, especially inheritance, is a major factor which

resists and compensates the tendencies toward expropriation from holdings. In addition, small absentee holdings are a source of possession for close relatives. And there are even some households which buy very small plots of land. Fifth, the prevailing alternatives of means of ownership and/or possession, and the sale and inheritance of the holdings of previous landlords due to the disintegration of * the structure are factors which resist the consolidation of land in ever-fewer hands, especially in regions where labour-intensive cultivation is dominant.

These processes provide conditions for the strengthening of small land ownership. It is true that as PCP's are increasingly reproduced via commodities, they depend more on the conditions of commercial and commodity relations over which they have no control. The above mentioned points and the factors which contribute to the survival of PCP must be taken into account in interpreting the conditions of survival and/or disintegration of PCP under capitalist relations.

4. The Role of Capital in Capital-Peasant Relations

4.1. Introduction

Capital as an 'abstract' term is used to cover the capitalist laws of motion which govern PCP in Turkish agriculture. It also embodies the various 'concrete' forms * of capital: essentially, private and state capital in industrial and commercial forms.

The abstract and concrete levels of the use of capital do not need to be conceptualised as two different and dichotomous processes. However, the role of concrete forms of capital is meaningful in terms of the capitalist laws of motion and is to be analysed within a class structure which embraces both PCP and capital.

The control of PCP by the capitalist laws of motion does not imply a conceptualisation that what is observed in industry is an exact copy of what happens in agriculture.

Capitalist relations are not simply composed of processes of production and realisation in which accumulation is possible, but also incorporate different levels and degrees of development and change in the economic and political organisations of the capitalist system, its culture and reproductive processes. The contradictory elements of the capitalist system manifest themselves through changes and crises in terms of capitalist development in underdeveloped countries. This is reflected in the interdependence between agriculture and industry and the way agriculture is linked to the world economy according to its historical and specific conditions of survival.

Capital penetrates into and dominates the SR structure of PCP; however, it falls short of direct control of its immediate labour process. Capital at the social formation level does not directly confront household labour in agriculture, except in the case of capitalist farming.

In this domination, the surplus labour of PCP'ers is appropriated by capital within the circuits of capitalist relations at the social formation level and according to the laws of motion of capital. 7

The explanation of how capital dominates and subsumes the labour of household enterprises necessitates analysis of the role of the different forms of capital in their relation with PCP. And among them, special emphasis is laid on the role of usury and commercial capital.

Exploitative relations further necessitate questioning the conceptualisation of the relations of production specific to PCP, that is, the significance of property relations or the ownership structure.

The imposition of additional functions on commercial capital, that is, in addition to its primary role of taking a share from the surplus of PCP'ers for its role in marketing agricultural products, reduces capital-peasant (c-p) relations to the level of market relations, an interpretation which is supported and explained through the different versions of unequal-exchange theory. Such a view implicitly considers the peasantry as an homogeneous group and explains the conditions of survival of PCP through the participation of PCP'ers in diversified economic activities. Furthermore, when market relations are drained of their commodity content, the emphasis is reduced to a simple price analysis. In addition, the role of the state is minimised and rarely used as a significant element in explaining the nature of c-p relations. The theory also fails in its heavy emphasis on the stability and survival of PCP, while the differentiation of the peasantry in general and PCP in particular are ignored. Hierarchy and heterogeneity among commercial capital are also overlooked, and the conflicts among the different forms of capital, crucially important

during the development of commodity relations, have been by and large ignored in the analysis of c-p relations.

Such an explanation does not take account of the basic characteristics of PCP: the conditions and the characteristics of the production and the reproduction cycles of PCP'ers; and the position of the peasantry within the class structure at the social formation level. So the following basic elements of PCP and issues related to PCP are either overlooked or totally neglected: (1) the non-commodity nature of the basic form of labour expenditure; (2) non-commodity forms of possession of land ownership; (3) the non-commodity aspect of satisfaction of reproductive needs; (4) the non-capital accumulating (subsistence) nature of the production and the reproduction of the household enterprise; (5) the dependence of agricultural production on natural conditions; (6) the limited mobility of labour and 'capital' used in PCP; (7) the fact that state intervention into PCP does not aim to provide the conditions for PCP'ers to accumulate capital; and (8) unorganised nature and partial commoditisation of the labour process.

These characteristics do not imply the concept of peasant mode of production. A general review of the conditions of SR of PCP'ers shows that they (1) are increasingly integrated with capitalist commodity relations in that they produce and consume progressively greater amounts of commodities; (2) increasingly use seasonal wage-labour, land, technical inputs and agricultural machinery in order to boost land and labour productivity as well as scale of production; and (3) are inclined to reduce the size of their households and families, in order to decrease the cost of

their reproduction and to maximise the productive expenditure of their household labour. So they enlarge their volume of output and their marketable surplus. PCP'ers struggle to secure their survival, but they also face the tendencies of differentiation. The conditions of their survival do not necessarily mean that they are more competitive than capitalist farmers.

The conditions of the persistence of PCP are not contradictory to the interests of capital and state: commercial capital enlarges its share as commoditisation increases; the continuation of agricultural production satisfies the needs of industry in terms of cheap food and raw materials and foreign exchange earnings from those crops that are exported. The state mediates to guarantee the continuation of (1) agricultural production; (2) PCP and (3) cheap production of agricultural commodities. It is crucial to understand that the survival of PCP does not necessitate the full capitalisation of its labour process. The policies implemented and the measures taken by the State in this mediatory role do not contradict the interests of land owners or the capitalist farmers in agriculture.

In the analysis of the nature of PCP, in relation to the role of capital in c-p relations, the following issues must be taken into consideration: (1) the aim and purpose of capital at the social formation level; (2) the role of different forms of capital and the state; (3) the level of development of the commodity relations; (4) the non-commodity aspects of PCP and the limits of commoditisation of the SR structure of PCP; (5) the non-capital-accumulating

nature of PCP; and (6) the magnitude of the surplus produced, marketed and transformed.

All this requires the analysis of the nature of PCP in terms of the prevailing capitalist relations. The development of commodity and commercial relations in agriculture is embedded in a class structure which incorporates the development of productive forces and the relations of production. The conditions of the survival of PCP must be analysed in terms of the tendencies and possibilities of expropriation or the transformation of PCP into fully commoditised enterprises.

The commoditisation at social formation level is increasing and extending to cover most areas of c-p relations. Commodity production and consumption in PCP have been increasing. The different markets related to c-p relations are extending and developing, especially the commodity and the credit markets. The agricultural commodity markets are less developed than industrial ones and the State involvement in the former is more intensive. The PCP'ers cannot market their own products; commercial capital mediates in the sale of the commodities.

The ownership of the means of production in PCP and the use of their own labour do not make PCP'ers independent of the developing capitalist relations, because their * production and reproduction depend heavily on generalised capitalist production.

The level at which PCP'ers are subordinated is that of generalised capitalist production relations. This subordination cannot be disregarded and c-p relations cannot be reduced to the level of circulation.

In the way I conceptualise and analyse c-p relations, I do not attribute additional functions to commercial capital. Instead, I argue that the exploitation of PCP'ers should be analysed according to (a) the nature and conditions of production and reproduction of PCP'ers; (b) the place of PCP within commodity rather than commercial relations, at the social formation level; (c) the position of PCP'ers within the class structure; (d) the direct and indirect intrusion of capital in general and particularly its state version into the SR of the PCP; and (e) the prevailing conditions of developing capitalist relations at the social formation level, which also provide the links with the outside world economy.

These are not simple high-level abstractions; they can be operationalised to tap the concrete conditions of the c-p relations specific to PCP.

The PCP'ers increasingly consume the products of industry and the industrial sector consumes agricultural commodities in the form of food and raw materials. Commercial capital mediates to circulate the commodities in this two-way transaction. Industrial capital does not directly confront the labour of PCP'ers, and hence does not directly exploit them. What it does is directly appropriate the surplus of the industrial worker while commercial capital takes a share of this surplus when it mediates in the marketing of industrial commodities. Similarly, the merchant who markets the commodities of the PCP'ers also receives a share of the surplus labour of PCP'ers.

Since PCP'ers are not independent of capitalist relations

at the social formation level, c-p relations must be analysed, first, according to the conditions of changing and developing capitalist relations at the social formation level, and second, with regard to the interdependent relations between capital and PCP. Thus, the conditions of SR of PCP must be taken into account. The producer is dependent, but this dependence is not simply limited to commercial capital, because commercial capital cannot and does not take the role of organising and controlling the production process. The peasant producer must be analysed within the general laws of capitalist production at the social formation level according to the nature of the production process: a link must be formed between the specific nature of the production process and the prevailing conditions of capitalist production at the social formation level.

In this link commercial capital acts as an agent of marketing, and because of this role takes a share of the agricultural surplus, as occurs, in the marketing of industrial commodities. This share increases if the trade is monopolised.

4.2. The Usury Capital

Although usury capital had played an important role in the dissolution of the landlord structure and the formation and development of commercial relations, its current role in the region diminished as (1) the formal state loans extended and its provision became continuous; and (2) the scale of commodity production increased and extended in agriculture.

The disintegration of the landlord structure had released the producers from dependency on the landlord for the provision of credit needs. As PCP became established, producers marketed their commodities directly either to the State or to the merchants for cash. The cash return on their commodities provided the source for the repayment of their formal loans. As this structure was established, the need for usury loans decreased, because formal loans were able to satisfy the credit needs of PCP'ers.

The total amount of formal credit loans, especially of those provided by the State, swelled after the 1950s.¹⁰ This was mainly due to increased commodity production and exchange in agriculture.

The increased commodity production of PCP'ers and the increased commoditisation of their SR extended the money economy and increased their demand for credit loans. The State actively took the responsibility to satisfy this demand in order to guarantee the continuation of commodity relations and agricultural production.

The State provides agricultural credits to PCP'ers and subsidises the interest rates. The amount and the distribution of these credits vary according to the differentiation of the peasantry. The State pledges to buy all tobacco harvest in line with its monopoly in tobacco production. It is the major buyer of tobacco, but does not purchase the entire crop, leaving a share to be purchased by tobacco merchants for export purposes.

The State monopolistically determines and declares the purchase price of tobacco and its tobacco experts determine

the quality of the tobacco harvest by examining samples taken from the producers. There always exists a significant difference between the declared state prices and the actual purchase prices.

The non-organisation of PCP'ers is reflected in the marketing of their products; they do not have marketing cooperatives. They are obliged to sell their produce either to the state or to merchants. These two powerful buyers use the leverage of this monopolistic structure to depress the purchase price of tobacco to its minimum possible levels.

Since tobacco cultivation is the major source of cash return on PCP in Gokceagac, it directly influences the degree of satisfaction of needs which require cash expenditure. The increase of formal credits aims at covering the annual circulating cash expenditure of PCP'ers. Thus, PCP'ers do not turn to usury capital for their normal circulating cash expenditure. But in some circumstances, where the cash need is very large, such as in purchasing a tractor or land, building or extending the house, prolonged and expensive medical treatment, unexpected crop failure, fire, flood or famine, the PCP'ers have to turn to other sources. Help is sought from the kinship network as a first recourse, then valuable assets including stored cereal crops (wheat and maize) and hoarded gold are sold; and after all these means have been exhausted, only then do they turn to usury.

Usury loans are not used for productive needs; they usually satisfy reproduction needs and are not a source for 'investment'. The reluctance to take out usury loans is mainly due to their high interest rates. Also, this is not a

continuous source of credit.

The usurer seeks two kinds of guarantees in lending money: (a) the capacity of the peasant to be able to pay the loan, including its high interest and (b) the amount of assets owned, such as land and real estate which could be seized if repayment were not made.

The usury is strengthened if it is combined with large landownership and usually is short-lived if practiced together with trade. In the second case, the significance of usury diminishes to its minimum level. If large amounts of cash are loaned from the usurer or small loans are not paid for several annual cycles, the PCP'ing enterprises could lose part of their important assets (means of production). Thus, PCP'ers are very reluctant to borrow from usurers unless there exist no other alternatives.

4.3. Commercial Capital

The role of merchant capital must be interpreted in terms of its position, first, within the agricultural class structure and second, among the different forms of capital.

Commercial and commodity relations are not constant; they fluctuate. This situation cannot be taken as the explanation of the nature of PCP. The changes, fluctuations and developments in the market should not be considered as independent of the prevailing relations of production.

I do not wish to underplay the importance of market relations. But it is not possible to explain the nature of PCP without analysing the nature and conditions of

production. Market relations do not have independent power to influence productive activities. The realisation of agricultural products is central to the nature of PCP, but it must be related to the conditions of production. Behind the exchange relations, one must be able to see the role of the concrete productive activities of PCP'ers.

The merchant capital does not have power independent of industrial capital in exchanging industrial commodities. Nor does it have the power to monopolise trade; even if it does, it is tentative. Merchant capital appropriates the monopolistic profits accrued in a specific trade. If commercial capital manages to enter into that profitable area, the accrued monopolistic trade profits are shared. This becomes more feasible as commodity relations extend.

Although PCP'ers take into account the conditions of realisation of their products, the conditions under which they produce limit their position as commodity producers at the market.

First of all, PCP'ers, although they produce commodities, they do not and cannot accumulate capital. This simply means that they do not organise their enterprises according to the conditions of capital accumulation; the purpose of simple reproduction dominates their organisation.

Second, although they respond to the conditions and fluctuations in commodity relations (specifically price changes), this response is limited by the prevailing characteristics of PCP. In organising their enterprises they seek any and all means to decrease their SR costs.

Third, irrespective of commercial relations, PCP'ers are under pressure to increase their volume of output.

In tobacco cultivation, owing to the state monopoly, there is a legal guarantee to purchase output. Although this minimises the risks of overproduction, the monopolistic structure of purchase of the tobacco, eradicates the advantages of guaranteed purchase. However, the total tobacco harvest is in any case not purchased by the State; a considerable amount is purchased by tobacco merchants for export.

On the other hand, in cereal cultivation, the size of the marketable surplus depends on the subsistence needs of the enterprise; thus big farmers are the main source of commodities exchanged in cereal trade.

For several centuries, peasants continued to produce by using minimum number of industrial commodities. With the increase of the amount of commodities consumed, they were integrated more and more into commodity relations. Commercial capital does not interfere in the organisation of production; but, whenever the merchant is also a land owner, a usurer, an investor in small manufacturing, a speculator on land and estate, or contractor in the projects of the State (usually for infrastructural projects), the simple exchange role of the merchant capital changes.

Although they may be owners of large land holdings and engage in extensive agricultural production, under the current prevailing conditions, merchants are no longer landlords. They rarely practice usury, but actively engage in speculative land and real estate transaction. Some merchants invest as partners in small manufacturing industries and, if they happen to be politically powerful,

take on state projects as well.

These are the possible combinations of income source for merchants besides commercial profits. Parallel to these activities, merchants have access to different kinds of state and private credits. Those merchants who are specialised only in the marketing of industrial commodities usually purchase them on credit either directly from the producer or from the wholesaler.

On the other hand, in the trade of agricultural commodities, the merchant is no longer a source of credit for PCP'ers. A few decades ago, tobacco merchants used to make cash advances to obtain the priority right in the purchase of tobacco. Nowadays, tobacco merchants prefer to give a slightly higher price than the State whenever they want to purchase the produce of a specific grower. In consequence, merchants have gradually left off making cash advances. Thus, the State has become the only source to meet the credit needs of PCP'ers.

Credit purchase is still practiced in the purchase of some of the means of life, while installment purchase is the case for durable household goods. But, for the latter, the terms of purchase are usually dictated by industrial capital, rather than by commercial capital.

A central feature of commercial capital is its differentiation according to the size of the trade operation (petty, big); position in the hierarchy of commodity circulation (intermediary); the nature of commodities traded (industrial, agricultural); type of agricultural products (cereals or industrial crops); markets (domestic, international); the number of merchants in a given trade

(specifically in tobacco trade); sources of finance and combination of different economic activities in which engaged.

In the landlord structure, the landlord monopolised the trade of the products of the peasant producers. As the landlord structure disintegrated,¹² the number of intermediary tobacco merchants grew. Later, however, when the State entered the tobacco market as the main purchaser, the role of small intermediary tobacco merchants declined.

The merchant who predominantly marketed industrial products were the shop keepers. And among the merchants, the tobacco trade was the major area of specialisation in the marketing of the produce of Gokceagac villagers. Later, cereals were added to the trade in crops.

The tobacco producing peasants have never been free in marketing their products: previously, the landlord was the single buyer; later, as the landlord structure dissolved, tobacco merchants and the State became monopolistic buyers. In the latter case, private merchants and the State cooperated in lowering the price of tobacco rather than acting as competitors in the market. The merchants even used the State as a mediating agent in knocking down the purchase price of tobacco.

As the commodity markets specialised and grew, the producers established more formal relations with commercial capital. Nevertheless, a competitive capitalist market structure is not yet established in the marketing of agricultural commodities. This has not been due to the lingering remnants of pre-capitalist relations, but has

mainly originated from the combination of the monopolistic power of the buyer and the conditions of production and reproduction of PCP.

4.4. The Trade in Industrial Commodities

In the trading of industrial commodities, commercial capital acts as circulating capital between the producers of industrial commodities (industry) and consumers of industrial commodities (PCP'ers, the producers of agricultural commodities). Commercial capital is situated between the two commodity producing sectors, and organise the conditions of exchange. In general, commercial capital tries to purchase agricultural commodities as cheaply as possible from agrarian producers and sell them to urban classes at the highest possible rate. In this trade, commercial capital is more powerful in its relation with PCP'ers than with industry.

In the trade of industrial commodities, exchange is predominantly determined and controlled by industrial capital; in other words, industrial capital dictates its terms to commercial capital.

Under these conditions, the 'independent' role of commercial capital is minimised. Individual merchants can theoretically enter into the trade of industrial commodities to intensify competition, The banking system or credit purchasing from industrial capital are the basic financial sources of merchants. The development of markets thus depends primarily on the prevailing characteristics of these two interdependent commodity production sectors.

4.5. The Role of the State in Commercial Relations

The monopolistic intrusion of the State in marketing relations not only creates non-competitive structures, but also creates conditions for commercial capital to buy agricultural commodities at prices far below their value. Such extra commercial profits do not, however, stem from the additional power of merchants, but mainly from the mediating role of the State, the interests and class position of industrial capital and the non-commodity characteristics of PCP. And the entirety of the above exchange relations is not contradictory to, and is governed, by the laws of motion of capital.

The State intervenes and actively participates in the agricultural commercial relations specific to PCP'ers. In general, the State (1) organises the agricultural credit system; (2) monopolistically determines the prices of agricultural commodities; (3) constructs and regulates the taxation system; (4) builds the agrarian infrastructure; (5) regulates agrarian technical extension programmes; (6) provides public services; (7) intervenes in commodity markets by regulating foreign trade (imports and exports); and (8) directly exports certain crops.

In addition to the just mentioned general role of the State, in the specific case of tobacco cultivation the existence of a monopoly confers on the State the right to interfere not only with the conditions of production of tobacco, but also with its trade and manufacture.

Tobacco growing is done with the permission of the State Tobacco Monopoly in four geographic regions of Turkey: the Aegean, Thrace, the Blacksea and the East. The Monopoly determines and stipulates which techniques of production are suitable for which region.

On the other hand, the Monopoly does not take the responsibility of supplying credit to the producers. It extends small cash loans to those producers, who do not receive credit from either the State Agricultural Bank or the State owned Agricultural Credit Cooperatives.

The Monopoly regulates the quality and volume of output at the national level by controlling the conditions of marketing through monopolistically setting the price of tobacco.

The Monopoly's control over the production of tobacco and the manufacture of cigarettes puts it in a position to adjust any financial imbalances between these two sectors. Meanwhile, the private tobacco merchants operate between these two sectors to purchase tobacco for export.

Since tobacco is a monopoly item, the trade engaged in private merchants is also governed by the Monopoly. The volume of tobacco production in Turkey has always exceeded domestic manufacturing needs. But the State does not buy the entire crop, because private tobacco merchants purchase part of the harvest in order to export it. Overproduction results, even under these conditions, in a consequent swelling of state stocks. Export of these stocks has always been a problem for the Tobacco Monopoly.

Throughout the centuries-old history of tobacco production in Turkey, peasant producers have always faced

'monopolistic' conditions in the marketing of their tobacco produce; formerly it was the landlord, today it is the State. Note that in the tobacco trade, commercial capital has never been independent of the landlord structure, of state intervention or of international capital. In the landlord structure, the landlord himself was the tobacco merchant. However, after the disintegration of this structure, the peasant producer was 'free' to market his own produce; but he still faced another organised body of buyers who had monopolised the tobacco trade: the State, and international capital with its national intermediaries.

The tobacco merchants could act only within the limits drawn by the State. They were thus unable to monopolise the tobacco trade, due to the monopolistic position of the State. This is not to suggest that the policies of the State Tobacco Monopoly conflicted with the interests of tobacco merchants. On the contrary, the State always took into account the interests of merchants and most of the time served them.

Such a coalition had a concrete base. Since the State is obliged by its own law to buy up all tobacco produce, the purchases of the tobacco merchants decrease the amount of tobacco that must be purchased by the State, thus easing its financial burden; for national output has always exceeded the demands of the domestic cigarette industry. If it were not for this partial absorption of supply by private sector merchants, the State would face an even larger surplus of tobacco. The interests of tobacco exporting merchants are also served by the monopolistic pegging of tobacco prices.

In the first place, prices are usually kept at minimum levels, thus increase commercial profits. Secondly, although commercial profits shrink when tobacco prices do happen to be raised, usually prior to national elections and during the growth of the national market, still the merchants appropriate their commercial share from the surplus of PCP'ers.

Furthermore, the tobacco merchant enjoys the advantage of purchasing the best quality tobacco. The State usually delays its tobacco payment for several months after the purchase. Such practices by the State give a competitive edge to tobacco merchants, who can easily make a slightly better offer to the producers. There exists a low degree of competition among the less powerful small tobacco merchants in the region, who are merely intermediaries collecting tobacco for the big tobacco merchants.

The agents of commercial capital, specifically the tobacco merchants in their trade, do not take the risk of financing because they are themselves financed by the private and state banking system.

In the town, furthermore, it is commercial capital which holds the political power, obviously linked to its economic power and reflected in its position in the class structure.

On the other hand, the nature of State involvement * hinders capitalist development in Turkey. The tardy rate of development of capitalism in agriculture stems from the contradictory class positions of the State in its purposive involvement in sustaining agriculture, rather than gradually transforming it.

Private capital cannot afford to take the responsibility

to organise agricultural production, given the conditions of capitalist relations at the social formation level. The State is involved in establishing the agrarian infrastructure and implementing different kinds of subsidy policies in order to decrease the cost of reproduction of small peasants. Rich peasants and land owners always benefit more from state policies.

The rise in the urban/rural population ratio and in productivity means that fewer people create more surplus for capital at low reproductive cost. In its mediating role in the class structure, the State takes into account the prevailing salient characteristics of PCP: (1) PCP'ers have the capacity to devalorise their household labour; (2) they are a major non-organised electorate group; (3) they are receptive and sensitive to populist policies; (4) they possess great purchasing power in the domestic market; and (5) they are the largest land-owning class.

The control exerted by capital over the conditions of PCP through the setting of prices and control of the marketing system is only partial. The price and marketing systems do not exist independent of peasant-capital relations. Neither is the nature of exchange relations simply dictated by those who control the market, but rather is also structured by the conditions of PCP. The producers are not passive agents; in other words, they do accept any price and adapt to all enforced changes. The PCP'ers seek means to secure their reproduction through using their domain of control over crop combination, scale of production, quality of produce, maximisation of their household labour expenditure and the use of seasonal wage-labour. But it is important to note

that they struggle to control the conditions of production, rather than controlling the whole cycle of circulation.

On the other hand, capital does not take the responsibility to control the agricultural economy through direct organisation of production, but prefers rather to coordinate it. Thus capital takes the given conditions of agriculture and integrates PCP'ers into the developing commodity and commercial markets. Thus, the level of development of capitalism in agriculture is limited.

Moreover, in Turkey, it is the non-agricultural sectors, such as trade and industry, which are the most profitable. Capitalist relations are more highly developed in industry, and although monopolistic features prevail, capital seeks means to invest in profitable areas. Second, the entry into agriculture requires the payment of rent to land owners, which increases the cost of production. Third, capital has to organise an agrarian labour market. Fourth, the infrastructure of the economy must be developed. Fifth, agrarian technology must be at a level where competition would be possible not only in the domestic market, but also international markets.

Footnotes

1. This section repeats part of the issues discussed in Chapter Four. This is made in order to provide the continuity of the analysis of the changes that explain the conditions of current capital and peasant relations.
2. Most of the village studies, such as Boran (1945), Balaman (1967), Yasa (1969), Kolars (1971) and Ozbas (1974) present a description of the commodities owned by the household enterprises. They omit the significance of the commoditisation of the simple reproduction structure of household enterprises under developing capitalist relations.
3. Turkel (1976) makes an analysis of the influence of using technical inputs on productivity. For the conditions of using technical inputs at national level, see Gunes (1986).
4. The significance of the subsistence production at national level for the development of Turkish agriculture is analysed by Aruoba (1973).
5. This has been gradually abandoned in Turkey after 1980. For the implications of this change, see Arslan and Kasnakoglu (1987).
6. The changing pattern of the consumption norms is analysed in Kiray (1962) with specific emphasis on 'social stratification'.
7. The influence of rapid mechanisation on the Turkish agriculture after the 1950s is reflected in most of the studies. Among these, works of Robinson (1952), Karpat (1960), Kiray (1970), Aricanli and Keyder (1979), and Tekeli (1974, 1980) focus mainly on the conditions of use of tractors and they analyse several important aspects of the mechanisation of Turkish agriculture.
8. Although the history of the establishment of cooperatives is long in Turkish case, nevertheless a strong cooperative organisation of production and marketing is not developed. It mainly remained in the control of the State. For the review of the conditions and significance of cooperatives in Turkish agriculture, see Mulayim (1967), Aruoba (1971), Aras and Cikin (1976), and Soral (1981).
9. There are several important studies on the conditions of capitalist transition and development in Turkish agriculture in addition to the ones that I have mentioned in the First Chapter: Aksit (1967), Kiray and Hinderink (1970), Birtek and Keyder (1975), Aricanli and Somel (1979), Silier (1981), Aksit and Keyder

(1981), and Keyder (1976, 1983a, 1983b).

10. For the analysis of the development of agricultural credits at national level, see Sayin (1969), Hassan (1970), Koksai (1971), and Yuzgun (1982).
11. If the prices given by the State and the tobacco merchant were the same, the party which had extended credit to the producer had priority in the purchase.
12. Not all small producers in the region were dominated by a landlord, so they sold their produce to small merchants or to the State.
13. The State owns all tobacco processing workshops and cigarette factories.

CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSION

The main concern of this study was to understand the nature of small peasant production or petty commodity production and its significance in an underdeveloped agrarian structure within a peripheral social formation.

My purpose was not to make empirical generalisations; rather, I aimed at using abstract and conceptual relations to understand the detailed and concrete conditions of PCP in one village. I chose tobacco production to realise this purpose, since it requires the most labour-intensive crop cultivation in Turkish agriculture. I have argued that tobacco production harbours the capacity, both to resist and to accommodate to the elements of both stability and change in agriculture.

The tendencies of change and stability in PCP were analysed in relation to (a) the ownership structure of household enterprises, their labour expenditure patterns and the role of capital; (b) the relations of production through the changing features of commoditisation, consumption and surplus appropriation; and (c) the class structure, and the role of capital and the State. The latter involved the ideologies and policies about agriculture, as well as the tendencies of differentiation, stability and transformation.

I have indicated that PCP'ers were subordinated, dependent and exploited; and they should be conceptualised not as a homogeneous group of producers, but as

differentiated producers according to their class position within the class structure at social formation level. The household enterprises also differed within the village according to the basic elements of their simple reproduction: commodity capital, land, household labour, means of production, means of life, and the standard of living.

PCP in agriculture conceptualised in this study as a form of production within a given mode of production. It was not considered as a specific mode of production. I have argued that the nature of PCP can be understood and explained within the prevailing characteristics of the capitalist mode of production in the Turkish social formation.

The link between PCP in agriculture and its outer world was determined by the prevailing laws of capitalist relations. Although the household labour and the land owned were not commodities and the 'capitalist' features of PCP deviated in several other respects from industrial commodity production, PCP should be conceptualised within the capitalist relations at the social formation level. In other words, I have tried to show that the features of PCP which deviated from industrial capitalist relations could be understandable if the conditions of production and reproduction of PCP and the way they are integrated into the prevailing generalised commodity relations are analysed.

In this study, I have related the conditions of development of capitalist relations specific to PCP in agriculture with the following central features of PCP: (a)

the ownership structure of the household enterprises; (b) the labour expenditure patterns which also involved the use of seasonal wage-labour; and (c) the nature of the commoditisation of the simple reproduction structure of the household enterprises.

The analysis of the history of the village have contributed in significantly to the understanding of the current structure and the evolving capitalist relations.

The establishment of the landlord structure, its conditions of survival and finally its disintegration in late 1940s revealed that the present structure of the village inherited important features from its historical past. The disintegration of the landlord structure had influenced not only the conditions of the establishment of the small land holding in Gokceagac but also the major changes in the recent history of the village.

I have suggested that the analysis of PCP necessitates a understanding of its ownership structure. The latter was taken as a significant factor that distinguished PCP'ers from both other commodity producers and industrial wage-workers.

The characteristics of the ownership of the means of production, land, household labour, and productive and reproductive goods and commodities were interpreted in terms of the stability and/or differentiation of PCP.

The first point argued was that production and reproduction cannot be effected without owning or hiring the elements of production. Second, the changes in PCP and its ownership structure covaried. Third, the ownership structure of the PCP'er included the tendencies of

transformation to petty capitalist relations; also latent in it, were the factors of differentiation and expropriation. Fourth, major changes in PCP gave rise to alternatives in the means of ownership, such as sharing, renting, possessing, and labour cooperation.

The ownership structure consisted of all goods and commodities produced and all commodities purchased. The production of subsistence goods and commodities both necessitated subsistence goods and commodities. This is the reason why I have pointed out that the ownership structure incorporated both the productive and reproductive cycles of PCP, and through commoditisation it linked itself intensively to capitalist relations.

I have suggested that although PCP'ers produced and reproduced within an extending commoditised ownership structure, the production of subsistence goods continued to subsidise the simple reproduction of the household enterprises.

I also indicated that the subsistence simple reproduction structure of PCP should not be confused with nor equated to the production of subsistence goods.

The subsistence nature of PCP, that is, the simple reproduction structure of PCP, were taken to mean that PCP'ers receive a mere subsistence return on their household labour expenditure. That is, PCP'ers were not able to accumulate capital. Despite the fact that they produced commodities, and almost all the elements of their production are commoditised, with the exception of land and household labour, they were not able to appropriate the surplus that

they created.

I have tried to analyse the nature of PCP by focusing on the significance of the commodity and non-commodity content and relations of PCP. The non-commodity features of PCP basically originated from the household labour and the means of access to land. Inheritance continues to be the major source of ownership of land. Although infrequent, the absentee possession of land of relatives was another source. On the other hand, land purchases, although in small scales, were made after the disintegration of the landlord structure and significantly contributed for the establishment and consolidation of small holdings in the village. In the present structure of the village, purchases * of land are more frequently realised than sales. Further, the Turkish state did not execute a comprehensive land distribution programme. Renting and sharecropping were alternative forms of using land, the former practiced more widely than the latter. The extension of commodity relations inhibited the practice of sharecropping and its cash return was low.

The distribution of land ownership in the village was unequal, but dominated by small holdings. The analysis of the land ownership showed that the ownership of land was central for the survival of PCP. The renting of land was a significant cost, but for many small land owners it was the only means of extending the size of their cultivation and a means of devalorising their household labour.

On the other hand, those households which owned more land than the average rented in land in large tracts to produce either cereals or industrial crops such as sunflower.

Since the amount of land owned by PCP'ers was small, the available means for increasing the scale of production were limited. This was especially true for capital-intensive cultivation. The latter necessitated renting large tracts of land which was possible for the large holdings, but not possible for the small. Hence, owner-cultivation was the rule for small land holders in Gokceagac. In addition to the availability, high rent was an important factor hindering the development of renting relations.

It was important to notice that renting very small plots of land for tobacco cultivation significantly increased the actual labour expenditure for the very small holdings in the village. This was possible because quite a number of households possessed more land than they can use for tobacco production. The availability of land was not a major limiting factor in increasing the scale of tobacco production; but the cost of renting was a limitation.

The division of land through inheritance was not a major obstacle until now, due to the high absorption capacity of tobacco cultivation. But, according to my findings, it will be a significant factor of differentiation in the future, especially for the very small land holdings. On the other hand, the pressures of population growth and the very low migration from the village were balanced by the labour demand created, due to changes in productivity and increases in the scale of production. These will also create conditions for the expropriation of some of the small holdings in the village. Since the crop combination adopted in the village has been dominated by labour-intensive crops,

the use of machinery did not result in idle labour among the Gokceagac villagers. On the contrary, it has saved a considerable amount of labour for the production of capital-intensive crops. It provided the conditions to increase the scale of production both in cereal and tobacco cultivation, and increased the productive expenditure of household labour.

It appeared that if land was available and the cost of renting it was 'bearable', PCP'ers could cultivate large acreages of capital-intensive crops. The PCP'ers were able to extend their cultivation by integrating seasonal wage-labourers up to the point where the use of the latter would not outweigh the labour expenditure of the household members. In Gokceagac, especially among the rich peasants, I predict a tendency of combining relatively medium-scale tobacco production together with relatively large-scale mechanised cereal cultivation.

Household labour was the most important factor in my analysis of PCP. I have tried to show that the household capacity and actual labour expenditure were closely interdependent. The conditions of actual labour expenditure were centrally important in the analysis of PCP, and involved not only the labour capacity of the households, but also depended on the changes in productivity, the means of production and the means of life; in the scale of production; the labour requirements of the crops cultivated; the division of labour; the return on labour; the intensification of labour; and the extension of the labour-time.

I have indicated several reasons why the nature of the

actual labour expenditure was the most important factor in the analysis of PCP: First, the characteristics of agricultural production determined the nature of the labour expended. Second, the labour expended was not in the form of individual but of family/household labour. Third, the labour demand varied according to different crops and their labour processes. Fourth, the age and sexual division of labour influenced actual labour expenditure. The division of labour was limited to the demographic characteristics of the enterprise and to the level of technology applicable to the specific labour processes. Fifth, the labour expended was organised as a combination of productive and domestic labour. This was more important when the peasant enterprises were composed of more than one family. Sixth, the productive skills were simple and learned within the family; no extra formal training was needed.

In my analysis, the non-commodity nature of the labour expended in PCP was taken as the most important factor that limited the full commoditisation of PCP. First of all, since PCP is based on the organisation of families, it continuously provided the major source of labour expenditure. Although my findings showed that there was a tendency for families to decrease in size, the current sizes of households were still large. Secondly, in PCP, almost all members of the household were able to contribute productively to the agricultural activities. Thirdly, given the conditions of the simple reproduction structure, PCP'ers were able to devalorise their labour by intensifying and extending labour-time. Fourthly, it was possible to

integrate seasonal wage-labour without eliminating the conditions of expenditure of household labour. Fifthly, under certain limited conditions the labour requirements were complemented by the labour cooperation between the households in the village. But all these does not mean that PCP were devoid of tendencies toward capitalist development in agriculture.

First, the simple reproduction of the household enterprise was facilitated by commodity production. Secondly, the reproduction of the household members were increasingly secured by the consumption of commodities. Thirdly, most of the enterprises were using seasonal wage-labour in varying degrees. Fourthly, the individual household members theoretically were able to work outside of the enterprise if this would not decrease the magnitude of the labour needs of the enterprise.

Although the possibilities were very limited, productive labour expenditure outside the enterprise contributed to the reproduction of the enterprises. In my analysis, I treated the non-enterprise productive labour expenditure as an indicator of differentiation, rather than a factor sustaining it. In other words, I argued that the non-household labour expenditure forms cannot be taken as stabilizing factors inherent to PCP; they must be taken as factors of differentiation. There were several reasons: First, such a labour expenditure is external to the organisation of production of the agricultural enterprises. Second, the labour expended in such forms usually occur at individual level and does not necessitate a division of labour between PCP and such labour expenditure forms. Third,

the nature of the labour expenditure is totally different from that of wage-labourers, casual workers or salary earners who expend labour without an ownership structure, i.e. they are not owner producers. On the other hand, I pointed out that alternatives, such as trade would necessitate large capital and therefore were beyond the scope of PCP. Seasonal wage-work in agriculture was the only alternative, but its practice was significantly limited by the high labour demand in tobacco cultivation which almost covered the whole annual cycle.

Furthermore, an analysis which combines labour expenditure within and outside the household enterprise must provide a theoretical analysis which does not exclude the prevailing structure of PCP. I argued that all non-household productive labour expenditure was marginal to the organisation of PCP in tobacco cultivation.

It was not possible to reproduce themselves by expending their labour productively in non-household economic activities. And when they did, especially as a family, it was taken as a significant element of disintegration. It is true that Turkish economy is 'diversified' and productive non-household labour expenditure could be an alternative expenditure of labour for only individual household members, but not for the whole family members. In that case, the individual secures his own reproduction as a wage-worker.

Moreover, in this study, I did not aim to analyse all factors which contributed to the survival of household members, but those factors which were integral parts of the structure of PCP in agriculture.

The household labour expenditure were closely related to the characteristics of agricultural production and the labour processes of the crops cultivated. I have considered the influence of the following factors: First, the natural features such as weather and the type and quality of the soil were important. Second, the amount and the quality of labour demand, i.e., the labour intensivity of the crops and their return were examined. The expenditure of household labour was distributed among the different labour processes of the various crops cultivated. A third significant factor was the subsistence and/or commodity nature of the crops cultivated.

The production of both labour-intensive (tobacco) and capital-intensive (wheat and maize) crops contributed to the maximisation of household labour expenditure and created conditions for agricultural machinery to be used by producers. In the cultivation of commercial crops, such as tobacco, where the use of seasonal wage-labour was rising, household enterprises expanded the scale of production in these crops.

The patriarchal nature of the household enterprises contributed significantly for the survival of PCP'ers in agriculture. The eldest male member of the family (usually the father or the grandfather) had the responsibility for organising the enterprises.

Patriarchal power and control was reflected in the sexual division of labour. Although adult females actively took part in the productive sphere, direct control was in the hands of the males. The patriarchal authority shared and passed down through the male members of the household. As

the organisation of production becomes more diversified and complex with the integration into commodity relations, the patriarch began sharing his responsibility in the organisation of the enterprise with the younger male members.

The social division of labour was limited, but the technical division of labour was relatively more developed and the patriarchal organisation increased the magnitude of the actual labour expenditure. The productive expenditure of women, children and elderly members of the household significantly contributed for the maximisation of the household labour expenditure.

The patriarchal organisation of PCP did not only produce gender differences in the division of labour within and outside of the household, but it resulted in subordination of female members of the household by alienating them from the return to their labour and denying access to land ownership.

In this study I have argued strongly that the conceptualisation of PCP in agriculture, especially in labour intensive crops such as tobacco, must incorporate the tendencies and conditions of use of seasonal wage-labour. The findings of my study showed that the conditions of survival of PCP was primarily made possible to the degree producers were able to increase the scale of their production. This was mainly made possible by the integration of seasonal wage-labour into the total labour expenditure of the household enterprises.

The conditions of production were neither constant nor

the same for all PCP'ers; in other words, the enterprises were not homogeneous in terms of their basic elements of production: ownership of land, labour, means of production and means of life. The PCP'ers did not merely differ in terms of the magnitude of these elements, but also according to the way these elements were used. The following were the primary changes which altered and necessitated adaptations: seasonal wage-labour integrated into the total labour expenditure; land and labour productivity increased during the last three decades; household sizes showed tendencies of decreasing; the use of capital and the degree of indebtedness increased; rental of land and machinery expanded and the simple reproduction structure further commoditised.

In Gokceagac, the simple reproduction structure of PCP'ers were strengthened by the opportunities for land possession, mainly due to the disintegration of the landlord structure which has significantly contributed to the continuation of production for the majority of the households. Productivity increases, too, have extended the chances for survival, and together with the use of seasonal wage-labour have decreased the need for a large household. If households did not use seasonal wage-labour, it meant that either they were too poor to afford renting agricultural machinery and hiring of seasonal wage-labour or that they cultivated capital-intensive crops and hence did not require large labour inputs.

There was a marked tendency among peasant families to use agricultural machinery, specifically tractors and harvesters, as far as the labour processes permitted. In

capital-intensive crop cultivation, regardless of the scale of production, a small size of household labour was sufficient if agricultural machinery was used. This however, was not the case for tobacco cultivation. Here, seasonal wage-labour was used alongside agricultural machinery when the scale of production increased to a level where the household labour cannot satisfy the labour demand, particularly during peak labour-demanding phases of production. Thus, the combination of household labour, seasonal wage-labour and agricultural machinery decreased the demand for household labour and created the conditions for the shrinking of household-family sizes.

The use of agricultural machinery had contradictory effects on the labour demand of PCP'ers. On the one hand, it saves household labour and provides conditions for its expenditure more productively; on the other hand, it augments the labour demand during peak phases, due to increases in the scale of production. As the scale of production enlarges, it becomes uneconomical to reproduce large sizes of family labour for to use only during the peak labour-demanding periods. This situation was particularly valid for capital-intensive crops, because their cultivation does not require long periods of high labour demand. Thus the combination of agricultural machinery, household labour and seasonal wage-labour for the labour-intensive crops and household labour with machinery for capital intensive crops was the primary pattern of cultivation in Gokceagac. However, I found that such a combination had limitations: seasonal wage-labour was used only for high labour-demanding

phases; agricultural machinery could not mechanise all tasks, especially those in labour-intensive cultivation; and the growth in household size increased the cost of reproduction.

The other central issue in the analysis of PCP was related to the conditions of integration of PCP'ers to generalised commodity production. They were integrated to commodity relations via their production and reproduction cycles. They were not able to secure their simple reproduction outside of the commodity relations.

The PCP'ers were involved in various markets: they sold and purchased in the commodity market; they hired seasonal wage-labourers in the labour market; and they acquired loans in the credit market.

Capital, in general, and the State in its different forms, intervened in commodity relations and exercised influences on the nature of commoditisation of PCP. I did not interpret integration of PCP'ers into commodity relations as an external factor; instead throughout this study, I tried to point out that PCP'ers integrated in accordance with the characteristics of their simple reproduction and according to the conditions of intervention of the State and capital into capital-peasant relations.

The conditions of integration to the generalised commodity relations were significantly influenced by the commodity nature of PCP. I have used the following basic commodity elements of PCP in the village: First of all, PCP'ers as household enterprises were both production units and consumption/reproduction units. As production units, they produced agricultural commodities, and subsistence

goods. As consumption units, they consumed industrial commodities and the subsistence goods that they have produced for both their productive and their reproductive needs. Second, the production of subsistence goods necessitated the consumption of commodities. Third, the reproduction of family labour (as a non-commodity element of PCP) also necessitated the consumption of commodities. Fourth, the household enterprises were hiring seasonal wage-labourers. Fifth, the maintenance of the quality of land (is barely yet a commodity) necessitated the consumption of commodities. Sixth, although in small sizes, land itself became a commodity for few enterprises of the village. Seventh, access to land in commodity form through renting was possible and practiced by many households for different sizes of land. And finally, hiring of agricultural machinery (tractors and harvesters) was widely practiced as a commodity relation in the village.

In this framework, I found that almost all elements of production (except land and household labour) were commoditised. It appeared that commodity consumption varied with regard to a number of factors, some of which were (a) the number, age and sex of household members; (b) the amount of the commodities that must be consumed in the productive and reproductive spheres; (c) the economic well-being of the households and the level of the standard of living; and (d) the role in changing the norms of consumption. Furthermore, the norms of consumption and the accepted standards of living influenced the amount and quality of consumption in the reproductive sphere. Here, it was

significant to note that under adverse conditions of return on labour, the amount and quality of reproductive consumption was reduced to an 'absolute' minimum.

Households under pressure attempted to lower the cost of their reproductive consumption, if possible, by replacing the new commodities with subsistence goods. They turned to the hiring, as opposed to, of machinery and land. They sought means to intensify and extend their labour-time in the production of subsistence goods that was replacing the commodities purchased. The latter option was more feasible in the satisfaction of the food needs of the household enterprises. If these choices were not available, the alternative was to either delay or completely omit such consumption.

The above 'alternatives' that were possible to a certain degree in the reproductive sphere did not exist at all in the productive sphere. In the latter sphere, the cost of commodity consumption could be lowered only by decreasing the scale of production, which strongly weakens the conditions of the survival of PCP.

The conditions of commoditisation of the simple reproduction structure of PCP was closely related to the prevailing conditions of agricultural credits. The sources of indebtedness were basically formal and loans were taken for short-term. Long-term borrowing was more feasible and common for the well-off peasants, who used investment credits rather than circulating credits. On the other hand, credit purchases for immediate consumption were more common than installment purchases of durable goods. Under conditions of large cash needs, in cases such as purchasing

a tractor or building a house, the PCP'ers sought all possible formal and informal means of borrowing.

The amount of the loan, the repayment schedule and the cash remaining after payment of debts, determined the purchase of the productive and the reproductive commodities throughout the year. Indebtedness should thus be considered as an integral part of simple reproduction structure of PCP'ers and used as a means of adjusting annual cash expenditure.

The reasons for indebtedness explained many aspects of PCP in relation to the following issues. First, due to the annual nature of agricultural production, the annual return on labour necessitated borrowing for almost all their circulation needs. Second, PCP'ers were not able to accumulate capital; but sometimes small savings were possible in favorable periods of exchange of commodities. Third, the financial planning of the household budget was almost impossible because the price of some of their inputs and most of their products were monopolistically determined by the State.

I have indicated that the effects of the markets on PCP'ers were important, but the role of the markets should be interpreted according to the conditions of production of household enterprises. The PCP'ers were under almost constant pressure to produce more commodities. They used various means to increase their scale of production. The penetration of capital and the intervention of the State aimed to provide the conditions for PCP'ers to increase their production. Commodity consumption, especially

productive technical inputs, increased both land and labour productivity. The production of agricultural commodities supplied industry with raw materials, food and its export was a source of foreign exchange earnings. Thus I have suggested that PCP should be conceptualised in terms of the development of capitalist commodity relations and the capitalist market, and this in turn necessitated an analysis of the role of state, commercial and industrial capital and the capitalist laws of motion.

The non-commodity form of land ownership, labour expenditure of PCP'ers, and the limitations of competitive commodity relations, curtailed the capitalist nature of PCP. They continued to subsidise their reproduction through the production of subsistence goods. They sought all means to compete in the exchange relations through the production of 'under-valued' commodities. They integrated most of their labour capacity into productive expenditure (including the labour of children and the elderly) to 'devalorise' their labour and to maximise its expenditure.

I have pointed out that there were limits to such simple reproduction, which were mainly determined by the conditions of production rather than the conditions of the market and its price system.

In the simple reproduction structure of household enterprises, the nature and extent of the State intervention varied, but it basically provided the conditions for the intensification of commodity relations in agriculture without specifically aiming to sustain PCP. In other words, the State maintained the survival of PCP without reversing the growing tendency towards commoditisation.

I have argued that the State uses subsidy policies to extend the commodity market and whenever necessary, stabilises it. As the economy grows, the PCP'ers become more fully integrated with the capitalist market; during a crisis, stabilisation policies are used to curb the return on labour and/or the purchasing power of PCP'ers.

The conditions of penetration of capital and the intervention of the State were determined by the following issues: (1) the underdeveloped nature of agricultural production; (2) the diffusion of PCP; (3) the absence of a land distribution programme; (4) the migration from rural areas which offsets population increases in agriculture; (5) the nature and degree of developing capitalist commodity relations at the national level; (6) the power and the interests of capital and big land-owners; (7) the return on capital investments at the national level; (8) the role of circulating capital; (9) the intersectoral relations between agriculture and industry; (10) the volume of output, the amount marketed and the internal demand for cereal and industrial crops and their export possibilities; (11) the provision of agricultural credits; (12) the extension of infrastructure and agricultural services; (13) the taxation of agriculture, (14) the devalorisation capacity of PCP; (15) the unorganised nature of PCP'ers; and (16) the political implications of populist policies.

The nature of the simple reproduction structure and its continuation had several important implications for the differentiation of the peasantry and for the rural class structure.

Although the PCP'ers managed to survive, it was certainly becoming more difficult for Gokceagac villagers to sustain their simple reproduction. The widening inequality in the distributive system was weakening the survival capacity of PCP'ers. The interests of big landowners and the rich peasants were protected and extended at the expense of PCP'ers. At the national level, although the migration rate has slowed down, segments of the rural population are still migrating to the cities. The PCP'ers are under pressure to increase the scale of production by integrating more seasonal wage-labour. As the domestic market and commodity relations extend, and the agrarian structure is integrated more with the world economy through the export of agricultural crops, and the import of technical inputs and raw materials, producers encounter a better organised capital in different forms and various economic organisations that have the backing of the State. In contrast, the PCP'ers are un-organised, a position accentuated by state subsidy policies.

*How
when
by when*

It appeared that analysis concerning PCP must take into account the distinction between the tendencies of full expropriation and differentiation. I have argued that the implications of the latter two tendencies drew the limits of change and development in agriculture and have taken into account the following issues related to PCP: the changes in demographic characteristics; (the decreasing birth rate, the increasing life-span, the declining number of children, and early separation from the parental home of married sons); the limited migration from the village; the absence of seasonal agricultural wage-work and very limited work in

towns; the absence of landlessness; the changes from ownership to tenancy relations (especially renting land and agricultural machinery); the increases in the magnitude of loans and long-term indebtedness; the prevalence of non-competitive market relations and monopolistic economic practices; the intervention of the State; the fluctuations in the terms of trade; the increasing commoditisation of the production process (including land and labour); the decreasing access to land; and the limited options to change the crop combination.

In this study I have taken these basic factors as the elements of differentiation and tried to see their impact on the conditions of survival of PCP and partial and/or full expropriation from the means of production. In other words, given the conditions of the capitalist laws of motion, the nature of the organisation of production and the simple reproduction structure of PCP, any factor which deviated from the basic subsistence maintenance aim of PCP were taken as a factor of differentiation. The combination of the prevalence and the nature of such a structure and the conditions of integration of PCP with capitalist relations at the social formation level was the domain that I used to conceptualise PCP. *

I have tried to show the significance of the following issues throughout the study:

- (1) The nature of commoditisation of the simple reproduction structure of PCP and the development of commodity relations.
- (2) The continuation of household-family structure which contributed significantly to the survival of PCP.

(3) The existence of limited alternatives of household labour expenditure outside of the enterprise.

(4) The continuing possibility of possession of land through inheritance.

(5) The decreases in the sizes of households which did not endanger the capacity to maintain simple reproduction. On the contrary, contributed to the survival of PCP, especially when combined with the use of seasonal wage-labour.

(6) The possibility of maximisation of the household labour expenditure on small-sizes of land cultivation, specifically in labour-intensive crops such as tobacco.

(7) The land and labour productivity increases due to technical inputs and agricultural machinery extends the capacity of PCP'ers to produce.

(8) State subsidy policies were used to decrease the value of agricultural products. *(You were saying previously that state sub. pols decreased the cost of reproduction of P.C.P'ers)*

(9) PCP'ers still could find means to devalorise their labour.

(10) The use of seasonal wage-labour increased the capacity to produce and volume of output.

(11) It was possible to benefit from the labour of young, old and disabled members of the households in the productive phases.

(12) Subsistence goods production subsidised the simple reproduction of PCP'ers.

(13) PCP'ers were able to decrease or delay their reproductive consumption.

These conditions and characteristics of the PCP'ers were advantageous for capital and the State. They thus provided the necessary conditions for the continuation of PCP within

the given relations of production, in order to guarantee agricultural production, controlled the marketing of agricultural commodities, influenced consumption norms and took measures to prevent the organisation of PCP'ers in the economic and political spheres.

APPENDIX
GOKCEAGAC TOBACCO PRODUCERS
HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEW FORM

Date of Interview:
Interview Number:
Name of the Household Head:

1. How old are you?
- 2.A Are you married?
- 2.B. How old were you when you married?
3. How long have you been the head of the household?
- 4.A How many people are there in your house?
- 4.B How many children do you think a family should have?
- 4.C How many persons do you think a household should have?
- 5.A Do you own land in the village?
- 5.B How many decares of land do you own?
- 5.C How many plots of land do you own?
- 5.D How do you cultivate land?
- 6.A Do you own land outside the village?
- 6.B If yes, where?
- 6.C How many decares?
- 6.D How many plots?
- 6.E How do you cultivate these land?
- 7.A Do you rent land?
- 7.B If yes, how many decares?
- 7.C How many plots?

- 7.D From where do you rent this land?
- 7.E Have you rented land before?
- 7.F If yes, when?
- 8.A Do you sharecrop land?
- 8.B If yes, how many decares?
- 8.C How many plots?
- 8.D Where?
- 8.E Did you sharecrop land before?
- 8.F. If yes, when?
- 9.A Do you rent out land?
- 9.B If yes, how many decares?
- 9.C How many plots?
- 9.D Where?
- 9.E Did you rent out land before?
- 9.F If yes, when?
- 10.A Do you sharecrop part of your land?
- 10.B If yes, how many decares?
- 10.C How many plots?
- 10.D Where?
- 10.E Did you sharecrop part of your land before?
- 10.F If yes, when?
- 11.A How did you own your land?
- 11.B How many decares did you inherit?
- 11.C From whom did you inherit?
- 11.D How many decares of land did you buy?
- 11.E When did you buy land?
- 12.A Did you sell any land?

- 12.B If yes, when did you sell land?
- 12.C How many decares did you sell?
- 12.D Why did you sell?
- 13.A Do you have enough land?
- 13.B Have you ever been landless?
- 13.C If yes, when?
- 14.A What crops did you grow last year?
- 14.B How many decares of tobacco?
- 14.C How many decares of wheat?
- 14.D How many decares of maize?
- 14.E How many decares of sunflower?
15. How much tobacco, wheat, maize and sunflower did you produce last year?
- 16.A What was the value of tobacco you sold last year?
- 16.B What is the value of tobacco you sold this year?
- 16.C How many tobacco permits do your household have?
- 17.A Are you better off than others?
- 17.B Are you better off than before?
- 18.A Are you in debt?
- 18.B If yes, to where?
- 19.A Do you loan from the Bank or the Cooperative?
- 19.B How much did you loan last year?
- 19.C What were the share of Bank and Cooperative loans?
- 20.A Where did you use the loan?
- 20.B Do loans are sufficient for a year?
- 20.C How do you meet your credit needs?

21. Where do you get cash besides formal credits?
22. Where did you spend your loan last year?
23. Where did you spend your loan in the last ten years?
- 24A Are the wedding expenses necessary?
- 24B If not, why unnecessary?
- 24C If yes, why necessary?
- 25.A When was the best price paid for tobacco?
- 25.B What should be the price of tobacco this year?
26. Whom do you call rich?
27. What is your total annual income?
28. What animals do you own?
- 29.A What agricultural tools do you have?
- 29.B Do you own or share tractor?
- 29.C If yes, when did you buy your tractor?
- 30.A Do you pay for agricultural work?
- 30.B If yes, for what kind of work?
- 30.C Do you need wage-labourers for tobacco?
- 30.D If yes, how much did you pay?
- 30.E Since when have you been using wage-labourers?
- 31.A Do you think married sons should separate?
- 31.B How long should they stay with their parents before separation.
- 31.C Would household costs decrease by this separation?
- 32.A How do you provide your food?

- 32.B Who supplies your food?
- 32.C Who supplies your other needs?
- 33.A Who is the most powerful person in the village?
- 33.B Why is he powerful?
34. How do you act if you face an injustice of the Headman?
- 35.A When was your house built?
- 35.B How many rooms are there in the house?
- 35.C Does your house have a separate kitchen and a toilet?
- 35.D Do you own more than one house?
36. Do you oppose injustice?
37. To whom do you apply first in difficulty?
- 38.A What would you do with an unexpected 100 000TL today?
- 38.B What could you have done with it before?
- 38.C What would you do with an unexpected 500 000TL today?
- 38.D What could you have done with it before?
- 39.A What kind of goods do you purchase by cash?
- 39.B What do you purchase on credit?
40. What kind of products did you buy in the last five years?
- 41.A What kind of help did you receive from the State in the last ten years?
- 41.B What kind of help do you want from the State?
- 42.A What kind of electrical goods are you planning to buy?

- 42.B Do you have the money to buy them?
- 43.A What problems do you have in your household?
- 43.B What are the difficulties of tobacco production?
- 43.C What are the most important problems of the village?
44. What would increase your household income?
45. Which quarter of the village you live in?
46. What is your family name?
47. Who do you know in Bafra?
- 48.A Were there anyone else during the interview?
- 48.B If yes, who was present?
49. Were there any breaks during the interview?
50. Did respondent understood questions easily?
51. Did respondent answered willingly?

LIST OF REFERENCES

- ACIL, A.F. 1953. Samsun Merkez İlcesi Tutun İşletmelerinin Ekonomik Yapısı. Ankara: A.U. Ziraat Fakültesi.
- AKALIN, G. 1975. Tarımımızın Sosyo-ekonomik Yapısı Vergileme ve Gelişme. Ankara: A.U. S.B.F.
- AKSİT, B. 1967. Türkiye'de Az Gelişmiş Kapitalizm ve Köylere Girişi. Ankara: ODTU Öğrenci Birliği.
- AKSİT, B. and KEYDER, C. 1981. Kırsal Donuşum Tipolojisi. Yeni İmece, No. 1.
- AKSOY, S. 1969. Tarımda İş Hukuku. Ankara: Türk Ziraat Ekonomi Derneği.
- AKSOY, S. 1982. Tarım İşçilerinin Hukuki Durumları. In Tarım ve Orman İşçilerinin Sorunlarına İlişkin Çözüm Önerileri Semineri. Ankara: Milli Produktivite Merkezi.
- AKTAN, R. 1971. Türkiye'de Toprak Reformu Çalışmaları. A. U. S.B.F. Dergisi, Vol. 26, No. 3.
- AKTAN, R. 1973. Türkiye'de Toprak Reformu. Türkiye Ekonomisinin 50. Yılı Semineri. Bursa: B.I.T.I.A.
- ALAVI, H. 1975. India and Colonial Mode of Production. Economic and Political Weekly, Special Number (August).
- ALTHUSSER, L. and BALIBAR, E. 1970. Reading Capital. London: New Left Books.
- AMIN, S. 1975. Unequal Development. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- ARAS, A. and ÇIKIN, A. 1976. İzmir ve Çevresinde Mevcut Tarım Kooperatiflerine Ortak Çiftçilerin Bu Kooperatiflerden Yararlanma Durumları ve Kooperatifçilik Eğilimleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi.
- ARAS, A. 1981. Türkiye Tarımında Üretimin ve Verimliliğin Arttırılması ve Ürün Deseniinde Gelişmeler. In 2. Türkiye İktisat Kongresi, Ankara: DPT.
- ARICANLI, A.T. and KEYDER, C. 1979. Notes on Labour Demand During Structural and Technical Transformation in Agriculture. Mimeo, Middle East Technical University.
- ARICANLI, T. and SOMEL, K. 1979. Türkiye'de Toprak Dağılımında ve Tarımda Değişimin Niteliği Üzerine Gözlemler. ODTU Gelişme Dergisi, No. 22-23.

- ARICANLI, T. 1984. Agrarian Relations in Turkey: State and Peasant Property: A Historical Sketch. Mimeo, University of California.
- ARUOBA, C. 1971. Tarimsal Kalkinmada Kooperatiflerin Onemi Uzerine Bazi Dusunceler. A.U.S.B.F. Dergisi, Vol. 26, No. 2.
- ARUOBA, C. 1973. Tarimda Geleneksel-Gecimlik Kesim-Buyuklugu, Yapisi, Isleyisi. A.U.S.B.F. Dergisi, Vol. 28, No. 3-4.
- ASENA, Dincer. 1981. Turk Tariminda Ana Urunler. In 2. Turkiye Iktisat Kongresi V Tarim Komisyonu Tebligleri. Ankara:Devlet Planlama Teskilati.
- AYATA, S. 1982. Differentiation and Capital Accumulation: Case Studies of the Carpet and Metal Industries in Kayseri (Turkey). Ph.D. Thesis, University of Kent.
- BADEMLI, R. 1977. Distorted and Lower Forms of Capitalist Industrial Production in Underdeveloped Countries: Contemporary Artisan Shops and Workshops in Eskisehir and Gaziantep, Turkey. Ph. D. Thesis, Mass. Institute of Technology.
- BALAMAN, A.R. 1967. Ankara Koylerinden Orencikte Meydana Gelen Kultur Degismeleri. Antropoloji, No. 4.
- BALAMAN, A.R. 1984. Aile Kurma, Cozme, Aile-ici Etkilesim ve Iliskiler. In T. Erder (ed.), Turkiye'de Ailenin Degisimi: Toplumbilimsel Incelemeler, Ankara: Turk Sosyal Bilimler Dernegi.
- BALAMIR, N. 1981. Kirsal Turkiye'de Egitim ve Toplum Yapisi. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.
- BALAMIR, N. 1983. Kirsal Ailedeki Isgunu Cesitlenmeleri. Presented in seminar on the honour of Tarik Okyay, Ankara: Mimarlar Odasi.
- BANAJI, J. 1976. Summary of Selected Parts of Kautsky's 'The Agrarian Question'. Economy and Society, Vol. 5, No. 1.
- BANAJI, J. 1977a. Modes of Production in a Materialist Conception of History. Capital and Class, No. 3.
- BANAJI, J. 1977b. Capitalist Domination and the Small Peasantry: Deccan Districts in the Late Nineteenth Century. Economic and Potical Weekly, Special Number (August).
- BARAN, P.A. 1957. The Political Economy of Growth. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- BARNETT, T. 1977. The Gezira Scheme. London: Frank Cass.
- BAYKANER, S.M. 1962. Koyde Saglik Isleri. In V. Iskan ve Sehircilik Haftasi Konferanslari. Ankara.
- BEELEY, B.W. 1969. Koysel Turkiye Bibliyografyasi. Ankara:

Hacettepe Universitesi.

BERKES, N. 1942. Bazi Ankara Koyleri Uzerinde bir Arastirma. Ankara: A.U. Dil ve Tarih Cografiya Fakultesi.

BERNSTEIN, H. 1976. Underdevelopment and the Law of Value: A Critique of Kay. Review of African Political Economy, No. 6.

BERNSTEIN, H. 1977. Notes on Capital and Peasantry. Review of African Political Economy, No. 10.

BERNSTEIN, H. 1979. African Peasantries: A Theoretical Framework. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 6, No. 4.

BERNSTEIN, H. 1981. Notes on State and Peasantry: The Tanzanian Case. Review of African Political Economy, No. 21.

BERNSTEIN, H. 1986. Capitalism and Commodity Production. Social Analysis, No. 20.

BETTLEHEIM, C. 1973. Theoretical Comments. In A. Emmanuel, Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade. London: New Left Books.

BIRTEK, F. and KEYDER, C. 1975. Agriculture and the State: An Inquiry into Agricultural Differentiation and Political Alliances: The Case of Turkey. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 2, No. 4.

BOESEN, J. and MOHELE, A.T. 1979. The 'Success' Story of Peasant Tobacco Production in Tanzania. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

BORAN, B.S. 1945. Toplumsal Yapi Arastirmalari. Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu.

BORATAV, K. 1977. 1923-1939 Yillarinin Iktisat Politikasi Acisindan Donemlendirilmesi. In K. Boratav, Iktisat Politikalari ve Bolusum Sorunlari Iktisat Yazilari 1969-81. Istanbul:1983.

BRADBY, B. 1975. The Destruction of Natural Economy. Economy and Society, Vol. 4, No. 2.

BRENNER, R. 1977. The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of neo-Smithian Marxism. New Left Review, No. 104.

BROMLEY, R. and C. Gerry (ed.). 1979. Causal Work and Poverty in Third World Cities. Chichester: John Wiley.

BULBUL, M. 1979. Bafra Ilcesi Tutun Isletmelerinin Ekonomik Yapisi, Yatirim ve Cari Harcamalariin Dagilimi ve Bunlariin Gelir Uzerine Etkisi. Ankara: A. U. Ziraat Fakultesi.

CAGLAR, Y. 1984. Turkiye'de Islenen Topraklariin Isletmeler Arasinde Dagilimi. Bilim ve Sanat, No. 45.

CARDOSO, F. and FALETTA, E. 1979. Dependency and

Development in Latin America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

CAVDAR, T. 1978. Turkiye'de Burjuva Demokratik Duzene Yonelik Ilk Hareketler. Yeni Ilke, No. 4.

CHAYANOV, A.V. 1966. The Theory of Peasant Economy, trans. and (ed.) D. Thorner, R.E.F. Smith and B. Kerblay. Illinois: R. D. Irwin.

COX, T. 1979. The Awkward Class or Awkward Classes? Class Relations in the Russian Peasantry Before Collectivisation. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 7, No. 1.

DEERE, C.D. 1977. Changing Social Relations of Production and Peruvian Peasant Women's Work. Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 10, No. 1-2.

DIE. 1986. 1985 Tarim Istatistikleri Ozeti. Ankara.

DIKERDEM, M.A. 1980. Factory and Workshop. An Investigation into Forms of Small-Scale Production in Turkey. D. Phil. Thesis: University of Sussex.

DJURFELDT, Goren. 1981. What Happened to the Agrarian Bourgeoisie and Rural Proletariat Under Monopoly Capitalism. Acta Sociologica, Scandanavian Review of Sociology, Vol. 24, No. 3.

DPT. 1977. Tutun ve Tutun Mamulleri. Ankara.

DUPRE, G. and REY, P.P. 1978. Reflections on the Relevance of a Theory of the History of Exchange. In D. Seddon (ed.), Relations of Production: Marxist Approaches to Economic Anthropology. London: Frank Cass.

EMMANUEL, A. 1973. Unequal Exchange. London: New Left Books.

ENNEW, J., HIRST, P., and TRIBE, K. 1977. 'Peasantry' as an Economic Category. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 4, No. 4.

ERDOST, M.I. 1987. Kirsal Alan: Yapisi ve Ozellikleri. Bilim ve Sanat, No. 78.

ERGIL, G. 1971. Turk Koyunde Modernlesme Egilimleri Arastirmasi, Rapor-II. Istanbul: DPT.

ERGUDER, U. 1981. Turkiye'de Tarim Fiyat Siyasasi ve Siyaset. Istanbul: Bogazici Universitesi.

ESERPEK, A. 1977. Turk Koyunde Formel Egitime Iliskin Tutumlar. A.U. Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, Vol. 9, No. 1-4.

ESERPEK, A. 1978. Turk Koy Ailesinde Isbolumune Iliskin Yapisal Degismeler. Ankara: A.U. Dil ve Tarih Cografiya Fakultesi.

- FOSTER-CARTER, A. 1978. The Modes of Production Controversy. *New Left Review*, No. 107.
- FRANK, A.G. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- FRANK, A.G. 1969. *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- FRANK, A.G. 1973. On 'Feudal' Modes, Models and Methods of Escaping Capitalist Reality. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (January).
- FRANK, A.G. 1981. *Crisis: In the Third World*. London: Heinemann.
- FRIEDMANN, H. 1978a. Simple Commodity Production and Wage Labour in the American Plains. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 6, No.1.
- FRIEDMANN, H. 1978b. World Market, State, and Family Farm: Social Bases of Household Production in the Era of Wage Labour. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 20, No. 4.
- FRIEDMANN, H. 1980. Household Production and the National Economy: Concepts for the Analysis of Agrarian Formations. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 2.
- GIBBON, P. and NEOCOSMOS, M. 1985. Some Problems in the Political Economy of 'African Socialism'. In H. Bernstein and B. K. Campell (eds.), *Introduction of Accumulation in Africa: Studies in Economy and State*. London: Sage Publications.
- GODELLIER, M. 1977. *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- GOODMAN, D. and REDCLIFT, M. 1981. *From Peasant to Proletarian: Capitalist Development and Agrarian Transitions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- GOODMAN, D. and REDCLIFT, M. 1985. Capitalism, Petty Commodity Production and the Farm Enterprise. *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 25, No. 3-4.
- GULALP, H. 1980. Turkiye'de Ithal Ikamesi Bunalimi ve Disa Acilma. *ODTU Gelisme Dergisi*, Vol. 7, No. 1-2.
- GUNES, T. 1986. Turk Tariminda Girdi Kullanimindaki Gelismeler. *Verimlilik Dergisi*, No. 1.
- GURGEN, Y. 1982. Tarimsal Isgucu Sorunlari ve Verimlilik Arttiracak Bazi Onlemler. In *Tarim ve Orman Iscilerinin Sorunlarina Iliskin Cozum Onerileri Semineri*, Ankara: Milli Produktivite Merkezi.
- GURKAN, A. and KASNAKOGLU, H. 1986. *Past Trends and Future*

Prospects of Turkish Agriculture. Mimeo.

GURKAN, A. and KASNAKOGLU, H. 1987. Tarım Sektörünün Güncel Sorunları. Bilim ve Sanat, No. 78.

GURSEL, S. 1983. Osmanlı Toplumsal Yapısı ve Kapitalizm. Yapıt, No. 1.

GUVEN, H. 1981. Tarımda Destekleme Politikası. In 2. Türkiye İktisat Kongresi V Tarım Komisyonu Tebliğleri. Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teskilati.

HAMITOGULLARI, B. 1968. Türkiye'de Atıl İşgücünün İktisadi Kalkınmaya Katılması ve İktisadi Kalkınma Seferberliği. A.U.S.B.F. Dergisi, Vol. 23, No. 2.

HANN, C.M. 1985. Rural Transformation on the East Black Sea Coast of Turkey: A Note on Keyder. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 12, No. 4.

HARRISON, M. 1975. Chayanov and the Economics of Russian Peasantry. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 2, No. 4.

HARRISON, M. 1977a. The Peasant Mode of Production in the Work of A.V. Chayanov. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 4, No. 4.

HARRISON, M. 1977b. Resource Allocation and Agrarian Class Formation. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 4, No. 2.

HARRISON, M. 1979. Chayanov and the Marxists. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 7, No. 1.

HASSAN, U. 1970. Tarımsal Kredi Sorunları Özellikle Tefecilik. A.U. S.B.F. Dergisi, Vol. 25, No. 4.

HILTON, R. 1976. The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism. London: New Left Books.

HINDESS, B. and HIRST, P.Q. 1975. Pre-capitalist Modes of Production. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

HINDESS, B. and HIRST, P.Q. 1977. Modes of Production and Social Formation. London: Macmillan.

HOBBSBAWN, E.G. 1964. Introduction to Karl Marx. Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

HUNT, D. 1979. Chayanov's Model of Peasant Household Resource Allocation. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 6. No. 3.

INAN, H. 1983. Osmanlı Tarihi ve Dünya Sistemi: Bir Değerlendirme. Toplum ve Bilim, No. 23.

ISIKLI, E. 1977. Tarımda Destekleme Fiyatlarının İlan Zamanı ve Bu Konuya İlişkin Bazı Düşünceler. Ege Üniversitesi Z.F. Dergisi, Vol. 14, No. 3.

- JANVRY, A. de and GARRAMON, C. 1977. The Dynamics of Rural Poverty in Latin America. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 3.
- KAGITCIBASI, C. 1981. *Cocugun Degeri, Turkiye'de Degerler ve Dogurganlik*. Istanbul: Bogazici Universitesi.
- KARPAT, K. 1960. Some Effects of Farm Mechanization in Turkish Villages. *Social Research*, Vol. 27, No. 1.
- KARTAL, K. 1983. *Ekonomik Yonleriyle Turkiye'de Kentlesme*. Ankara: Yurt Yayinlari.
- KAY, G. 1975. *Development and Underdevelopment: A Marxist Analysis*. London: Macmillan.
- KAZGAN, G. 1963. Turkiye Ekonomisinde Strukturel Degisme 1950-1960. *I.U. Iktisat Fakultesi Mecmuasi*, Vol. 23, No.3-4.
- KAZGAN, G. 1964. *Toplum Kalkinmasinda Bos Zamanlari Degerlendirme Yollari*. Istanbul: Halk Sagligi Egitim Komitesi.
- KELES, R. 1961. Turkiye'de Koylu Nufus ve Sehirlere Akin. In *V. Iskan ve Sehircilik Haftasi Konferanslari*. A.U.S.B.F.
- KELES, R. 1970. Turkiye'de Sehirlesme Egilimleri. *A.U. S.B.F. Dergisi*, Vol. 25, No. 4.
- KEYDER, C. 1976. The Dissolution of the Asiatic Mode of Production. *Economy and Society*, Vol. 5, No. 2.
- KEYDER, C. 1983a. The Cycle of Sharecropping and the Consolidation of Small Peasant Ownership in Turkey. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2-3.
- KEYDER, C. 1983b. Paths of Rural Transformation in Turkey. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- KIRAY, M.B. 1962. *Istihlak Normlari*. Planlama, Vol. 1, No. 3.
- KIRAY, M.B. 1964. *Eregli: Agir Sanayiden once bir Sahil Kasabasi*. Ankara: DPT Yayini.
- KIRAY, M.B. and HINDERINK, J. 1970. *Social Stratification as an Obstacle to Development*. New York: Prager Publications.
- KIRAY, M.B. 1973. *Gecekodu: Az Gelismis Ulkelerde Hizla Topraktan Kopma ve Kentle Butunlesememe*. A.U.S.B.F. Dergisi, Vol. 27, No. 3.
- KIRAY, M.B. 1978. *Kucuk Kasaba Kadinlari*. In Nermin Abadan-Unat (ed.), *Turk Toplumunda Kadin*. Ankara: Turk Sosyal Bilimler Dernegi.
- KOKSAL, E. 1971. *Turkiye'de Tarimsal Kredi Sorunu*. ODTU

Gelisme Dergisi, No. 3.

KOLARS, J. 1971. Tarimda Degisim Sistemleri. In E. Tumertekin et.al, Turkiye Cografi ve Sosyal Arastirmalar. Istanbul: I.U. Edebiyat Fakultesi.

KONAK, A. 1977. Koysel Bolge Saglik Hizmetlerini Degerlendirme Metodolojisi adli Eserin Tibbi Antropoloji Acisindan Incelenmesi. Antropoloji, No. 10.

KURMUS, O. 1974. Emperyalizmin Turkiye'ye Giris. Istanbul: Bilim Yayinlari.

LACLAU, E. 1971. Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America. New Left Review, No. 67.

LENIN, V.I. 1964. The Development of Capitalism in Russia. Collected Works, Vol. 3, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

LITTLEJOHN, G. 1973. The Peasantry and the Russian Revolution. Economy and Society, Vol. 2, No. 1.

LITTLEJOHN, G. 1977. Chayanov and the Theory of Peasant Economy. In B. Hinde (ed.), Sociological Theories of the Economy. London: Macmillan.

LUXEMBURG, R. 1971. The Accumulation of Capital. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MARX, K. 1962. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. Selected Works, Vol. 1, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

MARX, K. and ENGELS, F. 1967. The Communist Manifesto. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

MARX, K. and ENGELS, F. 1968. Selected Works. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

MEILLASSOUX, C. 1972. From Reproduction to Production. A Marxist Approach to Economic Anthropology. Economy and Society, Vol. 1, No. 1.

MEILLASSOUX, C. 1981. Maidens, Meal and Money: Capitalism and the Domestic Community. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mimarlar Odasi. 1978. Sanayide Kucuk Uretim Toplumsal ve Mekansal Boyutlar. Ankara: Mimarlar Odasi.

MULAYIM, Z.G. 1967. Tarimsal Kooperatifcilik. Ankara: A.U. Ziraat Fakultesi.

O'BRIEN, P.J. 1975. A critique of Latin American theories of Dependency. In I. Oxaal, T. Barnett and D. Booth (eds.), Beyond the Sociology of Development: Economy and Society in Latin America and Africa. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

O'LAUGHLIN, B. 1977. Production and Reproduction: Meillasoux's 'Femmes, Greniers et Capitaux. Critique of

Anthropology, Vol. 2, No. 8.

OZBAS, S. 1974. Konya Ili Cariklar Koyunde Aile Hayati. Ankara: A.U. Ziraat Fakultesi.

OZBAY, F. (1982a). Turkiye'de Kirsal/Kentsel Kesimde Egitimin Kadinlar Uzerine Etkisi. In N. Abadan-Unat (ed.), Turk Toplumunda Kadin. Ankara: Turk Sosyal Bilimler Dernegi Yayini.

OZBAY, F. 1982b. Women's Education in Rural Turkey. In C. Kagitcibasi (ed.), Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey, Indiana University Turkish Studies, No. 3.

OZBAY, F. 1984. Kirsal Kesimde Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Yapı Degismelerinin Aile Islevlerine Yansimasi. In T. Erder (ed.), Turkiye'de Ailenin Yapisi, Toplumbilimsel Incelemeler, Ankara: Turk Sosyal Bilimler Dernegi Yayini.

OZGUR, O. 1975. 100 Soruda Turkiye'de Kapitalizmin Gelismesi. Istanbul: Gercek Yayınevi.

OZET, O. 1978. Yaprak Tutun Ihracati. In Tutun ve Tutun Mamulleri Sanayii Sorunlari. Ankara: Milli Produktivite Merkezi.

PALMA, G. 1978. Dependency: a Formal Theory of Underdevelopment. World Development, Vol. 6.

PAMUK, S. 1982. Osmanli Tariminda Rejim Iliskileri 1840-1913. Toplum ve Bilim, No. 17.

PAMUK, S. 1984. Ithal Ikamesi, Doviz Darbogazlari ve Turkiye, 1947-1979. In K. Boratav, et.al. (eds.), Krizin Gelismesi ve Turkiye'nin Alternatif Sorunu. Ankara: Kaynak Yayinlari.

PAMUK, S. 1985. Anadolu'da Koyluluk Uzerine Tezler. Yapit, No. 13.

PATNAIK, U. 1972. On the Mode of Production in Indian Agriculture: A Reply. Economic and Political Weekly, Review of Agriculture, (September).

PATNAIK, U. 1979. Neo-populism and Marxism: the Chayanovian view of the Agrarian Question and its Fundamental Fallacy. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 6, No. 4.

PETRAS, J. 1969. Politics and Social Forces in Chilean Development. Berkeley: University of California Press.

PIERCE, J.E. 1964. Life in a Turkish Village. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

QUATAERT, D. 1984. Kacakcilar ve Osmanli Hukumeti. Yapit, No 3, trans. M. Tuncay.

RAIKES, P.L. 1978. Rural Differentiation and Class Formation in Tanzania. Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 5,

No. 3.

- REDCLIFT, N. 1985. The Contested Domain: Gender Accumulation and the Labour Process. In N. Redclift and E. Mingiona (eds.), *Beyond Employment: Household, Gender and Subsistence*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- ROBINSON, R.D. 1952. Tractors in the Village. A Study in Turkey. *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. 34, No. 4.
- ROXBOROUGH, I. 1976. Dependency Theory in the Sociology of Development: Some Theoretical Problems. *West African Journal of Sociology and Political Science*, Vol. 1, No. 2.
- ROXBOROUGH, I. 1979. *Theories of Underdevelopment*. London: Macmillan.
- SAYIN, T. 1969. *Zirai Krediden Istifade Sartlari*. Ankara.
- SCHRIJVERS, J. 1983. Manipulated Motherhood: The Marginalisation of Peasant Women in the North Central Province of Sri Lanka. *Development and Change*, Vol. 14.
- SEKER, M. 1986. *Turkiye'de Tarim Iscilerinin Toplumsal Butunlesmesi*. Ankara: Degisim.
- SENER, I. 1971. *Toprak Reformu ve Tarim Reformu*. Istanbul: Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etudler Konferans Heyeti.
- SEYHAN, B. and OZER, I. 1971. Bir Katma Butceli Idare: Tekel. *Maliye Bulteni*, No. 669.
- SHANIN, T. 1972. *The Awkward Class: Political Sociology of Peasantry in a Developing Society: Russia 1913-1925*. London: Oxford University Press.
- SHARMA, M. 1985. Caste, Class and Gender: Production and Reproduction in North India. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4.
- SILIER, O. 1981. *Turkiye'de Tarimsal Yapinin Gelisimi (1923-1938)*. Istanbul: Bogazici Universitesi Yayini.
- SOMEL, K. 1979. Agricultural Support Policies in Turkey: A Survey of Literature. *ODTU Gelisme Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 24-25.
- SORAL, E. 1981. *Turkiye'de Tarim Satis Kooperatifleri ve Birlikleri Sorunu*. Ankara.
- STARR, J. 1982. *The Legal and Social Transformation of Rural Women in Aegean Turkey*. Mimeo, Erasmus University, Rotterdam.
- STIRLING, P. 1965. *Turkish Village*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- TALIM, 1974. *Ege Bolgesi Gediz Havzasi Bazi Onemli Tarimsal Urunlerde Isgucu ve Cekigucu Istekleri*. Bornova: E.U. Ziraat

Fakultesi.

TAYLOR, J. 1974. Neo-Marxism and Underdevelopment -a Sociological Phantasy. Journal of Contemporary Asia, Vol. 4, No. 1.

TEKELI, I. 1974. Turkiye Tariminda Mekanizasyonun Yarattigi Yapisal Donusumler, Kirdan Kopus Sureci. In I. Tekeli (ed.), Turkiye'de Kentlesme Yazilari, Ankara: Turhan Kitapevi.

TEKELI, I. 1980. Dogu Anadoluda Traktor Kullanma Bicimini Saptamak icin Yapilan Sinirli bir Soru Kagidinin Uygulamasi Uzerine Yorumlamalar. In I. Tekeli (ed.), Turkiye Kentlesme Yazilari, Ankara: Turhan Kitapevi.

TERRAY, E. 1972. Marxism and 'Primitive' Societies. New York: Monthly Review Press.

TERZIOGLU, G. 1981. Malatya Ili Kirsal ve Kentsel Alanlarinda Yasayan Ailelerin Ev Yonetim Bicimi ve Kadinin Yonetimdeki Etkinligi Uzerinde Bir Arastirma. Ekonomik Yaklasim, A.I.T.I.A. Ekonomi Fakultesi, Vol. 2, No. 5.

TIMUR, T. 1971. Turk Devrimi ve Sonrasi 1919-1946. Ankara: Dogan Yayinlari.

TRIBE, K. 1979. Introduction to de Crisenoy. Economy and Society, Vol. 8, No. 1.

TURKEL, T. 1976. Tarim Kesiminde, Bolgeler ve Iller Duzeyinde Kaynak Kullanimi ve Verimlilik. Ankara: Milli Produktivite Merkezi Yayini.

TMMOB. 1978. Toprak Reformu Kongresi. Ankara.

TUTENGIL, C.O. 1966. Az Gelismis Ulkelerin Toplumsal Yapisi. Istanbul.

VARLIER, O. 1978. Turkiye Tariminda Yapisal Degisme, Teknoloji ve Toprak Bolusumu. Ankara: DPT Yayini.

WALLERSTEIN, I. 1974. The Modern World System. New York: Academic Press.

WALLERSTEIN, I. 1978. The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century. New Left Review, No. 110.

WALLERSTEIN, I. et.al. 1983. Osmanli Imparatorlugunun Dunya Ekonomisi ile Butunlesme Sureci. Toplum ve Bilim, No. 23.

WOLPE, H. 1972. Capitalism and Cheap Labour Power in South Africa: from Separation to Apartheid. Economy and Society, Vol. 1, No. 4.

WOLPE, H. 1980. The Articulation of Modes of Production. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

YASA, I. 1962. Toplum Kalkinmasi ve Koylerimizde

Yardimlasma Gelenegi. A.U. S.B.F. Dergisi, Vol. 17, No. 1.

YASA, I. 1969. Yirmi Bes Yil Sonra Hasanoglan Koyu. Ankara: A.U. S.B.F.

YOUNG, K. 1978. Modes of Appropriation and Sexual Division of Labour: A Case Study from Oaxaca, Mexico. In A. Kuhn and A. Wolfe (eds.) Feminism and Materialism Women and Modes of Production, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

YUZGUN, A. 1982. Cumhuriyet Donemi Turk Banka Sistemi (1923-1981). Istanbul: Der Yayinevi.

