

**FEMINIST THEORY AND METHOD:
THE CASE OF RURAL WOMEN
IN A VILLAGE OF TURKEY**

A MASTER'S THESIS

PRESENTED BY

NADIDE KARGINER

TO

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL**

FULFILLMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

SOCIOLOGY

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

FEBRUARY, 1993

ODTÜ KÜTÜPHANESİ
M.E.T.Ü. KÜTÜPHANESİ

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences


Prof. Dr. Haluk KASNAKOĞLU

Director

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


Prof. Dr. Bahattin AKŞİT
Chairman of the Department

We certify that we have read this thesis and in our opinion it is fully adequate,
in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in
Sociology.


Mehmet C. Ecevit
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet ECEVİT
Supervisor

Examining Committee in Charge:
Prof. Dr. Bahattin AKŞİT 
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kayhan MUTLU 

585000.24

ABSTRACT
FEMINIST THEORY AND METHOD:
THE CASE OF RURAL WOMEN
IN A VILLAGE OF TURKEY

KARGINER, Nadide

M.A. in Sociology

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet ECEVIT

February, 1993, 120 + X pages

This study aims to comprehend and understand what has been done in feminism about the feminist method, feminist research, feminist methodology and epistemology with a feminist consciousness and a feminist critique.

It is taken in this thesis that feminist postmodernism gives chance to extend the categories of Marxism. In this work, it is argued that conceptualization of rural women as a sex within Marxism is methodologically possible and it has the capacity to incorporate the structures of patriarchy and class. A feminine writing is aimed to be realized by deconstructing the related and relevant concepts in a village context. The primary concepts considered to be basic and essential are production, reproduction, household, sexual division of labour, gender, identity, sexuality, patriarchy, land and migration.

This thesis attempts to form a feminist theory including an empirical stage conducted as a political practice in a village of Bolu province of Turkey. The field-work is not aimed as an empirical support for the theoretical structure.

The theoretical framework of this study which is considered to be postmodernist and Marxist feminist, does not propose a comprehensive and complete structure.

It is assumed in this work that a feminist scholar/sociologist can embrace wide range of possible knowledge about the subject studied.

This thesis mainly consists of three areas: The first one is the discussion specifically directed to the conditions of the formation of a feminist theoretical structure incorporating and developing a Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist perspective. The second areas focused in the thesis is a review of the literature on rural women both in general and also specific to Turkey. The third area involves the practice of a feminist research as a political practice.

It is argued in this study that postmodernism is not a theory but has a structure suitable for almost every analysis. Although firm orthodox of Marxism is considered to be an obstacle for the development of a feminist grand theories.

The chance and the degree of deconstructing the sex-blind categories of Marxism with a postmodernist perspective is assumed in this study to provide an extensive scope of understanding the rural women. And with the help of post-structuralism, through deconstructionism, a theoretical framework is believed to be reached to analyze patriarchy and rural women with its ideological, institutional and organizational manifestations. This is argued to provide the plural and diversified experiences of women by producing alternative ways of thinking appropriate for political practice.

Keywords: Rural Women, Postmodernism, Post-structuralism,
Marxist Feminism

Science Code: 211.01.01

ÖZ

FEMİNİST KURAM ve YÖNTEM: TÜRKİYE'NİN BİR KÖYÜNDE KADININ DURUMU

KARGİNER, Nadide

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tez Yöneticisi: Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet ECEVİT

Şubat, 1993, 120 + 10 sayfa

Bu çalışma, feminist bilinç ve eleştirisi ile feminizmin, feminist method, feminist araştırma, feminist metodoloji ve epistemoloji için yaptıklarını kavramayı ve anlamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Bu tezde feminist postmodernizmin, Marksizmin kategorilerini genişletme şansını sağladığı kabul edilmektedir. Kırsal kadının, Marksizm içinde bir cinsiyet olarak kavramlaştırılmasının mümkün olduğu ve metodolojik olarak ataerkil ve sınıf yapılarını dahil edebilme kapasitesine sahip olduğu savunulmaktadır. Bir köy ortamında, ilişkili ve ilgili kavramları dekonstrak ederek bir kadın yazını gerçekleştirmek amaçlanmıştır. Üretim, yeniden üretim, hane, cinsel işbölümü, toplumsal cinsiyet, kimlik, cinsellik, ataerkillik, toprak ve göç temel ve gerekli kavramlar olarak ele alınmıştır.

Bu tez, ampirik bir aşamayı da dahil ederek, Türkiye'nin Bolu ilinin bir köyünde politik bir pratik olarak feminist bir kuram oluşturmaya teşebbüs etmektedir. Saha çalışması, kuramsal yapının ampirik bir destekleyicisi olarak gerçekleştirilmemiştir.

Bu çalışmanın Postmodernist ve Markist-Feminist olarak ele alınan kuramsal çerçevesi, kapsayıcı ve tamamlanmış bir yapı önermemektedir.

Bu çalışmada, feminist bir düşünür/sosyologun, üzerinde çalıştığı kişiler hakkındaki mümkün olan en geniş bilgileri kucaklayabileceği varsayılmıştır.

Bu tez üç alandan oluşmaktadır: Birinci alanı, Marksist-Feminist Postmodernist bakış açısını geliştiren ve dahil eden feminist kuramsal yapının oluşma şartlarının tartışması belirlemektedir. Türkiye'de kırsal kadın hakkında hem genel, hem de özel literatür taraması, bu tezde odaklaşılan ikinci alandır. Üçüncü alan, bir politik pratik olarak feminist araştırma pratiğini ilgilendirmektedir.

Bu çalışmada, post-modernizmin bur kuram olmadığını fakat hemen hemen tüm analizler için uygun bir yapıya sahip olduğu düşüncesi tartışılmaktadır. Marksizmin, katı ortodoksi feminist kuramının gelişmesi için bir engel olarak görülmesine rağmen, her meta kurama post-modernizmin hizmet edece ve yararlı olacağı düşünülmektedir.

Postmodernist bir bakış açısı ile Marksizmin cinsiyet-kör kategorilerini dekonstrük edebilme şansının ve derecesinin bulunması, kırsal kadını anlamada geniş bir alan sağlayacağı bu çalışmada varsayılmıştır. Post-yapısalcılığın yardımı ve dekonstraksiyon aracılığı ile kırsal kadının ve ataerkilliğin ideolojik, kurumsal ve örgütsel manifestoları ile analiz edebilecek bir kuramsal çerçeveye ulaşılacağı düşünülmektedir. Bu durumun, politik pratiğe uygun alternatif düşünce yollarını oluşturarak, kadına çoğulcu ve çeşitlenmiş bir deneyim sağlayacağı iddia edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kavramlar: Köyde Kadın, Post-Modernizm, Post-Yapısalcılık,

Marksist-Feminizm

Bilim Kodu: 211.01.01

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe special gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit. I learned to be a true social scientist from him. He made constructive comments, supported and encouraged me throughout this study.

I thanks to women in Sultanbey village who gave their valuable time to me during the fieldwork.

I would like to acknowledge Celal Kalaycı who is chairman of the Chamber of Agriculture in Bolu for his supports in determining and reaching the village.

I owe very special thanks to my friends, Baki Doğruyol, Kübra Eroğlu, Fatime Güneş and Nurten Canbeyoğlu in their assistance during the fieldwork.

I owe special thanks to Aynur Özügürü who did technical formation of thesis and to Ordadoğu Toplumsal Araştırmalar Kurumu (ODAK) which provided the best working conditions for me.

I owe a major debt to my sister Yasemin and Remziye Kelekçi who could help me throughout the study.

I owe a major debt to my beautiful family who supports me with their very special love.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AP: Adalet Partisi

ANAP: Anavatan Partisi

DP: Demokrat Parti

DSİ: Devlet Su İşleri

KH: Köy Hizmetleri

TEK: Türkiye Elektrik Kurumu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: FEMINIST THEORY AND METHODOLOGY	9
2.1. What Has Been Done In Feminism About Feminist Research Methodology And Epistemology	9
2.2. What Is A Feminist Theory?	18
2.3. Marxism And Marxist-Feminism	21
2.4. How Poststructuralism Revised Marxist-Feminism	28
2.5. Postmodernist Theory	33
2.6. Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist Theory	38
CHAPTER III: LITERATURE REVIEW ON FEMALE LABOUR IN AGRICULTURE	41
3.1. Rural Woman As A Category	42
3.2. Gender	43
3.3. Household	48
3.4. Production	50
3.5. Reproduction	53
3.6. Sexual Division Of Labour	56
3.7. Land	60
3.8. Migration	60
CHAPTER IV: LITERATURE REVIEW ON RURAL WOMEN IN TURKISH AGRICULTURE	62

CHAPTER V: WOMEN IN SULTANBEY:

MARXIST-FEMINIST POSTMODERNIST PERSPECTIVE	71
5.1. A Methodological Introduction	71
5.2. Agriculture In Bolu	77
5.3. What About Sultanbey	78
5.4. History of Sultanbey	84
5.5. A Daily Life of Women In Sultanbey	86
5.6. Household	87
5.7. Production In Sultanbey	91
5.8. Reproduction In Sultanbey	94
5.9. Sexual Division of Labour In Production In Sultanbey	96
5.10. Migration	98
5.11. Kinship And Relations In The Village	98
5.12. Patriarchy	100
5.13. Women's Identity	101
5.14. Sexuality	105
5.15. Land	106

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION 108

REFERENCES 112

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In Turkey, over the years many studies on women have been carried out. There are positive and negative dimensions of these studies. The positive dimension is the information about Turkish women both as case studies research and as subjects. The negative dimension is the lack of radical methodology and theory. Because of the, feminism both as a social movement and as a theory has not found a context in which to develop.

Most of the studies have focused on the empirical part and thus undermining theory. Every feminist study has to have a feminist theoretical framework with an agenda challenging patriarchal theories of women's role in Turkey.

According to Gross, a feminist has to be interested in patriarchal discourses about women's oppression using the concepts, frameworks and methods of these discourses (Gross, 1987: 190).

In Turkey, this kind of theoretical practice is almost impossible because "original" patriarchal discourse cannot be found to struggle against. Most of them are adaptations from the West.

Unfortunately, my theoretical framework will be also an adaptation from the West and I will try to devise an "original" theoretical framework from this adaptation. My consolation in this adaptation is to use radical and

leftist patriarchal theories of the West. These are Marxism, Poststructuralism and Postmodernism. The inevitability of adherence to patriarchal or phallogocentric theories of the West brings another inevitability of adherence to major male theorists of the West, Karl Marx and Jacques Derrida.

My feminist standpoint is "Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist." To solve the problems of Marxist-feminism for the sake of Marxism, I will address the issues of poststructuralism and to deconstruction of Derrida for the Marxist deconstruction of the concepts, patriarchy, sexual division of labour, production, reproduction, gender, women's identity, rural woman and sexuality in the context of research on rural women in Turkish agriculture.

The deconstructionism of Derrida is appropriate to Marxist - Feminist Postmodernist theory. His method of deconstruction paves the way for Marxist-feminist like me to revise their Marxism.

It is major concern of this study to understand what has been done in feminism about the feminist method, feminist research, feminist methodology and epistemology with a feminist consciousness and a feminist critique of the existing methodology. This seems to be essential in order to attempt to initiate a feminist analysis of rural women in Turkey, since the accumulation of such knowledge is very limited for the case of Turkey. Studies on this issue, like others, should be based on "objective" knowledge and in my view a feminist methodology has to be political in content and radical in "nature".

Rather than the epistemologies of feminist empiricism and feminist standpoint, a "feminist-postmodernist epistemology" is more close to me since the latter not only rejects all universal claims, but it fills the gaps and "absence" of the Marxist-Feminism.

It is taken to be assumed that feminist postmodernism gives change

to extend the categories of Marxism. In this study, the conceptualization of rural women as a sex within Marxism is considered to be methodologically possible, incorporating basically the patriarchal and class *structures*. A feminine writing is aimed to be realized by deconstructing the related and relevant concepts in the analysis of rural women in a village context. The primary concepts considered to be basic and essential are: production, reproduction, household, sexual division of labour, gender, women identity, sexuality, patriarchy, land and migration.

The reason why it seems to be valid to argue for the development of a Marxist-Feminist theory is mainly due to the lack of a "clear-cut" feminist theory in classical texts of Marxism.

It is thought to be central and unavoidable to attempt to develop a radical Marxist-Feminist epistemology in order to challenge the patriarchal and phallogocentric structures which originate the prevailing status of women in society.

It is believed that there is no need to be defensive on the "separative" character of the insistence on the feminist methodology. It is separatism, but one that favors feminine writing, by refusing "objectivity" for "subjectivity" and emphasis on the researched individuals as subjects rather than the ambiguous scientificity of being value-neutral and value-free.

There seem to be no harm in accepting to be essentialist if being women and feminine is taken simply to be essentialist.

The feminist character of any theory cannot be mono in any respect. A feminist theory should be taken as a weapon of a "theoretical" struggle of feminism which necessitates autonomy, right to reject "any and all" standard and aim to create alternative ones.

As an anti-sexist project feminist theory is considered to achieve

the challenge and deconstruction of the phallosentric discourses like Marxism by creating alternatives like Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist theory. The challenge of "everything that exist" and the struggle to problematise the patriarchal character of "the social" is the limited and extend framework of the theoretical standpoint in general and tried to be persuaded in this study.

A strategy for a feminist theory inevitably necessitates the tactical use of all existing different theories to fulfill the gaps of Marxist-Feminism and incorporate the deconstructive and postmodernist standpoint.

It is central to understand the political content and significance of how women are perceived and conceptualized which occupy a central role in Marxism. It should be praised from all spheres of social science of the struggle of feminism to fill the gaps of Marxism taken social relations as a community of men.

Avoiding the political content of the view that the world is perceived differently by men and women necessitated a challenge and political action and justifies and legitimize a focus on the nature of women whether taken as human or feminine.

It is considered as an attempt to give priority in feminist theory favoring both subjectivity and to the relationship between men and women through the reproduction of the species. And dialectics should be taken as its radical epistemology.

Dialectic is taken as a feminist methodology believed to have the capacity to differentiate the realities of men and women and integrate the interrelationship between Marxism and feminism. This integrating basically involves the origination and development of the meaning of women's social experiences, through consciousness-raising practices which are considered to be collectively and critically formed by a political practice. What cannot be

denied of Marxist theory is its political substance however it is qualified. Simply it is assumed that the dialectical method will support the radical and political stance of feminist theory.

The lack of emphasis on the women's reproductive role in Marxism and gender not even being considered as a secondary factor provides a genuine chance to challenge to interrelate class and patriarchy given the "gender blind" historical perspective and categories of Marxism.

The reason why I take Marxism of Marxist-Feminism to be more powerful than only feminism is that it has the capacity to explain the relation between men and women within the capital labour conflict.

The chance and the degree of deconstructing the limited and sex-blind categories of Marxism with a postmodernist perspective is assumed in this study to provide an extensive scope of understanding the rural women in general and specifically in this study. Furthermore, with the help of poststructuralism, through deconstructionism, a theoretical framework is believed to be reached to analyze patriarchy and rural women with its ideological, institutional, organizational manifestations. This will provide the plural and diversified experiences of women by producing alternative ways of thinking appropriate for political practice. In more detailed form, rather than the concepts of poststructuralism, the sphere of deconstruction best meets the need of Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist theoretical framework. It is believed that feminist could be "transformed", if feminists would rewrite deconstruction by incorporating its strategies into a political project. It is considered that deconstruction has the capacity to reveal the "absent", "different", "gap" or "trace" of the social. The deconstructive techniques of Derrida are taken as a critical force within feminist theory which seems to become attractive as subjects of discourse. The reason why all postmodern discourses are deconstructive is the emphasis on the feminine writing on women. In

postmodern conceptualization, woman is the "other". The conditions of otherness, first enables women to criticize the norms and values; and second, as a way of being, thinking and speaking it allows for openness, plurality, diversity and difference which helps us to see the unforeseeable. Postmodernist and feminine writing have a call for women to write about themselves. The important issue is the degree of participation of women in the process of creating a speaking position. It is assumed and expected that with the Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist perspective, social analysis will be transformed into activity.

The review of the literature with a given theoretical and methodological perspective is aimed given the scope and limitations of this study on rural women. The framework of the study was constituted by conceptualizing rural women constituted by the categories of household, reproduction, production, sexual division of labour, gender, land and migration. A partial but detailed literature about rural women in agriculture is reviewed with specific emphasis on the Latin American and Indian cases where significant transformations having theoretical implications are experienced. The review aimed to incorporate not only the theoretical but also empirical relevant case studies, mostly not feminist but studies on women.

The analysis of rural women in Turkey, mainly stayed at the level of studying the village structures with an undue emphasis on the conditions of "production" and female labour. Such a limited perspective made it almost impossible to understand the status of women, let alone misconceiving them.

A field-work at a village level is incorporated into this study intending to provide a partial information for the conceptualization of rural women in Turkey. It is never intended to seek full promising "empirical" conclusions or even findings.

It is the primary assumption of this study that the theoretical

framework which is offered in this thesis do not necessitate a full-scale support of "empirical" information. The basic and simple aim is first to understand, deconstruct and then provide the conditions for an analysis.

A methodological introduction that attends almost the knowledge of women is due to reduce the male bias at it possible maximum degree. This is aimed to be achieved by being against the objectivity and taken women as the subject of the study; otherwise it would be almost impossible to analyze women based on a qualitative research.

Sultanbey is the village which this study intend to adapt the theoretical and methodological standpoint aimed to develop in this thesis. It would not be appropriate to start indicating that the name of the village, Sultanbey, is a clear representation of a male bias: *Sultan* is the male emperor and *bey* is gentlemen that rules.

This masculine named village is within the Bolu province, situated between the borders of Marmara and Black Sea regions and on a major highway provides extensive conditions for social change.

The analysis of rural women in Sultanbey was primarily realized focusing on the life of rural women within the processes of reproduction, production and sexual division of labour which incorporated the issues of patriarchy, sexuality, women's identity, household structures, kinship relations and female networks within the village.

¶ This study should be taken as a step towards the formation of a feminist theory aimed to attempt to investigate women within her possible autonomous sphere in the society with a radical epistemology.

The second chapter after this one, first presents a review of what has been done in feminism about feminist method, feminist research, feminist methodology and epistemology, second, the guidelines of a feminist theory is

given; third, the reason why Marxism of Marxist-Feminism necessitates revisions is discussed; fourth, how poststructuralism provides this revision and last, the limits and scope of the Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist theoretical framework is provided.

The third chapter includes the review of the general literature on rural women incorporating the deconstructed concepts of gender, household, production, reproduction, sexual division of labour, women's identity, sexuality, patriarchy, land, migration and rural women as a category.

It became impossible to use the same methodological approach in the fourth chapter to the review of the rural women in the case of Turkey, mainly due to the content and the number of the relevant available studies. It ended up with a more "classical" review of the literature.

The fifth chapter, after simply explaining the method used in the field-work conducted in Sultanbey, rural women in the village were mainly analyzed as subjects and their life histories were collected -without resorting to classical techniques of so-called objective methods of data collection- with a Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist perspective.

The concluding chapter provides a short critical evaluation of the reason why the essence of the approach should incorporate feminist, Marxism and postmodernism.

CHAPTER II

FEMINIST THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. What Has Been Done In Feminism About Feminist Research Methodology And Epistemology

How is a feminist methodology formed? What is the relation between feminist theory and feminist research? Is it necessary to have a feminist research with its method and theory?

Firstly, it is rational to look at the debates about method, methodology and epistemology in the social sciences and humanities. Stanley and Wise in the recent feminist debates touch upon six aspects of these issue. The first aspect is about feminist consciousness and feminist research. The second is about the feminist method, methodology and epistemology. The third is silenced feminisit standpoint conceived black feminist and lesbian feminist epistemology. The fourth is about the silenced feminist standpoints. The fifth is the experience, research and theory in academic feminism. Sixth one is about the establishing of a feminist hegemony (Stanley and Wise, 1990: 20).

The first aspect consists of the necessity of "the feminist research process" given by Stanley and Wise and the feminist consciousness of feminist critique of existing methodology discussed by Ward and Grant (1985).

According to Stanley and Wise, the feminist research process consists of the researcher-researched relationship; research experience as an emotion; the intellectual biographies of researchers; the question of how to manage the differing "realities" and understandings of researchers and researched; writing and the power of research (1990: 22-23).

All of the above are valid for me in a feminist research process. In my research, I could only give importance to the researcher-researched relationship and to the research experience as an emotion. I could not sense the others because of the research conditions.

According to Ward and Grant (1985), another important point in the first aspect is the feminist consciousness of feminist critique in the existing methodology consisting of feminist research which focuses on women and is carried out by women who were feminist; perceiving the distinction between "male" quantitative method and feminist qualitative ones; the political purpose of feminist research and its commitment for changing women's lives.—

In this feminist critique, it is also necessary for me to carry out feminist research with feminist women for other women. The other is being of feminist research which is political in its purpose and commitment of it for changing women's lives.

The forerunner of the second aspect is Harding (1987) who focuses on epistemology in method and methodology. She examines various materialist feminist writings and identifies three distinct epistemologies. These are feminist empiricism, feminist standpoint and feminist postmodernism. Feminist empiricism maintains that sexism and androcentrism are social biases that deform the quest for objective knowledge. Feminist empiricism conceives these biases as errors which resulted from faulty implementations of empirical methods. I am against this feminist empiricism because I believe that feminist

epistemology which must be political and radical has no problems objective knowledge.

Feminist standpoint epistemology is seen in the works of Hillary Rose (1983), Nancy Hartsock (1983), Jane Flax (1987) and Dorothy Smith (1990). It derives its knowledge from a committed oppression and it is a practical achievement.

According to Harding, to achieve a feminist standpoint one must engage the intellectual and political struggle. These are essential for seeing the natural and social life from the standpoint of activity which produces women's social experiences. For her feminist standpoint, epistemology produces a successor science and accepts the premises of "scientific endeavour" just as feminist empiricism does. It accepts the existence of "true reality" and methods of science as the means to establish it. (Harding, 1987: 185) For Harding, feminist standpoint has inner tensions. Firstly, it has a Marxist paternal discourse which emphasis on class and economy by excluding the sex and patriarchy. Secondly, the feminist standpoint is admitted to exist and this causes the problematization of truth-claims of feminist standpoint as a successor science (Harding, 1987).

The third epistemology is a feminist postmodernist epistemology which rejects all universal claims with a feminist scepticism. It derives from semiotics, deconstructionism and psychoanalysis. They all reject any notion of a "more authentic self".

For Stanley and Wise, feminist postmodernism "creates troubles" for the other two epistemologies because it rejects universalism and sees "science" as a doomed project. By locating experience within micro-politics relativises it. Micro-politics is highly localized and organized through metanarratives and more grounded ideological discourses (Stanley and Wise, 1990: 28).

For Harding, in feminist postmodernism, there are the existences of a feminist standpoint of black women, working-class women, lesbian women and other "minority" women who combine those oppressed.

I am in search of this kind of feminist standpoint for the rural women is intervened as a category. Feminist postmodernist standpoint is expected to extend the categories of Marxism and involve the category of rural women as a sex under the repression of patriarchy near the classes of capitalists and proletariat.

By using the deconstructionism of poststructuralism and the feminine writing of postmodernism, I will attempt to present a feminine writing of rural women in a village study with the deconstruction of new concepts of Marxism which I seek to propose.

Feminist postmodernism of Harding in The Science Question In Feminism is criticized by Zita (1988) on three comments. For Zita, Harding theorizes the feminist standpoint with the sexual division of labour in society. By doing this she ignores the sexualisation of women's experiences and also the violence and threat of violence towards women. I could not agree with this criticism on the account that feminist postmodernism provides a freedom of subject to the feminist theoreticians by choosing not from determined subjects or categories but from the suppression of women which has infinite sources.

The second criticism is the half-hearted remark of Harding on feminist postmodernism because she is a proponent of the position of a materialist feminist successor science standpoint. For me this must not be a criticism but must be praise for Harding. Because the main aim in using postmodernism is to develop or sophisticate the feminist theory of Marxism. Marxism has no developed feminist theory and this is an attempt for Marxism.

The third criticism is the account of Harding cannot theorise

feminist pluralism satisfactorily, she denies the existence of a radical feminist epistemological perspective (Zita, 1988). I join this criticism because feminism needs a radical feminist epistemology to struggle against patriarchal and phallocentric structures.

Stanley and Wise (1990) criticized Harding's dismissing all feminist history and removing the existence of radical feminist and other feminist standpoint perspectives since she associates "academic" with materialist feminism.

I agree with this criticism for the reasons which I propose for the third criticism of Zita.

The third aspect is black feminist and the lesbian feminist epistemology which is known as the silenced feminist standpoints.

The fourth is the revision of a feminist standpoint by Smith (1990). She is a materialist feminist concerned with a materialist feminist analysis which operates at the level of ideology. Like Marx and Engels, she identifies ideas embedded in material institutional practices. Her analysis starts with sexual division of labour which are concerned with "social relations" in particular with all the work that women do. For her, the division of labour encompasses the sexualisation of women and male sexuality, and other violence towards women. Her feminist sociology starts from the standpoint of women who are "like her", who are located similarly in relation to particular kinds of institutional material practices. Her focus is on the activities and the "work" of men as obscene telephone callers, as sexual murderers and as sexual harassers in everyday life. She concerned with the specification of a "pre-textual" process but uses an epistemology which is textually influenced. Her feminist standpoint recognizes other standpoints and has similarities to the Harding's feminist postmodernism.

Smith's feminist sociologist is on the right track by problematizing the subordination of women and its conceptualization of the "work" of men as phallogocentric deviants of everyday life. She criticizes Harding's standpoint but her standpoint is similar to Harding's.

The insistence on the existence of feminist theory, feminist methodology brings dangers with it. If I insist on the existence of feminist methodology, am I a separatist or "Is feminist methodology separatist?"

The fifth aspect discusses this by mentioning the experience, research and theory in academic feminism.

According to Marilyn Frye (1983) separatism is a statement of "women identified" purpose. In contrast to Frye, Michele Barrett (1988) accused the proponents of feminist methodology of hijacking feminism in the name of separatism and they are responsible for the discipline of sociology which fails to "take gender seriously". According to Barrett, the "package" of essentialism, methodological separatism and relativism are the faultline of this mistaken feminism. For Sue Clegg (1985) again, a feminist methodology does not exist and proponents of it are completely misguided.

If insisting on the feminist methodology is separatism, I can accept being a separatist. It is necessary for the existence of a feminist theory. In contrast to the arguments against methodological separatism, Cook (1986) and Fonow (1986) propose five epistemological propositions of feminist methodology within the feminist research process. These are reflexive concern with gender as all-pervasive; consciousness-raising as "a way of seeing" and a methodological tool; challenging objectivity and refusing to see experience as "unscientific" and concerned with ethics, by not treating women as research objects, and lastly seeing the research as a political activity.

Another account of feminist methodology is by Margrit Eichler

(1985) who proposes four epistemological propositions for feminist research from the basic postulates of the sociology of knowledge. These are; that all knowledge is socially constructed; the ideology of ruling group is dominant; the non-existence of a value-free science which serves and reflects men's interests and the differences of the perspectives of men and women.

Epistemological propositions of Cook, Fonow and Eichler are at the center of my own separatist feminist methodology. As for these, I refuse objectivity, value-free science and accept other propositions.

Maria Mies (1983) presenting an other account of feminist methodology writes about the attempts of women to change their situations of exploitation and oppression. This change has consequences for the research areas, theories, concepts and methodology of studies which take women as research subject. Mies gives methodological guidelines for feminist research.

Firstly, value-free research, neutrality and indifference towards research objects has to be replaced by "conscious partiality". "Conscious partiality" is achieved through partial identification with the research objects. It creates the researcher and her "objects".

The second is the occurrence of the vertical relationship between researcher and "research objects". Third is the growth of women's studies from women's movement. Women's studies have to be closely linked to the struggles and actions of the women's movement. A historical, dialectal and materialist theory of knowledge is followed by a demand to link praxis and research. Fourthly, to understand this patriarchal system, there must be begin a fight against women's exploitation and oppression. Fifthly, by using the problem-formulating method, the research process must become a process of "conscientization" both for the so called "research subjects" (social scientists) and for the "research objects" (women as target groups). This must be accompanied by the study of women's individual and social history (ibid).

Mies's collective conscientization of women with its research subject and research object by collectivization of the experiences of women help women to overcome their structural isolation in their families and to understand that their individual suffering have social causes. Her quidelines is a way to see social world from women's standpoint.

Another criticism to feminist methodology other than separatism is its essentialist thinking. Barrett (1987) has an essentialist criticism of feminist standpoint arguments which take all together the essentialism, intellectual separatism and relativism.

Another rejection of "essentialist" views belong to Riley (...) who has an extended and interesting discussion and deconstruction of the category of "women" in history. For Riley, the category "men" requires an active deconstructionism. Stanley and Wise (1990) agree Riley's argument at this point but they refuse to buy the "If you say 'women' you say 'essentialism' argument." Unlike Riley, they convinced that theorisations of "women" necessarily theorize "men" even if it seems invisible. Riley's argument operates at the level of "theory", at the level of a perspective comparable with Alcoff (1989), Poovey (1988), Scott (1988) who propose different versions of feminist deconstruction. They argue that it is the rejection of essentialism which leads to relativism within a basically deconstructionist postmodernist framework.

Critics of "essentialist feminist standpoint reject what they negatively characteries as its "radical relativism". (Barret, 1986; Currie and Kazi, 1987; Currie, 1988) What about the dangers of relativism about feminist standpoint arguments?

In the "foundationalist / relativist" dichotomy Gross (1987) proposes an alternative as an option for a "middle ground" is a proposal in favor of a "fractured foundationalism". Her argument is that there are truths

which speak of the existence of different, overlapping but not coterminous material realities. (Gross, 1987) This is also the relativist view of Stanley and Wise (1990).

The main argument is the indivisibility of the ideological and the material social world. The use of "experience" of feminist standpoint positions is criticized by Currie and Kazi (1987) from the view that the feminist researcher is a theoretician who carries out activities different in kind from those engaged in by ordinary women.

Another criticism from Farganis (1986) and Marshall (1988) is that by welding together feminist structural analysis with a "critical theory" account of "social action", one allied to its critic of positivism and political commitment to theoretical discourse as practice.

Stanley and Wise (1990) with a reconstructed and deconstructed feminist standpoint epistemology reject the "successor-science" label and insist on the existence of feminist standpoints. From them, there is no need to assign ourselves to one "end" or another of the dichotomies of foundationalism versus relativism, idealism versus collectivism which have resurfaced in feminist discussions of methodology. They promote academic feminist pluralism. About the tensions within feminist epistemologies; Harding wonders whether the existence of such internal and relational tensions is actually the means of preventing epistemological and political hegemony within feminism: As Stanley and Wise propose as a last proposition that "a way of avoiding anyone feminism setting itself up as a 'dominant discourse' our answer is yes" (Stanley and Wise, 1990: 47).

After those methodological discussions it is necessary to put one's perspective methodologically and epistemologically. For doing this, one has to determine how a feminist theory is formed. For reconstructing a feminist theory according to a study in Turkey is both an experience of the researcher

and the researched. Formation of a feminist discourse as a dominant discourse is a feminist and especially a woman's practice.

I will put the procedures or theoretical necessities about feminist theory and the attempt to form a conceptual framework about the rural women in Turkey.

2.2. What Is A Feminist Theory?

Historically and politically, the equality of men and women is necessary. Without problematizing this equality we cannot problematize the subordination of women as subjects and sexual beings.

The patriarchal theories and discourses poses the question of how feminists use the patriarchal theories, whether by transforming them or by "rectifying" them. I am against the "rectification" because women could not integrate patriarchal theories without transforming of them.

According to Gross (1987), feminist perspectives have to re-evaluate the political, ontological and epistemological commitments of patriarchal discourses. For her, the whole social, political, scientific and metaphysical underpinning of patriarchal theoretical systems needs to be shaken up. The attempts of feminists to transform patriarchal theories necessitate an organized or unorganized struggle. Irigaray determines the form of the struggle:

"If feminist theory lacks the means to directly confront a sophisticated patriarchal theoretical regime in creating alternatives, feminists have tool to resort to form of intellectual guerilla warfare, striking out at the points of patriarchy's greatest weaknesses, its blindspots." (Irigaray, 1985; Part I, cited in Gross, 1987: 194).

If feminism requires this kind of theoretical struggle, this struggle must be in the direction of the struggle towards womens autonomy. Womens autonomy means the right of self-determination of women socially, politically, economically and intellectually.

In feminism, there is a transformation from the politics of equality to the politics of autonomy. For Gross, autonomy implies the right to see oneself in terms one chooses, which may or may not imply an integration or alliance with other groups and individuals. In contrast, equality implies a measurement according to a given standard. This standard takes the role of normal model in unquestionable ways (Gross, 1987).

Attempts for the right to reject such standards and create new ones implies a struggle for autonomy.

Feminists associate around womens autonomy and self-determination. This association makes change in usages of patriarchal discourses by feminist perspectives. These discourses become the objects of critical feminist discourses.

These patriarchal discourses have basic unspoken assumptions and feminists begin to analyse these. Women begin to see themselves as the subjects of knowledge. The struggle for self-determination and autonomy develops at two forms: Firstly, feminist theory problematizes the phallocentric or patriarchal discourses in a radical form. Secondly, feminist theory attempts to develop and search for alternatives to the patriarchal systems.

Feminist theory is in an "anti-sexist project" which challenges and deconstructs phallocentric discourses. Anti-sexism is negative and reactive. It aims to challenge everything existent and problematises the patriarchal position of women in theoretical frameworks. As Gross claims: "With anti-sexist projects feminism has to create alternatives to the patriarchal

theories." (Gross, 1987: 197).

According to Gross, feminist theory as a form of strategy needs to use whatever means are available to it, whether these are patriarchal or not (Gross, 1987: 197).

As a summary, feminist theory integrated first a recognition of the overt and covert forms of misogyny in which discourses participate. Second is the recognition of patriarchal discourses in terms of their absences, gaps around the problem of women and feminine. Third, feminist theory has to articulate the role which masculinist discourses use to suppress femininity and create alternative perspective to challenge the hegemony of patriarchal texts. Fourth is developing methods and take these methods as new starting points for theoretical research.

The procedures for a feminist theory by Gross above are taken by me for constructing and reconstructing Marxist-feminist postmodernist theoretical framework for analysing rural women.

As an anti-sexist project, feminist theory challenges and refuses the concepts which provide the functioning of patriarchal theory. In spite of constructing a new theoretical structure women have to seek a "discursive space", a space where women can write, read and think as women. As Gross says, "Theory in the future would be seen as sexual, textual, political and historical production." (Gross, 1987: 204).

As a strategy in Marxist-feminist postmodernist perspective, how can Marxism be used tactically for challenging the patriarchal sides of it. Firstly, I will try to recognize Marxism and Marxist-feminism in terms of their absences and gaps around the problem of women and feminine. Then, I will integrate another theory of poststructuralism for creating the alternative perspective of Marxist-feminist postmodernist and the last is to develop

methods according to this perspective as new starting points for both theoretical and empirical research.

2.3. Marxism And Marxist-Feminism

There is a methodological problem: how women are perceived has a political importance. For Andrea Nye; "Marxism is a community of men" (1988). If we starting from Engels who has a Marxist analysis of sexism, argue by explaining sexist institutions as a social phenomena, as events in time and possible response to human problems and by analysing the origin of the bourgeois family which is a functioning social unit and serves an economic purpose in which marriage is based on property. In the bourgeoisie each man owned a woman. Women are to be owned whether in common or privately. When capitalism is eliminated, women's oppression will disappear. Family will be economically useless and state will take the functions of the family (Engels, 1979).

Bebel repeated Engel's genealogy of sexism. For him, in the new socialist marriage, women will choose their mates freely and have the right to divorce. Without property, there are happy marriages (Bebel, 1980).

Goldman (undated) has a materialist, economic analysis of marriage and prostitution. Prostitution was economic but with marriage women give up her name, her privacy, herself respect, her very life.

According to Zetkin (1966), Marxism is the basis of new women's movement. Family structures change and disappear. The motor of such change is economics. For Zetkin, Marx provided a precise and certain method for studying and understanding women's struggle.

For Kollontai (1974), only under socialism can specific women's problems childcare, maternity, housework be solved. Everyone is a worker

and women will work. Kollantai participates in forming a socialist reality for women. "Single woman" has new needs and feelings. She is an independent working woman. She is purposeful and an individual and expects something of men. She is full of self-affirmation.

As indicated above Marxist men and women attempted to determine or develop a theory of women for Marxist theory. But social forms are explained as mechanic forms which change causally. This occurs similarly under socialism, maternity leave with access to childcare and socialisation of domestic work. But coming of socialism did not automatically bring liberation for women and worker women. Then Marxist-feminists struggle to revise or supplement Marxian theory, so it could accomodate feminist practices.

According to Nye (1988), feminists retain Marx's economic determination, analyse women's oppression as a functional part of the economic arrangements of capitalism and women could resume. Marx's underdeveloped notion of the "reproduction" as a means of production-and feminists could place women's oppression in a semi-independent ideological sphere.

There are two alternatives: First is the focus upon "reproduction" as a means of production. Second is the focus on women's domestic labour in the family as "value-producing".

Primarily, I will focus on the problems in Marxist-feminist analysis; the main focus will be the dialectics and feminist dialecticians focusing on the relations between the theory of human nature and a determined epistemology. According to Ring, woman ask the question; "Do I have a nature? Do I have a human or feminine nature?" (1991: 30).

How do we determine the nature of women? According to Farganis

(1986), men and women perceive the world differently. The concreteness of women's experiences affects how they come to understand the world; how their experiences are socially produced; how their experiences of subordination are explicable in terms of class, race and gender. For her, to be dialectical is to be critical. That means to see the given as subject to change. For her, feminism is akin to Marxism and it's both a mode of understanding and a call to action.

What do dialectics promises for feminists. Marx did not explain this in his theory and feminists attempted to understand dialectics and for feminism.

One of them is Ring and according to her the promise of dialectics is the reintegration of history with consciousness. The First aspect of dialectical method is its radical subjectivism. Second is the dialectician's recognition of history as an objective dimension which make a one-sided idealism impossible. In dialectical thought an objective world exists that events do occur. Even though knowledge depends upon acknowledged human subjectivity as an agent of interpretation this objective moment involve a role for subjectivity without reducing truth to subjectivism. Dialectics is a methodology for a theory of political and historical change that retains sufficiently traditional aspects of truth to permit inclusion of feminist theory in the history of Western political thought. A feminist should care how traditional theory regards feminist theory for her (Ring, 1991).

What is radical about dialectical epistemology and what it supposes for feminists? According to Ring, the radical activity of dialectical epistemology is its incorporation of both idealism and materialism which takes the form of an interplay between subjectivity and objectivity. For her, feminists focused on Marx's materialism as the foundation of his radical potential. In Marx, activities of everyday people are placed at the very

foundation of history by Marx's materialism. Marx redefines the basis or the first premise of history as fulfilling the physical needs of everyday life. Social activity and consciousness differentiates people from animals (ibid).

In dialectical thought, the relationship between subjective human activity and the objective material world is mutable. On every level in dialectical thought subjectivity and objectivity are capable of "losing" themselves to one another.

According to Ring, there are two levels upon which Marx's argument is promising for feminist theory. The first level is the relationship between the natural world and the human body. Second level is defining nature in a dialectical sense as the interpretation of body and world and as the understanding that nature is both a beginning and a historical product. For her, Marx eliminates the usual dichotomy between nature, history and culture (ibid).

For Ring, Marx's concept of nature signified the convergence of the material and ideal. There are two dimensions to the Marxian concept of nature; physical and historical. The physical involves the convergence of the beginnings of history with historical destination. Natural human existence for Marx involves the recognition that people need one another (ibid).

In Marx, the relationship between men and women is central because of the need of the both sexes for the reproduction of the species is an objective concrete manifestation of people's need for one another.³ For Ring, material need begets social organization, which in turn reproduces what is regarded as natural. He was not concerned with women's reproductive role; he is concerned only with the production and reproduction of private property. She proposes conditions for the promise of dialectical theory: "dialectical theory offers promises for feminist theory only if feminist theory utilizes its

strength, its force as a radical epistemology." (Ring, 1991: 30).

Jaggar also discusses the gaps of Marxism. For Jaggar, economic history is the sole determinant of consciousness. The only significant conflict in the modern world is between the capitalist and proletariat classes. Gender is a secondary element in Marxist theory by its abolition of gender distinctions in the market and towards androgynous future. Marxism values public life and its categories are gender-blind.

For Jaggar, Marxists emphasize material history rather than women's perspective. Jaggar's comparative theoretical analysis centered on the concept of human nature. Jaggar's socialist feminism describes the concept of human nature as inseparable from the socialist conception of political economy. She claims that "only socialist feminism makes a serious attempts to explain how human beings continuously transform themselves into men and women." (Jaggar, cited in Ring, 1991: 31).

According to Ring (1991), in the dialectical method, materiality and consciousness are interrelated and inseparable by virtue of their differences. Nature involves the convergence of material experience and human consciousness. In Marxian dialectics both history and nature exist and they are interrelated. But Jaggar dismisses the conflict between the history and nature as a contradiction, while Marx sees conflict as a prerequisite to unity. The other feminists who attempted to use dialectics as feminist methodology are Mary O'Brien (1982), Linda Nicholson (1987) and Catherine Mckinnon (1982).

In the feminism of Mary O'Brien, there is the absence of a solid theoretical perspective. For her, Marx's metatheory cannot make sense of oppression of women, which clearly transcends class, even though the theory disappear to make sense within the historical boundaries within which Marx worked. For her, activity that defines women is speculative and ideological

and activity that defines the living conditions of women has been political and legal. According to O'Brien, the definition of nature and its conceptualisations are central to any understanding of male-stream thought. Nature of woman differs from the nature of man. Man has a dual nature and the second nature is the one he makes himself, the offspring of his fraternal historical praxis. There is the separation between public and private life. The private realm is the realm of man's animality and where women lives governed by necessity. The public reality is the realm which man's first nature is transcended by his second. In the public realm, his humanity is created in freedom (O'Brien, 1982).

According to Nicholson (1982), Marx and production views on human life and social organization Marxism as historical analysis appears incompatible with Marxism as cross-cultural theory. By eliminating cross-cultural theory and following the historical analysis means to describe the progressive the domination of state and the market over kinship as a historical process. This enables Marxism to correct failures: One of its failures in explaining gender and history of gender relations. She focuses on kinship in structuring earlier societies and its interaction with other institutions as the state and the market and it could provide itself with a means for analysing gender

Lastly, Mckinnon (1982) compares feminism and Marxism by commoning them with the method consciousness-raising. For her, feminism does not have an appropriate existing method. Consciousness-raising comes not only to know different things as politics but also to know them in a different way. Male power is real and the only reality which raises to consciousness is to confront male power. The Marxist method is dialectical materialism and feminist method is consciousness-raising which is the collective critical constitution of the meaning of women's social experience. And pursuit of

consciousness becomes a form of political practice.

In the village study analysis of rural women, the consciousness-raising method was used in reciprocal discussions in focus groups. The focus groups were of different categories of women and allowed them to discuss their own problems.

For me, the most promising analysis is Ring's dialectical analysis for feminism. Because materialism has a substantive focus on production and labour and this is a welcome basis for feminist theory. For there is the unification of mind and action inherent in the labor process itself.

For Hartsock (1982) materialism is an appropriate substance for feminism because permits to a unified "nondualist" theory. For her, there are the links between materialism and feminism in more explicit epistemological terms. This is standpoint epistemology. For Hartsock, the sexual division of labour is the basis for this feminist standpoint as the capitalist division of labour is for the proletarian standpoint. For her, each division of labour whether by gender or class will have consequences for knowledge. Feminist standpoint originates in the examination of women's activities related to the proletarian standpoint. Reproduction represents a unity with nature and goes beyond the proletarian experience of interchange with nature. In Hartsock, there is the association of the unity of women with the material world as life itself. The unity with this world characterizes feminine experience is resulted from reproduction and female biology. Menstruation, coitus, pregnancy, childbirth and lactation all represent challenges to bodily boundaries. The female standpoint is the potential for life and its basis is reproduction.

For these bodily boundaries to women characterizes the unity with nature other than the material world. According to Ring, Hartsock's argument is dialectical by the inevitable connection between material experience and the idea is substantive rather than methodological.

Another important for Marxism is that it is impossible to look at Marxian epistemology without accepting the political substance of Marxism. According to Ring, interchangeability and interpenetrability of subject and object is characteristic of modern dialectical thought. Is it possible to separate the political content from the epistemological structure of a theory? And dialectical method has the capacity to support a radical political stance without sacrificing a solid base in history or traditional philosophical categories. (Ring, 1991)

Is it dangerous for an epistemology to turn into ideology? It will be seen no danger to turn of an epistemology into ideology. The transformation of patriarchy is a necessity. For Hartmann the Marxism of Marxist-Feminist is more powerful than their feminism. The relation between man and women is explained around the relation between capital and worker. For her, the categories of Marxist analysis which are class, reserve army of labour, wage-laborer do not explain why particular people fulfill particular places. Heidi Hartmann claims that "Marxist categories like the capital itself are sex-blind." (Hartmann, 1982: 174).

In Marxist-Feminism, Marxism and feminism combines to explain patriarchy by using materialist analysis. After explaining Marxism, dialectical epistemology and gaps in the Marxist-Feminism it has to be looked poststructuralism how it will revise Marxist-Feminism.

2.4. How Poststructuralism Revised Marxist-Feminism

What poststructuralism proposes for Marxist analysis to solve the problems of Marxist-feminist analysis. Scott (1988) argues for the needs of a theory that can analyze the patriarchy in all its manifestations-ideological, institutional, organizational and subjective which account not only for

continuities but also for change over time. Scott proposes a theory that will let us to think in terms of pluralities and diversities rather than unities and universals.

With this new theory one can articulate alternative ways of thinking about gender without either simply reversing the old hierarchies or confirming them which will be useful and relevant for political practice. According to Scott, poststructuralism best meets all these requirements. Rabine (1988) asks if feminists use deconstruction to deepen their own analysis.

The useful concepts in poststructuralism for feminism are language, discourse, difference and deconstruction. The deconstruction will be used primarily, but it is necessary to explain the others. The first is language and its analysis which is a crucial point of entry for understanding how social relations are perceived how institutions are organized and experienced and how collective identity is established.

According to Scott, there are questions that have to be answered in the analysis of language:

"How, in what specific contexts, among which specific communities of people, and by what textual and social processes has meaning been acquired? How do meanings change? How have some meanings emerged as normative and others have been eclipsed or disappeared? What do these processes reveal about how power is constituted and operates?" (Scott, 1988: 35).

In language analysis, it is important to analyse "specific texts" not only books and documents, but also utterances of any kind and in any medium, including cultural practices in terms of specific historical and contextual meanings.

The second concept of poststructuralism is discourse which is not a language or a text but a historically, socially and institutionally specific structure of statements, terms, categories and beliefs as in Foucault says Scott (Scott, 1988).

The third is the concept difference which will be explained according to Derrida. In opposition to logocentrism, Derrida develops a series of deconstructive techniques which seek out the traces and marks of textuality and materiality that are crucial if unacknowledged elements of the various texts he explores. The elements are key phrases, metaphors and images necessary for the text to function. Terms such as "difference", "supplement", "trace", "parmakon", "hymen", "dissemination" and even "woman" (Gross, 1990). These challenge the primacy of presence and are used as pivotal points to question the logocentric texts within they are embedded. According to Gross (1990), the play of difference is the unspoken condition of logocentrism.

According to Derrida, "difference" designates firstly the lack or absence, marks the origin itself, not simply the substituter for the (lost) object. Secondly, difference is the condition for both difference and sameness. Thirdly, difference is the condition of linguistic difference, and thus of signification. The fact that the author (or reader) cannot control the totality of text he or she produces and over the meaning intended. Fourthly, the concept of difference is the movement of difference that challenge the binary logic that these pose, are gathered together under this one term.

The fourth and most important concept in poststructuralism and Derrida is deconstruction it is essential to understand how feminists use deconstruction in their analyses? According to Poovey (1988), feminism must rewrite deconstruction so as to incorporate its strategies into a political project and this rewriting will necessarily transform feminism. She argues that the

project of deconstruction is not only to reverse binary oppositions but to problematize the very idea of opposition and the notion of identity upon which it depends. For Poovey, "deconstruction therefore undermines identity, truth, being as such; it substitutes endless deferral or play for these essences" (1988: 52).

According to Derrida, deconstruction involves three "phases": First is the "reversal", the second is "displacement" and third is the creation of a new term which he calls "hinge word" such as "trace" means simultaneously present and absent, "supplement" (simultaneously plenitude and excess); "différance" (simultaneously sameness and difference); "pharmakon" (simultaneously poison and cure); "hymen" (simultaneously virgin and bride, rupture and totality) etc. According to Derrida, there are terms which are both preconditions of the oppositional structure and terms in excess of its logic (Gross, 1990).

In Irigaray, these "hinge words" are the two lips, fluidity, maternal desire, a genealogy of women. In Kristeva, "hinge words" are semianalysis, the semiotic, polyphony, etc. According to Gross, if strategically harnessed, these terms rupture the systems from which they "originate" and in which they function (Gross, 1987).

For Gross, deconstruction reveals only what is absent, no-thing, non-sense, a difference, gap or trace. A deconstructive reading does not so much demonstrate the errors, flaws, and contradictions in texts, but tries to reveal the necessity with which what a text says is bound up with what it cannot say.

This is the point why I preferred deconstruction: to find in a theory what it cannot say. This is what I attempt to find in Marxism with the help of postmodernism and poststructuralism is this. According to Gross, Derrida's deconstructive project parallels and redefines the feminist challenge to

* Deconstruction and the play of difference have strategic phallocentrism. Deconstruction and the play of difference have strategic value to feminists (Gross, 1987).

Why Irigaray, Kristeva and others use Derrida's deconstructive techniques for his concept difference is that it has a powerful critical force within feminist theory. His work is the most politically motivated one. Gross explains how his work is a powerful critical force within feminist theory:

"His analysis of the metaphor of woman and femininity, whatever its problems still makes explicit a procedure common within phallogentric texts-their necessary dependence on an either implicit or explicit metaphor femininity as excess, materiality or instability. He makes clear how these metaphors have been necessary for phallogentric text to continue their dominance." (Gross, 1987: 195).

Spivak claims that:

"Deconstruction is illuminating as a critique of phallogentrism and it is convincing as an argument against the founding of a hystero-centric order to counter phallogentric discourse and lastly deconstruction as a 'feminist practice itself, is caught on the other side of sexual difference'." (1983: 184)

Instead of being metaphor, it is attractive to become the subjects of discourse. Attempting to deconstruct patriarchal theory is favorable for me. Deconstructing the Marxist-feminist post-modernist theory predominates to talk about post-modernist theory. As Jane Flax says that all postmodern

* Phallogentrism is a sub-category of logocentrism, where the phallus takes the role of logos.

discourses are all "deconstructive". That it is a good idea to refer post-modernist theory for deconstruction.

2.5. Postmodernist Theory

What postmodernist theory does is to show to show how deconstruction will be used. The main emphasis is on deconstruction and three postmodernist feminist theoreticians: Helene Cixous, Julia Kristeva and Luce Irigaray.

According to Tong, postmodern feminists attempt to criticize the dominant order, particularly its patriarchal aspects and to valorise the feminine woman, the other (1989: 225).

As reviewed by Poovey calling for women to "write herself". Cixous claims that woman must write about women and bring women to writing, from which they have been driven away as evidently as from their bodies for the same reasons, by the same law, with the same fatal goal (Poovey, 1988: 54-55).

Poovey claims that woman's body is; "A woman's body, with its thousand and one thresholds of ardor ... will make the old single-grooved mother tongue reverberate with more than one language." (1988: 54-55).

As reviewed by Gross, the other two, Kristeva and Irigaray are interested in developing accounts of the processes of production and constitution which create male and female subjects as distinct in personality, subjectivity and social position. Kristeva and Irigaray use methods, techniques and insights of psychoanalytic theory to develop their own projects. According to Kristeva, deconstruction has helped to establish a decentring of all social identities - personal, sexual and symbolic - as other theoretical object or goal.

According to Irigaray, deconstruction has provided a serious of methods of for interrogating philosophical categories and oppositions which contribute to women's theoretical containment within patriarchal or phallogocentric models (Gross, 1987: 126-27-28).

According to Tong, the postmodern feminists above take Beauvoir's understanding of otherness. Women is still the other and the condition of otherness enables women to stand back and criticize the norms, values and practices that the dominant culture (patriarchy) seeks to impose on everyone, including those who live on its periphery - in this case women (1989: 219).

For Tong, otherness is a way of being, thinking, and speaking that allows for openness, plurality, diversity and difference. If one emphasize the positive side of otherness means being excluded, shunned, "frozen out", disadvantaged, unprivileged, rejected, unwanted, abandoned, dislocated and marginalized is a major theme in deconstruction (ibid).

The deconstructionist approach is to have a critical attitude toward everything as Tong claims:

"The deconstructionist approach takes a critical attitude toward everything, including particular ideas or social injustices as well as the structures upon which they are based, the language in which they are thought and the systems in which they are safeguarded" (ibid).

Deconstructionist is anti-essentialist because the search for universal definitions is useless and challenges the traditional boundaries between appositions such as reason/emotion, beautiful/ugly, self/other (224). According to Tong, an anti-essentialist deconstructionist questions two of the assumptions that everyone holds: First is the essential unity of self through

time and space termed self-identity and second is the essential relationship between language and reality termed truth (219). According to Tong, deconstructionist challenges the self by splitting it to its conscious and unconscious dimensions. It challenges the motion of truth by the idea that language and reality are variable and shifting (220).

For Tong, Cixous, Kristeva and Irigaray offer to women the most fundamental liberation of all "freedom from oppressive thought" (223).

What is the possibility of freedom from oppressive thought in such a condition? Freedom from oppressive thought is a dream for me because as I said before my theoretical framework is an adaptation from the West. With this adaptation, I can only tell the oppression of women in rural Turkey or try to make the analyses of patriarchy. According to Tong, Cixous applied the Derrida's notion of "difference" to writing. She contrasted "feminine writing" with "masculine writing." According to Cixous, psychoanalytically masculine writing is rooted in a man's genital and libidinal economy and is emblemized by the phallus. For a variety of sociocultural reasons, masculine writing has spuriety over feminine writing (224).

According to Cixous, as reviewed in Tong (224) masculine writing and thinking are cast in binary oppositions. By coupling concepts and terms in pairs of polar opposites, one of which is always over the other. She listed these dichotomies as activity/passivity, sun/moon, culture/nature, day/night and men think through oppositions.

In those dichotomies the fundamental one is man/woman in which man is associated with all that is active, cultural, light, high or generally positive and woman symbolizes the passive, natural, dark, low or generally negative. Man is the self but woman is his other. Woman exists in man's world on his terms. She is either the other for man, or she is unthought. Woman is unthinkable and unthought (Tong. 1989: 224).

According to Cixous, as reviewed in Tong, feminine writing is a space which is in a springboard for subversive thought and it is the possibility of change. Woman has to write what is unthinkable and unthought. Women have to try to write the non-existent into existence and to foresee the unforeseeable. For her, there are connections between male sexuality and masculine writing on one hand, and female sexuality and feminine writing on the other (Tong, 1989: 225).

Masculine writing is a phallogentric writing and is boring. Men always write in black ink and write their thoughts in a sharply defined and rigidly imposed structure. Feminine writing is open and multiple, varied and rhythmic and full of pleasures. And woman writes in "white ink" and let her words flow freely where she wishes them to go (Tong, 1989: 225).

Cixous's call for feminine writing and for women to write about themselves is also a call to me. This theoretical framework and analysis of rural women will have to be a feminine writing and I will let my words go where they want to go (Tong, 1989: 225).

According to Gross (1987), Kristeva is a semiologist and theorist of literary production. With structural and poststructural analysis of textual or discursive production, Kristeva brings together a psychoanalytic account of the psychic and social production of subjectivity. Her object of analysis is "the speaking subject". There are semiotic and symbolic orders which are necessary for being a stable speaking subject, a stable discursive product or an agent of social unites, institutions and practices.

As reviewed in Gross (1987), according to Kristeva, the sexual phases of oral, anal, phallic, scopophilic, sadistic or epistemophilic of Freud are correlated with the unspeakable, repressed foundation of signification which Kristeva calls "the semiotic". The oedipal overlaying of this per-oedipal is anti-social, narcissistic sexuality is called "the symbolic". The key

characteristics of these two orders govern all individual, social and signifying unities. For Kristeva, the sphere of the symbolic, oedipal or patriarchal modes of organization owes a debt of existence to an unspeakable, prelinguistic repressed bodily domain of semiotic, libidinal, feminine, maternal flows. For Kristeva, semiotic is feminine and maternal. It is feminine because it is pre or proto-patriarchal. It is maternal because the mother, the maternal space and material support of the child's desire is the semiotic chora.

According to Gross (1987), Kristeva uses the Derridean challenge to identity and poses it with respect to feminist or women's struggles for identity. It is a feminist struggle for identity for a discursive, theoretical space for women's self-recognition. Feminine is a term released only in the destruction of male or female identity.

The last one is Irigaray; according to Tong, Irigaray agrees with Cixous that feminine sexuality and the female body are sources of feminine writing. For her, "Irigaray seeks to liberate the feminine from male philosophical thought as a psychoanalyst." (Tong, 1989: 226).

According to Gross (1987), system of phallocentrism is the object of Irigaray's critical analysis. This system of phallocentrism is the network of images, representations, methods and procedures for representing women and the feminine in some necessary relation to men and masculinity. It is the representation of one sex from a perspective which is shown to be universal by the other sex. Irigaray's work is an attempt to challenge and undermine the domination of phallogentric conceptions of femininity. Irigaray's attempt is to deconstruct phallogentrism for a new theoretical space and forms of language which enable women to see and represent themselves in positive, self-defined and self-judging terms. For Gross, in the hands of Irigaray deconstruction becomes an openly political weapon which is directed to the politics of female representation the politics of sexual difference and she takes psychoanalytic

theory as critical object of interrogation.

In the study deconstruction will be used as a political weapon. This political weapon is directed to the patriarchy and patriarchal structures in the village. The main patriarchal structure is land. As a last claim from Gross for Irigaray is that:

"Irigaray's project is political, it is directed to providing an intellectual or discursive space in which women can explore, experiment with and go beyond the experiences that distinguish them as oppressed in patriarchal culture. Woman wishes to participate in the creation of a speaking position (or many), a conceptual perspective and discursive space where women can articulate their specific needs and desires and contributions." (Gross, 1987: 197)

How has Marxist-Feminist theory caused rural women to see their experiences in patriarchal culture. How can structures in the village be formulated according to this theoretical framework. Can it be a political and feminine weapon?

2.6. Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist Theory

Feminism has to incorporate the strategies of deconstruction in a political project and has to rewrite it. A deconstructionist focuses on the moments of transformation not on the moments of objectivity and subjectivity. These moments of transformation create different experiences for both sexes. These experiences are lived by homosexuals, lesbians and heterosexuals.

Feminist postmodernism refuses universalism. It has a scepticism

towards universal assumptions and takes its power from deconstructionism, semiology and psychoanalysis. In postmodernism woman is the other. This otherness is a form of existence, thinking and speech which paves the way for openness, plurality and differences. This causes Marxist-feminism to see the unseen which is gender-blind. To put a postmodernist content to Marxist-Feminism means to develop a Marxist-Feminist feminine method. Feminine method is a deconstructive tool and in the feminine method words are free to go where woman wishes them to go.

The Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist standpoint provides to transform social analysis to activity.

There are concepts which have to be deconstructed in analyzing the labour of rural women, rural women as a category, gender, household, production, reproduction, sexual division of labour, women's identity, sexuality, patriarchy and land.

If we use the techniques of deconstruction for deconstructing the above concepts against patriarchal theories: Using Derrida's deconstructive phases:

- Rural Women (production and reproduction)
- Gender (sexual division of labour and household)
- Household (sexual division of labour and reproduction)
- Production (sexual division of labour and land)
- Reproduction (production and sexual division of labour)
- Sexual Division of Labour (female reproduction and male sexuality)
- Women's Identity (sexuality and rural woman)
- Sexuality (gender and patriarchy)
- Patriarchy (production and land)
- Land (production and patriarchy)
- Migration (land and sexuality)

At the same time rural women she takes her place both in production and reproduction. In the production process she works on the land or activities related to the land and has intimate relations to the means of production according to a sexual division of labour. Reproduction again is a kind of production finding its meaning in household and woman's daily activities. Reproduction is the marker of a sexual division of labour in the household and in the activities on the land. Women's sexuality determines their place in production and reproduction process. Sexual division of labour operated on the behalf of the reproduction process. Women's sexuality valued in the sexuality of men relies on patriarchal structure and gender roles. It is affected by both production and land. The production process in the village is a patriarchal process and mostly related to the land. Land is in the prison of patriarchy and it is impossible to analyse land out of patriarchy.

Sexual division of labour operates on behalf of reproduction process. Women's sexuality valued in the male sexuality. Sexuality of women relies on patriarchal structures and gender roles. It is affected by both patriarchy and gender. Patriarchy symbolizes both production and land. Production process in the village is a patriarchal process and mostly related to land. Land is in the prison of patriarchy and it is impossible to analyse land of patriarchy.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW ON FEMALE LABOUR IN AGRICULTURE

In this chapter, a critical view the general literature about the rural women in agriculture will be used in line to the theoretical structure presented Chapter One, the subjects dealt with are both related to rural women and to agriculture.

These are: rural woman as a category, gender, household, production, reproduction, sexual division of labour, women's identity, sexuality, patriarchy and land.

Studies on rural women are mostly from Indian and Latin American literature. Rural woman in agriculture is a new area of research and the agricultural labour of rural women is highly used in the Third World. Because; according to the statistics of United Nations, 75% of the world population lives in the Third World and 75% of this Third World population is in rural areas (UN, 1985). Studis on rural women in agriculture are mostly seen in Third World context.

In this chapter the situation of rural women is examined according to its place in the household, reproduction, production, sexual division of labour, women's identity, sexuality, patriarchy and land. The structural

changes can be seen in agriculture according to these processes and categories and vice versa.

3.1. Rural Woman As A Category

In the Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist perspective rural women are integrated as a category. By mentioning the position of rural women both in production and reproduction simultaneously means that the rural woman is both a productive and reproductive category. In the rural household her reproductive activities are more dominant than her productive activities. Because of the gender roles and sexual division of labour her reproductive activities are primary. But rural women work as hard in production as in reproduction. But reproduction activities make the productive activities unseen. What is the situation in other Third World countries?

According to Brydon (1989), the rural women is a major category in the world and the expectations and the type of work rural women do varies with economy, climate, political or religious ideology and culture. For her, the common tasks for women are cooking, housework (sweeping, cleaning), care of small children and fetching water and fuel. These are contained in the reproductive process. On the other hand, rural women have responsibilities in the production of the important share of the household economic resources. These responsibilities are production of crops for food, care of herds, work in the storage and processing of crops both for food and seed or the production of cash crops and craft products for sale. Brydon indicates that there is a combination of domestic service and productive work in women's work in rural area.

What Brydon mentions as domestic service must be reproductive activities or production. I am against defining domestic work or domestic

production because either definition makes the main activity invisible and make sense that the most important process is production.

There is a differentiation between reproductive activities and productive activities. This differentiation doesn't mean that productive activities are more important than reproductive activities. According to Bennholdt-Thomsen, as a futile exercise, women's work is separated as productive in the sense of remunerated work from other work (Bennholdt-Thomsen 1981:46-29).

Stella Odie-Ali (1986) gives importance to the "time for personal care and recreation" and this make her account different. According to Odie-Ali, if we look to a day in the life of a woman we can see the "fluidity and flexibility" of women's roles. The day combines personal care, care of livestock, garden work and field agricultural work, family care which contains cooking and caring for /overseeing children and housework and marketing activities and recreation.

As can be seen rural women as a category, as the subjects integrated in Third World social science and discussed both in production and reproduction. Household activities and work in garden known as reproductive and it is not valued by rural women themselves. According to them, work done on land is production; reproductive activities are not seen as work and true labour. Their place in both of the activities make them an inevitable category.

3.2. Gender

The conditions for gender relations are based on the sexual division of labour and the household structure. That is, gender roles and relations express themselves both at sexual division of labour and household. Sexual division of labour in production and reproduction reflect themselves on

household relations and to the division of labour in the household. In spite of mechanization and high economic conditions there seems to be no change in the division of labour along gender roles.

According to Mackintosh (1981), the meaning of sex is the biological characteristic, but gender is the socially constructed category and the sexual division of labour is the division of labour along gender lines.

According to Deere and Leon de Leal (1982), for determining the specific nature of gender inequality, class has a major role. According to Rogers (1980), the incorporation of gender inequality into development is realised both ideologically and practically.

According to Brydon and Chant (1989), the major themes which have relevance for "gender questions" in less developed countries are the household, reproduction, production, policy and migration. They proposed two approaches to development in the Third World. These are the conservative modernization approach and the radical / dependency underdevelopment approach. Their main subject is the general situation of Third World countries and relation of them to the advanced economies. The striking thing for these approaches is that they have little or no place for women. They take women either in attachment to men or by ignoring altogether; which means that women are not theorised and analysed as a social group in their own right.

Another outlook is given by Wilson (1985) from the capitalist development in agriculture perspective. For her, there are three distinct theoretical areas in which capitalist development has an effect on women's lives. The first area is the agrarian change along capitalist lines. The second and most important is how they conceptualize gender relations and the position of women in society. the Third theoretical area is how the changes in agriculture are related to the lives of rural women. To answer the important question of how rural women overcome subordination; Stolcke (1983)

explained the necessity of discovering the specific socioeconomic and political constraints which operate on women and the extraordinary persistence of gender hierarchy.

Recent literature on Latin America attempts to conceptualize the relationship between capitalist transition agriculture and women's lives. According to Wilson (1985), an impact model has been adapted to observe the effects of agricultural change on women. For her, by changing agrarian structure and rural society, capital intervenes in the agricultural societies which are on the "periphery" of the world economic system. The first impact model is the development through modernization and its radical image is the underdevelopment through dependency.

The second impact model is within the Marxist analytic tradition: Imperialism and the spread of capitalism are recognized as intensively contradictory processes which are capable of generating both progressive and regressive tendencies (Wilson, 1985). Wilson proposed that studies on impact made a contribution to our understanding of rural women by making women visible. Second contribution is to show how a rural population could be disaggregated to reveal differences according to social group. The third and important one for us is that divisions along gender lines are taken as important as divisions along lines of class. The other issues which are important for Wilson are the changes in the sexual division of labour; women's contribution to agricultural production as part of a female labour and the increasing participation of women in waged jobs in agriculture and agro-industry.

Gender has to be linked to the wider theoretical debates. According to Deere (1977), relations of gender are brought into discussions on the mode of production. She argues that capitalist expansion in the periphery has often intensified women's economic participation in non-capitalist modes of production. She has findings on changes in women's work on haciendas in

Cajamarca, Northern, Peru. A central importance is given to the dimension of gender in characterizing the relations of production. According to Deere, in the Andean Hacienda system in Peru the right of appropriating an unlimited quantity of labor from women and children is given to landlord. When the male head of the household entered contractual obligations on behalf of his family, women and children's labor was largely unrecognized. She claims that:

"The exploitation of women under servile relations increased the potential appropriation of surplus labor, increased effective length of the working day, and reduced the value of labour power. The basis for the sexual division of labour was grounded in an ideology of differential worth implanted by the ruling elite." (Deere, 1977: 48-49).

She examines changes in women's work after hacienda enterprises had been transformed into capital-intensive dairy farms. Firstly, under private ownership and secondly as cooperatives following the agrarian reform of 1969 in Peru. With this process of modernization many property owners expelled the resident labor forces and sought to employ a smaller number of skilled workers. Since milking had long been designated as women's work, many women did enter waged work on these farms. By the 1970's women represented about a third of the permanent waged workers employed in agriculture in the department of Cajamarca. The vast majority of rural women had to subsist on tiny plots while their menfolk emigrated periodically to find income - earning work elsewhere (Deere, 1977; reviewed by Wilson, 1985: 1019).

According to Deere, the development of productive forces under capitalism, is progressive in terms of the total surplus production of society.

The reorganization of work process and liberating women from the servile appropriation of labor time is a step forward in women's control over their own lives. With the development of capitalist relations of production, women have gained a degree of autonomy over the distribution of their labor time whether proletarians or producers of use values on the minifundia family was the basic unit of exploitation, because it was problematic to make an adequate comparison of women's labor under the later wage system (Deere, 1977; reviewed by Wilson, 1985: 1019).

Wilson criticized Deere that the individual not the family was the basic unit of exploitation. Because it was problematic to make an adequate comparison of women's labor under the later wage system and she claims that:

"Capitalization of agriculture has led to expulsion from the hacienda and the growth of smallholders, how can the actual burden of women's work be evolved. The hacienda system had offered a measure of security and protection form the cash economy to families bound to it. How do women compare their present economic insecurity and dependence on cash brought in by husband/father/son with their previous dependence on the landowner?" (Wilson, 1985: 1019).

As reviewed by Wilson, lastly, Babb examines transformation in Peruvian haciendas after the agrarian reform of 1969, where agrarian reform meant improvement in general conditions like increased incomes, better health and education. Babb (1980), argues that women lose by "shunting out of the production process" as their tasks are taken by men and rationalized out of existence. Moreover, women were being denied control and recognition in a traditional domain, child-rearing (Babb, 1980; reviewed by Wilson, 1985: 1020).

3.3. Household

Harris defined the household as the common form of social organization which is seen in most regions of the developing world. The household is the primary site for structuring gender relations and women's specific experience (Harris, 1981: 48-67). According to Mackintosh, as a residential unit members of household share domestic functions and activities are group of people who "eat out of the same pot." (Mackintosh, 1979: 173-191) According to Robertson, in the household there is a group of people who "share the same bowl" (Robertson, 1987: 97-135).

Harris's definition is better than others because a household must be more than a container or shelter which preserves a group of people who "eat out of the same pot".

The household is both the source of sexual division of labour and reproduction. My aim is to rescue production and land from the patriarchy. The production process as a patriarchal structure and the land as the patriarchal structure of production process create the division of labour between the sexes which originates from the ownership of land. The owner of land determines the sexual division of labour and the reproductive process. If the owner of land totally ignores women in the production process, women will stay in the household and widen reproduction. The form of the sexual division of labour is determined in the household by the patriarch.

As Brydon and Chant (1989) put that household is important for the labour and resources of its members. Household is the point in which productive and reproductive relations meet. And it is the focal point of sexual division of labour and it is critical for the analysis of gender roles and relation.

According to Brydon (1989), the household is focused around the management of the resources. In the household, there is a division of labour

among adult man, adult women and children. Kinship ideology is oriented to the composition of the household. The fundamental principle of social organisation is kinship. Gender determines the place of members in the kinship system. In most of the societies, kinship status depends on the father and property is inherited and descent is traced in the patrilineal line. In matrilineal societies, public power in the community is in the hands of the men. But these men are the maternal uncles, brothers and sons of women. For Brydon, a distinction is made between "household as a residential unit" and household as domestic (consumption /production) unit.

The authority and patriarch of the household is the owner of the land. In most Asian countries, the increase in female labour demonstrates the ability of patriarchal authority in the peasant household for extracting more labour from family members (Palmer, 1978; cited in Duvvury, 1989: WS103).

The labour of female members is allocated from fieldwork to household activities by the patriarch who is the owner of land. According to Harris, in the peasant households, the withdrawal of women from "visible" to "invisible" work affected their status and their role in decision making negatively (J. Harris, 1979; cited in Duvvury 1989: WS103). But the studies of Devadas (1975), Sisodia (1985) and Sharma (1983) showed the opposite: They argue that women are consulted in agricultural decisions such as choice of crops, variety of seeds, use of fertilizers and quantity to be marketed. When the role in decision-making declines there is a rise in the position of the household in the social hierarchy (Devadas, 1975; Sisodia, 1985; Sharma, 1983; cited in Duvvury, 1989: WS103).

Analyses of rural households are done according to household as a unit of residence and as a unit of consumption. According to Brydon (1989), the household has multiple functions that it is the place of biological and social reproduction, socialisation of nurturing and of fundamental decision - making.

According to Bennholdt-Thomsen (1981) by analysing the household one cannot only analyse the labour of Third World peasant producers in subsistence production as "productive work" but also the work done by housewives in capitalist societies.

In the analyses of the household in the First and Third World there is an increasing frequency of female-headed households. Men move to work in cities, mines and plantations, women tend to live in rural areas.

Another important part of the household is marriage and Brydon in 1985 claims that:

"Marriage consists of kinship, residence and household structure and organization. Marriage is the process by which most households are formed. Types of marriage are polygyny means the marriage of one man to more than one woman and polyandry means the marriage of one woman to more than one man." (Brydon, 1989: 101)

3.4. Production

As previously stated, production and land are in the prison of patriarchy. In the production process, rural women work on land and related activities to land and have intimate relations with the means of production according to a sexual division of labour. Production process in the village is a patriarchal process. For Brydon (1989), in the definition of production, remunerated work is known as productive labour but subsistence activities are not remunerated. How is this remuneration done, according to which measure is it valued or not. According to Bennholdt - Thomsen (1981), reproductive labour known as subsistence production which are cooking, cleaning, child-care, water and fuel collection can have a value in productive sense.

According to Boserup (1970), with economic development women's status varies with the nature of productive activity and their involvement in it. If the involvement in production is high, the status of women is high, especially in shifting cultivation systems or systems of irrigated agriculture. With the economic development which means the mechanization of agriculture and the specialization and differentiation of agricultural tasks highly separates women from production and causes the declining of their status. According to Whyte and Whyte (1978) involvement in agricultural work is a criteria for women in the determination of their status.

An important criteria involving of women in agricultural production is the economic development and developments like agricultural technology. Ember (1983) argues that agricultural intensification means the development or advance in agriculture and the work of women will decline in agriculture. Also Sacks (1976) argues that the separation of women from "social production" causes decline in the status of women.

In Latin American literature, studies mostly take as their starting point the impact of agrarian change on women's participation in the sphere of "production". There is an emphasize on the labour process and relations of production; the gender relations do not enter directly into discussions. According to Stolcke (1983), the incorporation of women into a waged labour force brings other changes. Capitalist development is understood as the commoditization of social relations. So it will undermine the "traditional links of personal dependency and subordination based on gender and produce the formal freedom that men are supposed to enjoy in class society" (Stolcke, 1983; cited in Wilson 1985: 1020). According to Wilson, women's work in agricultural production is seen as "prime locus" from which there will be changes in women's lives.

According to Wilson (1985), the negative effects of commercial

expansion of women in agriculture is the case that control of cash production which is in the hands of white men, women began to work in the non-modernized subsistence sector that produces food for domestic consumption. These occur in small-scale cultivating areas. Another impact is the imposition of commercialisation process heavier work loads on women who work both on cash crop production as unremunerated workers and perform the domestic labour at the same time. According to Whitehead (1981), women perform additional unremunerated labour according to gender relations. This is explained "in social institutions such as the conjugal contract which sets out the duties and obligations wives and husbands owe each other" (Whitehead, 1981; cited in Wilson, 1985: 1020).

As in Latin America there have been many studies carried out in India on rural women in agriculture. According to Bardhan (1985), in India the extent of female participation in production is determined by a nexus of class / caste hierarchy and norms of patriarchal ideology. In hierarchical society like India based on patrilineal - patrilocal families and the location of a family in the caste/class hierarchy would determine the level and forms of women's productive work. In India, importance is given to Sankritisation process which means the withdrawal of women from the manual work. The distinction is made between the taboo against "outdoor" and "indoor" work (Chackravarty, 1977).

According to Duvvury, in rural households manual work related to cultivation and processing is an important part of the work women do. Most women work in pre-and post-harvest operations which are done in the home rather than in the field. Poor women go to the field as outdoor work. Women who are on the upper end of the hierarchy must not work outdoor (Duvvury, 1989, WS-96).

According to Dantwala (1975), before women go outwork there is a

significant reduction in family income and before going outdoors women have heavy domestic responsibilities (Dantwala, 1975; reviewed in Duvvury, 1989: WS-97).

The production or the place of rural women in production process, involves the main indicators such as are agricultural development, economic development, mechanization of agriculture, land-ownership, commercialisation and patriarchal ideology. These indicators cause the withdrawal of women from productive activity. In the village study, production is mostly related to the sexual division of labour and land. It is related to land because the activities on land are recognized as productive activities.

3.5. Reproduction

Reproduction as another form of production find its meaning in household and women's daily activities. It is the marker of a sexual division of labour in the household and in the activities on land. The definitions of reproduction by Barrett (1986), Edholm (1977), Harris and Young (1982) and Mackintosh (1981) are reviewed by Brydon claiming that:

"Reproduction has a variety of connotations, ranging from the process of 'biological' reproduction on the one hand, and the process of 'social' reproduction at the other. Biological reproduction comprises child-birth and lactation, 'physical' reproduction involves the daily regeneration of the wage labor force through cooking, cleaning and washing and so on: and 'social' reproduction, an all-embracing category, refers to the maintenance of ideological conditions which reproduce

class relations and uphold the social and economic status quo." (Barrett, 1986; Edholm, 1977; Harris and Young, 1982 and Mackinstosh, 1981 is reviewed by Brydon, 1989: 112).

According to Brydon and Chant (1989), reproductive activities fall upon the shoulders of women and they remain outside the domain of public life and politics.

Mies (1984) has studied the dry villages of Andhra where women perform continuous activities for the family's subsistence. Activities such as gathering fuel and vegetables are interwoven with other tasks and Mies told that men has no conscious that these tasks are necessary for the subsistence of the family.

According to Duvvury (1989), this invisible work is part of a cultural/ideological system that views man as the primary bread-winner. Material reproduction of the family by women is not seen as economically meaningful. In Indian economy, women's mobility is controlled as an essential element of the property structure. For example, social norms of Purdah restricts outside wage work for the women and also they are seen as natural wage workers by peasant households. When women are forced into agricultural wage-work they become visible as agricultural labourers. Men seems to be invisible as agricultural labourers but land is largely owned by them.

The intra-household distribution of sources and food consumption is difficult to measure. The available study by Sen and Kynch (1985) argues that food consumption is biased against females within the household. This results in greater malnourishment of female children regardless of economic class (Sen and Kynch, 1985; reviewed by Duvvury, 1989: WS-194). According to Horowitz and Kishuar (1982), women consume less calories

than men (Horowitz and Kishuar, 1982; reviewed by Duvvury, 1989: WS-104). For Duvvury, this deficiency of food is severe in pregnant and lactating women who require additional calories. Duvvury points out that health-care is also biased against females in the household is proved by hospital arrivals of males and the period of delay in attending to an illness which is much smaller in the case of male members of the household (Duvvury, 1989: WS-104).

According to Agarwal (1986), gender discrimination is higher among the poorer households.

As a reproductive activity, for Mies (1984), water carrying is an additional task for women who have little time and the decreasing water supply in the hot season means women have to struggle to collect enough water for their own requirements. It is seen that for Duvvury women are still confined to womenly tasks as tending milch cattle, poultry rearing, kitchen - gardening, ducking, tailoring, etc (Duvvury, 1989: WS-106).

As we see women's reproductive activities comprise most of the activities in the village which are necessary for the life. In this subject, Young argues that there is an interplay between women's productive and reproductive roles and this creates a theoretical problem. For Young (1987), it is necessary to look at the political and economic forces which can lead to either production or reproduction. For this, it is necessary to understand the mechanisms behind the construction of the sexual division of labour and the elaboration of the stereotype of "women's work" and how such stereotypes change. The significant action is to understand the relation between the political and economic bases of the sexual division of labour and its ideological reinforcement: the degree of autonomy of ideology makes the situation more complex (Young, 1987; cited in Wilson, 1985: 1025). But Stolcke (1983) claims that it is not clear in which way gender hierarchy and

effective constraints are connected with women's reproductive responsibilities and behavior in work and in production. If it is accepted that family structure and ideology in society is a decisive dimension in the constitution of gender hierarchy may be suggested that there is an organic link between production and reproduction (Stolcke, 1983; reviewed by Wilson, 1985: 1025).

In an another analysis of structuring of women's subordination in rural Andean Society, Bourque and Warren (1981) questiones two areas: One is the role of social and cultural beliefs and values, attitudes, perceptions and beliefs in reinforcing and transforming sexual hierarchy. Second is the conceptualization which examines those dimensions of sexual subordination which cancel class divisions in rural society. They develop a social ideology perspective that gives a more central role to belief systems and worldviews than the other approaches to women's subordination. Those belief systems are examined in the concrete conditions of social life. They have a "grounded" concern with the meanings of sex differences for the participants of the social and political system. This view permits a focus on the interconnections of sex-role stereotyping, sexual division of labour and institutionally structured access to crucial resources. They can follow the interplay of sexual subordination and class stratification without analytically reducing either dimension of social inequality to the other. By emphasizing on ideology and gender construction is that women are not silent or inactive victims according to the economic consequences of sexual subordination, indicate directions for the alternative conceptual enquiry (Bourque and Warren 1981; reviewed by Wilson, 1985: 1025).

3.6. Sexual Divison Of Labour

The sexual division of labour operates on the side of the reproduction process by its relation to male sexuality. First of all the place of

men in the sexual division of labour is determined; the other activities are attributed to women according to this place man occupies. If men don't want to do any kind of activity, this is transferred to women.

According to Deere and Leon (1981), the sexual division of labour in production related tasks was highly heterogeneous and varies with the type of productive activities, labour and class position of the household.

According to Wilson (1985), in contrast to production, sexual division of labour in domestic tasks was homogeneous. All productive activities are performed by women. For Wilson, this is a finding that crosses classes and structures and if there is a great internal differentiation along class lines in a community this means that gender hierarchy and male values strongly influence this community. Gonzales (1978) analyzed such a community where before and after the spread of commercial agriculture, women not engage in fieldwork. Sexual division of labour has no effect on agricultural change (Gonzales, 1978; reviewed by Wilson, 1985: 1022).

According to Wilson (1985), the analysis of the sexual division of labour which shows rapid and significant changes was important. The work of women and men is non-comparable and this lies at the heart of the sexual division of labour. Also, there is the control of men over women's work with male-out migration, women have more effective control over agricultural production and have greater independence and potential for controlling their own lives.

Proletarianization¹ of men and women occurs along different lines from which are derived their gender roles in the nucleus of origin as sons or daughters, fathers or mothers. This argument belonging to Roldon who conceptualized women's work as cheaper and emanable (Roldon, 1983; reviewed in Wilson, 1985: 1025).

According to Wilson, in Latin America women's lives are affected by relations of class which are interactive with relations of gender. The discussions are located within the family, domestic group. It is not the individual who faces the labor market as an independent agent. The options of men and women are mediated by family. Economic change conditioned the household structure and familial relationship. This finds its expression materially through changes in the sexual division of labour and forms of distribution of family income and at an ideological level it is the way relationships of gender are challenged and reconstructed. For Wilson, the discussion of the family allow an organic connection between production and reproduction (Wilson, 1985: 1033).

In India, the impact of technological change and changes in agro-processing sector on women is a new area of study. There are three types of impact of technological change, on employment and productivity, on income and expenditure and on quality of life.

Agarwal (1984) makes the assumption of a household, in a particular socioeconomic class as a unit of converging interests, is not entirely valid given that there are significant differences between men and women: the first is the extent and nature of involvement in agricultural work and the second is the extent and nature of involvement in non-field work such as cattle tending and rearing, poultry care, housework and child care and lastly the extent of control over pattern of distribution of household earnings and expenditure. Development of commercial agriculture leads to irrigation development and shift to cash crops (Agarwal, 1984: A39).

According to Mies (1984), in India, the production cycle of most crops are sex-sequential and depended on hired labour to a large extent. For her, the introduction of certain cash crops have a very positive impact on employment. The introduction of cigarette tobacco in the early twenties had a

dramatic impact on female labour. Tobacco cultivation depended on female labour for transplanting, weeding, de-pesting, harvesting and curing.

For Duvvury (1989), for the first time, large numbers of women began to work in factories for grading, de-stemming and stripping tobacco leaves. In Southern India, female agricultural labourers are transported by tractors and other vehicles extended the labor pool available to the employer. According to Greeley (1981) and Salahuddin (1986) the commercialisation process is another element in the expansion of agro-processing. It has given importance to the modern processing of rice, replacing female labour in the traditional hand-pounded rice (Greeley, 1981; Salahuddin, 1986; cited in Duvvury, 1989: WS-100).

Chatterji (1984) argued that the wages of female agricultural workers are at the bottom of the rural wage hierarchy which is close to a minimum subsistence wage which cannot be further reduced (Chatterji, 1984; reviewed in Duvvury, 1989: WS-102).

According to Duvvury (1989), the combination of capitalist relations and new technology in agriculture has a differential impact in terms of class and gender. The mechanization of harvesting and post-harvesting operations causes women to enter into the labour market from peasant and artisan households. In areas which have new agricultural technology, no improvement is seen in the economic position of wage labourers and female labourers. Wage of women labourers are one-half or less of male wages. With the new technology, there is a decline in days of employment the work burden increases for assessing the resources such as fuel and water collection which are female tasks. The impact of technological change and the process of capitalist agriculture has negative implications for women of agricultural labour and marginal peasant households.

3.7. Land

Patriarchy symbolizes both production and land. The production process in the village is a patriarchal process and mostly related to land. Land is in the "prison" of patriarchy and it is impossible to analyze land out side of patriarchy. It is important to set land free from patriarchy. According to Saradamoni (1980), with the process of commercialisation there is an increased demand for land. With patriarchal ideology, women lost their traditional rights to an ancestral home and there is a minimum security for them without owning land.

For Duvvury (1989), the modernisation of agriculture had a negative effect on the economic position of women in landless and small peasant households. There occurs limitations of these households in accessing productive resources such as land. In India, traditionally women have no right to use land in the agricultural production cycle which is based on sex-sequential tasks than sex-segregated task.

In rural context, land is owned by men by inheritance as a patriarchal ideology. For the analysis of patriarchy it is necessary to analyse the ownership of land according to sexes.

3.8. Migration

Migration is related to both to land and sexuality. The migration process is performed by men and the reason is mainly the deficiency of land. Access to land is difficult for men due to the division of land by inheritance.

Brydon tries to relate gender and migration and put forward the consequences of the process is migration for the lives of rural women. For her, migration is both related to industrialization and urbanization both in the First

and Third World and migration is mostly characterized as labour migration. The reason for labor migration is the demand for income to buy consumer goods. Migration is the process of the division of labour which provides the supply of labour for industry. Migrants also go to work on labor - intensive agricultural plantations which produce export crops such as tea and bananas. In parts of Africa there is a considerable population movement associated with peasant cash crops agriculture. The mass migration of men from rural areas has consequences both for rural economy and rural social organisation (Brydon, 1989).

The major impact of male migration on rural females is the increase in women's work load. Women have to work more for the survival of the family (Desai, 1982; Jetley, 1987; Gulati, 1983).

Studies about male migration show that there is a rise in the number of the female - headed households. In developing countries, most of the rural households are female - headed. Agarwal (1986) argues that female - headed households depend more on wage labour than self-employment and have less land and are unable to find work and are in with lower educational level. Female- headed households have less access to productive resources and are more prone to poverty.

CHAPTER IV

LITERATURE REVIEW ON RURAL WOMEN IN TURKISH AGRICULTURE

There are few studies on rural women in Turkish agriculture. Analysis of rural women is done as one part of the general study about agriculture. Studies which focus directly on rural women by analyzing patriarchal structures are not seen. If the studies on rural women in Turkish agriculture are reviewed the following the process which are mentioned previously where rural women as a category, gender, household, production, reproduction, sexual division of labour, women's identity, sexuality, patriarchy, land and migration. I will only mention the rural studies which focus on women.

A more recent and comprehensive study by Sirman (1988) related her own study to the general womens movement in Turkey. According to Sirman, as a dominant paradigm modernisation effected the study of rural women in Turkey. With a "progressivist perspective" this paradigm conceived rural women as the most "backward" or underdeveloped representatives of a nation. The other is the evolutionist Marxist paradigm by giving priority to economy could not change the dominant perception of rural women. For Sirman very few studies were based on the lived experience of women they portray. Women are conceptualized in categories such as education, work and reproduction.

For Sirman (undated), anthropologists like Erdentug (1956, 1959); Emiroğlu (1972) in their village studies women in relation to marriage and family and to a lesser extent to the division of labour according to gender. For Sirman, main points of these monographs are cultural values like virginity and modesty of women that are examples of traditionalism and the role of Islam which give a subordinate role to women in society.

Another group is Abadan-Unat (1967), Kandiyoti (1977) and Coşar (1978) for Sirman they mention on the corporation of women from traditionalism to modernity and their spatial correlates are the village, large urban center and the small town.

For Sirman, there are new approaches for studying rural women in Turkey. The first is the symbolic approach by Meeker (1976) and Delaney (1984) that focuses on the concepts of honour and the notions of state and community affecting gender constructions. (Sirman, undated) The other approach is by Starr (1984) and Yalçın (1986) have efforts to show women as active agents which define the contexts in which they exist. (Sirman, undated) These are all anthropological studies. Sirman as a social anthropologist claims that:

"Research of women is a relative novelty in Turkish studies especially in the studies of the countryside. Rural women have been used as the very image of female subordination in Turkey" (Sirman, undated).

In her study, Sirman (1988), in her fieldwork, in a cotton producing village of Western Turkey, she writes about the power of women seen in networks among women within the neighbourhood and women who are in a similar position in life. She exemplifies this as the friendship and nurture links of young unmarried women with other young married women within their neighbourhood. With this network, households help one another

and this network gives an identity to woman in the village whether they are respectable or not in the village. By this network, women gain the information about other households. The knowledge about them affects the status of women in the village. This identity which is taken from outside of the household affects the power relations in the household. For Sirman, a woman giving birth to sons gains status and in her old age she has power over others by bringing in brides (Sirman, 1988).

In short, to exist in the village women have to have relations with other women and have their place in the mechanism of social change. And the social role of the women is not only explained by her role in production but by her place in this network. With this information network, a woman can reach concrete knowledge which affects her household in the village (Sirman, 1990: 231-52). Sirman, in her anthropological studies, mentioned on the situation of rural women as research subject, on women's identity by affection of networks in the village and household and tries to put women on a general theoretical structure by overviewing the anthropological and sociological studies. In Sirman, the main unit of analysis is household.

Ferhunde Özbay (1982) argues the participation of female labour outside the home and its effects on the status of women. Participation of rural women in the labour force affects the patterns of landholding. In family labour farms the active participation of women in farm work changes according to the mechanization and the type of crop cultivated. As a result of land insufficiency men seek seasonal work and women control the agricultural production and are involved in craft-production such as carpet-weaving. Landless peasant women worked as seasonal wage workers such as cotton pickers. Women of large landowners do not participate in the productive activities. Also, participation in rural labour was the indicator of law status for women. Education has no effect for participating labour force. The more educated women worked less in the fields (Özbay, 1982).

Özbay emphasizes the participation of women in labour outside the home and its effect on the status of women. By status it is mentioned here the social and economic situation of women according to land ownership in the village. She emphasized the landholding patterns and its effects on production and male-migration and effects of male migration on the women left behind.

According to Deniz Kandiyoti, rural women make up the majority of women in developing countries and rural women are prime targets for policy-makers and they concerned with women's high-fertility, their illiteracy, their low labour productivity and the inability of rural women to avail themselves of advanced technology or modes of organisation. Kandiyoti wrote about the women in rural production systems and conceptual issues. She saw an advancement in the rights of women in the Third World. She asks the question why and how women were subordinated as "women" as "rural women" as "poor women" or as "Third World" women. For her, the objective consequence of the sexual division of labour in the households low wages. To see the effects of development on women it is necessary to take comprehensive account of the pre-incorporation productive systems and of the sexual division of labour within it. It is necessary for an analysis of change that the essential factors are different sorts of pre-capitalist modes of ownership, control and allocation and the nature of kinship systems. An understanding is required of the specificities of different process of rural transformation and how these are related to the regional, national and international levels. Lastly, it is necessary to be aware of the processes of household formation and internal dynamics of household which is cultural reproduction area of women's subordination (Kandiyoti, 1985).

Kandiyoti proposes that how we study or analyse rural women by that requirements for seeing the effects of development on rural women. Those requirements show the necessary subjects for analysing the rural women. She

argues that in Turkey, the proportion of economically active women in agriculture is equal to that of men because all members of the rural household contribute to production in the same way. She proposed that with the particular mode of transformation of the rural community, the patterns of women's contribution to agricultural production are easily followed. In Turkey, it is possible to detect the intensification of women's input into agricultural production (Kandiyoti, 1980; reviewed by Kandiyoti, 1985).

Moreover she argues that contribution of women to agricultural production is restricted to very minor tasks in the case of capital-intensive, mechanized cereal farming the nature of the crop leaves no room for labour-intensive operations and the labour-saving nature of technology. But the labour of women is critical among smallholders who cultivate cash crops such as cotton. Bureaucratic commercial dealings and mechanized tasks are performed by unskilled men, unremunerated and seasonal operations are performed by women. Some families have to find other sources of subsistence income other than land in the case of marginal or suboptimal holdings. Then migration of men for permanent and seasonal employment cause the "feminization" of agriculture. If men migrate from regions where labour-intensive crops such as tea, tobacco or hazelnuts are cultivated this does not bring equality in sharing of production. If men do not find an alternative source of employment he remains idle and all the work is done by women especially in regions where labour-intensive crops are cultivated. The same situation is valid in the regions where the carpet-weaving of women is the main source of the village economy. But in the southern plain of Çukurova all men, women and children have to participate in seasonal wage work. Those workers are landless agricultural workers (Kandiyoti, 1985).

Kandiyoti's studies depend on a comprehensive analysis on rural women in production. Her main unit of analysis is production and not the

women's identity and the factors which affect the daily life of women. In her study about carpet-weaving, Günseli Berik (1989) examines "how gender subordination is transformed through the study of women's participation in wage labour in carpet workshops in rural Turkey." (Berik, 1989: 1).

According to Berik (1987), carpet weaving is an activity based on women's subordinate position in the household and poor and landless households depend on weaving income. These characteristics of the rural weaving labour force give advantages to the merchants and exporters. There are two places of weaving at home and at the workshop. Workshop weavers have the least autonomy than home weavers. Home weavers can control the pace of their work and make decisions about the allocation of their time among tasks. The contribution of weavers to the household income is determined by the relation of production in weaving, household composition and the prevailing agrarian structure. With the type of crop cultivated, the agrarian structure affects the volume of weaving and the demands on women's labour time. But the reproductive activities of women don't affect the weaving (Berik, 1987).

According to Berik, in small rural communities, weaving both in the home and workshops "doesn't challenge existing gender relations and the ideology embedded in the daily social practices and do not confer power on women. The conditions under which weavers engage in paid work both depend on and reproduce their subordinate position as women. Workshop weaving is not the solution to the lack of decision-making power of women" and "women continue bearing other productive work responsibilities in addition to all the reproductive tasks, upon all of which is weaving superimposed, there by creating year-round work for women." (Berik, 1987).

As seen in the analysis of Günseli Berik, having waged-work other than productive and reproductive activities in agriculture not give anything to

women. No difference occurs in the position of women in the household and in the community. Her main unit of analysis is production and gender.

Morvaridi (1990) has studied gender relations in agriculture and women in Turkey. How the penetration of market economics into agriculture transforms the agrarian structures. What about the effects of the commercialisation of agriculture on the farming household in Turkey? There is a division of labour by gender which becomes acute with women's participation in the production process. In his study in Ak village which is representative of field cultivation and land ownership. The patriarchal household as the economic unit of the village has as its head the eldest male family member who is the owner of land and the means of production and decision-maker and commands respect from all other members. Inheritance of land is along gender lines. Investment and consumption depends on the evaluation of household head. Household reproduction depends totally on women but she is excluded from the control of household economic resources (Morvaridi, 1990: 1-13).

The study of İsmail Beşikçi (1969) about the Alikan tribe in Eastern Turkey is reviewed by Deniz Kandiyoti (1985):

"Beşikci stresses the respect and status which hard work earns tribal women. Beşikci informs us that the value of giving birth to a child, particularly male, is so high that its only when a woman becomes a mother that she can cover her head with a white headscarf, which makes her a social adult. Barrenness is always interpreted as the woman's failing and is the worst fate that can befall her. The level of visibility in male-female hierarchies may vary. For instance, they were very visible among the Alikans" (Beşikçi, 1969; reviewed by Kandiyoti; 1985)

Fatma Mansur Coşar (1978) studied women in Turkish society. She studies the Turkish peasant woman beginning with her birth. In villages, birth registration of girls is done very late, together with another birth in the family or sometimes never. Girl child is called as a guest means she will leave the paternal home. A girl child is thought of "womenly virtues of discretion, chastity and obedience and segregated from boys except at school. The important aim for a girl to be a good mother and homemaker and a good fieldworker. In marriage, virginity is important: the marriageable girl should be known to be "untouched by any hand". After the first night of marriage the virginity of girl is announced to the village by female relatives of the husband (Coşar, 1978: 124-140).

For Coşar, peasant woman bears children delivers the child everywhere and does all dairy work. In the poorest areas she emigrates with her children. Both in large - holding and small landholdings agricultural work rests on women's shoulders. Women may acquire authority in some situations because of the responsibilities they take. In the Black Sea region wives of sailors have the authority of decision-making. In other regions, being a first wife of a large land holder carries with it authority and prestige. Politics are left to men. Economic pressure on land causes a movement internal migration. Migration occurs from villages to small town and to large cities. Unlanded men migrate with their families with the hope of finding work (Coşar, 1978: 125-140).

Seniye Çınar who is an agricultural engineer has a good analysis of peasant woman in agriculture which gives pleasure to a feminist sociologist.

Çınar Claims that:

"In the Black Sea region the hazelnut and tea crops are entirely produced by women. In Central Anatolia wheat is worked by women, from the planting until the harvest,

and it is women who carry it to the mills. In the Southeast region of Çukurova most of the work connected with the production of sugar beets and tobacco is done by women. Cotton in the hot and primitive region of Çukurova in the Southeast is picked by women and girls. Girls and small boys walk for miles on the plateaux of Eastern Anatolia watching the cattle and gathering their droppings." (Çınar, 1975: 5 quoted in

Coşar, 1978, 130)

As reviewed by Coşar, for Çınar, women turn the result into bricks for fuel and building and care of all animals belong to women and in the West regions of Turkey, it is the women who pick and process almonds, olives, citrus and figs. The men only do plowing (Çınar, 1975; reviewed by Coşar, 1978: 30).

As we saw that there are a limited number of studies which analyse rural women in Turkey in comparison with Latin America and India which comprises a huge amount of studies on rural women on all subjects. More or less they can find solutions for the liberation of rural women.

In Turkey, women's studies about rural women have no organic relation with the women movement in Turkey. A feminist perspective is needed to studying women. The analysis of women whether rural or urban must be the work of a feminist researcher or theoretician by dissolving it with a detailed analysis.

CHAPTER V

WOMEN IN SULTANBEY: MARXIST-FEMINIST POSTMODERNIST PERSPECTIVE

5.1. A Methodological Introduction

At the beginning, Marxist-Feminist Postmodernism did not determine a methodology for a feminist research. It didn't have to have this kind of methodology. The condition for the existence of a methodology was being against the positivist methodology and traditional social science. Positivist methodology has a patriarchal basis and for Du Bois this basis rendered women unknown and virtually unknowable (Du Bois, 1987: 107). According to Westkott, traditional social science concentrates on the distortion and misinterpretations of women's experience (Westkott, 1979: 423).

Moreover,¹ Margrit Eichler proposed therefore women are isolated, marginal and dependent than it is easy for others to speak for them. Historically, in the social sciences men have been attempted to do that speaking (Eichler, 1977: 418). According to Griffin (1988), if one wants to see the reflection of male bias in social science one has to look at how samples are selected and how questions are phrased in the absence of categories and concepts of variations in women's experience by time and place.

According to Billson, there are several myths in the feminist critique of traditional social science methodology. These myths are the myth of a single society, the myth of objectivity, the myth of historical and cultural abstraction, the myth of non-interference and the myth of authority. Against those myths Billson proposed (PVM) Progressive Verification Method as a research approach designed to enhance the ability of women social scientists to relate to women as subjects rather than objects of research in a collaborative mode of inquiry which brings us to doing research "with" women rather than "on" men. This PVM defines research "subjects" as equal participants in the research process. Against the myth of single society for Billson the essential thing is to include gender as a major category and a variable in all studies and to design studies that focus specifically on women's concerns.

Against the myth of objectivity, Smith (1980) claims that the norm of objectivity mystifies rather than explains human relationships and alienates the "object" of research through anonymous and impersonal methods.

In contrast to objectivity, Westkott advocates "intersubjectivity" as an appropriate feminist research approach to acquiring knowledge and understanding of social reality; "it is only where women are also brought in as the subjects of knowledge that the separation between subject and object breakdown" (Westkott, 1979: 425).

Klein (1983) believes that feminist (communal) research should bridge this gap through "conscious subjectivity".

According to Mies (1983: 122), the myth of "value free research, of neutrality and indifference" toward research subjects, should be replaced by "conscious partiality". This may involve some degree of identification with those whom we study rather than neutrality. In discussing the myth of historical and cultural abstraction, a feminist methodology implies "seeing things in context" (Du Bois, 1983: 111) and contexts differ drastically for

women in various places and times.

Assumptions of universal patriarchy; devaluation of women; male control of the material base of daily life; women as outsider, other, deviant and alienated are all bound to the narrow context of white social science (Rosser, 1988).

This interpretation of women's place is hardly generalizable to woman in all cultures, yet we have treated it as such. Cannon argues that qualitative research is biased insofar as it ignores women of color and working class women:

"Correcting this imbalance in feminist scholarship requires theoretical conceptualizations that include all dimensions of inequality, more complex research designs, and strategy that confront the obstacles to the incorporation of diverse groups of women" (Cannon et al, 1988: 450).

In discussing the myth of non-interference, positivism traditionally assumes that the research process is (and should be) non-interfering. Measuring rates or types of domestic violence is the research mandate; changing those rates or women's perceptions of them is not.

The feminist perspective, by contrast, asks "knowledge for what?" In some cases, measuring is not the end of the researcher's job. We cannot measure a social phenomenon without affecting it even if only to raise people's awareness of it. Interference involves risks and perplexities. Even if non-interference and value-neutrality are mythical creatures, care must be taken to be aware of our biases, values, and the ways in which our research approach might affect subjects (Billson, 1991). We are as female researchers, also the other in our own cultures: we must be self-reflective about our own

positions. In important ways, the oppression of women cuts across all societies.

The last myth is the myth of authority: Traditional social science establish the researchers as authority, an expert who will be able to describe, predict and control social reality, even if the subjects of that research are ignorant of the study's existence, of its findings, or disagree with those findings.

Feminist methodology implies a nonhierarchical, nonauthoritarian, nonmanipulative relation to the subject (Reinharz, 1983: 181). Only women can serve as authorities on their own lives.

As Smith argues, "the sociological inquirer herself is a member of the same world she explore active in the same relations as those for whom she writes" (Smith, 1987: 142).

As women have said to each other while we try to make sense out of gender relations and women's issues, "we are really sisters."

At last, the progressive verification method, is a vehicle for gathering data that can be used to build a theory of shifting gender roles that embraces the complexity of within-gender experiences, as mediated by other central socio-cultural characteristics such as race, class, age and residence, explicitly delineating the distinctions between men's world and women's world. Gender is conceptualized as a critical dimension of socio-cultural organization, as well as a fundamental theoretical category (Billson, 1991).

The stages of the progressive verification method is the preparation, contact, data-gathering, writing, community reflection and revision.

The last myth of feminist methodology is the inevitability of female oppression. The task of feminist methodology is to break out of the all women

are oppressed everywhere and in all times. The difference between a social science about women and a social science for women is our ability to develop a theory that can be used to overcome the subordination and devaluation of women wherever it, in fact exists. A feminist methodology also includes overcoming our own assumptions about subordination and devaluation (Billson, 1991).

With perspective of Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist, it seems difficult to form a research method. In Turkey, developing a feminist methodology of research is a new area. There are problems of women's studies in Turkey and these are firstly discussed by Yildiz Ecevit (1992) defining what a woman study is has to be a study which is done for women by other women. These women's studies embrace the lessons about women and woman's studies programmes and non-academic women's studies. For her, the problems are proposed as lacking in feminist researchers who use feminist theories which lay out the traditional hegemonic and classic theories. The discussions about feminist thinking and theory and feminist knowledge are deficient and there is the limitation in the discussions of theory, methodology and method. The third problem is that necessary concepts and categories for understanding women's problem are not taken in a detailed analysis. The fourth is not to marginalize theory in the empirical debates. Ecevit proposes the results of those problems is the absence of a theoretical framework and have not brought the progressive, different, original methods to the newcomers of women's studies. For her, in Turkey, the feminist movement couldn't be supported by feminist theoretical discussions and relieves feminist movement powerless. Feminists can't spread widely their perspectives with the richness of feminist thinking (Ecevit, 1992: 11).

Ecevit (1992) proposes pre-conditions of a feminist methodology and research that the refusing and problematizing the traditional social science

methods; to escape from the anxiety of objectivity; woman is the "subject" of research rather than "object"; involved in a reciprocal influence with group of the women researched; not being an authority and controller in research; the most radical supplement of feminists is that researcher cannot be value-neutral and escape her value-judgement; and using qualitative methods in place of quantitative methods provides an equality between the researcher and researched and the perspectives of researched are put into account by the researcher. People are seen as objects by quantitative methods not as humans (Ecevit, 1992: 13).

By following the conditions above, a feminist method will be attempted in this village study. It is seen that study is full of the explanation and interpretation of concepts about rural women. According to Marxist-Feminist perspective, methodologically the research is with concepts to patriarchy and patriarchal structures.

The Marxist-Feminist Postmodernist perspective necessitates the analysis of one concept or a category like rural woman. But this village study includes so many categories which brought the interpretation of the research about rural women is difficult. The conditions below were attempted to be realized:

1. Interviews are done with women individually by women researchers.
2. Knowledge about village and their life is taken from women by women researchers.
3. General knowledge about the village and history of the village is inevitably taken from men by the male researcher.
4. Focus group studies are done according to categories like girls, brides and older women by women researchers with the aim of conscious raising.

5. The women researchers include, as participants, their own experiences to the research.

The most supportive method which can be proposed to the women researcher is focus-group method. It has to be done as the analysis of only one concept or category like rural women.

Rural women will be analysed in production, household, reproduction, gender, patriarchy, women's identity, sexual division of labour, land and migration.

It will be seen whether this method realizes the analyses of rural women in Sultanbey in Bolu.

5.2. Agriculture In Bolu

The agriculture is important in economy of Bolu. The natural conditions of the Bolu cause variations in the agricultural production. Agricultural land is limited by a wide area of forest. The mechanization of the agriculture and the production for the market is widespread. A small population is interested in agriculture which has important supplement to the economy of Turkey for the underdevelopment of industry. Agricultural productivity is higher than the mean in Turkey.

There was no growth in the areas of planting and production during the period of republic. At the ends of 1970 was a decrease in the areas of planting. Wheat production and planting levels preserved their levels and a development was seen in the production of potatoes. Wheat is produced only for subsistence in Bolu and the production of tobacco lost its importance totally. This was development in the production of fruits and vegetables. Hazelnut save produced commercial purpose. The second important fruit in Bolu are apple. Cabbage production is 3.5% of Turkey's production. Animal

husbandry is not a widespread activity except poultry. The most widespread area of agricultural activity is forestry. In the 1988 potatoe production the amount of area sown was 10.498 hectare and area harvested was 10.498 and the total amount of potatoes production is 305.519 ton. In the production of sugar beets, the amount of area sown was 2.572 hectare and area harvested was 2.572 hectare and the total amount of sugar beets producted was 83.496 ton. In the production of wheat, in 1988, the amount of areas sown is 82.383 hectare and areas harvested is 82.383 hectare and the total amount of wheat production is 203.811 ton.

The main important agricultural products of Bolu ore wheat, barley, oats, maize, hazelnuts, sugar beets, potatoes and apple. The number of villages is 783. The amount of cultivable land is 89%, area sown is 19%, forest area is 53% and the amount of pasture is 17% and the amount of area unsuitable for cultivation is 11%. The total number of tractors in 1998 was 11.244 (S.I.S. 1988, 166).

5.3. What About Sultanbey

In Sultanbey, there are 100 households now. There were 65 households 20 years ago. There is an increase in the number of households because of new marriages. One of the sons stays within the household of father, other will have new households. Electricity was brought in 1968 to all households. All of the villagers are native except six households. Three of them are "laz" who came from Gümüşhane. Other three households migrated from Seben which is the town of Bolu. They have their own accent. They have solidarity among them but marriages are rare between them and villagers.

Laz villagers had a water mill in the village and a quarrel had occurred between them and villagers 15 years ago. Before 1975, there were

fountains in the village for drinking and using water. These fountains were built in 1950 in every district of the village and laundries were built beside these fountains. Before 1950, water came from the wells. In 1975, a water depot was built by the villagers and water was pumped to all the houses by Y.S.E. There is only one telephone in the village in the home of the head man (muhtar). It is said that all households must have telephone because there are thirty-five trucks in the village. When they go to transport something they may want to telephone their homes.

The distance between the Bolu and the Sultanbey is six kilometers. There are municipal buses two kilometers away. Most of the villagers have their own cars to go to the city.

In the past, there was a small passenger bus running between Bolu and Sultanbey. Now, there are 35 trucks, 40 cars, 1 small truck, 15 motorcycles and 100 tractors in the village. Some households have 2 or 3 tractors one of them is used for carrying and the other is used for plowing. Most of them are bought by hiring except tractors.

The primary school was built in 1949. There are six of classes which one is the nursery class. There are 50 students in the school. All of the boys are sent to secondary school but not the girls. They will be sent to the school in Bolu than it is difficult to control them. There is the cooperative for the development of village which has no help to the village why the head of the cooperative can do nothing. Cooperative can't give equal service to all the villagers. There is no grocer or coffee-house in the village why the Bolu is near to village.

There is no workshop in the village. In the other villages there are workshops to cut wood. After potatoes production, transportation began with trucks to Istanbul and to other cities.

There has been a changes in the population of households because of marriages and the disagreement between sister-in-laws, brides and mother-in-laws, brides and husband's sister. It is seen that the community cooperation in the village is necessary. Because they use their own labour the money of the villagers is valuable and that are stingy. It can be said that important social and economic changes in the village is seen with the coming income of potatoes. New houses are constructed in the place of old ones according to needs of the household members. Newspapers are not sold in the village because men buy and read them in the Bolu and they bring the newspaper to the village. Young women and girls read newspapers but older women prefer television.

All of the villagers can read and write except old women. While electing the head man of the village they give importance to his entrepreneurship with telling about the problems of the village and forerunner to solve them. It is not important the political party which he belongs to.

There have been significant changes concerning the traditions of wedding feast that was good entertainment by drinking and eating. Now, traditions are changed religiously that an Islamic ceremony was performed. There have been religious ceremonies performed for 10 years. A wedding costs approximately thirty million Turkish Lira. Brides want so many things before the marriage ceremony like refrigerators, televisions and washing machines. A sewing machine has to be bought to a bride as an old tradition.

There is no medical centre in the village the nearest is in Doğancı village one kilometer distance from Sultanbey.

It is said that changes in prices of products, mostly potatoes depend on supply and demand. There has not been an important change in price of wheat. But significant changes occur in the price of potatoes which determines the future of the villager. Less demand more supply means decrease in prices

and a difficult year for the villager. It is important to have more products while the demand is more and supply is less for villager.

Roads were built with the labour of villagers the state supplied a loader machine and a grayder by the tractor of villagers. Bridges on the roads were built by the villagers. School buildings and mosque also built by the state and electricity and water is brought by the state.

The village support the right wing political parties. Before the revolution of 1980, they supported AP, now ANAP. There have not been changes in the political preferences. Fourteen people who have not changed their political preference since 1923 supporting left wing parties.

The total land of the village is 3 million 7 hundred square meter. 3/4 of this land is cultivated area and the remainder is for pasture.

In the past, most of the land of the village was owned by people who lived in the city. They gave their land to the shareholders. Then these fields were sold to the villagers.

Approximately, 10% of the cultivated land belong to people who live in other villages. Most of them are owned by the girls who were brought to other village as brides. These fields were given to shareholders.

The same situation is valid for the households who are brought brides from other villages might have fields there. The average amount of the land for the substitution of a household is 10.000 squaremeter which head of the household has to have a job as a civil servant in a government office. For the total substitution only from the land necessitates a 30.000 squaremeter field which household head has no other job.

There is a distribution of land in the village below:

Land	Households
1-10.000 m2	7%
10.000-30.000 m2	70%
30.000-50.000 m2	15%
50.000-80.000 m2	5%
100.000-150.000 m2	3%
No land	3%

Table: 1.

All of the landowners stay in the village. Only one person stays in the village comes frequently during the fieldwork time. Seasonal wage-labour is not hired. Wage-labour is hired at the most for 10 days. These are women wage labourers who are brought from the "gecekondü" areas of Bolu. There are women in the village who work for the daily wage during the fieldwork.

There are three households with no land. The other 97 households have land but most of the land are not registered to them but on their fathers. Practically land is divided with no land registry. There is no household which does not cultivate its land.

Registration of the lands of village was done in 1965. Formal inheritance of land is done 3 to 10 years later after the father's death. It depends on the relations between brothers. Rich brother causes his brother to

lives in the city or any other where bought potatoes before and after harvesting. Villagers prefer merchants because they give high prices for the potatoes. All the heads of the households have another job in the city as civil servants or chauffeurs of their trucks or have coffee-house or shops in Bolu.

In the village women have heavy workloads because their husbands work in other jobs. The production process in agriculture is managed by rural women. Male work are relieved by women and waited for men. Rural women's labour is important in the village and it is seen no decrease in the need for women's labour why men have to work in other jobs. But rural women has never use the means of production to protect the men's place in production process. The reproduction process in totally controlled by women.

5.4. History Of Sultanbey

The history of village is known from the War of Independence. After the implementation of the Republic, the villages were divided. On the one hand there were the supporters of the Sultan. On the other hand, there were the supporters of Mustafa Kemal. There were so many guerrilla group in Bolu. Most of them are Abhazya and Çerkes. Nazım Bey who was the head of a guerrilla group distributed weapons to all the villagers, so villagers rebelled against Mustafa Kemal. This guerrilla group said Mustafa Kemal was a bolshevik and protected Sultan. Everybody in the village was brought to plateau during the war.

Soldiers of Kemal Atatürk were killed by the guerrillas. Most of the villages were burnt by them. During that times they only produced wheat and because all the men were at war, the production of wheat was done by women. Then soldiers of Mustafa Kemal won the war.

Sultanbey is an old village. There have been "Türk Beys" there.

Public of Abhazya and Çerkesia had no land. They came from Düzce and Adapazarı.

It is said that there was an Armenian district in the village which was irradiated from the village during the War of Independence. Armenian people were merchants who had shops in Bolu.-They were not labourers.

Sultanbey experienced earthquakes two times. The first in 1944 and caused the death of 25 persons. All houses in the village were destroyed. A crack had occurred under the village through Abant. Help did not come from the government because the earthquake happened during World War II. Two deputys from Bolu promised to send nails for the construction of new houses. The nails and timber were donated by the government. The second earthquake happened in 1953 but it did no damage to the village. Roads, electricity and water were brought to the village by Democrat Party. Both in the times of Democrat Party and after the stroke of the 12th September it was not produced potatoes. It was difficult to produce wheat with primitive conditions. It is easy now with tractors. Potatoes were produced after 1980 with the ANAP government . Potatoes was produced mostly in Adapazarı. A determined amount of potatoes was brought by the Chamber of Agriculture and was experienced in Sultanbey Village. A good result was reached with this experience. Seed of potatoes were sown in all the lands of the village and satisfactory products were taken by the villagers. With the coming of fertilizers potatoes were the main source of high income in the village. Before the potatoe production, men worked in the lime kiln carrying wood from the forest for the lime kiln. The village land was owned by the important people of the city like the chairman of the municipality of Bolu. Land was sold by them and it was bought by the villagers. A quarrel occurred with another village Çetmi. It was decided on the court that a cock crowed from the land belonged to. The crowing of the cocks was heard from Sultanbey and land was therefore

owned by the villagers of the Sultanbey.

In 1965, it had wanted the "firman" which is imperial edict of the land by the servant of the cadastre. This "firman" was issued by the Sultan which gave a forest to Sultanbey was not accepted by the court and forest was owned and cut by the state. In old times, womens heads were covered with white scarfs only eyes were seen. It is said that women's workload was lighter than now. If men was in the army women did the production.

It is said that the work was lighter than now. But now it is worked wage-labourers. Food and clothing was limited in past. In past, women were beaten if they didn't listen to men. There were prostitutes in the city and men were gone their home. In old times, men had more than one women and wanted obedience from women.

In wedding feast, women were danced by men and a brideprice was given for the girls.

5.5. A Daily Life of Women In Sultanbey

Life of women in the village consists of productive and reproductive activities. Daily life of a woman is formed according to these activities. Household division of labour was done between women. Every man in the village has a job or a workplace in the city or in another village. Every head of the household has enough subsistence income for the substitution of the family other than the sources of income from the land. All households get up at 6 o'clock during the time of fieldwork. Life is divided between the fieldwork time and non-fieldwork time. During the time of labour. This intensity occur on the behalf of the agricultural production why reproductive activities may be challenged. Fieldwork time is in the summer. During the summer, older women of households may brought to stay in the plateau of the

village with the animals. While working on the land animals create problems women have no time to take care of them. Those older women, in other words, mother-in-laws who cannot work on the field are brought to the plateau with the animals. In the plateau of the village, most of the villagers have their own house. During the summer, plateau would be village of the old women. Their husbands are not brought there. Pasturing of animals in the plateau is done by a herdsman. With this situation the disagreement between the mother-in-laws and brides is prevented in the household. It is gives freedom to brides during the summer and fieldwork. If this is not the situation brides have to care for animals during the fieldwork.

After getting up in the morning, breakfast is eaten, the house is cleaned with chilking and produced yoghurt, cheese and fresh butter. It is done the cleaning of herd, going to the field. If there are two women in the household, one of them must stay at home. One cleans the house, prepares dinner and lunch and looks after the children. After dinner, they watch the TV. Washing the dishes and the other housework of evening belongs to other woman who came from the field. Some of the women work for a daily wage on the land of the neighbour. Some of them perform "ödünçleme" in the place of the daily wage. During the winter, there is no fieldwork. Neighbours visit each other. Most of women do lacework at home.

5.6. Household

The household is the source of sexual division of labour and reproduction. The household is that main unit the preserve patriarchy and patriarchal structures and processes and land. The patriarchal structure of production process creates the division of labour between the sexes which comes from of the ownership of land. The owner of land determines the sexual division of labour and reproductive process. If the woman is not part of the

production process she has to stay in the house and perform household activities. Helping each other occurs between women neighbours.

Every activity in the household is under the control of husband and his male relatives. A woman can work on the field as a wage-worker, especially girls do this. In the household, television programmes are selected by the men. Household members have to watch what he wants to watch. If he doesn't want to watch T.V. he can turn off the T.V. and nobody can challenge him.

The method of marriage which is known as "görücü" method is created according to the men. In choosing the girl, an authority is given to the relatives of men and they can use this authority after the marriage is conducted. Religious wedding is a necessity whether formal marriage is performed or not. Marriage event needs the approval of God. For the health of the marriage is performed by man and woman which the "imam" issues it. In past marriages, brideprice created so many problems for men now they don't want a brideprice for their girls.

The condition of being a good bride is to show respect to the husband and husband's family, and husband's property. With the death of mother in law her duties are transferred to the daughter in law.

Materially and morally heavy loads are on the shoulders of women in the household. The responsibility of children, housework and animals belong to them. The same situation is valid for the women of large landholding households. There are differences in the reproduction process for the women of both large landholding and small landholdings.

Women work in the fields during the time of fieldwork. They do "ödünçleme" with neighbours and relatives. "Ödünçleme" means to help neighbours and relatives when their is heavy work in the field; Sometimes

women work for daily wage on the fields of their neighbours and relatives. This daily wage is not given to husband.

During the fieldwork times, they cannot watch T.V. If there is a film about villagers and about the health of mother and child they will watch. They prefer "arabesk" and folk music. They watch Turkish films and film series. They are affected by advertisements. From the influenced to buy detergenets. Only one woman bought a toaster for she saw on television. They get ideas about cooking from T.V.

The average marriage age for girls in the village is seventeen. They married the ages between fifteen and twenty-two. They married without seeing their husbands. They married with "görücü" method. In "görücü" method, elder relatives go and see girls and choose one of them for him without seeing each other. In old marriages they are performed the religious wedding first and then formal wedding is performed. Sometimes formal wedding is performed after many years.

The situation in new marriages is different. Firstly a formal wedding is performed and then religious wedding is performed on the day of wedding ceremony before the first night of marriage.

Every woman in the village marry with a brideprice. The brideprice is given for them according to inflation. None of them will get brideprice for their daughters. Brideprices which given for the women in the village differentiates between 300 Turkish Lira and 20.000 Turkish Lira. Fathers will not want a brideprice for their daughters because it would be difficult to paying brideprice for them. The marriage age of husbands is between sixteen and nineteen years old. A good bride respect her husband and her husband's family. She has to perform housework and fieldwork perfectly. She must cover her head with a scarf. She has to ask permission from her mother-in-law

to do anything. She has to do what her husband, her mother-in-law and her father-in-law tell her to do.

To be a good mother-in-law, a woman must be a good bride first. If their mother-in-law is not good, they try to be good brides. Everybody thinks herself a good bride but it must be asked to the mother in law. Bad one is a good example for being good. If mother-in-law of a bride dies, the duty of a bride dies, the duty of a bride is to perform the duties of mother-in-law from now on. Bride has to think every work whether productive or reproductive. Women cry more than men because men have solid hearts. For women give birth to children they have soft hearts.

For the unity of the family, a bride has to perform the duties of her dead mother-in-law. If she doesn't do this, the unity of the family will be destroyed. If her father-in-law is a young widower, she has to search for another wife for him. A woman doesn't have to tell her husband everything. A woman mustn't tell to her husband about the secrets of her family. If her mother-in-law or relatives of her husband. Insults her she mustn't tell. If she tells it will cause a quarrel or a blood feud. She cannot complain about her mother-in-law, her mother, father and brother and sisters and her husband's sisters and brothers to her husband.

She can complain about people swearing at her and her children. A woman mustn't tell her husband about the secrets of women in the neighbourhood. If she tells this secret to her husband and inevitably her husband will tell this secret to neighbour's husband and a quarrel will occur between them. The neighbour's husband may beat his wife. It would be gossiping. First permission to do something is necessary from husband and secondly from the mother-in-law. Nobody challenges to women other than their husband, mother-in-law and father-in-law.

5.7. Production In Sultanbey

Production is in the prison of patriarchy with its powerful indicator of land and of sexual division of labour. With the social and economic developments there can be a change in the sexual division of labour then women have less time on field but her reproductive activities in the household don't change.

Land is an important factor ~~for the survival of patriarchy~~. Two households in the village is a good example of this. Those households brought husbands for their daughter. After the death of the woman's parents, all amount of land belongs to woman. In these households, all of the agricultural activity managed by women. They intervene in the decision-making for the products. In the village they known as male-woman because they are brave and can intervene in every process of production. All the decisions about land depend on these two women. Their husbands have another job in the city they only come at nights and at weekends to the village. On land activities, commands are given by them. They have more right on the income of the products than other women.

Every information about production process is known by women the amount fertilizer used, amount of potatoes produced. They know the costs of all the products. In the village there is production of potatoes, sugar beet and wheat.

With high income living conditions changed in a modernized way. Males in the village live like urban males. They go to the city every morning for their other jobs. During the day, women work on the land but the operation of the means of production is done by males during their leisure days. Although they have no time for fieldwork males try to find time for using means of production in the time of fieldwork.

Before 1975 this village was poor but with the coming of potatoes their land was valuable and huge amounts of potatoes brought the village to richness and comfort.

The women in the village exactly know the amount of products in their household. Also they know the amount of their land exactly too. The produce for the market are potatoes, wheat and seed of sugar beet. The owners of lands are male except two households. These two households ownership depends on woman which took groom because of they had no brother to inherit family land.

In this type of family, woman's family had no son and they had girls. They arranged a marriage for one of their daughters. This groom will come to the woman's home like a bride and bring nothing materially only his surname.

For the household consumption, onion, bean (fasulye), maize, squash (kabak), green pepper, puls (bakla), alfalfa (yonca), oats (yulaf) are produced for household consumption. The growing of these products are done by women only.

They sell the potatoes to the merchant and wheat to the "Office of Land Products". They depart a determined amount for yearly household subsistence both for potatoes and wheat. High amount of potatoes are produced by the villagers. The least amount of potatoes is produced by a household is 2 tons. Every woman knows the costs of products both for this year and last year. They don't sell all the potatoes at once. They sell some part of it according to their needs. They put other amount in a silo and will sell it according to the costs which changes through time. They gain high amounts of money from potatoes. This is reflected to their living conditions. Women sell yoghurt, milk and egg and butter(tereyağ) in the market in Bolu on Thursdays. Seed of beet is sold to "Office of Beet".

Villagers have used artificial fertilizer (sunni gübre) and insecticide for years. Every household has been used them for years. For a good harvest they have to use them, though they have lower "gelir". If they have no money for the fertilizer (gübre) and insecticide, they get credit from the cooperative to buy them. Whether they is expensive or not, every villager wants to use them and buy them:

In the village, there are all means of production for the production of potatoes, wheat and seed of beet. In every household, there is a tractor. And there are two tractors in some households. The means of production in the village are tractor, truck, tractor plow (pulluk), harrow (tırmık), (tırpan), (taral), milking machine (süt makinası), fertilizer distributor (gübre saçma makinası), potato planter (patates ekme makinası), wheat planter (buğday ekme makinası), (ilaçlama motoru), watering vehicle (sulama aleti), (römork), baller (saman balyalama makinası), (patates çizgi açma ve çapalama sabanı).

There is a (tomruk biçme atölyesi). In most of the households, there are private cars. All of these means of production are bought with the income of production of potatoes. All of these means from production are used by men. Owners of these means of production are men. Most of households have these means of production are men. Most households have these means of production. All of the households try to have all of these means of production.

They relieve old means of production. They get credit from the bank and cooperative with high rate of interest. There is a cooperative in Paşaköy and most of the villagers take credit from this cooperative. Some of the households take credit every year. They are accustomed to take credit even though they have money. Sometimes they get credit from the "office of beet". The debt this year will be paid next year. All of the households take credit in

the village but some of the women said that they didn't get credit.

Only one family couldn't pay its debts to the "Cooperative of Credit and Agriculture", but nothing happens. The husbands of some women are civil servants and paid the debt from his monthly wage.

5.8. Reproduction In Sultanbey

Reproduction finds its meaning both in household and in daily activities of women. Reproductive activities again comprise a sexual division of labour along with the sexuality of male. Reproductive activities are productive activities even though they do not depend on land. Reproductive activities are not patriarchal activities in their essence, because they do not comprise any ownership. In reproduction, nobody owns anything, such as land. Biological reproduction belongs to child birth of women. Reproduction comprises rearing the child and only the ownership of the child belongs to women. I tried to find the inheritance of the child which are inherited from mothers. Inherited are few things like a "çevre" a "scarf" or a cloth. But ownership of a child is not a material but a moral ownership. They are the concrete things which a woman can say that "they are belong to me".

Giving birth to children belongs to woman. The period of lactation and pregnancy and their problems are experienced by woman individually. But giving birth to a son belongs to man and giving birth to a daughter belongs to woman. The son belongs to the man patriarchally, because the worst event in the world is that nobody will own his land and nobody will cultivate his land. If he knows that somebody owns his land is the best event in the world. They are afraid of bringing a groom for owning his land. He needs other owners for his sexuality and his property. Who comes from his blood. Women do not have these kinds of anxieties because they have property in economic meaning.

As a biological reproduction activity, they ideally want two children a boy and a girl. Average number of children family's own in the village is there. They use birth control methods systematically and do not have not a lot of children. If having three children, what that one is girl and the other two is boys. Because the girl goes another village, another home, but the boys remain and wait the home of father. Some of the women say: "Only God knows the sex of the children".

If a girl elopes she cannot take her trousseau from father's home. Her family never gives the trousseau to her. All types of trousseaus are made by girls themselves. The most important trousseaus for a woman are; the lacework cover of bed and table cloth. Lacework is important in this village. Trousseaus of women mostly consist of lacework in the village. Girls make a handkerchief with lacework around it to give the men who will marry with them. They call this handkerchief a "çevre". Trousseaus aren't inherited from mother, because of these aren't a lot of trousseaus. Only one woman in the village makes a "scarf" for her daughter from her wedding dress. One of them will give her own "yazma" and "çevre" to her daughter. A "yazma" is a hand painted scarf.

The women in the village aren't bored with fieldwork. Only housework is boring for them. There is a division of labour that mother-in-law or bride prefers fieldwork. When mother-in-law goes to, the daughter-in-law stay at home to do housework. Despite its difficulty rural women prefer fieldwork and say that fieldwork is inevitable. Compared with fieldwork, housework seems easy for them. There is a division of labour between mother-in-law, bride, husband's sister and servant in the house for performing fieldwork and housework.

5.9. Sexual Division of Labour In Production In Sultanbey

Sexual division of labour in the village is related to the female reproduction and male sexuality. Sexuality determines the gender roles of men and women and it lies at the heart of patriarchy. Male sexuality manages the patriarchy and sexual division of originated from the patriarchal sources. Males believe that they have power to direct every social process. In short, they are phallogentric in determining their place in the sexual division of labour and other place-rely on women. Female reproduction is created from this determination.

The main source of patriarchy is land and the activities on land is divided between men and women on the behalf of the men. The heavy workload of fieldwork belongs to women. We can see a division of labour in the reproduction process. But this division of labour occurs between women of different ages and social hierarchies. During the time of fieldwork all activities are divided between them. But mother-in-laws and old women generally perform the work in the households. They are not given a heavy workload. Though old men and children help with both productive and reproductive activities the heavy work mostly fall on women and wives. Work related to animals are reproductive activities and old men participate in these activities. Male children help both production and reproduction though they have school or other jobs in the city. In the household division of labour, men have their job or work in the city. If he is old, he goes to the land for work and helps with housework. The jobs in the city are; owner of coffee, "muhtar", head of the cooperative, transporter (chauffeur in his truck), worker in the flour factory, civil servant in post office, machine operator in DSL, servant in KH, civil servant in TEK, chauffeur in Tarm II Müdürlüğü, chauffeur in DSL, retired from state hospital (devlet hastanesinden emekli).

Every man has his own job in the city other than agriculture. They

help with the agricultural activities. The activities and work of men on the land are: cutting the plant of sugar beet, balering with machine, putting the products in the sack, working with machines, plowing, planting potatoes with machine, cutting wood, carrying potatoes with truck or tractor, distributing fertilizer, throwing straw, carrying wheat with truck, disinfecting, harvesting, machine harvesting potatoes and etc.

Activities which old women perform on land are: cleaning shed, milking, harvesting potatoes, feeding the animals, cooking and washing the dishes, praying, gardening and looking after babies. After the bride is brought women don't work on land. They have work in the house.

Boys who are older than 12 years old go to the school. In their leisure time, they help on land. Boys who not go to the school work as apprentice in industrial sector, in factories, foreman of furniture, they help their fathers in their father's coffee houses.

Girls who are older than twelve years old: help their mother with housework. Some of them go to the school, watch television, they work for daily fee on land. Some of the girls are sent to a Kuran course under the name of course of carpet weaving. They stay in the course of Kuran as boarders. Girls who are older than 15 years old harvest potatoes, hoe, work on the land, do housework. Some of them go to the sewing course and they work for daily fee to prepare their trousseau.

In the village, every household has animals. These animals are cows, horse, donkeys, calfs. Cleaning shed, feeding the cows, milking, cleaning the chickens are belong to the bride and mother-in-law.

The mother-in-law wates over the animals, boys and sometimes old men feed of chickens and children gather eggs.

In summer, all the old women are taken to the high plateau of the

village. They bring the cows and calves with them. During the summer they stay there and make cheese, yoghurt and fresh butter on their homes in the plateau. All these products are made for the winter.

5.10. Migration

The general reason for the migration is the division of land with inheritance. With the increasing number of children, land has to be divided and some of the children have to migrate to city or other villages for other sources of income. It can be said that there is no migration in the village. There were two families which moved to the Bolu years ago. One person migrated to Germany years ago and constructed a fine house in the village. Young girls move to the village by marriages. A family had been lived in the village for fifteen years and they returned to village. Head of the family was a chauffeur there. By having a traffic accident he couldn't work. Her returned to village with his family. Men who work in the city have daily migration that they return to their homes at the evening.

5.11. Kinship And Relations In The Village

A good mother-in-law admire both her bride and her son with love and pity. She must see her bride as her daughter. If there is mother-in-law, the wife is always under control. If there is no mother-in-law a bride can sleep more. If a mother-in-law interferes everything, her bride doesn't want her. Some mother-in-laws make their sons angry with their wives, an angry son can beat his wife. This is a bad thing for the family.

A mother-in-law wants more service from the bride. They always talk and want something. If you live with your mother-in-law you cannot sit or

stay in bed easily. If you sit or sleep they wouldn't want you. All of the young wives said that they will not interfere to the works of their bride.

There are mother-in-laws which beat their daughters when married daughter-in-law wants to learn something, the mother-in-law may tell her. Firstly permission is asked from husband. If he is not at home she is asked from mother-in-law. If mother-in-law doesn't give permission, husband will not give permission either.

In the home they own, only their trousseaus which they brought from father's home. If she leaves home she will bring her clothes and trousseaus. If she has father's home she will not take her mattress and quilt. If she does not stay in father's home, she will bring a mattress and quilt with her.

Neighbourhood relations in the village is good. Intimate friends are chosen from among the brides of relatives. The brides uncle and aunt are intimate friends. Also, sister-in-laws are good friends.

In summer, during the time of fieldwork they cannot meet. In winters, they organize meetings among women. Most of these meetings depend on money. In every meeting, every woman brings an amount of money. This accumulated money is given to a different woman by drawing lots.

Old women come together to read the Kuran, "mevlüt" and "yasin". They perform religious activities. They make cakes, cookies and tea in these meetings. They do knitting, lacework and handicrafts. They give the patterns of those knitting and lacework to each other. They talk about pregnancy and menstruation. How many days passed from the menstruation time? etc. They don't talk about their secret things. Mostly, chatting is about sexuality. They talk about their mother-in-laws. If the woman is ill, her mother-in-law and children look after her. During the illness of her husband, she will look after

her husband. All of the households help each other during the time of fieldwork.

5.12. Patriarchy

Patriarchy is firmly related to both production and land. Land is owned by men. Production processes in the village are patriarchal processes and it realizes on land. Life in ~~the~~ village has a patriarchal basis. Patriarchy is formed according to the sexuality of men. Men own the land and life is planned according to production. It is thought by men that life in the village can be challenged by them. Cursing of men in the village shows both their dependence on sexuality of them and women. Patriarchal power depends on the sexuality of men. The sexuality of men gives them all power what they want to do. Everything can be controlled by patriarchal power. The focus of this power is women's sexuality and through this women's life. Control of household life depends on this power.

Bringing a husband to in the village affects the inheritance of land and an equality between man and woman is seen in those households. Women of those households are more autonomous than women of other households. Formal owners of land in the village are men. In only two families, formal owners of land are women. These two women brought husband because they have no brother to inherit land from their fathers.

Owners of the means of production are men and all of them are used by men. Men don't release the critical stages of production to women. Though they have work other than agriculture they go on to control the agricultural production in the village. During the plowing time, head of the household get permission from his office. Men curses in the village. When they get angry they always curse. The focus of cursing are his wife, his

children, his bride, women neighbours and everybody. Curses are directed to the sexuality of persons. From sexuality of men to the sexuality of other persons.

"...muna koyarım" : Means I can rape you and your female relatives, if I want.

"anani satarım" : Means the sexuality of your mother belongs to me. If I want I can preserve it. If I don't want, I can sell it.

"geçmişini ... iktigimin" : Means I am powerful against you and I can rape all your women ancestors.

"sülaleni ... iktigimin" : Against it is related to the all women in your family. I can rape all women in your family.

"eşsekoğlueşsek" : Means that ancestor of your family is coming from donkey.

"geçmişî boklu kadın" : Past of your family coming from savage. As a woman you are coming from savage.

5.13. Women's Identity

Women's identity comprises of sexuality and rural woman. It is both affected from sexuality of men and women. What makes a rural woman a rural woman is her place in production, reproduction, sexual division of labour according to gender roles. Gender roles are determined by their sexuality. Patriarchal structure of male sexuality affects both women's sexuality and her

life as a rural women. The education of women prevented by fathers. Because they are afraid of sexuality of other men that their daughter will be under the supervision of many men. It is secure to put her under the supervision of one man. She is preserved otherwise she is in danger.

Woman can differentiate their place easily in the village by being wife and daughter. They know that marriage transforms their identity in the village. By marriage there occurs a transformation in their sexuality from virgin to woman.

Their primary pure situation belongs to father's home. When a woman lives in the father's home she is preserved by her father with her sexuality and virginity. When she goes to husband's home, her sexuality changes and she will lose her virginity.

Fathers of village are successful in preserving their daughters because there is no event of returning to father's home because of non-virginity. If this is the situation, it is clear that father couldn't preserve his daughter from the supervision of other men.

Rural woman is not a modern woman because modern woman show her sexuality to other people. When you see a modern woman you can say she is open to everything. Rural woman is also an honest and religious woman. She is closed to everything which gives pleasure to women. And if she prays and reads the Kuran it will always good for her religioisity and honesty.

Permission is an important patriarchal process in the life of rural women. Rural woman has to get permission from a patriarchal authority what ever she does. Field and housework are her life. The second wife in the village is an difficult situation. Non of the women want a second wife with them to live in the same house.

Women who elope couldn't have gold. Gold of other women are sold for buying, tractors, houses, coffee-houses, fields, harvesters. If family has a debt to the bank or cooperative, the gold will be sold to of women in the households. The fields of women inherited from their family may be sold easily. But firstly, unproductive fields and fields which are far from the husband's village will be sold easily.

Older women don't attend primary school but other have graduated from primary school. If they went to school, they want to be nurses, widwives, and teacher. All women want their children to go school if their economic and social conditions allow it. They don't want to differentiate between their sons and daughters. But the priority is given to sons, because girls will go to the another house and they will not think their conditions socially and economically. But a boy has to have a job to supporting his family. Girls don't have these kinds of problems.

The education of women is prevented by their fathers. All of them couldn't go to other school because of their fathers. Mother has no role to decide whether a child will go to the school or not.

The other reason why girls will not brought to school is that some girls are chosen for the groom. If the family doesn't have a son, they choose one of their daughters for the groom and she can't go to school. All of the women in the village think that having a job will provide a comfortable life for them.

They say: "My family doesn't permit me to go to the school, but it is the father not the other members of the family. Another reason is that school is far from the village and they prefer boys for the necessity of going to the city for school. But Sultanbey is nearer to city in comparison to other villages.

If I ask women whether they are brides or daughters of somebody.

They say that they are brides in the husband's home but daughters in the mother's home. For being bride is different because one has her own child and husband. She has a life of her own with her family. In comparison to husband's home, one was free in her mother's home as a daughter. But first you are a bride and you are restricted. When you go to your mother's home you will feel who a guest, a refuge.

When one goes out of the door of father's home, both virginity and daughter ends at the same time and being bride begins. Ending of virginity means the ending of her past life in her father's home. The difficulty of adapting her self to a new life style and she has to adapt herself and forget the past.

Women who live in the city and go out are modern women. Head of modern woman is open and she wears according to fashion. Modern woman is a narcissist and meets her needs by herself. Modern woman is not a normal woman but they are normal. Researcher women are not modern women.

An honest woman has a scarf on her head, not gossiping, talk the truth, praying, honorable, do not challenge other individuals, wear long skirts, closed woman. Woman who does good facilities to other people and dependent to her husband with fidelity, who has no intercourse with other men is modern woman.

A religious woman is a closed woman. She is closed to everything. She prays and reads Kuran. She knows of the alphabet of Kuran. For them, the women of the village are not religious because they do nothing other than closing.

They say they are both mother and mother-in-law at the same time. The mother-in-law of both of their bride and groom but the mother of their own children. Women who live in the village works both on the field and at

home. Housework and fieldwork are her accustomed works. She must be a villager and look after her animals. She must be closed and pray. Village woman cannot go to anywhere she wants. She has to get permission from her father. Women who do not perform those activities cannot live in the village.

None of the men in the village brought another wife. Bringing another wife is the worst situation in the life of women. Woman who comes as a second wife is an irresponsible and selfish woman. If he isn't satisfied with one he can bring second. The second wife mustn't be permitted to live in her home with her children.

If husband forces the first wife to live with a second wife, a woman says she has two alternatives: to kill the second wife or to kill both the husband and second wife. If a woman says that she has been living in this household for years and cannot accept the second wife. The husband of jealous women must bring a second wife. If a husband bring the second wife, the first wife must go to the father's home. If a woman doesn't respect her husband, he will bring another wife.

5.14. Sexuality

Gender roles and patriarchal structures are determined by sexuality of men and women in society. Their sexuality determines their place in society. Among the women, the proportion of abortion and death birth is high. They don't want to be pregnant.

The birth control methods they know are: abortion, contraceptive, preservative, "spiral" which is a kind of intra uterus tool, folk remedy. In preparing a folk remedy, they put quinine in the crust of a lemon and put it to the uterus, because of this method most of the women don't have children for years.

They have no sexual expectations from their husbands. They depend on husbands on sexual matters. Sexual intercourse is never desired by women. If husband wants sexual intercourse there is no refusal of woman. Woman must not refuse man. Woman has to be ready from man. Abnormal intercourse is not accepted by woman. Offer of husband is a bad thing for woman. These kinds of offerings are accepted by bad woman and prostitute.

5.15. Land

In the village, the source of the income of households in not only land. It is attempted to have other sources of income other than land by having job in the city. It is necessary to have a monthly wage for the children for the villagers as a solution to the division of land. The number of children is determined according to the land facilities of households. Share holding is not widespread among the villagers. The land is only sold to buy another property. Other wise, the land is not sold. The owners of the land are men.

Women inherit fields from their family in their home villages. But they are far from the husband's village. They can't cultivate those lands. Sometimes they give it to the shareholder. Mostly, those fields are empty. Selling the field is limited. There are families which sold some part of their fields. Four years ago, a family sold four "dönüm" of their field.

Other villagers have neither sold nor bought land. Old persons give their fields to the shareholder became they can't cultivate it. The deed of the land belong to the fathers. Practically the land is divided between the brothers but not legally.

Every family cultivate its own land. Shareholding occurs between the brothers and sisters. For example, a woman inherits a field from her family but it is in a far village. She gives it to her brother as a shareholder to cultivate.

Or her brother buys her field.

Some of the families sold a part of their fields to buy trucks and tractors. The fields of the village are productive and suitable for cultivation. High income is provided from the fields.

Division of land causes landless children. They have to look for a job in the city. They have two choice whether they go to the school or go to the city for work.

From the fear of poverty, they have few children. The average number of children is three in the village. This number also proposes the problem of division of land. Some of the families try to buy land but nobody sell land in the village. Children have to have job which has a monthly wage. Now every head of the household has a job other than agricultural income.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

One of the main argument of this study resolves around the controversy and probably the conflict between the theoretical /conceptual nature and the empirical/concrete character of the studies. The limitations and shortcomings of an understanding and conceptualization of sociology as a summation of "empirical" researches would create important and lasting barriers in approximating the social reality.

The incorporation of the interrelationship between the conceptual and empirical spheres of any social issue investigated is the first and the unavoidable stage of any researches/study. However, it is taken that a theoretical analysis has to reflect itself in the political practice with a considerable contribution of an empirical aspect of a study. The methods used in the empirical study should be suitable to the political "aims" of the researcher which supports the women's movement. The unstructured and indepth interviews and planned "focus-group" discussions, as a conscious-raising method were used which are considered to be essential.

This study attempted to develop a radical epistemology with its Marxist-Feminist and Postmodernist theoretical framework and standpoint. The interpretations and the "findings" of this study are not considered as empirical, because the research on rural women is conceptualized as a political

practice and simply as a support for the theoretical structure as in the case of positivist perspective.

Since it has no theory of change and no political view, postmodernism can be used in all theoretical framework. It has the ability and the capacity to serve and contribute to all grand theories in widening their categories and conceptual structures as long as they are deconstructed. Here it is essential to the concepts of feminism, like sexual division of labour being reduced to capitalist division of labour.

Marxism is taken in this study as a grand theory having significant absences about the feminist theory; basically being sex-blind and unconditioned and overdue emphasis on the essentialist conflict between capital and labour.

The method of analysis proposed and attempted in this study involved "everything", "all" structures in the agricultural production. It also attempted to deconstruct all concepts, thus the theory proposed necessitated the analysis of concepts like sexual division of labour, reproduction and the like. Similarly, the method of the research and the focus-group discussions -as conscious raising tool- were constructed around such a conceptualization.

The patriarchal character of the social relations were taken as determining a wide-range of structures and processes in the village life. Its significance could be practically reduced with the help of policies aiming to reduce the inequalities in the sphere of inheritance and the control of the production process.

It is considered that sexuality creates the gender roles and primarily intervenes for the continuity of the existence of the patriarchal relations. Ownership of land, per se, provides significant source of power that could be used at the process of production. There exist strong tendencies that destroy

the women's identity through the practices of sexuality of men. It is almost customary to think that masculinity provides man to own almost everything in life. Household is the suitable place where these and similar practices are realized.

This study aimed to have a feminine writing of the village life as a woman's study that is done for women and by a woman. Possible subjective means are used to collect information and about women with the primary help of women. Every voice out of their mouth that could be conceptualized formed the base of the knowledge and information of this study. Such an approach significantly contributed to examine how the concealed patriarchal oppression of women emerged as a social "reality". The ownership of "all", including the sexuality of women, almost by men, significantly conceals the concrete reasons of women's oppression.

One of the main question in this study was whether there exist a relationship or not between theoretical framework and the research. The former provides a different kind of analysis of the feminine processes in the village. The study involved an approach to resolve the problems of having a feminist analysis of rural women in the context of a given village. It is clear that this study has a purposive female bias realized almost by females in a feminine way.

It is thought to be appropriate and fruitful to refuse the frameworks of "classical" village studies and the analysis of patriarchy. However, it seems to be unavoidable to reach a confusion about the concepts and their reflections used at the village level.

It was interesting at least for me to use the patriarchal theories of Marx and Derrida tactically for the formation of a Marxist-Feminist and Postmodernist perspective.

It is controversial that this study is an anti-sexist study where men and their masculinity are excluded.

With a radical and political stance within feminist theory, men are not taken into consideration as much as conceptualization of social relations allowed theoretically. In this sense the study is a sexist one. Rural women as a social category is attempted to be incorporated into the sex-blind and essentialist categories of Marxism. In its conceptual form, rural women is aimed to be analyzed with an ideological, institutional and organization manifestations of Marxist-Feminist and Postmodernist theory, considering women in this framework as a "speaking subject", primarily for "themselves".

REFERENCES

- Abadan-Unat, N. 1967. Turkey. In *Women in the Modern World*, ed. Patai, New York: The Free Press.
- Agarwal, B. 1985. Rural Women and the High Yielding Variety Rice Technology. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 19(13), Review of Agriculture.
- Agarwal, B. 1986. Women, Poverty and Agricultural Growth in India. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 13(4).
- Alcoff, L. 1989. Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crises in Feminist Theory. In *Feminist Theory in Practice and Progress*, eds. Micheline Malson, Jean F. O'Barr, Sarah Westphal-Whil, Mary Wier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bardhan, K. 1985. Women's Work, Welfare and Status: Force of Tradition and Change in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20, 50, 51, December.
- Barret, M. 1987. The Concept of Difference. *Feminist Review*, 26.
- Barret, M. 1988. *Women's Oppression Today*. London: Versa.
- Bebel, A. 1980. *Kadın ve Sosyalizm*. Çev. Sabiha Zekeriye Sertel. Ankara: Toplum Yayınevi.

Bennholdt - Thomsen V. 1981. Subsistence Production and Extended Production. In **Of Marriage and the Market**, ed. Kate Young, Carol Wolkowitz and Roslyn McCullagh. London: CSE.

Berik, G. 1987. **Women Carpet Weavers in Rural Turkey**. Geneva: International Labor Office.

Berik, G. 1989. **Born Factories: Women's Labour in Carpet Workshops in Rural Turkey**. New School for Social Research. Working Paper.

Beşikçi, İ. 1969. **Doğuda Değişim ve Yapısal Sorunlar**. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.

Billson, J.M. 1991. The Progressive Verification Method: Towards a Feminist Methodology for Studying Women Cross Culturally. **Women's Studies International Forum**, 14(3).

Bleier, R. 1986. **Feminist Approaches to Sciences**. New York: Pergamon Press.

Boserup, E. 1970. **Women's Role in Economic Development**. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Brydon, L. and Chant, S. 1989. **Women in the Third World: Gender Issues in Rural and Urban Areas**. Great Britain: Biddles Ltd.

Cannon, L.W., Higginbotham, E., Marianne, L.A. 1988. Race and Class in Qualitative Research on Women. **Gender and Society**, 2(4).

Chakravorty, S. 1975. Farm Women Labour: Waste and Exploitation. **Social Change**, 5(1 and 2).

Clegg, S. 1985. Feminist Methodology. Fact or Fiction? **Quality and Quantity**, 19.

- Cook, J., Fonow, M. 1986. Knowledge and Women's Interest: Issues of Epistemology and Methodology in Feminist Sociological Research. **Sociological Inquiry**, 56.
- Coşar, F.M. 1978, Women in Turkish Society. In **Women in the Muslim World**, eds. Beck and Keddie. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harward University Press.
- Currie, D. and Kazi, H. 1987. Academic Feminism and The Process of De-radicalisation: Re-examining the Issue. **Feminist Review**, 25.
- Currie, D. 1988. Re-thinking What We Do and How We Do It: A Study of Reproductive Decisions. **Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology**, 25.
- Çınar, S. 1975. Unpublished. İstanbul.
- Deere, C.D. 1977. Changing Social Relation of Production and Peruvian Peasant Women's Work. **Latin American Perspectives**, 4(12-13).
- Deere, C. and Leon de Leal M., 1981. Peasant Production Proletarianization and the Sexual Division of Labour in the Andes. **Signs**, 7(2).
- Du Bois, B. 1989. Passionate Scholarship: Notes on Values, Knowing and Method in Feminist Social Science. In **Theories of Women's Studies**, eds. Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli Klein. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Duvvury, N. 1989. Women in Agriculture: A Review of the Indian Literature. **Economic and Political Weekly**, October 28.
- Ecevit, Y. 1992. "Türkiye'de Disiplinlerarası Kadın Çalışmalarına Yönelik Bir Değerlendirme". **Türk Sosyal Bilimler Demegi'nce düzenlenen III.**

Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi'ne sunulan bildiri. 21-23 Ekim. Ankara.

Eichler, M. 1977. Sociology of Feminist Research in Canada. **Signs**, 3(2).

Eichler, M. 1985. And the Work Never Ends: Feminist Contributions. **Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology**, 22.

Enber, C.R. 1983. The Relative Decline in Women's Contribution to Agriculture With Intensification. **American Anthropologist**, 85.

Emiroğlu, V. 1972. Edilli Köyünün (Akçakoca) Kültür Değişmesi Bakımından İncelenmesi. Ankara.

Erdentuğ, N. 1956. Hal Köyünün Etnolojik Tetkiki. Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Erdentuğ, N. 1956. Sun Köyünün Etnolojik Tetkiki. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Engels, F. 1979. Ailenin, Özel Mülkiyetin ve Devletin Kökeni. Çev. Kenan Somer. İstanbul: Kent Basımevi.

Farganis, S. 1986. Social Theory and Feminist Theory: The Need for Dialogue. **Sociological Inquiry**, 56.

Frye, M. 1983. **The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory**. New York: Crossing Press.

Gross, E. 1987. What is Feminist Theory and Philosophy Subjectivity and the Body: Kristeva and Irigaray. In **Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory**, ed. Carole Pateman and Elizabeth Gross. Northeastern University Press.

Gross, E. 1990. Contemporary Theories of Power and Subjectivity. In

Feminist Knowledge: Critique and Construct, ed. Sneja Gunew.
Routledge.

Harding, S. 1987. **Feminism and Methodology**. Open University Press.

Harding, S. 1989. How the Women's Movement Benefits Sciences: Two Views. **Women's Studies International Forum**. 12(3).

Harris, J. 1979. Capitalism and Peasant Farming: A Study of Agricultural Change and Agrarian Structure in Northern Tamil Nadu. Monograph in Development Studies. University East Anglia.

Harris, O. 1981. Households as Natural Units. In **Of Marriage and the Market**, ed. Carol Wolkowitz and Roslyn McCullagh. London: CSE.

Hartsock, N. 1983. **Money, Sex and Power: Towards a Feminist Historical Materialism**. New York: Longman.

Johnson, L.C. 1990. Socialist Feminism. In **Feminist Knowledge, Critique and Construct**, ed. Sneja Gunew. Routledge.

Kollontai, A. 1974. **Marksizm ve Cinsel Devrim**. Çev. Aysem Göztok.
Ankara: Bilgi Yaynevi.

Kandiyoti, D. 1977. Sex Roles and Social Change: A Comparative Appraisal of Turkey's Women. **Signs**, 3.

Mackintosh M. 1981. Gender and Economics: The Sexual Division of Labour and the Subordination of Women. In **Of Marriage and The Market**, eds. Carol Malkowitz and Roslyn McCullagh. London: CSE.

Marshall, B. 1988. Feminist Theory and Critical Theory. **Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology**, 25.

Mckinnon, K.A. 1982. Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory. In **Feminist Theory and Critique of Ideology**, eds. Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Barbara C. Gelpi. University of Chicago Press.

Mies, M. 1981. Dynamic of Sexual Division of Labour and Capital Accumulation: Women Lace Workers of Narasapur. **Economic and Political Weekly**. 16(10-12).

Mies, M. 1983. Towards Methodology for Feminist Research. In **Theories of Women Study**, eds. Gloria Bowles Renate D. Klein. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marvaridi, B. 1990. Gender Relations in Agriculture: Women in Turkey. Paper Presented at the Workshop: Culture and Economy: Changes in Turkish Villages, School of Oriental and African Studies. University of London. May 24-26.

Nicholson, L. 1982. Feminism and Marx: Integrating Kinship With The Economic. In **Feminist Theory and Critique of Ideology**, eds. Michell Z. Rosaldo and Barbara C. Gelpi. University of Chicago.

Nye, A. 1988. **Feminist Theory and the Philosophies of Man**. Routledge.

O'Brien, M. 1982. Feminist Theory and Dialectical Logic. In **Feminist Theory and Critique of Ideology**, eds. Michell Z. Rosaldo and Barbara C. Gelpi. University of Chicago.

— Odie-Ali, S. 1985. Women in Agriculture: Case of Guyana. In **Social and Economic Studies**, 35(2). Institute of Social and Economic Research. University of West Indias.

Özbay, F. 1982. Women's Education in Rural Turkey. In **Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey**, ed. Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı. Bloomington,

Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Palmer, I. 1977. Rural Women and Basic Need Approach to Development. *International Labour Review*, 115(1).

Poovey, M. 1988. Feminism and Deconstruction. *Feminist Studies*, 14(1).

Rabine, L.W. 1988. A Feminist Politics of Non-Identity. *Feminist Studies*, 14(1).

Reinharz, S. 1983. Experiential Analysis: A Contribution to Feminist Research. In *Theories of Women Studies*, eds. Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli Klein. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ring, J. 1991. *A Dialectical Analysis*. State University of New York Press.

Robertson, C. 1987. Developing Economic Awareness: Changing Perspectives in Studies of African Women. *Feminist Studies*, 13(1).

Rogers, B. 1980. *The Domestication of Women: Discrimination in Developing Societies*. Tavistock, London.

Rose, H. 1983. Hand, Brain and Heart: A Feminist Epistemology for the Natural Sciences. *Sign*, 9.

Sacks, K. 1976. Sate Bias and Women's Status. *American Anthropologist*, 78. —

Saradonami, K. 1987. Labour, Land and Rice Production: Women's Involvement In Three States. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 22(17).

Sirman, N. 1988. *Peasants and Family Farms: The Position of Households in Cotton Production in a Village of Western Turkey*. University of London: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.

Scott, J. 1990. Deconstructing Equality Versus Differences: Or, the Uses of Post-Structuralist Theory in Feminism. In **Conflicts in Feminism**, eds. Marianne Hirsch and Evelyn Fox Keller. Routledge.

Smith, D. 1990. **The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge**. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Spivak, G.C. 1982. The Letter as Cutting Edge. In **Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading Otherwise**, eds. S. Felman. John Hopkins University Press.

Stacey, J. 1988. Can There be a Feminist Ethnography? **Women's Studies International Forum**, 11(1).

Stanley, L. 1990. **Feminist Praxis, Research, Theory and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology**. Routledge. — *note* }

State Institute of Statistics Prime Ministry Republic of Turkey (1988), **Agricultural Structure and Production**.

Starr, J. 1984. The Legal and Social Transformation of Rural Women in Aegean Turkey. In **Women and Property - Women as Property**, ed. Hirschon. London: Croom Helm.

Stolcke, V. 1983. Position Paper for the SSRC Workshop on Social Equality and Gender Hierarchy in Latin America. Mexico City.

Tong, R. 1989. **Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction**. Colorado: Westview Press.

United Nations Centre For Human Settlements (UNCHS). 1985. **Women and Human Settlements. UNCHS (HABITAT)**. Nairobi.

- Wallace, R. 1989. **Feminism and Sociological Theory**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ward, K. and Grand L. 1985. The Feminist Critique and a Decade of Published Research in Sociology Journals. **Sociological Quarterly**, 26.
- Westkott, M. 1979. Feminist Criticism of the Social Sciences. **Harvard Education Review**, 49(4).
- Whyte, R.O. and Whyte P. 1978. Rural Asian Women: Status and Environment, Notes and Discussion Papers, No: 9, Institute of South East Asian Studies. Singapore.
- Wilson, F. 1985. Women and Agricultural Change in Latin America: Some Concepts Guiding Research. **World Development**, 13(9).
- Yalçın, L. 1986. **Kinship and Tribal Organization in the Province of Hakkari, Southeastern Turkey**. University of London: Unpublished PHD Dissertation.
- Zetkin, C. 1966. **The Emancipation of Women**. New York: International Publishers.
- Zita, J. 1988. Review Essay: A Critical Analysis of Sandra Harding's The Science Question in Feminism. **Hypatia**, 3.