



INTRODUCTION

The history of the transformation of modern Turkey is usually written in terms of the problems and deficiencies encountered in the transition of its political and socioeconomic structures: community to society, authoritarianism to democracy, workshop to factory, peasantry to proletariat. Burdened with the ascendancy of the structural-functionalist theories of the modernization paradigm, modern Turkish history appears to be a narrative of unaccomplished promises and continuing abnormalities.

A primary target of this book is to explore the politics and ideologies of class as important elements of the historical process from big cities and weaving mills to national domains of social regulation, labor law, and trade union policy between 1946 and 1962. The working class appears to have been both an active force and a point of contention during the period, which witnessed the movement of many producers from the agrarian economy to urban industrial work and the visible expansion of wage labor. This process not only shaped the emergent labor movement but also attracted the interest and concern of social reformers, social scientists, and politicians who investigated, discussed, and expressed their opinions regarding this sense of predicament. Merged with these questions was the need for a stable and productive manufacturing labor force, the absence of which had been perceived to be undermining the efforts to build an industrial economy since the early years of statist industrialization in the 1930s. Within this historical context, class was a determining element in the politics of work, defining how workers organized and regarded their everyday experiences in the workplace, shop floor cultures, and resistances, and the meanings they assigned to work and to the social identity of class. More specifically, class in the large cities also shaped the urban space and its politics, representing the problems asso-

ciated with the housing conditions of working-class families and their new leisure habits, which were not always approved of by the urban elites and social reformers.

Such an endeavor requires a shift in the perspective of writing labor history in Turkey, which has remained trapped within narrative strictures and structures. A predominant premise of labor history literature in Turkey assumes that the working class has been relatively inconsequential in the country's economic, social, and political transformations. The reasoning behind this conclusion is simple and familiar to all students of modern Turkish history: first, the state granted labor rights and freedoms without a protracted struggle from below; second, the emergent working class prior to the 1960s could not develop its own distinct culture and consciousness given the restrictive character of the capitalist relations of production and repressive and paternalist state policies in Turkey. Underpinning such claims is a teleological model that explains the progressive and unilinear advancement of various levels of class formation as being shaped by a movement that starts from the expansion of market relations before proceeding toward the organization of working-class politics. Turkish labor historiography has trapped itself in narratives that strive to account for the divergence of the Turkish model from the universal model of working-class formation.

There are abundant examples of this perspective from both contemporaneous and historical accounts. For example, Yüksel Akkaya examines Turkey's sketchy and immature capitalist relations to explain the country's weak labor organizations before 1960.¹ In an informative essay on the development of trade union democracy from 1960 to 1980, Mehmet Beşeli concludes that the granting of political rights by the state prior to the political struggle of workers is the most important reason for "the limited role of the union movement in democratic developments."² Similarly, Günseli Berik and Cihan Bilginsoy argue that "the labor movement did not play an active role in the political and economic transformations of the country." Instead, they claim, several workers' rights were recognized after the late 1940s because the ruling parties wished to tame labor and control it as an electoral bloc. They argue that the characteristics of the industrialization strategies pursued by Turkey in combination with the particularities of Turkish history explain the divergence from the classical model of working-class formation based on Western Europe's experience.³

Such arguments are particularly commonplace in analyses of the period between the end of World War II and the early 1960s. In his influential study on the relationship between the state and the bourgeoisie, Çağlar Keyder suggests that "it is the historical underdevelopment of the working class—both as an economic and as a political force—which invites an interpretation privileging the interaction between the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy."

Class struggle, according to this line of argument, had not yet become the mobilizing element in social transformation. The rights that workers gained to unionization, collective bargaining, and strikes, as well as those that widened social security during the early 1960s, were entitlements handed out to workers in accordance with the requirements of the new model of capital accumulation based on inward-oriented import substitution.⁴ Some labor historians tend to neglect or at best overlook the 1950s in their narratives of working-class formation in Turkey because they see no significant labor struggles during that period when the right to strike and other collective workers' rights were denied.⁵ Taken together, these exemplary studies present Turkey's working class as a passive recipient of state policies, lacking a consciousness of its own, circumvented by the late development of capitalist relations, and thus only half formed.⁶

The present study does not simply aim to reverse this argument and claim that the working class was always present there as a self-conscious political agent and whatever social rights introduced in modern Turkish history were earned by the struggles of the working-class movements themselves. Rather, it analyzes the processes of class formation that occurred in different forms and with different contents due to the impact of both "objective" conditions that are not defined by it and a set of complex contingent and cultural factors. Hence, the concept of class formation adopted in this study is not teleological. Rather, it assumes that processes of class formation are never complete and can be reversed, thereby allowing tendencies and countertendencies to be identified. As Jürgen Kocka remarks, "Classes are always in the process of becoming and disappearing, of evolution and devolution."⁷

Under certain conditions, those who hold a common position in the production process may become conscious of what they share. They may then develop a common social identity, a certain degree of internal cohesion, and common experiences, dispositions, aspirations, interests, and loyalties. This is "something like a common consciousness as a class." Considered in this way, the working class ceases to be a mere category and develops the characteristics of a group. "The contrast between workers and capitalists becomes a source of tension that is felt and experienced by those concerned. Whether class in this sense came into existence or not and in which way depends on many cultural factors as well as economic, social, and political ones that need to be studied empirically."⁸ Thus, we must recognize, with Löic Wacquant, that "groups and boundaries are made and unmade in history, not in theory."⁹ Whether and to what extent a working class in this sense emerged should be studied with respect to that group's places of work and residence, social origins, family structures, cultures, and lifestyles.

In order to come to terms with the question of the alleged retardation of working-class formation in Turkey, a powerful trend among labor histories

has focused predominantly on the emergence of working-class consciousness. Left-wing writers of labor history have a long-standing preoccupation with the question of why the working class in Turkey lacked this consciousness.¹⁰ Part of the answer lies in the specific concept of consciousness adopted. These studies, for example, appear to draw on a Lukácsian or Second International form. According to Georg Lukács, the proletariat is either fully conscious of its real conditions (ascribed consciousness) or trapped in the reified world of appearances (false consciousness).¹¹

This book aims to transcend this question by centering the discussion on the category of everydayness, which Harry Harootunian defines as “the minimal unity that provides its own principle of historical temporality that easily challenges the practice of history-writing as we know it.”¹² That is, the book focuses on the quotidian and local contexts in which the possibilities are created for class politics and resistance, on the one hand, and conformity and acquiescence on the other.

In the immediate aftermath of World War II, everyday life became an object of reflection and investigation in the context of late Euro-American capitalism. This was characterized by developments like rapid modernization and urbanization, the growth of mass media and consumption, and the “colonization” of the everyday by state and capital.¹³ Earlier thinkers like Lukács and Martin Heidegger had presented the everyday as simply a negative category: as the site of dullness and banality, the ordinary, and trivial repetition. For these early observers, everydayness was defined by alienation and colonization, which stole the voice of individuals. Walter Benjamin, on the other hand, had a far different conception of the everyday as the place of “actualizing.” According to Benjamin, actualizing the historical present implied “putting into practice a political intervention ... rather than merely the space for getting through one day to the next by resorting to tactics of survival that masquerade as forms of resistance. In this sense, the idea of tactics of resistance is simply another name for everyday routines.”¹⁴ For him, the category of everydayness also offered a different historiography in order to “extract from it lost and forgotten promises of the past and possibilities of the future.”¹⁵

Similarly, Henri Lefebvre saw in everyday life the emergence of new emancipatory possibilities at the same time as these were circumvented in other ways. For Lefebvre, the everyday certainly consisted of a sequence of regular, unvarying repetition and largely unconscious actions and performances: “Many men, and even people in general, do not know their own lives very well, or know them adequately.”¹⁶ Yet, in this very triviality and baselessness lay the contrary dynamics: in the poverty of routine lay the potential for creative energy and politics. After all, people engage in politics not because of abstract ideological principles but simply because they want to change their lives. For Lefebvre, then, the everyday, even in its most de-

graded forms, contains the potential of its own transformation. To unveil this potential of the everyday, its dialectical nature, we should conduct an interpretive reading and analysis of “documents and works (literary, cinematic etc.) for evidence that the consciousness of alienation is born, however indirectly, and that an effort towards ‘disalienation,’ no matter how oblique and obscure, has begun.”¹⁷

Thus, the concept of everyday life poses radical and inventive challenges to the teleological narratives of class. It is a critique of the idea that society is determined in simple ways. By drawing on the everyday, this study distances itself from models that explain the progressive advancement of class formation as fundamentally shaped by specific economic and social structures. Instead, it presents a more nuanced, culturally aware presentation of the lives of ordinary working people. A basic theme of the book is that it is the small, everyday catastrophes and victories that lastingly influence workers’ lives and affect their self-perception as a distinct social and political community. It is also such small experiences that enable workers to assert themselves against the often-hostile world surrounding them.

In the last three decades, everyday life has become the object of intense historiographical investigation. *Alltagsgeschichte* (the history of everyday life) has become the most important German historiographical development since the 1970s. As Geoff Eley marks, in the first instance, following in the footsteps of Thompsonian historiography, the history of everyday life involves marking out a particular empirical terrain: the history of work and workplace, housing and community life, family, and especially popular cultures and leisure. All these bring “the inner world of popular experience in and out of the workplace” to the agenda of social history.¹⁸

Second, there is an emphasis on subjectivity, experience, and the social production and construction of meaning. This emphasis is often theorized by the turn to anthropology and ethnographic analysis to account for the varieties of human experience.¹⁹ Particular interest is thus directed toward the ambiguities and contradictions of workers’ behaviors and perceptions as they live their lives. According to Alf Lüdtke, the leading advocate of this approach:

Alltagsgeschichte concentrates on the forms and meanings of social practice. In question are the ways of perceiving and acting through which people experience and “appropriate” the conditions of their life/survival. The aim is to show how societal demands and inducements are perceived, worked through, as interests or needs but also as anxieties and hopes.²⁰

This brings *Alltagsgeschichte* closer to the analysis of culture and cultural expressions, which are explored as “an element and medium of the active representation and construction of experiences and social relations, and

their transformation.”²¹ Therefore, one of the most promising features of such historiography lies in its attempt to reveal the cultural construction of societal processes as manifest in the everyday circumstances of life. As suggested in a review essay on the promises and pitfalls of scholarship, *Alltagsgeschichte* has integrated social and cultural history into what might be called a self-critical history of the present.²²

What follows from this, as the third characteristic of *Alltagsgeschichte*, is the search for politics at a more basic level, conveyed by everyday culture in and outside the workplace. Geoff Eley comments on how this everyday culture and politics are articulated in the works of *Alltagsgeschichte* historians:

The experience of everyday life, as the terrain where the abstract structures of domination and exploitation were directly encountered, encouraged attitudes of independence and solidarity that afforded obvious political potential in a class-circumscribed context of social value and action ... In other words, the workers' *Alltag* generated a culture of resistance, which, under circumstances of general social and political crises ... or during smaller local mobilizations, might acquire fuller political meaning. Then the worlds of politics and the everyday could converge.”²³

Alltagsgeschichte does not imply a retreat from social structures and relations of production into the particular and the unique but entails an enriched and specified treatment of the structural processes of change. The dynamism and contradictory character of historical change are linked with what Engels called “the production and reproduction of real life.” “In this view,” Lüdtkke suggests, “reconstructions in the history of everyday life involve more than situations recurrent in the daily struggle for survival (and momentary experiencing of workaday events). Rather such reconstructions reveal in particular the way in which participants were—or could become—simultaneously both the objects of history and its subjects.”²⁴

Alltagsgeschichte attempts to deal with the repetitive quality of everyday life, with the problems of contingency and ambivalence in human experience. Moving from the insights of *Alltagsgeschichte* and of the labor process theory, Lüdtkke manages to portray the German worker in a different light from that in most conventional history informed by the modernization paradigm. In his work, the average German worker is neither a hero of class struggle nor a powerless victim of high politics. Rather, Lüdtkke argues, “German factory workers were simply out to stake their own claim in German society, to obtain or retain as much control over their work as possible, and to have some pleasurable moments in the brief bits of leisure time.”²⁵

This book seeks to explore this perspective in several chapters. Chapters 1 and 2 discuss the everyday lives of workers outside the workplace. Chapter 1 seeks to understand the daily living conditions in working-class districts lack-

ing basic urban services like piped water and sewers, and where transportation services were hardly available at all, which made walking long distances to work a central experience for most workers. However, the meaning that workers attached to home differed radically from their middle-class contemporaries, who forcefully emphasized physical and moral health as the ideal qualities of home. Nonetheless, the primary drive of workers in building or purchasing a squatter dwelling was to assert control over a significant part of their lives, especially during a period when workers had limited autonomy within the workplace. In this context, neighborhood associations provided the primary mechanism to strengthen group solidarity and articulate the common interests of residents.

Chapter 2 explores cinema, football, and coffeehouses as working-class leisure pastimes. Modern social thought, from the Frankfurt School's conception of the "culture industry" to Jean Baudrillard's postmodern analysis of "hyperreal and image saturated society," represents leisure as a manipulated way of relating to the world.²⁶ This perspective is not shared in this study. As Lefebvre asserts, modern capitalism provides a vast domain of illusory reverse images through exploding leisure activities. Yet leisure cannot be separated from work and other practices of social life, which simultaneously "contain within themselves their own spontaneous critique of the everyday."²⁷ Accordingly, chapter 2 reveals how working-class men and women imposed their own meanings and uses on new leisure forms to transcend the routinization of everyday life. Taken together, the two chapters' analyses aim to discredit a key dichotomy of Turkish labor history, between work and nonwork, which has resulted in the latter being omitted from narratives of working-class formation.

Chapter 3 distinguishes the structural transformations in the regimes of factory discipline from the meanings workers themselves gave to their work and labor. The repetitiveness of production processes, which was decisive for the reproduction of the whole system, was rendered possible in many mills by the introduction of new technology and "scientific management techniques," as well as what Lefebvre calls the transformation of "cyclical time" to "linear time" at the point of production by punch clocks and other instruments of domination.²⁸ Drawing also on the insights of labor process theory,²⁹ this chapter discusses the solidarities generated by particular kinds of technology and shop-floor labor organization and the shared identities created by similar confrontations workers experienced in different activities and temporalities. Chapter 4 deals with the development of labor law as a set of everyday practices, based on an anthropological vision of law as a constitutive system that creates and enforces conceptions of order. This chapter argues that law, in our case labor law, played a crucial role in working-class formation because it was used to both regulate and legitimate the indige-

nous production and enforcement of norms in the everyday functioning of the workplace. The chapter also scrutinizes how these legal norms and institutions produced unpredictable consequences in terms of working-class identity and consciousness. This is because the legislation system magnified the worker's sense of himself as a worker rather than a citizen or nation as a whole.

With its emphasis on the different ways of perceiving everyday life and how it is shaped by sociocultural meanings, *Alltagsgeschichte* echoes some of the issues raised by the linguistic turn. Indeed, the most prominent feature of working-class history during the 1960s and 1970s was its concern with the “totality” of class experience and its materialist inspiration. That is, it attempted to understand all aspects of human existence in terms of their social determinations. However, this commitment experienced a severe crisis in the 1980s, and the last three decades have witnessed the rise of a revisionist historiography drawing on the linguistic turn to produce new narratives about the constitution and transformation of collective identities.³⁰ According to the advocates of this approach, the new social history inspired by Thompson failed to analyze properly the ways in which language crucially intervened between social conditions and experiences, and the workers' responses to them.³¹ In other words, the linguistic turn questions the purported reflexive relationship between the real world and its representations and asserts the constitutive role of language in the construction of power relationships and human consciousness.

Many historians on the left were ready to dismiss the linguistic turn for its assumed idealism and concealment of agency.³² However, linguistic analysis could help to decenter subjectivity and, as James Vernon suggests, to apprehend how language endows it with agency by reconstructing the subject as worker, woman, consumer, socialist, etc. Far from privileging the autonomy and determining role of language at the expense of social agency, linguistic analysis can help us place agency at the center of historical study by examining how we are positioned as subjects acting under the objective relationships of social power. As Vernon puts it, “To assert that subjects are constrained by the discourses available to them ... is not to be a linguistic determinist. Not only are all languages multivocal, but there are conflicts and tensions between discursive systems, so that it is always possible to play at the margins of those languages, extending their possibilities, appropriating and subverting them in unanticipated ways.”³³

Moreover, the linguistic turn has also been helpful for rethinking the relationship between the ideal and the material. The orthodox Marxist treatment of the question was that Marx himself simply reversed the direction of causality between them, whereas more novel interpretations of Marx argue that what he opposed was not simply idealism but the validity of the very

distinction between the material and the ideal.³⁴ Thus, Derek Sayer stresses that “Marx’s critique is less an inversion of the subject/predicate relation than an insistence that such predicates cannot, in the nature of things, be subjects at all. The only subjects of history, he insists, are ‘real, living individuals’ themselves.”³⁵ If consciousness cannot be regarded as a “living individual” but instead is recognized as an attribute or predicate of “real, living individuals” themselves, then the material existence of these individuals can no longer be individualized in ways that exclude their language, identity, and consciousness.

Thus, Sayer’s interpretation of historical materialism is completely different from orthodox approaches that define class as a “purely economic” relation, which then obliges us to seek causal connections between this economic essence of the relationship and the real empirical forms that class identity, language, consciousness, and action actually take in history. “But,” concludes Sayer, “we can no more conclude from the undeniable fact that there can be no social life without production, the consequence that the mode of production therefore determines any other area of social life, than we could conclude from the equally true proposition that there can be no social life without language, the corollary that social structures are determined by the laws of grammar.”³⁶ Therefore, it was possible to acknowledge the importance of discursively constructed dimensions of social relations between historical actors. In this sense, language, symbols, and cultural conventions provide the context within which the material and nonmaterial circumstances of workers’ lives are rendered meaningful.

These observations also tell us something about the context within which Michel Foucault’s work has been read by historians looking for an alternative framework for thinking about social history. Foucault criticized Marxist approaches for being overly preoccupied with defining class at the expense of understanding the nature of the struggle.³⁷ He therefore called for studying “the mechanisms of power that function outside, below and alongside the State apparatus, on a much more minute and everyday level.” Such mechanisms of power function as “individualizing strategies” that recognize and constitute “the social” as the main object of science and surveillance. Foucault’s conceptualization of “the social” as a target of policy, a site of practice, and a discursive product has inspired historians to examine critically the creation of those discourses “concerning society, its health and sickness, its conditions of life, housing and habits, which served as the basic core of the social economy and sociology of the nineteenth century.”³⁸

Foucault’s conception of the social as such has become paradigmatic in various fields, although it has been feminist historians that have done the most to show the benefits of his conceptual repertoire. In a classical essay, for example, Joan W. Scott suggests how the process of constructing gender

(“the effect of gender”) can be used to discuss class, race, ethnicity, or any social process and relationship:

Gender provides a way to decode meaning and to understand the complex connections among various forms of human interaction. When historians look for the ways in which the concept of gender legitimizes and constructs social relationships, they develop insight into the reciprocal nature of gender and society and into the particular and contextually specific ways in which politics constructs gender and gender constructs politics.³⁹

Likewise, Kathleen Canning’s work, with its marked emphasis “on the everyday and on the language used by workers,” historicizes the meanings of work through a discursive analysis. Canning defines discourse as both a textual and social relation, “a convergence of statements, texts, signs and practices across different, even dispersed, sites (from courtrooms to street corners).”⁴⁰ She suggests, for example, that discourses on “morality” and “normal family life” for workers represented “a repertoire of bourgeois concerns and also mapped out a domain of sexuality.”⁴¹ Feminist historians have also broadened our understanding of experience from simply denoting the realm that mediates between the relations of production and the development of group consciousness and identity to a more complex apprehension of the concept as “the linguistically shaped process of assigning meaning to events as they are lived by individuals.”⁴²

Discourse analysis offers a particularly useful method for reconstructing the everyday experiences of workers because archival resources rarely allow us to hear their authentic voices. It is noteworthy that “the silence of archives” has been seen as the most important obstacle to writing about the social history of labor in Turkey.⁴³ However, by using the tools of discourse analysis, this book seeks to demonstrate the groundlessness of this argument.

Along with the history of everyday life, this study applies linguistic analysis to reveal how different and often competing discourses of working-class identity functioned in the particular historical context of the late 1940s and 1950s. These were shaped by urbanization, growing private-sector activity, expanding social welfare regulations, and the relative liberation of the political regime (the transition to a multiparty system, increasing trade union activity, etc.). However, while acknowledging the constitutive power of discourses as central in defining and locating experience, this book also responds to Canning’s call to “untangle the relationships between discourses and experiences by exploring the ways in which subjects mediated and transformed discourses in specific historical settings.”⁴⁴ Historical subjects mediate, resist, and transform discourses in the process of defining their identities against other subjects.

Chapter 1 discusses the discourses of social reform in Turkey, which depicted the housing shortage for working-class families as constituting a new social and moral question in the immediate aftermath of World War II. Along with growing anxieties about worker instability as reflected in high turnover rates and about low productivity in key sectors of the growing urban economy, there were fears about working-class families, the poor sanitary conditions of homes, and the overcrowded living spaces that drew men into taverns and coffeehouses. The narratives of danger about these housing conditions ranged from scholarly surveys on poor neighborhoods to alarming newspaper reports about the epidemics and crime that haunted the newly established *gecekondu* settlements. As the postwar transformation to a multiparty regime proliferated opportunities for political participation, a wide spectrum of voices competed to shape this discursive domain.

Chapter 2 traces the different discourses on working-class leisure activities produced by politicians, bureaucrats, employers, socialists, trade union leaders, and particularly prominent social scientists. All these groups claimed the right to survey and observe working-class leisure habits to define and control the new urban fabric. For middle-class observers, for example, cinema salons, stadiums, and coffeehouses appeared as arenas for disorderly and ungovernable behaviors. In this book, however, I argue that workers sought to preserve their off-work time as a distinct cultural sphere of existence.

Chapters 3 and 4 explore different discourses on the problems of the labor process and the adaptation of labor power to the requirements of rationalized production. Among the actors forming this new discursive domain of work were prominent German social scientists who escaped to Turkey after the Nazis seized power and the students they taught at Istanbul and Ankara universities during the late 1930s and 1940s. They spoke as “scientific” experts and wrote extensively in journals like *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, *Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları*, *Çalışma Dergisi*, *İçtimai Emniyet*, and *Forum*. They also wrote many books and booklets. Their writings reveal much about both the living and working conditions of the workers, the characteristics of the labor market, and the philosophy behind the regulation of labor during this period. On the other hand, the rudimentary apparatus and ideology of regulation and reform incited new forms of working-class action and language calling for institutional representation and recognition of workers’ rights.

Finally, chapter 5 explores the organization and discursive construction of worker identity. Resisting a one-sided view of working-class identity as a discursive construction of the ruling elite, this chapter tries to uncover how the workers defined their place in society. I trace the discursive shift from the term *amele*, an ambiguous term with degrading connotations, to *işçi*,

which is defined with reference to one's place in the production relations. Trade unions and the emergent labor media movement were active actors in drawing the boundaries of class and defining class interests.

In the pursuit of uncovering the everyday lives and the changing meanings of work for laboring people, this book draws on both textual and quantitative evidence, including the scholarly studies of social reformers, parliamentary motions, trade union reports, factory documents from various firms in Istanbul, and the national and trade union press, which provide invaluable information about the everyday lives of working families. State archives do not provide rich accounts for retrieving the workers' authentic voices. However, they do reflect the perceptions of the ruling elite on the lifestyles and living conditions of working people. They also contain various reports on the technical and managerial problems of production as well as some statistical data about workers.

Finally, a note should be made regarding the dates of the study period. The dynamics that were conducive for creating a distinct working-class culture and identity started in the immediate aftermath of the war: urbanization, the growth of mass media, the expansion of the public sphere, the development of the labor movement, the extension of off-work time, the emergence of organized leisure, and the growing concern on the part of capital and state for the rationalization, colonization, and homogenization of everyday life. The research period ends in 1961 with the Saraçhane demonstration of at least one hundred thousand workers on the last day of the year, for it symbolized the formation of a working class with distinct dispositions, identity, and politics. However, the patterns described here are often found in the following years, albeit with significant variations due to the changing political environment in the 1960s. It would have been interesting to see how the politics of the everyday were linked to institutionalized political activities by extending the scope of the study to cover later periods. However, this question awaits the attention of future studies.

Notes

1. Yüksel Akkaya, "Çukurova'da Sendikacılık ve İşçi Eylemleri, 1923–1960," *Kebikeç* 5 (1997).
2. Mehmet Beşeli, "1960–1980 Döneminde Sendikacılık Hareketleri İçinde Demokrasi Kavramının Gelişimi," in *Türkiye'de Sendikacılık Hareketleri İçinde Demokrasi Kavramının Gelişimi*, ed. Alpaslan Işıklı (Ankara: Kalkan Matbaacılık, 2002), 237.
3. Günseli Berik and Cihan Bilginsoy, "The Labor Movement in Turkey: Labor Pains, Maturity, Metamorphosis," in *The Social History of Labor in the Middle East*, ed. Ellis Jay Goldberg (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 37.
4. Çağlar Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey* (London: Verso, 1987), 149.

5. See M. Şehmus Güzel, *Türkiye’de İşçi Hareketi, 1908–1984* (Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1996); Yıldırım Koç, “İşçi Hakları ve Sendikacılık,” *11. Tez* 5 (February 1987). For a critical review of the literature on labor during the Democrat Party era, see Hakan Koçak, “50’leri İşçi Sınıfı Oluşumunun Kritik Bir Uğrağı Olarak Yeniden Okumak,” *Çalışma ve Toplum* 18 (2008). For similar arguments, see Aziz Çelik, “Türkiye Emek Tarihinin Tartışmalı Konuları: Aşağıdan mı Yukarıdan mı, İç Dinamik mi Dış Dinamik mi?” in *Cumhuriyet Tarihinin Tartışmalı Konuları*, ed. Bülent Bilmez (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2013).
6. The arguments about discontinuity in working-class formation in Turkey are discussed in Özgür Gökmen, “The State of Labour in Turkey, 1918–1938,” *Mitteilungsblatt des Instituts für soziale Bewegungen* 33 (2005).
7. Jürgen Kocka, “Problems of Working-Class Formation in Germany: The Early Years, 1800–1875,” in *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*, ed. Ira Katznelson and Aristide R. Zolberg (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 283.
8. *Ibid.*, 282.
9. Löic J. D. Wacquant, “Making Class: The Middle Class(es) in Social Theory and Social Structure,” in *Bringing Class Back In*, ed. Scott G. McNall, Rhonda F. Levine, Rick Fantasia (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1991), 51.
10. Touraj Atabaki and Gavin D. Brockett, “Ottoman and Republican Turkish Labour History: An Introduction,” *International Review of Social History* 54(S17) (2009): 6.
11. Gareth Stedman Jones raises the question of how the proletariat passes between these Lukácsian poles. For him, the answer is that Lukács remains trapped within the mechanical and fatalistic Marxism of the Second International. That is, according to Lukács, for the emergence of the true proletarian consciousness, “the final, cataclysmic economic collapse of capitalism” is needed. “The active and practical side of class consciousness, its true essence, can only become visible in its authentic form when the historical process imperiously requires it to come into force, i.e. when an acute crisis in the economy drives it to action. At other times it remains theoretical and latent, corresponding to the latent and permanent crisis of capitalism.” See Gareth Stedman Jones, “The Marxism of the Early Lukacs,” in *Western Marxism: A Critical Reader*, ed. New Left Review (London: Verso, 1977), 42.
12. Harry Harootunian, “Shadowing History: National Narratives and the Persistence of the Everyday,” *Cultural Studies* 18(2/3) (March/May 2004): 181.
13. See Kristin Ross, *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995).
14. Harry Harootunian, “In the Tiger’s Lair: Socialist Everydayness Enters Post-Mao China,” *Postcolonial Studies* 3(3) (2000): 346.
15. Harry Harootunian, *History’s Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 70.
16. Henri Lefebvre, *The Critique of Everyday Life* (London: Verso, 1992), 94.
17. *Ibid.*, 66. See also Michael Gardiner, *The Critiques of Everyday Life* (London: Routledge, 2000), for a systematic examination of Lefebvre’s studies.
18. Geoff Eley, “Labor History, Social History, *Alltagsgeschichte*: Experience, Culture, and the Politics of the Everyday—A New Direction for German Social History?” *Journal of Modern History* 61 (June 1989): 315. Kristin Ross, too, maintains that everyday life “inserts itself in between a rigidly maintained opposition between public and private.” It permeates the realms of both production and reproduction of social life.

- Kristin Ross, “Two Versions of the Everyday,” *L’Esprit Créateur* 24(3) (Fall 1984): 35.
19. See Hans Medick, “‘Missionaries in the Rowboat’? Ethnological Ways of Knowing as a Challenge to Social History,” in *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*, ed. Alf Lüdtke (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995); Paul Steege et al., “The History of Everyday Life: A Second Chapter,” *Journal of Modern History* 80(2) (2008).
 20. Quoted in Mary Nolan, “The Historikerstreit and Social History,” *New German Critique* 44 (Spring/Summer 1988): 58.
 21. Medick, “‘Missionaries in the Rowboat’?” 53.
 22. Steege et al., “History of Everyday Life,” 358.
 23. Eley, “Labor History, Social History,” 324.
 24. Alf Lüdtke, “What Is the History of Everyday Life and Who Are Its Practitioners?” in Lüdtke, *History of Everyday Life*, 6.
 25. See Alf Lüdtke, “Cash, Coffee-Breaks, Horseplay: Eigensinn and Politics among Factory Workers in Germany circa 1900,” in *Confrontation, Class Consciousness, and the Labor Process*, ed. Michael Hanagan and Charles Stephenson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986).
 26. Gardiner, *Critiques of Everyday Life*, 84–85.
 27. Lefebvre, *Critique of Everyday Life*, 40.
 28. The transformation of time and its implication for relations at the point of production was also discussed in Thompson’s “Time, Work and Discipline in Industrial Capitalism.” He revealed that, with the onset of industrialism, production was no longer a self-regulating activity subject to the producer’s natural requirements but was instead subsumed under the requirement that socially necessary labor time be minimized. This meant that the linear repetition and characteristic rhythm of industrial production replaced the rhythmic character of natural time. E. P. Thompson, “Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism,” *Past and Present* 38 (December 1967).
 29. For a review on developments in labor process theory, see Chris Smith, “Continuity and Change in Labor Process Analysis Forty Years after *Labor and Monopoly Capital*,” *Labor Studies Journal* 40(3) (2015). See also Jim Kitay, “The Labour Process: Still Stuck? Still a Perspective? Still Useful?” *Electronic Journal of Organizational Theory* 3(1) (June 1997).
 30. William H. Sewell Jr., “Toward a Post-Materialist Rhetoric for Labor History,” in *Rethinking Labor History*, ed. Lenard R. Berlanstein (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993).
 31. Marc W. Steinberg, “Culturally Speaking: Finding a Commons between Post-structuralism and the Thompsonian Perspective,” *Social History* 21(2) (May 1996): 49.
 32. See Neville Kirk, “History, Language, Ideas and Post-modernism: A Materialist View,” *Social History* 19(2) (1994). Judith Surkis correctly argues that there is no *singular* turn to discourse and cultural analysis, but multiple, overlapping, and dynamic critiques of established historical paradigms, encompassing different epistemologies and methodologies. See “When Was the Linguistic Turn? A Genealogy,” *American Historical Review* 117(3) (2012).
 33. James Vernon, “Who’s Afraid of the ‘Linguistic Turn’? The Politics of Social History and Its Discontents,” *Social History* 19(1) (1994): 84.

34. Richard Marsden, *The Nature of Capital: Marx after Foucault* (London: Routledge, 1999), 21.
35. Derek Sayer, *The Violence of Abstraction: The Analytical Foundations of Historical Materialism* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1987), 87.
36. *Ibid.*, 148.
37. Marsden, *Nature of Capital*, 22.
38. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977), 176. Quoted in Geoff Eley, “Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later” in *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*, ed. Terrence J. McDonald (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 217.
39. Joan W. Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” *American Historical Review* 91(5) (December 1986): 1070.
40. Kathleen Canning, *Languages of Labor and Gender: Female Factory Work in Germany, 1850–1914* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 11.
41. *Ibid.*, 11, 100.
42. Sewell, “Toward a Post-Materialist Rhetoric,” 17.
43. For a discussion on the resources of Turkish labor history, see Ahmet Makal, “Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Emek Tarihi ve Tarihçiliği Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme,” in *Ameleden İşçiye* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007).
44. Kathleen Canning, “Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience,” *Signs* 19(2) (Winter 1994): 373.