PARTIAL ATTUNEMENTS: EVERYDAY ENVIRONMENTALISM OF THE FOOD SOVEREIGNTY MOVEMENT IN ISTANBUL'S FOODSCAPE

by
ÇAĞDAŞ CAN KARA

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabancı University
December 2022

PARTIAL ATTUNEMENTS: EVERYDAY ENVIRONMENTALISM OF THE FOOD SOVEREIGNTY MOVEMENT IN ISTANBUL'S FOODSCAPE

Approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Cenk Özbay .....
(Thesis Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Aslı İkizoğlu Erensü .....

Assoc. Prof. Ayfer Bartu Candan .....

Date of Approval: December 28, 2022

ABSTRACT

PARTIAL ATTUNEMENTS: EVERYDAY ENVIRONMENTALISM OF THE FOOD SOVEREIGNTY MOVEMENT IN ISTANBUL'S FOODSCAPE

ÇAĞDAŞ CAN KARA

CULTURAL STUDIES M.A. THESIS, DECEMBER 2022

Thesis Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Cenk Özbay

Keywords: infrastructural politics, temporality, logistics, scale

This thesis presents an ethnography of the everyday practices of İstanbul's food sovereignty movement, in order to understand what it means to both refuse and be involved in the capitalist and anthropocentric political economy of the existing food regime. As a social movement consisting of everyday environmental and economic practices, İstanbul's food sovereignty movement materially and discursively emerged in an atmosphere where neoliberalization of agriculture began to be exceedingly implemented; and accelerated after the Gezi protests through ethical and logistical experimentations of the emergent food collectives and consumer cooperatives. Drawing on 18-month fieldwork, the thesis traces these ethical and logistical experimentations in order to interpret the political potentiality they offer within the form of what I call infrastructural politics. Specifically, the thesis asks this question: To what extent is it possible to economically and ecologically reinvent İstanbul's food infrastructure by enacting infrastructural politics? Ultimately, the thesis argues that this possibility of reinventing the elements of food infrastructure – as well as scaling these elements in time and space – is enabled by the activists' labor of mediation – or what I call attunement – between the temporalities and scalar horizons of the existing food regime on the one hand and the practices of reclaiming and recreating these temporalities and scalar horizons on the other. In other words, İstanbul's food sovereignty movement maintains its political existence not despite but because of its partial position within capitalist and anthropocentric forms of relations.

ÖZET

PARÇALI UYUMLAMALAR: İSTANBUL'UN GIDA PEYZAJINDAKI GIDA EGEMENLİĞI HAREKETINDE GÜNDELIK ÇEVRECILIK

ÇAĞDAŞ CAN KARA

KÜLTÜREL ÇALIŞMALAR YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, ARALIK 2022

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Cenk Özbay

Anahtar Kelimeler: altyapı siyaseti, zamansallık, lojistik, ölçek

Bu tez, var olan gıda rejiminin kapitalist ve insan merkezli politik ekonomisini aynı anda hem reddetmenin hem de bu politik ekonominin içerisinde var olmanın ne anlama geldiğini anlamak amacıyla İstanbul'un gıda egemenliği hareketinin gündelik pratiklerinin bir etnografisini sunar. Gündelik ekolojik ve ekonomik pratiklerden oluşan bir hareket olarak İstanbul'un gıda egemenliği hareketi materyal ve söylemsel olarak tarımın neoliberalleşmesinin yoğun bir şekilde uygulandığı bir atmosferde oluşmuş; ve Gezi sonrasında gıda topluluklarının ve tüketim kooperatiflerinin etik ve lojistik deneyişleriyle birlikte ivme kazanmıştır. Bu tez, 18 aylık saha çalışmasından yararlanarak bu etik ve lojistik deneyişlerin sunduğu siyasi potansiyelin "altyapı siyaseti" adını verdiğim bir formda yorumlama amacıyla izini sürer. Bilhassa tez şu soruyu sorar: Altyapı siyaseti icra ederek İstanbul'un gıda altyapısını ekonomik ve ekolojik olarak yeniden icat etmek ne derece mümkündür? Nihayetinde tez bu gıda altyapısının unsurlarının yeniden icat edilme imkanının aktivistlerin var olan gıda gıda rejiminin zamansallıkları ve ölçeksel katmanları ile bu zamansallık ve ölçeksel katmanları geri alma ve yeniden yaratma pratikleri arasında performe ettikleri aracılık emeği ile - bir diğer deyişle uyumlama pratikleri ile - var olabildiğini iddia eder. Başka bir ifadeyle, İstanbul'un gıda egemenliği hareketi kendi siyasi varlığını kapitalist ve insan merkezli ilişki biçimlerinin içerisindeki parçalı konumuna rağmen değil bu konum sayesinde sürdürür.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the labor, care, and generosity of many. I would like to sincerely thank to my advisor, Cenk Özbay, without whose patience and mentorship I would not have convinced myself to see the end of this journey. I am also extremely grateful for my extraordinary committee, Aslı İkizoğlu Erensü and Ayfer Bartu Candan, whose invaluable comments have deeply guided me to shape the trajectory of this work.

I would like to express my gratitude to Sibel Irzık, whose illuminating courses and encouraging comments on my works have had a very special place in my academic journey as well as the achievement of this project. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Kristen Sarah Biehl Öztuzcu. I feel deeply privileged to work on a project under her supervision, where I had a chance to further discover my academic interests.

I cannot express enough how grateful and fortunate I am to be a part of the Kadıköy Cooperative. The Cooperative has been where I have learned what it really means to carefully listen to the other. The Cooperative has been the first place where I discovered my deep excitement for food activism: it has shown me how to be attached to better forms of praxis by building bridges between the near and the far, the abstract and the material, and even our joy and our sorrow. Many, many thanks to all members, volunteers, and regulars of the Cooperative as well as the producers with whom I contacted during the fieldwork of this thesis.

Special thanks should go to my extraordinary cohort. I would like to especially mention that I would not have overcome this very stressful time period of thesis writing and doctoral applications without the wonderful friendship and support of Cansu and Enis. Thank you for making this stressful time more colorful and enjoyable. I am also thankful to Sena, İrem, Gizem, and Doğa for their extremely thorough comments on my applications and earlier versions of the chapters of the thesis. I would also like to acknowledge Nancy Karabeyoğlu. I am very thankful for her close reading of an earlier version of one of the chapters. Also thank you so much, Sedef Uluğ and Tuğcan Başara. I would not have been able to submit this work without your guidance at crucial times.

I am also very indebted to the friendship, love, and solidarity of Kaan, Hazal, Bilge,

and Güneş, which I exceedingly felt during all parts of writing this thesis. I am very fortunate to have you all in my life. Thank you very much to my parents, Zerrin and Hüsamettin. I will be forever grateful to you for your unconditional love and support. Last, but not least, thank you so much, Suzy. I would not have been able to continue this journey without you.

Anneannem Hatice Korkmaz'a

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION **1**
- 1.1. A Curious Irony 1
- 1.2. A Brief History of Turkey's Foodscape 4
- 1.3. Sites of Refusal in Istanbul's Foodscape 10
- 1.4. Theoretical Engagement and Argumentation 17
- 1.5. Fieldwork Research 23
- 1.6. The Chapters 26

2. TEMPORALITIES OF REFUSAL **28**
- 2.1. Introduction 28
- 2.2. Temporalities and Labor of Mediation 32
- 2.3. Promises of Another Ecological Time: Porosity, Situatedness, Contradiction 38
- 2.4. Economic Time: Attunement, Debt, and Food Quality 47
- 2.5. Conclusion 55

3. SCALING THE REFUSAL **57**
- 3.1. Introduction 57
- 3.2. Scale and Logistics 59
- 3.3. Logisticality in the City 63
- 3.4. In Search of New Bureaucratic Promises 69
- 3.5. Conclusion 73

4. CONCLUSION **75**

BIBLIOGRAPHY **80**

1. INTRODUCTION

> If one can ask "big" questions of "small" data, then the difference between big and small disappears. It is reinstated only with the reinstatement of perspective and levels, and a concomitant sense of the partial nature of description
>
> Marilyn Strathern, *Partial Connections*

> Policy is not the one against the many, the cynical against the romantic, or the pragmatic against the principled. It is simply baseless vision, woven into settler's fabric. It is against all conservation, all rest, all gathering, cooking, drinking and smoking if they lead to marronage. Policy's vision is to break it up then fix it, move it along by fixing it, manufacture ambition and give it to your children. Policy's hope is that there will be more policy, more participation, more change. But there is also a danger in all this participation, a danger of crisis.
>
> Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, *The Undercommons*

> [T]he question of politics becomes identical with the reinvention of infrastructures for managing the unevenness, ambivalence, violence, and ordinary contingency of contemporary existence.
>
> Lauren Berlant, *On the Inconvenience of Other People*

1.1 A Curious Irony

In one of the theoretical meetings organized by the Kadıköy Cooperative bi-monthly on Thursdays, a discussion was carried out on Aslıhan Aykaç's recently published book, *Dayanışma Ekonomileri* (2018), in which several experiences of building solidarity economies around the world are investigated. After a short presentation of

the book by one of the volunteers, the discussion moved towards how they see their own experience of solidarity economy in the light of various examples underlined by the book. To speak of his personal experience throughout his routine voluntary work in the cooperative, one volunteer asked for the floor and expressed his feelings: "the meaningful things that we do for producers and consumers notwithstanding, I should say that there are some moments that I feel like we are merely a grocery store." It was not, however, totally a strange feeling for the other volunteers, including me as I sometimes felt it, particularly during my voluntary work in the store of the Cooperative where the political standpoint of the cooperative is hardly visible within the everyday rhythms of the routine market work. As a response to his feelings, another volunteer asked to speak and said: Our feelings like this are probably related to our position within the larger economic system. Are we doing something alternative to neoliberalism? I think yes. But are we also being immersed in neoliberalism? I could say yes to this as well. We should also see ourselves under this condition."

This thesis is an ethnography of this partial position of the self-governing consumer cooperatives of the food sovereignty movement in relation to İstanbul's neoliberal food infrastructure. Andrea Muehlebach (2012) defines the partialness of the emergence of self-governing leftist initiatives under the conditions of neoliberalization as a "curious irony" as it leads to the simultaneous existence of individualization and collectivization. For Muehlebach, the consequences of this ironic existence of these initiatives are twofold: on the one hand, it generates the hegemony of neoliberal capitalism; and, on the other, it unmakes the neoliberal project by creating "the grounds for hope" (200).

I am specifically interested in under what conditions these grounds for hope emerge – and could be observed – within the everyday environmental and economic activities of these self-governing consumer cooperatives. With this regard, I implicitly or explicitly ask throughout the chapters: How does neoliberal precarization lead to a form of everyday emancipatory politics? To what extent is it possible to economically and ecologically reinvent İstanbul's food infrastructure by enacting a politics of infrastructure? How do the food sovereignty activists endure the frictions between their alternative politics of infrastructure and İstanbul's existing food regime which relies on the capitalist and anthropocentric forms of relations? How do they experience multiple forms of economic relations and multiple temporalities during their everyday environmental and economic activity?

In this regard, the main argument of the thesis is twofold. First, precarity – and precariousness in a more ontological sense – could be understood as a source of

political organization, through which the possibility of inventing a new infrastructural politics could flourish. Indeed, this first part of the argument operates as a premise more than an argument. Therefore, I predominantly explain this part of the argument not through everyday observations but through providing a theoretical and historical standpoint. Instead of adopting a nostalgic affirmation of the policy implementations of the protectionist era of Turkey's food regime, the thesis questions the policy and planning practices of this era as the significant obstacle to the economic and ecological organization of human and nonhuman relationality. In this sense, the thesis suggests reclaiming the concept of precarity and precariousness – whether these are led by neoliberal policies and practices or not – as a source for rethinking the vital infrastructures of this human and nonhuman relationality.

To put it specifically, the thesis argues that İstanbul's consumer cooperatives maintain their political existence not despite but because of its partial position, through which they manage to initiate their ethical and logistical experimentations with human and nonhuman relationality and operations of capital. With this regard, it seeks to make sense of how the new possibilities manifest themselves in a neoliberalization of vital infrastructures, where contingency and the absence of the promise of stability are not exceptional but the definitive characteristics of our relationality with the other (Neilson 2012; Tsing 2015). As Isabell Lorey (2015) points out:

> "Living and working in precarious conditions, therefore, does not just mean being exposed to the unforeseeable, to insecurity, being unable to make long-term plans and being exploitable specifically for this reason. Beyond this, in dealing with contingency, the possibility arises at the same time of being able to leave and start something new; the potentiality of exodus and constituting." (104-5)

Therefore, as explained in the section on theoretical engagement in this chapter, the thesis avoids the mere alarmist conceptualization of neoliberal precarity, which is backed up by colonial and anthropocentric assumptions of capitalist labor conditions. Rather, it frames precarity and precariousness as the necessary conditions for building and reinventing the infrastructures of our sociality.

Second, and related to the first part of the argument, the thesis asserts that this alarmist conceptualization leads to the interpretation of the infrastructural and experimental politics of the self-governing initiatives as impotent in terms of its limited temporal horizon and scalar politics. In order to avoid this simplistic conceptualization, the thesis offers to more deeply focus on the concepts of temporality and scale; and it questions the possibilities of observing these phenomena around infrastruc-

tural politics. It defines this effort of questioning these possibilities as ethnographic praxis (Rajan 2021). Before moving on, I want to provide a broader view of Turkey's existing foodscape and the emergent sites of refusal through a closer look at İstanbul's food sovereignty movement.

1.2 A Brief History of Turkey's Foodscape

Although the thesis mainly focuses on the everyday environmental and economic practices of İstanbul's consumer cooperatives, I suggest that it is important to portray the elements of Turkey's agricultural politics in order to better make sense of the very link between precarity and the possibility of reinventing food infrastructure through ecological and economic ways. By demonstrating the very link between the "styles" of infrastructural politics on the one hand and the bureaucratic planning apparatuses of certain entities, including the state, ministries, municipalities, and cooperatives on the other, I aim to make sense of what has already been imagined and enacted as infrastructural action within certain time periods of Turkey's existing food regime.[1]

In order to understand the current foodscape of Istanbul in particular and Turkey in general, it is necessary to specifically look at how the neoliberalization of agricultural production and food provisioning happened after the 2000s. Although the 1980s and the January 24 Decisions are considered the turning point for the neoliberalization of numerous sectors in Turkey, the 2000s were the years when the farmers and agricultural sectors began to largely experience the transformation only after the state's more serious enactments of the ARIP (Agricultural Reform Implementation Project). Çağlar Keyder (2013) describes this transformation as the interruption of a centuries-long tradition of the relationship between the farmer and the state. Then, it is significant to understand what had been interrupted with this relatively new transformation. Therefore, I first aim to portray the relationship between the farmer and the state before the transformation.

What could be formulated as the centuries-long form of relationship between the state and the farmer is the way in which the state administrators give promises regarding economic stability for farmers. As Anand, Gupta, and Appel (2018)

[1] It is necessary to indicate here the lack of the non-anthropocentric standpoint in the history writing for Turkey's food system, which obliges to focus on the relationship between the farmer and the state while largely ignoring the history of the human and nonhuman relationality. Nevetheless, there is an emergent field of the environmental history of Turkey and the Ottoman Empire. See İnal and Köse 2019; Kentel 2018; White 2011.

indicate, how promises related to the future are given to the segments of communities matter if we are to understand the maintenance and ruination of a system or an infrastructure. Before the transformation, the main form of technicality of the state to distribute its promises of economic stability for farmers was price and tax regulations, incentives, and subsidies, which had been distributed through the micro-interventions of the state administrators to the agricultural production and provisioning. In that sense, it is quite possible to trace this distribution of promise as a form of the state-farmer relationship back to the Ottoman era.

Until 1838, as an empire whose operations largely depended on the expansion of its frontiers and extraction of its outside, its promise of stability was distributed to the segments of *avam* as long as its frontier moved toward the outside. Both the expansion of its frontiers and the distribution of stability indicated the sultan's power, or *kudret*, to name specifically. Creating a sustainable web of provisioning in an ever-expanding territory meant the existence of a living community (Larkin 2013). However, the stability and wealth of some segments of the people require the instability and starvation of others. As Sam White (2017) demonstrates in his analysis of the "imperial ecology" of the empire, enormous territory and long distances meant lots of contingency for provisioning (93). Feeding the cities, armies and navies required a large number of regulations, which in turn both dealt with and reproduced frictions. Besides certain tax and price regulations including the price system of *narh* or the tax system of *aşar* as micro-interventions of the Ottoman administration, when food was not possible to be circulated along with distances, what was circulated was the people through forced resettlement and migration controls. Nomadic and semi-nomadic people were forced to be settled to produce agricultural output in times of uncertainty. The preeminence of the agricultural rhythm was guaranteed to feed the expanding population of the empire with these regulations and enforcements.

With the Treaty of Balta Liman in 1838, the micro-interventions of the Ottoman administration were replaced with market-friendly policies of agriculture. In this regard, the period between 1838 and 1908 could be named as the first interruption of the relationship between the state and the farmer in the Empire's and Turkey's foodscape. This period also could be defined as the period where the operations of capital, specifically financialization and logistics, largely permeated the foodscape (Neilson and Mezzadra 2019). These operations reformulated the frontiers of the sovereign power of the Empire as agricultural products began to more freely enter the foodscape. Besides that, with the commodification of the agricultural lands, large-scale production was achieved with the appropriation of the small farmers' lands into large estates (Türkkan 2021*a*). Instead of producing with small farmers, large

estate owners mainly preferred seasonal laborers. In other words, those who had access to capital largely began to manage the processes of agricultural production. Similarly, the access to capital determined how food provisioning was logistically operated. With the railway infrastructure, agricultural production was circulated in an easier way; and production was consequently increased. Nevertheless, the merchants were the main actors in food provisioning, who bought the products from producers and transported them to the city, thanks to their increased access to capital. In this regard, the processes of the production and circulation of food were mainly determined by the operations of capital through the financialization of agricultural land and the increased role of capital in the circulation of food.

With the years of war and the foundation of the Republic of Turkey until the 1950s, protectionist policies and direct interventions manifested themselves as countries, which were the trading partners of the Empire, turned into enemies because of the war and a new paradigm of agricultural production (Türkkan 2021). In this sense, it was the period when the long tradition between the ruler and the farmer returned with micro-interventions including price and tax regulations. In this period more taxes were implemented for foreign companies (Boratav 2007). It was also the period where *narh* as the system of price regulation was back as a continuation of the long tradition (Toprak 1994). With the republic, new tax regulations had been in favor of the rural economy while it had been a burden for the urban economy and consumers in the city. Bases prices for each product were instituted and regulated to prevent price fluctuations. Besides base prices, bulk purchases were initiated for a better promise of economic stability for producers (Köymen 1999). In this protectionist period, the state was very involved in food provisioning through these governmental tools of controlling taxes, prices, purchases, and shipments. In these years, the state initiated producing new promises through the Land Reform Act for the landless peasants to give them land through the reallocation of unused lands of large landowners to small farmers (Pamuk 2015). Unsurprisingly, the bourgeoisie having large lands became unsatisfied with this reform.

Nevertheless, after the 1950s, the operations of capital re-started to haunt Turkey's foodscape in favor of creating a national bourgeoisie. These had been the years when the state still had a considerable role in food provisioning. However, this role gradually became limited to providing the conditions of competition for the sake of the bourgeoisie of nationalist development. As Candan Türkkan (2021) suggests, these years led to a new regime of food provisioning, which could be called "co-dependent provisioning", where the state's institutions gradually left the apparatuses of food provisioning to the bourgeoisie. This gradual transformation in the food regime was achieved through the state's incentives and policies in favor of

the most competitive market actors and a discursive shift towards free trade and private entrepreneurship. In turn, the state had expected from the bourgeoisie the promise of obedience and the maintenance of the food system.

These years also had been the years when agricultural and industrial sectors were largely expanded. With the increased uses of agricultural machinery, the accelerated land uses for cultivation through tree cutting and deforestation practices, and the abundance of small farmers who work on large landowners' lands led to a new regime of cheap labor and cheap nature (Atasoy 2017; Keyder 1999; see Moore 2015). In other words, these changes have paved the way for Turkey's plantation regime. Moreover, starting to use synthetic ferilizers to increase production and the construction of highways and providing incentives for private transportation companies for a better logistical system, especially for fresh fruits and vegetables, led to the formation of Turkey's agroindustrial sector, which in turn gave more economic promises for investors and private entrepreneurs (Türkkan 2021). The agroindustrial sector in particular and Turkey's food system in general were supplemented by the implementation of certain criteria, certifications, and labelings for the processes of agricultural production and provisioning. Those having more access to production equipment and provisioning apparatuses became more favored as a result of these implementations of standardization.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Turkey's agroindustrial sector continued growing in an accelerating manner. Particularly, the increased demand for food in the cities and the insufficiency of the infrastructure of food provisioning – which was largely the remnant of the Ottoman food system – led to new solutions enacted through the collaboration between public and private actors. To deal with the new contingencies as a result of a more complex structure of the cities, fresh fruits and vegetables could be circulated through more developed practices of planning and coordination among different actors and spaces – which were achieved through Migros's efforts of building a new food infrastructure through more complex logistical apparatuses (Türkkan 2021).[2]

How did cooperatives accompany these relationships between the public and private actors in general and between the state and the farmer in particular? What was the role of the cooperatives throughout the state's efforts of distributing its promises along with different actors? From the first years of cooperatives in Turkey – when the Committee of Union and Progress (*İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*) initiated to establish at the beginning of the 20th century – until the 1980s, the cooperatives

[2]Before Migros was a private supermarket chain, it initially entered Turkey's foodscape as a cooperative union with the collaboration of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IBB) as joint venture (Lemeilleur and Tozanlı 2006).

had been the main channel for the state to distribute its promises for the farmers through bulk purchases, subsidies, and incentives (Toprak 1982). In the 1950s, the cooperatives had been a populist apparatus in order to win votes from the agrarian communities (Çavdar 2002). The role of the cooperatives as a populist apparatus continued in the 1960s and 1970s as well. In these years, the cooperatives had been – at least ideally – the prominent actors of rural development. As Mustafa Erdem Sakınç (2009) demonstrates in his discourse analysis of the State Planning Organization (*Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı*), the discourse of rural development goes quite hand in hand with the strong emphasis on cooperatives. Nevertheless, the lack of coordination throughout the process of agricultural production and food provisioning and the reluctance of the administrators of the cooperatives had led the cooperative members to start producing for the market instead of keeping their supply promises for the cooperatives. To develop better coordination for the production processes and the administration of the cooperatives in 1969, 23 agricultural sales cooperatives and unions gathered to establish the Central Union for the Agricultural Sales Cooperatives and Unions (TARKO) (Aysu 2019). TARKO could be seen as the first attempt of both demanding promises of economic stability from the state institutions and creating its own promises for the farmers in a democratic way. However, it was disbanded after Turkey's coup d'état in 1980.

It is important to indicate here that there are different views about the trajectory of the sales cooperatives before the coup d'état. In my conversation with an agricultural engineer, who had been politically involved in the cooperative movement before the coup d'état, they pointed out the anti-democratic structure of the cooperative unions even before 1980. As they indicate:

> "The unions were really powerful before the 1980s. They even initiated serious amounts of exportation of their products. But they were disbanded with the coup d'état. But what is important here is that they were already going to disband themselves even if the coup d'état could not have happened. Serious cases of corruption already started to be revealed before 1980. [The administrators of the unions] managed to do something only for the sake of themselves. They founded many companies due to their position in the unions. [...] All these mean that we do not need any other vertical form of organization. This is why the horizontal, bottom-up organization is important."

After 1980, while the administrators and the personnel were dismissed from the positions and cadres, the state gradually paved the way towards a politically more obedient but economically less dependent structure of the cooperatives and unions.

The efforts of the state to restructure the cooperatives and unions set aside, its populist concerns did not allow it to totally keep its hands off the promise of economic stability for the farmer. Particularly after 1987, the state institutions continued supporting the producers as in Turkey's protectionist era (Keyder and Yenal 2013). Even if the state tried to abolish subsidies and price regulations to provide a ground for the market mechanisms, it had not have been easy for the governments to encounter the risk of losing the elections. However, the promises of the state in this period remained mostly insufficient. The producers in these years already started to seek new solutions, as the state's increased support for capital accumulation and for the role of the private entrepreneurs in the food system already resulted in the experience of economic precarity for the producers. Therefore, in search of agricultural practices that promise a more stable future, the producers became exceedingly involved in contract farming, which turned the producers into mere apparatus for the capital accumulation of the private actors in the agroindustrial sector. Alternatively, most producers switch their production from fresh fruits and vegetables, which require eliminating more contingencies along with production and logistics, to grain products, which promise more stability for the producers (Türkkan 2021).

After the 2000s, with the strong pressure from the World Bank and IMF, the state was more intensely forced to abolish its support to the farmer through ARIP – particularly, the state was expected to abolish its base price policy, which could not allow creating a well institutionalized international food infrastructure. In other words, the state's micro-interventions for agricultural processes had been a considerable obstacle for the regulation of agriculture in a global scale. Even if the state tried to implement an agricultural system through the 2006 Agricultural Law, whose rules were already prescribed without micro-interventions of the state institutions, neither the populist state nor the producer was satisfied with these changes.

Throughout the 2000s and 2010s, the state's populist concerns, which were backed up by its micro-interventionist approach in agriculture, metamorphosed into more visible and less mundane forms of infrastructure, including urban transformation processes, through which it also aimed to build new collaborations with the private actors. As the agroindustrial companies already had considerable control over the producers through contract farming, the state's micro-interventions were no longer required for its populist aims. Its role in agriculture increasingly remained limited to providing more space for the commercialization of agriculture. In this process, the state's incentives and subsidies for the small farmer were not to support their agricultural practices. Rather, the small farmers, as less competitive actors, in the neoliberal agriculture system were encouraged to leave the sector through these incentives and subsidies (Atasoy 2017). As the state was no longer primarily con-

cerned with distributing the promises for the agrarian communities on its own, the cooperatives as its populist apparatus exceedingly started to be privatized in this period.

To put it specifically, what had been interrupted by the recent neoliberal transformation of agriculture is the state's promise of economic stability given to the agrarian communities. Whether to indicate the sultan's *kudret*, to build a national bourgeoisie through rural development, or to maintain the survival of the government through populist interventions, the food infrastructure had been maintained through the state's promise of economic stability for the farmer. This promising food regime had been interrupted by the international institutions' efforts of reformulation and the normativization of agricultural production and food provisioning. These processes of reformulation and normativization – which meant all micro-interventions of the state should be obligated and prescribed by law – resulted in the standardization of the agricultural production processes for the sake of capital accumulation and high-efficient production. Nevertheless, all efforts of standardization leave some room for the proliferation of unruly elements within a system by directly refusing or enduring the efforts of standardization – which might lead the system to unexpected trajectories (Tsing, Mathews, and Bubandt 2019).[3] In the next section, I turn to these forms of refusing the efforts of standardization by specifically focusing on İstanbul's foodscape.

1.3 Sites of Refusal in Istanbul's Foodscape

Before portraying the sites of refusal, I first want to explain my emphasis on refusal instead of any other concepts, including resistance. The main reason why I preferred refusal is that it resonates with the more mundane forms of critique. As I am more interested in apparently noneventful aspects of any political actions than apparently more interrupting actions like the resistance of peasants to reclaim their land against the mining or any other energy operations of the state-capital partnership, the concept of refusal is better suited to my aim of emphasizing the more invisible and more infrastructural sides of political action. Besides this reason, I find refusal more capable to indicate the complexity of power relations instead of portraying a simplistic relationship between the superior and the inferior along with

[3]Here, I do not use refusal and endurance in a contradictory way. Rather, I use endurance as a peculiar form of refusal, which necessitates an active involvement in a system. As Elizabeth Povinelli (2017), "the endurant is not a thing that endures but the creativity of keeping in place something that is constantly changing" (14).

food infrastructure (Seymour 2006; McGranahan 2016).

On the other hand, I do not aim to focus on all mundane practices of refusing the mainstream food system. As Candan Türkkan demonstrates (2021*b*), it is possible to classify these practices as alternative provisioning networks (APNs) and alternative food networks (AFNs). She describes APNs as follows:

> "[APNs] develop as a response to deal with urban food security. It usually involves some combination of wage labor, bartering and/or gifting across neighbors, and familial relations (real and/or fictive). In addition to relieving some food expenses from the family's budget, APNs also help particularly new migrants maintain familial and/or village networks and enforce a sense of heritage, belonging, and community in the younger generations[...]" (2).

APNs also deserve specific attention to understand the possible forms of refusing the existing food system. However, I am less interested in observing the ways of deepening the already existing familial relationships through food provisioning. Instead, I am interested in understanding the ways of creating new relationships, or making kin in the Harawayian sense of expression (2016), as a way of opening up new possibilities of alliance among different actors – and even a way of offering a new politics of infrastructure as I will point out in the next section – through practices of food.

Before its emergence as a movement, food sovereignty was discursively introduced as a paradigm by La Via Campesina in 1994, in such a way that differs from other alternative paradigms including FAO's concept of food security (Edelman 2014). While the emphasis on sovereignty was indicating the right of each nation to determine its own capacity of production at first, this emphasis was replaced with the anarcho-Communist practices of food provisioning in time for diverse food communities in many countries (Kass 2022; Trauger 2017; Dunford 2020). Although food sovereignty as both discourse and a world-making project emerged as a response to the worldwide neoliberalization of agriculture, it has turned itself to a politics of infrastructure, through which it has aimed to offer the possibility of alliance among different actors in line with the distinction between the urban and rural on the one hand and the human and the nonhuman on the other (Rosset and Val 2019; Roman-Alcala 2013; Cote 2016; Huambachano 2019; Portman 2018).

The emergence of food sovereignty in Turkey as a paradigm corresponds with the years when the efforts of the state were quite visible to implement the ARIP in

2001, the Organic Law in 2004, and the Seed Law in 2006 as a part of the neoliberal restructuring of agriculture. Particularly, Çiftçi-Sen's encounter with the representatives of the La Via Campesina led food sovereignty to discursively emerge in Turkey's foodscape (Doğançayır and Kocagöz 2017). With this regard, Çiftçi-Sen is the first organization in Turkey that describes its activities with a strong emphasis on the paradigm of food sovereignty. Besides Çiftçi-Sen's encounter with La Via Campesina, the anti-GMO platform in 2004 was an important turning point for the emerging food sovereignty movement in Turkey, as it led to significant alliances among farmers, the chambers of engineers, and the NGOs of seed protection.

In the following years, the discourse of food sovereignty has been influential in the foundation and the everyday activities of certain food initiatives in İstanbul, including KEÇİ[4] and BÜKOOP.[5] Particularly, BÜKOOP, a consumer cooperative that was founded in 2009 at Boğaziçi University, has been one of the most prominent actors of the emergence of the food sovereignty movement in İstanbul. With the aim of "re-defining the organization of producer and consumer relations in such a way that it was possible to provide justice for farmers and consumers simultaneously", it started to build a network of small farmers and producer cooperatives to initiate the self-determination of the producer and consumer communities beyond İstanbul's mainstream food infrastructure (Öz and Aksoy 2019, 6). Its network and criteria for the partnerships with producers paved the way for the future food collectives and consumer cooperatives of the food sovereignty movement in İstanbul.

Among these food collectives and consumer cooperatives, the foundation of the Kadıköy Cooperative, as an initiative in 2014 and as a legal consumer cooperative in 2016, is another turning point for the trajectory of İstanbul's food sovereignty movement (see Figure 1.1). The idea of founding a consumer cooperative in Kadıköy initially manifested itself in the forums of *Yoğurtçu Parkı* during the Gezi protests in 2013. After the forums turned themselves into solidarity groups in different neighborhoods, this idea permeated the agenda of these neighborhood groups through a series of workshops organized by volunteers and experienced food activists (Yılmaz et al. 2020). With the support of the representatives of Çiftçi-Sen and the volunteers of BÜKOOP, the volunteers of the Kadıköy Cooperative began to work with small farmers and producer cooperatives all around Turkey while aiming at broadening the idea of food sovereignty in the urban space.

---

[4]KEÇİ (*Kentlilerin Çiftçilerle Dayanışması İnisiyatifi*) was founded in 2008 with the aim of being in solidarity with Çiftçi-Sen (Bingöl N.d.).

[5]Also see Karakaya 2016 for the emerging network of the food sovereignty movement in İzmir and Ankara.

Figure 1.1 The store of the Kadıköy Cooperative in Kadıköy, İstanbul

As the Kadıköy Cooperative could be seen as one of the most preeminent remnants of the Gezi protests, the organizational values of the Cooperative highly resonate with those of the groups organized during the Gezi. The position of the Cooperative as a remnant of the Gezi, indeed, is not only my inference from observing the general profiles of the volunteers of the Cooperative. Rather, it is mostly indicated by the volunteers as well. For instance, in the presentation material of the Cooperative which was prepared for introducing the general history of the Cooperative to newcomers, the Gezi and its neighborhood forums are described as the starting point for the trajectory of the Cooperative. Therefore, the horizontal and nonhierarchical structure of the forums and other initiatives of the Gezi is secured for the general operations of the Cooperative.

I would like to elaborate more on how volunteers experience the horizontal structure of the Cooperative. Once one decides to be a volunteer in the Cooperative, they should attend the event where the volunteers of the Cooperative present a PowerPoint slide to explain how the general works of the Cooperative are operated. After this event, they are invited to the following meeting of the Cooperative, which is called Thursday meetings, and sometimes called *Mutfak Toplantıları* (Kitchen Meetings). In this meeting, an old volunteer is assigned to the newcomer to train the general principles and how things work in the store of the Cooperative. After a couple of weeks, they become able to decide which unit of the Cooperative is best suited

for them. These units could be sorted out as follows: the Unit of Coordination, the Unit of Social Media and Communication, the Unit of Organization and Institutional Relations, the Unit of Education and Research, the Unit for Food Products and Relations with Producers, the Unit for non-Food Products and Relations with Producers, the Unit of Technical Coordination, the Unit of Archival Organization, and the Unit of Financial Affairs. For these units to operate well in accordance with the horizontal structure of the Cooperative, the principle of rotation is attributed a particular importance by the volunteers. Once a volunteer joins a unit, they can involve in the activities of the unit for at least six months and at most nine months. Moreover, they become not able to rejoin the same unit before joining all other units. By doing so, the Cooperative aims to prevent possible hierarchical relations which could be resulted from the professionalization of the volunteers. And the principle of rotation is applied not only for the involvement of the units but for other mundane works of the Cooperative as well. For instance, besides the involvement of a unit, a volunteer is expected to be responsible for a couple of producers to track the orders in accordance with the demands of consumers. In order to prevent a volunteer from being the face of the Cooperative for specific producers, all volunteers rotate their producers whom they are assigned once a year. This principle of rotation is generally applied to prevent certain volunteers from being the face of the Cooperative by developing a list that indicates how many events are attended by which volunteers on behalf of the Cooperative. If a volunteer attended only one event on behalf of the Cooperative whereas another volunteer attended five events, the former is encouraged to attend more events in that year. The principle of rotation is also sought to be applied to opening the store. However, as the volunteers work in very different jobs and some of them are busier than others during the working hours of the Cooperative, the volunteers need to be more flexible to apply the principle of rotation when it comes to opening the store.

Although other consumer cooperatives and food collectives seek to apply this horizontal structure of the Cooperative, it is possible to say the Kadıköy Cooperative could be seen as the most cautious organization in terms of preventing possible hierarchical relations. As a volunteer indicates in our interview:

> "Sometimes other initiatives who try to reach us get really tired of our bureaucratic structure [laughing]. [...] I cannot decide what to do with a new invitation of an event by myself before our meetings where we collectively decide, or before I ask other volunteers via sending email... I know that others [other cooperatives and collectives] are not as much as us in terms of being sensitive for the issue of collective decision making."

This structure of the Cooperative and the cautious attitude of its volunteers, I would suggest, pave the way for the possibility of more creatively enacting and reclaiming the elements of food infrastructure. Moreover, this horizontal structure does quite resonate with its ideal of food sovereignty. It is not surprising that the Kadıköy Cooperative is among the first organizations which directly use the concept of food sovereignty in Turkey. For the Cooperative, food sovereignty could only be practiced by developing nonhierarchical and reciprocal relationships with producers and the environment. It is important to indicate here that the material and semiotic formation of food sovereignty does not have to correspond with the ecological ways of producing food. Instead, it particularly emphasizes the practices of self-determination of producers and consumer communities as opposed to the global agri-industrial regime of the multinational corporations as a form of the alter-globalization movement. Nevertheless, the way in which the Kadıköy Cooperative materially and discursively prefigures the self-determination of food communities not as isolated from the non-human world but directly intertwined by it is important in terms of demonstrating the multiple dimensions of the food sovereignty movement.

Moreover, this formulation of the food sovereignty which the Kadıköy Cooperative enacts did not remain limited to itself. Rather, it became a source of inspiration for a variety of food collectives and consumer cooperatives. In other words, the foundation and the everyday economic and ecological practices of the Kadıköy Cooperative accelerated the expansion of the idea of food sovereignty movement among the existing food collectives as well as it supported the foundation of numerous consumer cooperatives.

Here, it might be asked what the other food collectives and consumer cooperatives are and how they – if any – differ from each other. When I refer to food collectives, I mean consumer communities that are organized to get their food directly from producers without any middlemen. In this regard, food collectives could be seen as a broader umbrella under which consumer cooperatives could also be categorized. However, I prefer to use both terms in order to indicate the legal difference between them, which indeed shape the ways in which they organize themselves in general and economically and ecologically practice their everyday activities in particular. As food collectives can be any groups of people who organize to directly get their food from producers, I find them not quite different from alternative provisioning networks (APNs) by themselves. For instance, one volunteer of the Kadıköy Cooperative was involved in many food collectives since 2004, in which people organize to get cheaper and healthier food for their needs in certain neighborhoods of İstanbul. However, I am not directly interested in these forms of food collectives. Rather, I am more interested in the food collectives which locate themselves within the

recent experimental attempts of broadening the food sovereignty and the cooperative movement in Turkey and İstanbul. As far as I observed, these food collectives which I described do not aim to limit themselves to the autonomous and isolated practices of food provisioning for themselves and their neighborhoods. Rather, they constantly seek to organize bulk purchasing with other collectives in order to both get cheaper products and be more compatible with their political agenda of changing the elements of food infrastructure through their understanding and practices of food sovereignty. And as these efforts are directly intertwined with the recent expansion of the cooperative movement in Turkey or "new cooperativism" as indicated elsewhere, these food collectives in most cases tend to describe themselves as "cooperative initiative" (Hacısalihoğlu and Şahin 2018). The main reason for their tendency of turning themselves into cooperatives is to get benefit from the legal advantages of ordering bulk purchases from producers, through which they could be more compatible with their ideals of food sovereignty and reinventing the elements of food infrastructure. Therefore, even if they describe themselves merely as a food collective, it is possible to locate themselves within the new cooperative movement and the food sovereignty movement in İstanbul and in Turkey.

As such, I am specifically interested in food collectives and consumer cooperatives which make a serious effort for scaling their economic and ecological action to be an alternative to the existing capitalist and anthropocentric food regime. To name a few, these food collectives and consumer cooperatives include, but are not limited to, Beşiktaş Cooperative, Koşuyolu Cooperative, Yerdeniz Cooperative, Göztepe Cooperative, Ataşehir Cooperative, Salkım Cooperative, Maltepe Cooperative Initiative, and Beyoğlu Food Collective (see also Soysal Al 2020*b*). It is important to see the role of the Kadıköy Cooperative in providing support and a source of inspiration for them. The ways in which the Kadıköy Cooperative manages to keep its store open despite its voluntary labor and logistical contingencies applies its criteria without being subjected to the standardization system of the agroindustrial sector and sustains its non-hierarchical organization among its volunteers and members have been a reference point for these consumer cooperatives and food collectives. As the Kadıköy Cooperative has been sharing its very detailed forms of products and producers as well as its instructive documents for a non-hierarchical organization, the idea of food sovereignty and its everyday appearances have permeated the ethical and logistical activities of these collectives and cooperatives as well.

In addition to this acceleration after the foundation of the Kadıköy Cooperative, the foundation of the Ovacık Agricultural Development Cooperative in 2014 (with the brand name of Ovacık Doğal) by the municipal administration of the Communist Party of Turkey in Ovacık has been another significant moment for the food

sovereignty movement in both İstanbul and Turkey. By providing coordination between its producers and consumer cooperatives as well as prioritizing the ecological concerns of the food sovereignty movement, Ovacık Doğal has been among the pioneering actors of the food sovereignty movement in a short time (Çiçek 2021). Besides being in solidarity with the existing consumer cooperatives, Ovacık Doğal has initiated its own stores in İstanbul's neighborhoods to expand its ability of production and logistical operations.

The Kadıköy Cooperative and the Ovacık Doğal are today the major actors of the food sovereignty movement in terms of expanding the idea of self-determination of the producer and consumer communities through ethical and logistical experimentations. While the Kadıköy Cooperative regularly shares its experience of being a consumer cooperative in İstanbul with the existing and emerging consumer cooperatives, Ovacık Doğal provides its laboratory and logistical capability for other producer cooperatives, small farmers, and consumer cooperatives. By initiating bulk purchases and organizing the distribution of products among İstanbul's consumer cooperatives and food collectives, they aim to provide economic and ecological promises for both producers, consumers, and themselves as the volunteers of cooperatives and collectives besides the eroded promises of İstanbul's neoliberal food infrastructure. On the other hand, while they emerged in the very moment of neoliberal precarization of food infrastructure, it is not possible to categorize the actors of the food sovereignty movement merely as the activists of an anti-neoliberal, anti-precarity movement. Rather, their ethical and political agenda goes beyond the discursive formation of anti-neoliberalism and anti-precarity as their politics of alliance between the urban and the rural on the one hand and the human and nonhuman on the other enables to develop refusal through more-than-economic promises beyond neoliberal precarization. In the next section, I seek to provide a theoretical framework to better understand the refusal of İstanbul's food sovereignty activists.

1.4 Theoretical Engagement and Argumentation

The experience of economic precarity for the farmers and the consumers lies at the heart of the centuries-long tradition of the relationship between the state and the farmer – as well as the interruption of this relationship. Therefore, it is important to indicate the existing assumptions behind the concept of precarity. While it has been a useful analytical concept to demonstrate the insecure labor conditions or even a new social class in the making, its liberal and colonial formulation has made it open

to many criticisms (Bourdieu 1998; Standing 2011). Particularly, postcolonial scholars have criticized the mainstream conceptualization of precarity in the neoliberal context as it does not ask for whom precarity is a new phenomenon (Puar 2012; Millar 2017). In this sense, the criticisms assert that precarity as an insecure labor condition is a new phenomenon only for the white middle class (Puar 2012). With neoliberalism, therefore, "precarization becomes 'democratized'" in such a way that the relatively privileged ones begin to experience it (Lorey 2015).

Moreover, the postcolonial conceptualization of precarity allows us to question at what cost the experience of precarity is eliminated. As Brett Neilson and Ned Rossiter (2008). argue, precarity has not ever been an exceptional condition of living labor. Rather, the Fordist era had been an exception within the history of economies and labor regimes of human sociality. With this regard, it is important to ask at what cost the farmer's experience of economic precarity is eliminated by the state policy in the protectionist era of Turkey's agriculture. It is, in this sense, misleading to only focus on a single time and space to understand the experience of precarity if we are to consider postcolonial criticism on the one hand and the relationality between human and nonhuman actors on the other. From the first years of the Republic until the neoliberalization of agriculture, the costs of agricultural subsidies and incentives were compensated either by leaving the urban economy to the market mechanisms or by delaying the costs of these subsidies and incentives for the next governments through the Agricultural Bank (Türkkan 2021a; Keyder 2013). In other words, the costs of eliminating the economic precarity of the farmer were distributed across time and space – which would not be possible to interpret it as a planning achievement of a protectionist government and its policies.

On the other hand, fordist, protectionist, and developmental fantasies, which nostalgically narrate the pre-neoliberal period, are usually backed up by anthropocentric assumptions (Boyer 2018). The anthropocentric perspective overlooks the costs of, say, tree-cutting and deforestation practices to create more cultivated lands or the uses of synthetic fertilizers for both human and nonhuman labor regimes. In this sense, the costs of the economic precarity of the farmer are compensated by the invisible, apparently noneventful damages of the more than human relationality – which requires considering the ecological temporality besides the economic temporality in order to make sense of the anthropocentric ways of compensating precarity. Therefore, the multiplicity of temporalities urges us to better understand the multiple dimension of precarity. For this purpose, Judith Butler (2015) makes a distinction between economic precarity and ontological precariousness. While economic precarity refers to unstable working conditions, ontological precariousness is a necessary condition as a result of our encounter with the other. Ontological precariousness as

a concept, in other words, is a way of formulating our vulnerable position within the encounter with difference as a necessary result of the indeterminacy of the future. While it is possible to separately focus on these concepts, I prefer to approach them in a dynamic way as I am more interested in the interplay between economic and ecological forms of relationality in an encounter. Moreover, I suggest that both economic precarity and ontological precariousness require to be considered in terms of their constitutive characteristic for each other. Focusing only on one phenomenon brings about the existence of colonial and anthropocentric assumptions. Nevertheless, this is not about applying long-termism for the future existence of the human being but the realization of the multiple human and nonhuman temporalities existing in the present (Solomon 2021). This is, in other words, a form of being attached to a promise of an object in the present, whether that object could be a food system as a hyper-object or a particular plant – in less cruel ways in the Berlantian sense (2011; also see Morton 2013).

The multiplicity of our precarious position in our encounter with the other and the coexistence of human and nonhuman regimes are overlooked not only in developmental and protectionist planning practices of the state but counter-hegemonic, autonomist, and grassroots organizations and initiatives around the world (Armiero and De Angelis 2017; Povinelli 2017). As Nelson and Braun (2017) assert, the Autonomia movement in Italy designates the emancipation of the multitude by relying on the invisibility of the nonhuman labor regimes. Therefore, as much as movements begin to realize the consequences of the Anthropocene and the non-autonomous existence of the human with the nonhuman world in their everyday struggle, they begin to question the invisible and nonevetful aspects of the struggle of the multitude, or the struggle for the infrastructural politics of the commons, as the human and nonhuman cooperation.[6] The conceptualization of infrastructure as the human and nonhuman cooperation as a living capacity on the planet, instead of merely a politics of the distribution of "resources" or a defense of a public park in an urban space, allows us to question our existing political concepts and the very definition of the political, which are backed up by the fantasy of the human as a free-standing subject (Berlant 2016; Neilson 2012).

With this regard, it is significant to pay attention to the nonhuman forms of existence within the environmental and economic politics of social movements as constitutive of refusal as a material and sensuous politics for the organization of everyday life. The ways of developing forms of sensuous politics, creating the forms of being attentive to the nonhuman and material life is, I would suggest, crucial to understanding

[6]In this regard, I find meaningful this rhetorical question Nelson and Braun (2017) pose: "What happens to autonomism if it begins to question the autonomy of the human?" (225)

and developing the possibilities that infrastructural politics of social movements offer. The importance of being sensuous and attentive is also described by Alex Loftus in *Everyday Environmentalism* (2012), and also his use of Arundhati Roy's well-renowned statement, which has been one of the main sources of inspiration for the thesis:

> "This book therefore situates arguments about the socio-natural firmly within the sensuous creation of everyday life. Arundhati Roy speaks beautifully of this: "Another world is not only possible, she is on her way. On a quiet day I can hear her breathing." Within the noise and the dirt, the fumes and the concrete, of the contemporary city, I argue that there are conditions of possibility for sensing this alternative world. Not only in quiet moments of reflection but in shared acts of making the world, people hear, feel, and begin to touch the possibilities for making things differently." (x)

In other words, this sensuous and material dimension of social movements requires us to focus on the everyday environmental praxis as a form of world-making practices. Similarly, the possibility of creating alternative worlds through this form of politics is pointed out by Dimitris Papadopoulos (2018) with a specific focus on the experimental dimensions of the everyday material politics of social movements. As he rhetorically asks:

> "What if we approach social movement action not as targeting existing political power but as experimenting with worlds? What if we see social movement action not as addressing existing institutions for redistributing justice but as the creation of alternative forms of existence that reclaim material justice from below? And, what if this becomes possible not when social movements engage in resistance to power but when they experiment with the materiality of life? [...] Experimental practice in this sense is about modes of intuition, knowledges, and politics that trigger intensive material changes and mobilize energies in ways that generate alternative and autonomous spaces of existence." (3)

In his work, Papadopoulos defines these experimental movements not as social movements but as *more than social* movements. By also referring to ecological transition projects, food collectives, urban gardens, and other forms of creating infrastructural politics, he questions the capability of these movements to scale themselves by being expanded in different times and spaces. He argues that the difficulties of scaling these world-making projects are the necessary condition of scale-making,

which does not have any simple solutions besides constantly enacting the labor of "craft" to deal with these difficulties emerging from our entangled existence with the nonhuman world (22).

Therefore, it is important to position the food sovereignty movement within the framework of *more than social* movement, whose capacity is directly affected by the everyday relationality between human and nonhuman actors. In order to understand the capacity of a movement to be "more eventful" even from an anthropocentric perspective, it is necessary to look at how human labor engages with the materiality of the world – as the capacity of a consumer cooperative, for example, to scale its activities depends on whether it preeminently works with producers of legume crops or with producers of fresh fruits and vegetables.

However, how I diverge from Papadopoulos's conceptualization of more than social movement is concerned with my understanding and empirical observation of the autonomous – or sovereign – politics of these material, experimental movements.[7] These movements are not sovereign but do intensely experience forms of "friction" with not only the nonhuman world but also the capitalist forms of relations (Tsing 2005). In this regard, the food sovereignty movement encounters the second irony of its formation as it requires being attached to the forms of "nonsovereign relationality" to maintain its existence (Berlant 2022). By paying specific attention to world-making practices and their infrastructural aspect as "central to the problem of transforming democracy-under-capitalism", Lauren Berlant defines nonsovereign relationality as the inevitable characteristic of our attachments in the world. By only living with the "inconvenience" of our nonsovereign attachments, they assert, could we "reinvent" the infrastructures of our existence. By doing so, Berlant attributes significance to infrastructural world-making projects, including alternative forms of building "roads, bridges, schools, food chains, finance systems, prisons, families, and districts" as the material politics of creating these infrastructures are particularly observable in the political practices of the post-Occupy initiatives – as "they work on infrastructural principles" (21-25). In terms of emphasizing the inevitability of nonsovereignty and inconvenience as a condition of our entangled existence, Berlant provides a significant theoretical standpoint in interpreting the everyday frictions with which the actors of the world-making projects necessarily live.

The particular analytical attention to nonsovereign relationality with both ecological temporality and capitalist forms of relations also allows being more critical about the purely postcapitalist expectations in observing these infrastructural projects. I find

[7] See also Escobar (2017) for the recent debates of the autonomy of world-making projects around the concept of "pluriverse".

the literature of postcapitalism, in which Gibson-Graham's *A Postcapitalist Politics* (2006) has been the most pioneering work, meaningful in terms of making alternative economic projects more visible from a feminist standpoint. However, I suggest that it should not lead to an understanding where capitalist and noncapitalist forms of relations could be purely attached (Neilson and Mezzadra **?**; Tsing 2015).

What do the nonsovereign aspects and ironies of the food sovereignty movement as a world-making project say about the possibility of empirically understanding both its everyday existence and its transformative capacity? Donna Haraway (1985) explains irony as "about contradictions that do not solve into larger wholes, even dialectically, about the tension of holding incompatible things together because both or all are necessary and true" (65). This ironic capacity of holding compatible things together defines the partial characteristic of the food sovereignty movement. Doğançayır and Kocagöz (2017) also mention the partial aspect of Turkey's food sovereignty movement with regard to its limited position within the larger political economic system, as a result of which the movement could not turn itself into a popular project.

Nevertheless, I define the partialness of the food sovereignty movement from the perspective of feminist anthropology, which intrinsically questions the very relationship between the part and the whole. In *Partial Connections* (1991), Marilyn Strathern defines partialness by building on Donna Haraway's conceptualization of partial connections as a necessary form of "social relationships as connections that are both a part of and not part of each other" (40). By destabilizing the formations of the part and the whole, Strathern's conceptualization allows seeing beyond the discursive formulation of the Western political, economic, and social institutions as the single whole, as if it is the single established order within the world. In doing so, it makes it possible to better understand the everyday practices which could easily be classified as both part and not part of capitalism, or both part and not part of the existing food system, or, both part and not part of the anthropocentric order, depending on the experience of the multiplicity of the whole. To put it specifically for the case of the food sovereignty movement, the experimental politics of the food sovereignty activists does not have to be entirely encompassed by the wholeness of the political economic order of the food regime as we know it. Rather, their experimental politics might be involved in multiple wholes; or it sometimes deserves to be considered as another whole in itself.

Considering the multiple characteristics of the whole, a relationality could be both eventful and noneventful, both political and post-political (see Chapter 2), or both capitalist and postcapitalist. In this thesis, I suggest preeminently focusing on

the relationalities that could be easily defined as nonevents within the lens of the existing political institutions. Therefore, I aim to ethnographically focus on the everyday formations of these partial nonevents, or micro-events, whose existence is allowed by the infrastructural world-making practices of the food sovereignty activists as a part of the sensuous politics of everyday environmentalism. As it is an easier way to focus on the post-political aspects of these micro-events, I prefer to constitute a subject position as a researcher who prioritizes and attends to the simultaneous existence of the multiple temporalities, or multiple parts and wholes, in the present, which create new possibilities and new micro-events throughout the encounter with the other. As Elizabeth Povinelli (2021) points out: "Microevents rumble through microinhabitations. Their sensory effects barely break the surface of human perception. They are the crackling one just hears just below the ambient sound of everyday life in rural and urban slums" (19-20). In other words, I aim to focus on the nonsovereign and partial attachment of these micro-events to other parts and wholes in order to understand what possibilities and labor regimes are produced within the potential mediations and attunements among these "ironic" time-spaces as grounds for hope for an everyday politics of infrastructure.

Moreover, what is part and what is whole, what is eventful and noneventful cannot be prescribed autonomously from the positionality of the observer. As queer and feminist science studies demonstrate, the observer and their apparatuses of observation are quite constitutive of the very phenomenon of the event and the relationality constituting it (Barad 2007). In the next section, for the sake of "strong objectivity", I explain my experience in the fieldwork research in general and my positionality along with the partial existence of the food sovereignty movement in particular (see Harding 1995).

1.5 Fieldwork Research

This thesis draws on 18-month ethnographic fieldwork between March 2021 and October 2022, during which I observe and actively participate in the everyday activities of İstanbul's consumer cooperatives and their regular meetings. However, although I describe this fieldwork as an ethnography of İstanbul's food sovereignty activism, my research largely relies on my volunteer experience in the Kadıköy Cooperative. The main reason why I predominantly focus on the everyday economic and ecological activities of the Kadıköy Cooperative is its preeminent and supportive role within İstanbul's food sovereignty movement. As I indicated, the ways they organize bulk

purchases, as well as everyday activities within their store, have been a reference point for many collectives and cooperatives. Therefore, I realized that by observing the activities of the Kadıköy Cooperative would I also get an insight into the general situation of İstanbul's food sovereignty movement. Besides that, I also realized during my fieldwork that the Kadıköy Cooperative is capable to sell its products to more consumers, thanks to its popularity since the Gezi protests. To give an example, while most consumer cooperatives seek to extend their turnover beyond 600 TL a day, the Kadıköy Cooperative could easily get 3000 TL in an ordinary working day of the store. This also makes me think that the Kadıköy Cooperative would be an ideal research site in order to observe the interactions between the volunteers and consumers in a more frequent way on the one hand the scalar politics of a cooperative which is the prominent actor of the food sovereignty movement on the other.

During the times when I volunteered, I had been responsible for organizing weekly, monthly, and bimonthly meetings, presenting the brief history and principles of the cooperative for new volunteers, and communicating with certain producers to order products or invite these producers to the events which the Cooperative organizes. With this regard, the Kadıköy Cooperative has been a node of a larger network of consumer cooperatives and food collectives for me. Through my position within the Cooperative, I had a chance to meet with many volunteers and workers from other cooperatives and collectives. Besides my position within the everyday activities of the Kadıköy Cooperative, I attended meetings and workshops organized among cooperatives and collectives with the agenda of expanding the cooperative movement and the practices of food sovereignty.

Before beginning my ethnographic research, my main research interest was to observe the formation of postcapitalist subjectivity in Gibson-Graham's sense (2006) in the urban space of İstanbul. However, as I spent more time in the cooperative's everyday activities, I more seriously questioned about my assumptions about the existence of a postcapitalist subjectivity, which the postcapitalist literature seeks to trace by observing the everyday activities of alternative economic spaces like producer and consumer cooperatives. Although I realized the discursive formation of solidarity economy or community economies among the food sovereignty activists, the material relationality in which they are involved prevented me from simply interpreting their activities as a lived experience of the formation of a postcapitalist subjectivity in the urban space. In this regard, I do not mainly rely on the discursive narratives of the food sovereignty activists as "discourses are not always deeply formative of subjects and their desires" (Lyall, Colloredo-Mansfeld, and Rousseau 2018, 11) As I observed, the everyday frictions which they experience with capitalist forms of relations were

more constitutive of their activities than a pure understanding of postcapitalism. Then, I thought that the use of postcapitalist literature would be another way of applying radical alterity for a community, or a set of practices, which would force me to simplify the complexity of their action for the sake of being consistent within the frame of postcapitalism (Graeber 2015). This has been the main reason why I keep thinking of the partial characteristic of the food sovereignty movement within the spaces of consumer cooperatives throughout my fieldwork.

Besides that, my everyday involvement and observation of the cooperative activities made me realize the intertwined characteristics of the economic and ecological phenomena, which were constantly in interplay during the weekly and monthly meetings of the cooperatives and their activities within their store. Even if I was more interested in postcapitalist possibilities in a political economic sense than the material politics of a social movement at the beginning, my attachment to producers and products transformed my theoretical interests and my preferences of observation. As human and nonhuman relationality was haunting every single decision within the cooperatives, I realized the multiplicity of established orders, including the everyday existence of the Anthropocene, besides the political economic formation of the food regime. This has been another reason for thinking of the partialness of the food sovereignty movement as it has been simultaneously encompassed by the multiple wholes, and what was defining the activities of the food sovereignty activists was their labor of mediation among these wholes.

From a perspective within a single whole, whether it is the economic or ecological existence of the consumer cooperatives, it was not possible to understand their everyday activities. More than that, I did not find it analytically and ethically sufficient to focus on only one aspect of their activities. As Kaushnik Sunder Rajan (2021) describes, what is the constitutive feature of ethnographic praxis is the ability to move across scales and temporalities – which would only be possible by attentively listening to the less visible forms of labor and slowing down within and between these scales and temporalities. As he asserts, the ethnographer does not only trace the connections between these scales and temporalities but also creates these connections through ethnographic writing. In this regard, besides tracing these connections, I also aimed to create connections, which could have been visible only through ethnographic writing. Therefore, I find this short ethnographic project as a form of praxis that might help speculate new formulations of the politics of infrastructure without overlooking the partialness of our world-making projects in our "inconvenient" and "troubling" relationality, as Berlant (2022) and Haraway (2016) would call it.

1.6 The Chapters

The chapters of the thesis ultimately seek an answer for what is the meaning of the partialness of the everyday politics of infrastructure, through which the elements of the existing food infrastructure could be both refused and reclaimed. In this regard, the chapters trace the ethical and logistical experimentations within and among consumer cooperatives and food collectives, where the partialness manifests itself as both an obstacle and capacity for the food sovereignty movement. While I primarily focus on the everyday activities within the store of the Kadıköy Cooperative in the second chapter, I pay specific attention to the efforts of expanding the scale of the food sovereignty movement by drawing on my observations of certain meetings and workshops as well as the processes of food provisioning in the third chapter.

To put it specifically, the second chapter asks how the multiplicity of temporalities and established orders besides the singularity of the political economy of food infrastructure is experienced among the food sovereignty activists. By focusing on the everyday experience of two temporalities – which are economic time and ecological time – and the labor of mediation among these temporalities, the chapter traces the possibility of loosening and reinventing the existing elements of food infrastructure, primarily including the relations of debt and food quality as a very constitutive element of the maintenance of the food infrastructure. In doing so, I also aim to portray the ecological time of the Anthropocene as not a description of a catastrophic future but a lived experience in everyday life throughout the activities of the volunteers of the Kadıköy Cooperative.

The third chapter delves deeper into the question of scale and its relationship with the politics of infrastructure. By developing a connection between logistical practices and the capability of scaling world-making projects, I ask what it looks like to perform the practices of coordination of production, provisioning, and consumption without being attached to the fantasies of frictionless profit, just-in-time production, and free-standing human subject. I also seek an answer for alternative forms of democratic planning and bureaucratic promises in line with the tensions emerging throughout the encounters with the difference. By doing so, I also aim to better demonstrate the exhaustive – and craft-like – labor of the food sovereignty activists, which is exceedingly experienced during the efforts of scaling the food sovereignty movement.

However, this is not a pessimist description of the everyday politics of infrastructure. This is a portrayal of what the coexistence of the necessity and the ordinariness –

and the coexistence of constituting the common ground and securing the specificity – look like along with the partial existence of the living capacity of the human and nonhuman relationality. Only by allowing to reveal the portrays of these coexistences could it be possible to imagine, speculate, and reinvent the infrastructures of our sociality.

2. TEMPORALITIES OF REFUSAL

> The house of economy is haunted. And the specter that disturbs it is that of ecology. A haunted house is a place where more is received than the owner desires, putting the sovereignty of the host in doubt.
>
> Michael Marder, *Ecology as Event*

> Those who invest their energies in attuning themselves to others can learn over time to discriminate increasingly subtle differences in one another's utterances.
>
> Carla Hustak and Natasha Myers, *Involutionary Momentum*

2.1 Introduction

On a cold February evening in 2021, I arrived at the front of Istanbul's Kadıköy Food Cooperative where I was to volunteer. While waiting for the person who was to shadow me until I knew what I was doing, I watched pedestrian shoppers slow down in front of the store to better see the products inside and read the large and small stickers on the window glass, with the words "sustainability", "healthy food", "natural", and "local" (See Figure 2.1). After observing this for a few minutes, I unwittingly and half-seriously questioned why these words are also used by supermarket chains to advertise their organic food section. Then the volunteer showed up to train me for the shift. I was slowly but thoroughly learning how to use the pos machine for credit card purchases, reconcile the amount in the cash box with that of the Cooperative's online tracking system, or take new product inventory.

As the days passed, I more seriously questioned what is really being refused through the cooperative activities. The political standpoint of the Cooperative was hardly

visible to me within the everyday rhythms of routine market work. And I was not alone. Most volunteers were indicating their feeling of being merely a grocer – especially when they spend more time in the store. Considering the ecological time of the Anthropocene, cooperative activities as environmental action seem largely impotent in terms of their scale in time and space.

Figure 2.1 The stickers on the window glass of the Cooperative's store

Besides the impotency of the Cooperative in relation to the ecological time of the Anthropocene, the everyday activities of the Cooperative would also seem impotent

in terms of building an alternative economic organization, which would enable enacting a postcapitalist politics. For Gibson-Graham (2006), postcapitalist politics relies on eliminating the discursive dominance of the capitalist mode of production. As the economic activities consist of not only capitalist practices but also diverse economic activities – including the practices of non-capitalist and alternative capitalist enterprises which distribute the surplus besides profit-making – Gibson-Graham suggests a performative theory of diverse economies, through which it becomes possible to make flourish diverse economic practices other than capitalist relations.

In doing so, Gibson-Graham attributes peculiar importance to workers', producers', and consumers' cooperatives in enacting diverse economic practices. Through alternative practices of cooperatives, postcapitalist politics is performed to move beyond the capitalocentric understanding of economic relations so much so that interdependency between, say, producers and consumers, the human and their surrounding, or the economic and the social paves the way for an alternative politics of social connection. As they point out:

> "When a meal is cooked for a household of kids, when a cooperative sets its wage levels, when a food seller adjusts her price for one customer and not another, when a farmer allows gleaners access to his fields, when a green firm agrees to use higher-priced recycled paper, when a self-employed computer programmer takes public holidays off, when a not-for-profit enterprise commits to "buying local," some recognition of economic co-implication, interdependency, and social connection is actively occurring. These practices involve ethical considerations and political decisions that constitute social and economic being." (82-83)

However, what would a postcapitalist politics look like in the everyday activities of a cooperative? Throughout my fieldwork, it was barely possible to observe economic practices that would be categorized under the umbrella of postcapitalist politics. The main reason for the difficulty of observing postcapitalist politics in cooperative activities is the assumption that noncapitalist forms of relations could be detected, observed, and enacted as if these relations are isolated from capitalist forms of relations. The intertwined characteristics of the capitalist and noncapitalist forms of relations have been the common point for many empirical critiques of postcapitalism. For instance, Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson (2013) criticize the postcapitalist framework as it does not empirically cover how noncapitalist practices touch upon the already existing capitalist practices and their axiomatic power. As they argue:

> "The practice is built on the conviction that many forms of noncapitalist economy already exist and are submerged under a metaphorical iceberg that the mainstream economy and even radical anticapitalist politics maintain. Yet the question of how such actually existing noncapitalist practices are articulated to capitalist economic activity remains muted." (301-02)

This critique indeed resonates with my experience during my voluntary experience in the Cooperative. In other words, I would agree that if one is searching for a post-capitalist politics within the Cooperative in Gibson-Graham's sense (2006), they will be disappointed when they find themselves panicked during a shift, amidst the incessant demands of affluent consumers while simultaneously trying to find the lost invoices of capitalist cargo companies, with whom the Cooperative partners. However, instead of criticizing the consumer cooperatives' everyday activities as not postcapitalist enough to build an emancipatory potential, I prefer to focus on this intertwined characteristics of capitalist and noncapitalist forms of relations as the source of building a politics of alternative economic infrastructure. Therefore, what builds a postcapitalist politics is not the practice of discursively creating borders among forms of economic relations. Rather, mundane frictions between these relations are the necessity of building this form of politics. In other words, the partial position of the cooperative practices among forms of economic relations and different temporalities are the sites of observation and enactment of alternative politics of economic and ecological infrastructure.

I ultimately argue in this chapter that food sovereignty activism as a way of performing alternative economic and ecological infrastructure develops its refusal not despite but because of its partial position within capitalist and noncapitalist forms of relations on the one hand and within different temporalities on the other. In the first part of the chapter, I suggest a politics of interpretation to consider this form of action beyond the postpolitics debate by pointing out the need of taking into account of multiple temporalities – ecological time and economic time – for their refusal. In the second part, I delve into how the ecological time of the Anthropocene is experienced by the activists in the urban space, not as a catastrophic future but as a living phenomenon in the present through the material-semiotic formulation of organic food. In this section, I also mainly explore how another form of ecological time besides the Anthropocene can be promised – as a lived experience of the temporality of another food infrastructure – by food sovereignty activists in the form of porosity, situatedness, and contradiction and how it clashes with the promises of the Anthropocene. In the final section, I explain how promises of this "another" ecological time are permeated into everyday economic action as a way of environ-

mental refusal. I suggest that this environmental refusal as a way of reinventing an element of food infrastructure could be observed in reformulations of the relations of debt and food quality throughout the interactions with volunteers, producers, and consumers.

2.2 Temporalities and Labor of Mediation

The lack of transformative power in local environmental movements – including eco-transition projects, consumer collectives, urban gardening groups, or alternative food provisioning networks – is extensively questioned by the scholars of postpolitics (Blühdorn 2017; MacGregor 2021; Swyngedouw 2013; Žižek 2004). Their work widely points out that local, small-scale environmental practices are "simulation exercises" at best and, at worst, mundane practices waiting to be absorbed by the axiomatic power of neoliberal capitalism (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013; Pellizzoni 2020, 5). The neoliberal critique of the postpolitics scholars for environmental policy making notwithstanding, their analyses of local forms of environmentalism stand out for me in terms of the ambiguous formulation of "properly political" within these analyses (Postero and Elinoff 2019).

The arguments of the post-political critique are not only debated in theoretical articles but felt on the ground by food sovereignty activists." This feeling on the ground was visible in many cooperative events, as the name of one aptly indicates: "Are we chasing our tails?" (see Figure 2.2). The feeling of being not revolutionary or emancipatory enough is not peculiar to İstanbul's food sovereignty activists; rather, it is particularly observable in a variety of post-Occupy activism around the world. In dialogue with Portwood-Stacer (2013) and Naegler (2018), for example, Luigi Pellizzoni (2020) points out how "post-Occupy Wall Street activists engaged in initiatives such as service centers, urban farms and other forms of mutual aid, are afraid that this type of micro-politics, rather than undermining capitalist relations, may, unintentionally, (re)produce exclusionary relations and strengthen the consumer paradigms it aims to oppose" (4-5). Then, is the post-political critique right about the lack of transformative power of local environmental activism? Or does it just indicate a problem of interpretation?

Figure 2.2 The event called "Boşuna mı Kürek Çekiyoruz?", organized to be in solidarity with the Kadıköy Cooperative

I argue for the latter that the post-political critique heavily depends on the temporal and capitalocentric observation of the neoliberal capitalist order through which the critique classifies political action alongside the micro-macro binary. Rather than assessing what is "properly political" from a single economic and temporal point in Rancière's term (2001), I suggest considering multiple temporalities and economic forms that are simultaneously at play and constantly constructed during everyday activities. At this point, it is necessary to explicate what it means to consider multiple temporalities and economic forms for food sovereignty activism.

How I use the concept of temporality is not so much different from a formulation of the established order, where multiple rhythms of economic and ecological relations interact with each other. In this regard, I do not give temporality an ontological

status, which could be taken for granted without referring to these economic and ecological relations which make and remake these temporalities (Ringel 2016). In other words, temporality could be simply seen as "particular patterns of sociality" and multiple, and often contested, forms of these patterns (Appel, Anand and Gupta 2018, 17). Moreover, temporality as a social phenomenon cannot be investigated as isolated from other temporalities as it always operates "in the network of interrelationships between the multiple rhythms" (Ingold 1993, 160). This understanding of temporality is also formulated by Henri Lefebvre's rhythmanalysis (2004), where he classifies the relationships between rhythms in three categories: polyrhythmia, eurhythmia, and arrhythmia. Polyrhythmia refers to the coexistence of multiple different rhythms; eurhythmia is consonance, or what I would call attunement, of these multiple rhythms; and arrhythmia indicates the tension and conflict between these rhythms (see Birth 2012). In this sense, temporality as a site of the interaction between multiple rhythms provides the possibility of understanding the symptoms of peculiar conflicts consisting of economic and ecological relations – and efforts of dealing with these conflicts. In order to deal with these conflicts, I would say, it is necessary to endure the conflicts – or frictions – between different temporalities as a form of postcapitalist and more-than-human infrastructural politics through attunement of the multiplicity of these temporalities.

In other words, in order to understand why food sovereignty activism as an infrastructural project is not effective enough to lead to a transformation within the economic order of neoliberal capitalism, it is necessary to look at what is really happening within and between different temporalities and forms of economic relations during their everyday activities. From a single perspective of capitalist and anthropocentric post-political critique, it would not be possible to apprehend the labor of mediation between forms of economic relations and temporalities – and representations of these temporalities – which is the constitutive characteristic of İstanbul's food sovereignty activism. As Laura Bear (2014) indicates the role of the labor of mediation between different temporalities as a way of performing creative and emancipatory politics:

> "[The use of the term 'labor'] is meant literally to demarcate our creative, mediating action in the world. With our labor, we have to reconcile disparate social rhythms, multiple representations of time and non-human time. We argue that the act of working in and on time involves: an encounter with the material world; the limits of the body; multiple tools; and co-ordinations of diverse rhythms and representations. [...] It also suggests that new time-maps might emerge from the pressing back of the non-human material world on human action." (20-21).

This point of the labor of mediation between different temporalities, forms of relations, and established orders, I would suggest, is the missing point within the postpolitical critique of local environmental action as a form of infrastructural politics. Instead, it is necessary to give specific attention to this labor of mediation if we are to understand and build alternative infrastructures, whether it is food infrastructure or not, where these multiple temporalities, forms of relations, and established orders constantly shape.

Then, how do we understand the temporalities that food sovereignty activists seek to deal with in their everyday infrastructural activism? What does it mean to separate temporalities as ecological time and economic time? Firstly, the politics of food infrastructure as world-making practices cannot be merely enacted in accordance with already existing temporalities. Rather, these practices, as Laura Bear would suggest, make possible new temporalities and social and non-human rhythms to creatively flourish. However, these new temporalities as elements of a new infrastructure do not manifest themselves as if they operate in an isolated manner. Rather, within the case of food infrastructure, the elements of the attempts of building new food infrastructure go hand in hand with the constant frictions and conflict with the capitalist and anthropocentric temporalities of the already existing food infrastructure. Secondly, categorizing temporalities in terms of ecological time and economic time lies behind my observation during my fieldwork. Throughout my experience in cooperative activities, what constituted everyday infrastructural politics of food sovereignty activists was the constant tension between ecological and economic phenomena. Therefore, I decided to specifically focus on these two forms of phenomena from the lens of temporality as constitutive elements of a food infrastructure. It means that these are not given temporalities waiting to be observed; instead, these are constituted through the positionality of the ethnographic observer. In other words, it is quite possible that another ethnographer could add another temporality – for example, they could add bureaucratic time as in Laura Bear's classification – or bring out a brand new classification of temporalities, depending on the ways in which they position themselves within the field. Yet, my experience in the store and during meetings has made me specifically focus on the food sovereignty activists' constant labor of mediation between ecological time and economic time.

And thirdly, what it means to offer new temporalities – and how these new temporalities operate and could be observed in everyday life – is another point that should be considered in order to empirically infer the everyday infrastructural politics of the food sovereignty activists. For this purpose, I decided to pay attention to promises which are given in different ways for different subject positions in different temporalities. To put it specifically, what I observed is that building new tempo-

ralities and rhythms of a food infrastructure largely depends on how promises are given to producers, consumers, and activists through everyday ecological and economic formulations of that food infrastructure. By focusing on promises of different temporalities, I also aim to imply the very connection between temporality and infrastructure, as the concept of promise deeply relies on an infrastructural understanding. As Brian Larkin (2018) asserts – though he does not specifically mention food infrastructure but the concept of infrastructure from an analytical standpoint:

> "As a concept, promise is tied to the political aesthetics of infrastructural systems. These do not have just technical requirements— circulating radio waves, vehicles, people from one place to another— but transmit ideas at the same time. Those ideas address people, create subject positions— deeply attractive for some, repulsive for others— through which they operate to fashion sensibilities. Taking all of these into account allows us to expand our concept of infrastructure, to draw on the insights gained from the material turn but without rejecting the fact that infrastructures are also figures." (183)

Another point to show why it is important to focus on ecological time and economic time in observing an infrastructure could be explained through my inspiration from Gabrielle Hecht's (2018) analysis and narrative strategy that demonstrates the coexistence of multiple temporalities. In her work about the value and waste practices of uranium mine, she investigates how the objectness of uranium mine allows the simultaneous consideration of human time and deep time, through which it enables revealing and narrating slow violence of deep time around a specific object without overlooking human time. By doing so, she calls the object of her analysis "interscalar vehicle", which allows zooming in and out along with the time of the Anthropocene and the political economic time of capitalism in the present at the same time. Inferring from her analysis, I would say that food could also be categorized as an interscalar – or intertemporal vehicle – through which it becomes possible to observe and build multiple temporalities of an infrastructure.

Besides that, I suggest that the post-political critique's discursive standpoint provides too limited perspective to understand the labor of the food sovereignty activists in everyday life. In the literature of post-politics, the engagement of local environmental and economic actions with the fantasies of sustainability and development or with the narratives of catastrophic future (Blühdorn 2017). In this sense, the post-political perspective would easily interpret the stickers on the window glass of the Cooperative or the catastrophic narratives of the volunteers as a sign of being attached to post-political fantasies. I argue that this discourse-centered interpretation

of food sovereignty activism would be misleading as it prevents from understanding how the already existing elements of food infrastructure are reclaimed in everyday life.

Moreover, wittingly or not, the discursive existence of sustainability, development, or any concepts having a consumerist connotation, provides the possibility of loosening the fantasies which are attached to these discourses. It also enables them to maneuver thanks to their partial position between capitalist and noncapitalist, or between consumerist and nonconsumerist forms of relations. Similarly, as Lyall, Colloredo-Mansfeld, and Rousseau (2018) argue, discourses "can be strategic resources for marginalized actors to maneuver within limited spaces for political engagement" (11).

Therefore, instead of an analysis from a political economic and discursive perspective, I suggest investigating the constant interplay between economic and ecological temporalities by focusing on how promises of these temporalities are felt by food sovereignty practices in an urban space. As Mario Blaser (2019) asserts, "the post-political critique has the neoliberal consensus as the order of reference, but is blind to the humanist order of which it is part" (88). To better understand how humanist order is experienced in the practices of food sovereignty activists, I ask how they encounter the promises of the Anthropocene as a form of ecological time. In doing so, I do not focus on the manifestations of its promises by pursuing narratives of a catastrophic future but instead portray how its promises are refused in the present through new promises of the ecological as a living phenomenon. My main purpose of focusing on the present instead of a narrative of the future is to demonstrate that the ecological time of the Anthropocene is not merely a catastrophic narrative about the future but it is a temporality that is constantly made and remade through infrastructural politics of food sovereignty activism.

This way, I also aim to demonstrate how refusal is performed by food sovereignty activists throughout multiple temporalities on the one hand and offer insights about the difficulty of empowering such a project within the neoliberal capitalist order. In the following sections, I define the activists' labor of mediation within and among temporalities as a craft, a form of a caring and listening practice that cannot be institutionalized as we know it (Martin, Myers, and Viseu 2015; Papadopoulos 2018).

2.3 Promises of Another Ecological Time: Porosity, Situatedness, Contradiction

How do food sovereignty activists encounter the ecological time of the Anthropocene in their everyday life? How do they advertently or inadvertently refuse its promises while offering those promises of another ecological time? To answer these questions, I primarily focus on the food sovereignty activists' encounter with the logic of organic food certification. I suggest that this encounter provides a possibility to portray what it means to experience promises of the ecological time of the Anthropocene in everyday life. Drawing on the observations of this encounter, I define these promises as modularity, purity, and noncontradiction. By doing so, I also suggest that the promises of the Anthropocene appear beyond the boundaries of the plantation regime and extend toward the neoliberal regime of organic food certification.

On one day of my work shift, I opened the store of the Cooperative as I was now quite eligible to work independently. A couple of minutes after I opened the store, a customer in their fifties entered the store and began to peer into the refrigerator and at the eggs aligned on the table. "Why could not I see the code for organic production imprinted on eggs?" they asked disappointedly. "We do not rely on products officially certified for organic production as it exacerbates the already existing inequalities that small producers suffer from. Instead of these certifications, we use more detailed forms that we send to small producers to eliminate inequalities as much as possible" I answered. They were not satisfied with my answer. "Then I cannot trust these eggs if they are not subjected to regulations," they replied and left the store with a disappointed face.

I am not in favor of blaming or constructing an argument that assigns who is more ecological in this encounter. Instead, I am in favor of asking how this disappointment represents the temporal frictions that everyday environmental activism strives to address. Organic certification in particular and agricultural certification systems for assessing and maintaining quality in general, I argue, serve the promise of creating self-contained and "modular" units of production, which anticipate the future time of agriculture by universalizing the idea and practices of being ecological (Appel 2012). Hannah Appel defines modularity as a form of structure that does "not require changing the zoning code but, instead, come with an anticipatory relationship to place and time – legally compliant, mobile without foundation, impermanent, and disposable or reusable elsewhere" (697). Although she defines the concept to explain how the oil industry works through offshore operations of extraction and develops technologies of disentanglement for frictionless profit, I find her argument quite

useful to understand the technicality of organic food certification through which the everydayness of the ecological time of the Anthropocene is experienced.

The promises of the temporality of the Anthropocene are distributed through organic food certifications along with producers, consumers, and food sovereignty activists. Organic food certification in Turkey is mainly provided by the certification companies that the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Livestock delegated after the 2004 Organic Agriculture Law. The amount of governmental red tape, in terms of the Ministry's certification process for the regulation and requirements for organic food, has made it exceedingly difficult for producers to maintain high-quality organic food in an ecologically sustainable manner (Soysal Al 2020*a*). As a consequence, it has become the norm for producers to be trapped between price fluctuations or the need of expanding the field of organic production so as to develop further strategies for maintaining high quality.

In this sense, organic food certifications devolve their ecologically based promise into a luxury good production either by disempowering the producer within the larger organic food industry or by forcing the producer to modularize the unit of product (Keyder and Yenal 2013). Through modularization, high-quality organic product is produced by crystallizing the idea of the ecological whose rules could be applied anywhere in the world as long as indeterminacies, contradictions, and frictions – which are indeed intrinsic to, and even definitive characteristics of ecological production – remained invisible within the aesthetic temporality of the Anthropocene.

The emphasis on invisibility is crucial here to an understanding of the temporality of the Anthropocene. If we are to simply define the importance of the ecological time of the Anthropocene, it is possible to assert that the Anthropocene refers to "scalar enormity" (Hecht 2018, 113). In other words, the term basically refers to the ecological harm induced by human and nonhuman sociality which are mostly invisible but whose effects could be easily accelerated. In this regard, what makes the elements of human and nonhuman sociality invisible in such a way that the effects of them could be acceleratedly harmful is a necessary question in order to understand the ecological time of the Anthropocene. Therefore, the answer of this question does not lie behind the narratives of a catastrophic future; rather, what remains visible or invisible – and to whom they remain visible or invisible – are the questions directly related to the present elements of the temporality of the Anthropocene.[1]

How is the ecological time of the Anthropocene experienced by the consumers of

[1] As such, these questions are also concerned with the aesthetic dimension of temporality. Although I find Ranciere's emphasis on truly political misleading, his conceptualization of aesthetics in terms of distribution of the sensible could be helpful here in clarifying how ecological time operates in the present.

the Cooperative? What does remain visible and invisible for them? To put it simply, the logic of certification provides the opportunity for consumers to integrate the possibility of being ecological and responsible into the time and space of the city. During my work shift experience and our conversations with volunteers in the store of Kadıköy Cooperative, the activists' encounters with consumers busily searching for codes or any other indicators of healthy food have represented to me the exhausting labor of food sovereignty activists in relation to the promise of the Anthropocene within the urban space. Consumers enter the store, scrutinizing the details of products. Some shoppers even avoid conversations; some interrogate the volunteer for the absence of necessary information on some products. Even if the Cooperative does not work with certified organic food producers, the persistent rationality of certification permeates the store through encounters with consumers.

The encounters in the store are mostly reminiscent of any encounters between a cashier working in a supermarket and a consumer. For this reason, some consumer cooperatives seriously think of turning themselves into a closed group that only serves themselves instead of the community outside the walls of the store. As a volunteer from Koşuyolu Cooperative indicates in a meeting among consumer cooperatives:

> "We deeply suffer from the lack of motivation as well as you do because of the shopping mentality of consumers. Because of those [consumers] who do not even dare to take a little pain to get healthy food... Because of their obsession with healthy food without any effort... They think by paying with money they can buy our efforts but we are exhausted by this. So, we decided to cut our service to people from outside to only serve ourselves."

This feeling of exhaustion – and sometimes the lack of motivation – was highly observable among the volunteers of the Kadıköy Cooperative as well. Although whether they should cut their service to people from outside has long been a point of debate during the routine meetings and workshops, it could not have been achieved during my voluntary experience. The main reason why it could not have been achieved is that it requires a serious amount of transformation of the everyday activities of the Cooperative – which would also require more motivated volunteers to deal with the contingencies of this transformation. Besides this ongoing lack of motivation, what I have observed during my fieldwork is that this lack of motivation and energy has been going hand in hand with the increased workload that the volunteers need to carry out in their professional and familial life. As one volunteer

of the Cooperative indicates:

> "It is not so surprising that we were more motivated before [the recent economic crisis of Turkey]. Now, we need to work more exhaustingly than we needed one or two years ago. [...] Let us think of the Thursday meetings [of the Cooperative]. For one year, I wake up at 6 am to go to my work. And only after 7 pm do I manage to arrive home. Our meetings start at 7:45 pm. [...] Of course, I should consider how I want to spend the rest of the day. Of course, it is extremely reasonable for one to spend their time with their family instead of joining the meetings."

Similarly, another volunteer of the Cooperative complains about the unequal distribution of time among men and women in the Cooperative in addition to their increased workload during the recent economic crisis in Turkey:

> "It is not an exaggeration to say that cooperative work is like a second shift. [...] There are many women [in the Cooperative] who need to care for their children while also working so hard [in their professional jobs]. [...] For instance, 8 pm is really not suitable for these women. I do not think it is possible for these women to contribute to decisions made in the cooperative with a clear mind while they need to think of what is really going on in their home at the same time."

While volunteers mostly feel motivated and joyful during many events and organizations about broadening food sovereignty and the cooperative movement in the urban space, this lack of motivation and exhaustion are also commonly observable in the majority of consumer cooperatives in İstanbul. While it is possible to regard their joyful exhaustion merely as a consequence of their voluntarism, I tend to interpret it as the consequence of the intertwined experience of the labor regimes within the urban space and the demanding labor behind the everydayness of the ecological time of the Anthropocene. This experience, in other words, is a form of friction between the temporalities of different labor regimes.

In addition to that, what I would like to particularly point out is that the experience of the volunteers could also be observed as a friction between the promise of the ecological time of the Anthropocene and the creation of promises for another ecological time. In order to understand this form of friction in the everyday activities of the volunteers as a way of temporal refusing, it is necessary to delve into what it means to experience the Anthropocene within the present time of their activities. In this

regard, purity has been one of the most preeminent themes regarding the tensions between the forms of ecological time during my fieldwork; and this has been clearly observable around the everyday material-semiotic of formation of the organic food.

Organic food certification – or the general rationality of predetermined rules of being organic – creates a normative system that strictly determines what is purely ecological and what is not. This logic of "purism" as the promise of the Anthropocene is also pointed out by Alexis Shotwell (2016): [T]o mark the beginning of the Anthropocene: roughly, the moment that humans worry that we have lost a natural state of purity or decide that purity is something we ought to pursue and defend" (3). The logic of purity, or the imagined lack of porosity among entangled forms of existence in the world, has long been questioned by scholars of feminist science studies and environmental humanities as well as the foundational readings of the anthropological theory (Alaimo 2010; Barad 2014; Haraway 1991; Tuana 2008; Douglas 1966). I am interested here in how this lack of porosity, or purity, as a form of promise is encountered by food sovereignty activists. This encounter was observable when Kadıköy Cooperative decided to sell vegan meat that is displayed on the shelf in plastic packaging. While many vegan consumers were happy to see a vegan product in the store, there was a serious amount of complaints about the use of plastic packaging among consumers. Many consumers who examined the packaging accused the Cooperative of not being truly ecological. Max Liboiron (2021) describes this form of consumer behavior – or activist behavior in some other cases – as a scalar mismatch based on the purity relationship:

> "Even if you swap out your plastic bottle for a glass one, you still have BPA coming in from cash register receipts, paper bills, the lining of canned food, and epoxies. Avoidance, based on the concept of the possibility of separating human (body) and (polluted) Nature, is a scalar mismatch where problems and their proposed solutions occur at different scales and do not affect the relationships that matter. Purity relations based in discreteness and separation do not scale for plastics." (101)

Moreover, the encounters with the logic of purity were not limited to vegan products with plastic packaging during my fieldwork. It was quite common for the volunteers to have conversations with women consumers who look for the purest products for their children. This eagerness to seek for purest products could be defined as the everyday manifestation of precautionary consumption (also see Soysal Al 2015). Dayna Nadine Scott, Jennie Haw, and Robyn Lee (2017) explain precautionary consumption as follows:

> "When people exercise precautionary consumption, they are required to engage as consumers; that is, by buying particular kinds of products and not others. In doing so, they validate corporate marketing strategies that appropriate people's desires to be environmentally conscious and toxic-free for the goal of generating profit. It is possible that there is a theory of 'market signals' that underlies these practices and/or campaigns (i.e. the idea that our consumer choices send signals to corporations about what kinds of toxics we want them to avoid, which will eventually result in cleaner products for everyone) but since these are neither explicit nor consistently articulated as part of the campaigns, precautionary consumers tend to enter a 'boundary-making mode' rather than a politicized mode of collective engagement towards broader system change." (14-15)

Besides women who look for the purest products for their children, this search for the purest products, as far as I have realized during my fieldwork, could be observable among people who define themselves as activists involved in slow food activism. Although its emphasis on slowness could be interpreted as a counter-position for the destructive rhythm of capitalist agro-industrial production, its engagement with purity activism necessarily leads it to reinforce the purity-based promises of the ecological time of the Anthropocene.

Moreover, the engagement of the slow food movement with the purity-based promises of the Anthropocene goes hand in hand with ableism and the aesthetic invisibility of crip time, the excessive visibility of the temporality of unhybridity and authenticity, and unquestioned formations of healthiness. Frequently, slow food activism sees unhealthiness as a consequence of hybrid, unauthentic, impure agricultural products as a result of agro-industrial production and seeks solutions for unhealthiness and disability around the purity practices as if these practices can be held in a fixed and isolated manner in such a way that food justice could be achieved. Kim Q. Hall (2014) explains the very link between activities of purity and ableism and the practices and discursive formations of the slow food movement:

> "Despite the promise of its name, the discourse of the slow food movement also relies on a metaphysics of purity and alimentary ableism. There are ironies here, of course. The slow food movement emerged in opposition to fast food, the very food Harlan Hahn identifies as the food of disability culture because of the inaccessibility of most restaurants. Slow food celebrates that which is authentic because it is tied to one place. In addition, it champions self-reliance (e.g., cooking, hunting, or foraging for one's own food) as the most moral relationship to food. Within the slow food movement, self-reliance and authenticity are the ultimate values that sustain health, bodies, and just food systems. But,

> as Parama Roy (2010) and Sarah Jaquette Ray (2013) remind us, places and the foods associated with them are not fixed. They are frequently fraught sites of becoming." (191)

The dichotomy between slowness and fastness here requires us to consider temporality beyond the isolated paces of the rhythms of production and consumption. Rather, it is crucial to have an understanding that how and to whom the present promises of these temporalities are given. The dynamicity of healthiness and impossibility of an isolated purity need to be taken into account for the creation of promises of another temporality.

Then, what is the response of food sovereignty activists within this environment where being ecological or not is purely prescribed? How do they differ from the material-semiotic formations of the slow food activism? The way activists differ from slow food activism and cultivate their own ecological promise lies behind the activities which could be categorized under the umbrella of situated ethics. Situated ethics is both a form of refusing the promise of the Anthropocene and offering a new one within the everydayness of ecological time. By drawing attention to the motto of "it depends" within permaculture movements, Maria Puig de la Bellacasa (2017) delves into the crucial role of situated ethics in careful actions as, she explains, "[o]n the ground, doings are always more 'messy' than they appear in principles" (163-164).

This messiness is experienced in its most basic form when food sovereignty activists constantly encounter the situation that small farmers can barely maintain the necessities for ecological production whereas farmers engaged in middle size farming are more able to control their fields to meet the production criteria of the Kadıköy Cooperative. To deal with this messiness, the Cooperative prioritizes certain profiles of producers when deciding which products will be bought or which producers will be partnered with. For instance, when a decision should be made among two chickpea producers, if one is a woman, produces on a smaller farm, or already works with other consumer cooperatives instead of being a newcomer to the network, the Cooperative is most likely to decide to work with that producer.

Besides this prioritization, the cooperative sends producers a detailed form that questions the conditions under which products are produced. The questions do not only interrogate profiles of producers in a simple way or detect whether a pesticide is used during production but investigate numerous forms of human and nonhuman sociality. The form includes, for instance, questions regarding child labor or requests for specifications from producers as to their knowledge of the production of raw

materials they bought for production. To put it more specifically, for instance, a question in the form asks whether worms are damaged during the production of the vermicompost that they bought for use.

While applying the criteria in accordance with the answers of producers, volunteers are far from being strictly guided by these questions. Although there are strong tendencies such as preferring pesticide-free products or women producers, all elements about producers and general criteria are discussed in detail in weekly meetings or monthly workshops. As such, prioritizing certain producers over others is not strictly determined through prescribed rules. Even if the Cooperative has prescriptions for all stages of buying foods from producers as well as for describing the daily, weekly, and monthly tasks of the units of the Cooperative, these prescriptions are subjected to the decisions which are dynamically made in weekly meetings and monthly workshops instead of the other way around. Therefore, although I exemplified how decisions are made through prioritization above in the case of two chickpea producers, this prioritization can be easily upside down through a piece of additional information provided by any volunteers during a meeting.

This could be observed in the volunteers' efforts of deciding which products should be entered into the store and which products should be excluded from it as well. With this regard, the discussions about buying propolis from a woman producer during meetings could be a good example in terms of demonstrating the role of the flow of information and changing ethical considerations which could be challenging for the efforts of prioritization. In one of the weekly meetings of the Cooperative, the unit of products and producers recommended buying propolis from a woman producer from whom the Cooperative already buys a variety of kinds of honey. As propolis was seen as a super healthy food by a majority of volunteers, it was decided to buy propolis from that woman producer. It was a good decision to buy it in terms of both supporting the local small producer who is also a woman and increasing the variety of products which could be beneficial, particularly for women who look for super healthy products like propolis for their children. Nevertheless, this decision was accompanied by the Cooperative's recent attempt of decreasing the variety of animal products within the store. Therefore, an additional animal product was contradicting these recent attempts. After a couple of weeks, the working group, which are formed to do research on the processes of extracting propolis, came up with a piece of information that the legs of the bees are broken during the extraction process. After this information, it was not easy for a collective who work for better ethical considerations by reducing the exploitation of both human and nonhuman animals and entities. Finally, the Cooperative decided to not buy propolis from this producer even if buying propolis would be quite beneficial for both

this women producer and many consumers as well as the economic contingencies of the Cooperative.

What I mean by messiness and the necessity of situated ethics could be seen through this example. The ways of managing interdependency through everyday action require living with those contradictions – if not eliminating those contradictions. As Timothy Morton (2016) explicates:

> "Interdependence, which is ecology, is sad and contingent. When I'm nice to a bunny rabbit I'm not being nice to bunny rabbit parasites. Amazing violence would be required to try to fit a form over everything all at once. If you try then you basically undermine the bunnies and everything else into components of a machine, replaceable components whose only important aspect is their existence. I assume you are sensitively aware of the ecological emergency we call the present—which has been happening in various forms for twelve thousand years. It is that there are logical limits on caring, a function of interdependence." (150)

Because of the constant flow of information regarding the possibility of exploiting human and nonhuman animals and other entities within the Cooperative, this sad and contingent dimension of the practices of the volunteers is constantly experienced by them. This experience, I would suggest, is a way of creating another temporality that is fueled by these contradictions, instead of the apparently noncontradictory dimension of the ecological time of the Anthropocene. To put it differently, if it is possible to assign a strict criterion for food sovereignty activists as a way of creating another temporality, it would be the criterion of having loose criteria, which opens its material-semiotic boundaries to many contradictions.

These contradictions are indeed another promise of the ecological time that food sovereignty activists offer. As Timothy Morton (2016) suggests, agriculture, including practices of organic food today, depends on the very promise of "noncontradiction" "to eliminate contradiction and anomaly" for the sake of human existence (46).[2] Food sovereignty activists, nevertheless, could prefer the use of plastic for the sake of being ecological. These individuals could tolerate 'more innocent' forms of chemical use as an ecological preference if criteria other than ordering pesticide-free products should be prioritized. Such contradictions explain why they experience intense frictions with the ecological time of the Anthropocene appearing in the form of organic food production, a conflict that underpins the promise of noncontradiction

[2] Although Timothy Morton (2016) points out the principle of "noncontradiction" in investigating their concept of "agrilogistics" instead of in directly explicating the promises of the Anthropocene, I find it quite applicable to the food sovereignty activists' encounters and frictions with these promises.

along with modularity and purity.

The labor of the volunteers is exhausting, sad, and contingent, in Morton's sense of the expression, as a result of contradictions along with the need to constantly situate themselves in different subject positions without being attached to the promise of purity. The ways of creating another form of ecological time in everyday life besides the Anthropocene bring about this messiness of human and nonhuman sociality instead of invisibilizing this sociality. This is a kind of an exhausting "art of noticing" in Tsing's terms (2015) or the "art of paying attention" in Stengers's definition (Savransky and Stengers 2018) which is required for the enactment of this ecological time for another infrastructural politics of food. This is seemingly the only way of escaping the scalar enormity of the Anthropocene's temporal formation of food infrastructure. In the next section, I will delve into creating the possibility of attunement of ecological and economic time as another form of the volunteer's art of paying attention and mediation as an aesthetic, ecological, and economic praxis.

2.4 Economic Time: Attunement, Debt, and Food Quality

The way that I understand the temporal formulation of the ecological and the economic in a dialectical way does not only rely on my observation during my fieldwork; but it resonates with certain philosophical discussions around these two concepts. Deriving the Greek word oikos, which means dwelling in its most basic sense, both words refer to the order of the house by indicating the dialectical relationship between maintaining that order through calculation and the chaotic emergence of the incalculable (Marder 2018). Through a Derridean understanding, Michael Marder explicates this dialectical haunting of the ecological and the economic for each other. As the organization of everyday life is predominantly held by the capitalist economy as the main reference of order, its disruption is led by the incalculable emergence of the ecological. In that sense, instead of the source of human and nonhuman coexistence, it turns itself into a source of chaos for the current organization of everyday life. As he points out:

> "[T]he fold of the ecological dwelling has mutated into a break in the circle, immanence has flipped into transcendence, and the event has turned into a violent disruption instead of the possibility of a continuous habitation. These reversals are happening for a good reason: we are expelled from the dwelling by our own unremitting economic activity [...]." (152)

What Marder points out as being "expelled from the dwelling by our own unremitting economic activity" is easily applicable to the capitalist forms of relations. I would like to ask here this question: what if imagination and creation of another economic time come into existence – though inescapably in such a way that is in relation to the existing capitalist forms of relations? What would it mean for the economic and ecological activities to be dwelling into each other in Marder's terms?

By referencing Mauss's (1969) concept of *hau* as the spirit that enables the continuation of Maori gifting, Hannah Appel (2012) defines profit as the *hau* of capitalism. Then, what would be the *hau* of the everyday experimentations that enables food sovereignty activists to perform another form of economic action besides capitalism? I would argue here the *hau* of the economic practices in their everyday experimental politics is attunement. Drawing on Shiho Satsuka's (2019) conceptualization of attunement as a form of human and nonhuman communication by noticing the coexistence of multiple rhythms in the present, I understand food sovereignty activists' labor of mediation as an attunement of the promises of ecological and economic temporalities toward each other (also see Hustak and Myers 2012). In the daily activities of food sovereignty activists, attunements are a set of mediating practices that turn economic action into a form of ecological refusal. In this regard, I explore here the manifestations of food sovereignty activists' labor of mediation in reclaiming the relations of debt and food quality – as very constitutive elements of the existing food infrastructure – as a way of attunement and ask how porosity, situatedness, and contradictions permeate their economic practices. Moreover, as in the efforts of the food sovereignty activists in creating another ecological time, the attunement of the ecological and the economic refers to the art of paying attention, noticing, and listening activities for the creation of another economic time as well as the refusal of the existing one. As Marina Peterson (2021) would suggest, "[l]istening offers the possibility of attuning toward one another, or the refusal thereof" (9).

Why I prefer to use attunement instead of only using the labor of mediation is its connotation that refers to the simultaneous consonance of two temporalities beyond the mere agency of human labor. Because the agencies of both the human and nonhuman entities and their relations are the ones that constitute this possibility of creating alternative forms of ecological and economic time, the labor of mediation might remain insufficient in terms of emphasizing the complexity of this relationality. Besides, the conceptualization of the labor of mediation might unwittingly imply the position of the mediator as if it is isolated from the relationality of temporal attunement. Because of these reasons, I find attunement a more applicable term for observing the temporal creation of the economic elements of a new food infrastructure as well as the partial existence of this new food infrastructure within

the existing capitalist and anthropocentric food infrastructure. Now, I would like to describe how the economic time of the Cooperative operates in everyday life and whether this economic time would differ from the economic time of another market store which could be easily evaluated under the category of capitalist enterprise.

In terms of the frequency of ordering products in the Cooperative, it is possible to classify the orders into four categories: weekly orders, monthly/bimonthly orders, annual orders, and less frequent – or arrhythmic – orders. The weekly orders of the Cooperative predominantly consist of eggs, cheeses, and bread. Because of the high demand by the consumers, these products could be easily sold and could directly contribute to the weekly turnover. As the economic benefits of these products are relatively higher than the other products, it is not easy to relinquish selling them for ethical reasons – this ethical dilemma is particularly visible for animal products. Moreover, it would be quite difficult to describe the order of these products as temporally different from another market store located in the same neighborhood. The relationships between the volunteers and consumers on the one hand and the volunteers and producers on the other mostly keep going without serious temporal tensions that would peculiarly shape the economic time of the Cooperative.

Nevertheless, as much as the products are ordered less frequently than the weekly products, the pace of the circulation of things brings about certain tensions which could be peculiar to the economic time of the Cooperative as well as the possibility of dealing with these tensions. As the expenditure of the amount in the bank account is prioritized for the weekly products to keep sustaining the faster circulation of products and money, less amount of money in the account is allocated for the payment of the products which are ordered less frequently than the weekly products. Moreover, because the Cooperative adds a very limited amount of surplus value for each product, saving money for the payments of the products could last much longer than that of any capitalist enterprise which prioritizes economic maintenance and profit-making. Besides that, the Cooperative is reluctant to reflect the commission to the consumer, which the bank charges for the use of the pos machine. Because of its reluctance, the Cooperative should wait longer to get the payment from the bank in order to be charged a less amount of commission. All these reasons lead to delayed payments of the Cooperative for producers. In other words, as opposed to a general understanding within the literature of alternative food networks, the Cooperative as an initiative from the consumer side of the food network does not initiate – or cannot initiate, to define their situation more properly – advance payments within the form of supporting the small producers (Poças Ribeiro 2021; Kato 2014). This difficulty in initiating advance payment could be seen as a result of the partial position of the Cooperative within the capitalist political economy of food infrastructure and

its temporal order. As it does not seek either profit-making or a faster pace of the circulation of products and money, its economic activity differs from that of a capitalist enterprise and its technical apparatuses for dealing with the slowness of the circulation of products and money. Moreover, because the Cooperative needs to find a balance between the rhythms of the orders of different products and the conditions of their payments, it differs from other consumer initiatives which relatively buy less variety of products from producers or from those who need to meet the demands from fewer consumers.

It is possible to say that ordering fewer circulating products turns the relationship between the activists and producers into a relationship between the debtor and the creditor. Yet, how would it differ from that of any capitalist enterprise – if any? How would the elements of the economic time of the Cooperative come into being through this relationship between the debtor and creditor? I would assert here that the very difference between the debtor and the creditor - or the giver and the receiver – to some extent becomes blurred within the economic time of the Cooperative. Through this blurring difference, it becomes possible to develop more non-hierarchical relationship between the activists and producers. As a volunteer of the Cooperative indicates in our interview:

> "Yes, on the one hand, we support the producers, because they are not able to reach the market mechanisms because of their very limited production, etc. But we also make our payments in a very delayed manner. Especially these days... It sometimes takes 3 months for us to make our payments to our producers. [...] So it is not very clear to me who is supporting whom. I feel like the producers support us more predominantly than we support the producers"

However, there is another difficulty for the activists to convince producers: the fact that the activists do not make any profits during the economic activities of the Cooperative. And it is suspicious whether they are able to convince producers most of the time. Another volunteer of the Cooperative complains about the lack of efforts of convincing producers in our interview:

> "I am really thankful for producers who are very sympathetic about our situation and who know very well about our voluntary labor. But sometimes, we remain insufficient in explaining ourselves [to the producers]. [...] For instance, a producer says that 'we did not reach an agreement this way', or 'this is not what we mean by solidarity', etc. I really under-

> stand them. But I do not think that they really understand us and our labor. I think they are not really aware that we do not get any monetary profits [from the Cooperative]. [...] We should have explained ourselves in detail, why we are doing this work... We should make more efforts to show our voluntary labor henceforth to make them more tolerant [for our delayed payments]."

Nevertheless, these complaints do not reflect the majority of the relationship between the activists and producers. As long as the voluntary labor of the activists is understood by the producers, these delayed payments are turned into a reason for developing stronger social ties between the producers and the activists. As indicated within the literature of the anthropology of credit and debt, as opposed to barter, relations of debt lead to more lasting social ties as a result of its temporal horizon (Peebles 2010; Humphrey and Hugh-Jones 1992; Caldwell 2004).

During my voluntary experience, I seek to explain the motivation of the Cooperative in a good manner to the producers for whom I was responsible. As a producer from Çanakkale says in our written conversation after I was trying to explain the recent difficulties that the Cooperative faces in making the payments for producers:

> "I am really sad about the recent situation. These days are really horrible in which everyone is making an enormous effort to be afloat, and we are not able to offer any single solution for each other. Of course, it is not a problem [for us to get payments delayed for 2-3 months. [...] All of us in certain ways make a serious effort and I know that you are obliged to do very different things [besides the cooperative work]. I am very sure that this is not a result of any malicious intentions. [...] We need to take our step not in such a way that puts a spoke in each other's wheel but that allows us to be deeply supportive of each other."

In other words, as long as the efforts of the activists are well known by the producers, the debts of the Cooperative do not lead to serious tensions between the activists and the producers. Instead, the monetary relationship between them is turned into a possibility of deeper future alliance within the economic time of the Cooperative. In this regard, the economic activities are practiced within the economic time of the Cooperative in such a way that the very hierarchical relationship between the debtor and the creditor – or the giver and the receiver – becomes nonsensical as a result of the distribution of the responsible along with the temporal horizon of the Cooperative.

It is possible to say that this distribution of the responsible along with the temporal

horizon of the Cooperative is a significant characteristic of the economic time of the Cooperative as an element of a new food infrastructure. However, because this economic time of the Cooperative partially coexists with the temporality of the political economic formation of the existing food infrastructure, the elements of this existing food infrastructure, including the bank's rates of commission and the current inflation rates, determining the prices for both the activists and the producers is turned into temporal calculations which require serious effort for the maintenance of both the Cooperative and the producers' farming activities. As the prices dramatically change in a period of two or three months considering the recent economic inflation in Turkey, setting the prices without considering the possible increases within the following months turns their solidarity activities into ones that require certain forms of sacrifices particularly in terms of food quality. Nevertheless, it leads to another creative formulation of the element of a food infrastructure. Then, it is necessary to delve into what the formation of food quality for another economic time looks like as a constitutive element of food infrastructure.

If a new producer wants to work with the Kadıköy Cooperative, they should fill out a detailed form of production. If volunteers approve the answers in the form, the producer is asked to send a sample of the product for volunteers to taste it. If they like its taste or think that consumers in the neighborhood will like its taste, then the product is ordered and the producer begins to work with the Cooperative. Through this tasting practice, volunteers try to make sense of whether the product is of good quality.[3] Nevertheless, quality mostly means more than the taste of a product in a single time and space. Rather, in order for a product to be of good quality, the taste of it is expected to be consistent in more than one single moment. Sarah Besky (2020) points out this multiple, and contradictory, nature of quality: "Quality is an internally contradictory thing. At some times and in some places, it has connoted singularity, and other times and in other places, it has connoted standardization" (180).[4]

The products in the cooperative store are mostly announced to consumers with a singular quality of tastes or authentic origins of these products. Particular products tend to be announced with more reference to their singular qualities: Olive oils are extracted from the olives of thousands-year-old olive trees. Goat cheese is very delicious as producers gently treat the Saanen and hair goats during milking. Nev-

[3]However, it is important to indicate here that good quality for the cooperative has much less importance than being in solidarity with producers.

[4]I would like to note here that Besky explores in her ethnographic work that the process of quality control to achieve a consistent product is not a result of "insisting on the rigid repetition of the same series of assembly-line tasks" but a result of certain experimental practices to be constantly able "to be replicated over and over again" (180).

ertheless, consumers' expectations around the other side of being of good quality, which is the consistency of taste, take an amount of time to reveal. It is a very common moment that a consumer enters the store with a jar of olives while complaining about its taste. Some of them ask the volunteer to warn the producer that this jar tastes very different from the ones that they previously bought. Some want the volunteer to taste a piece of cheese and ask if the Cooperative is really happy to offer this kind of product to consumers. Or some show the volunteer lots of little stones in the plastic bag of lentils while the volunteer tries to explain that the producer is not currently able to buy a peeling and splitting machine for lentils or indicate the general situation of small farmers that they cannot control all contingencies during production because of the lack of equipment, and so on.

These moments are the signs for the volunteers that they should have a role in sustaining the quality of products by mediating between ecological and economic temporalities. The significant part of this labor of mediation is to listen to both consumers and producers and to maintain a flow of information among them. If the volunteer does not have an answer for the reason of bad quality, they ask the consumer for their phone number to inform after contacting the producer. Besides directly mediating between consumers and producers, the volunteers try to anticipate how long it will take for products to be sold in a period of time, with complaints from customers as the last consideration. Mostly, statistical information regarding the last one or two months in the Cooperative's online tracking system is evaluated for anticipating order amounts. Or alternatively, they search for new producers for the same product to offer consumers more than one option.

Through this labor of mediation, I assert, the volunteers reclaim quality by creating an alternative temporality of singularity and standardization as constitutive elements of food infrastructure. Complaints, mitigation of these complaints, sympathetic understanding, and waiting for a response from producers become essential parts of quality control with the everyday mediation of the volunteers. By doing so, the very process of quality control goes out of the walls of a factory or the zones of agricultural production; and it is distributed along with both production and consumption. In some cases, a product's inconsistent taste is now regarded as a sign of ecological production – and consequently, it allows quality to signify an alternative meaning beyond consistency and standardization. This way of opening up the possibility of new significations is managed by the constant labor of the activists to convince both consumers and producers. This labor, which allows the dynamic processes of signification around food quality to exist, enables the new food infrastructure to operate with apparent contradictions without any serious tensions within the economic time of the Cooperative.

In other cases, the volunteers mightily strive to serve the product in its best form. For instance, if products were too easily spoiled in the last order, a working group is formed to research possible reasons for spoilage and provide the best storage conditions. If an easily-spoiled product is to be ordered, the order amount is very calculatedly determined in weekly meetings.

For instance, during my fieldwork, I participated in one of these research groups, where we investigated the possible solutions for the spoilage of fresh fruits and vegetables. One of the main reasons for spoilage of the products within the Cooperative is that these products mostly enter the store after a long journey from the Aegean region to İstanbul. As these products – particularly the products like organically-produced tomato which requires to be quite sensitive during the long logistical routes – become more subjected to being wasted during this journey, short logistical routes could increase the quality of fresh products of the Cooperative. Because of this reason, the research group initiated to discover new producers around İstanbul for fresher products by visiting bazaars in order to meet with new producers and make them involved in their food network.

Through these efforts, neither a pure understanding of being ecological nor conditions of economic stability are prioritized. This labor of mediation creates another economic temporality by allowing a different set of ecological and economic promises to attune toward each other. In order to be ecological, being attached to economic promises – availability for different segments of consumers, providing economic stability for producers, and remaining self-sustainable during these activities – is a necessary condition. In that sense, the ecological becomes a living phenomenon as it derives new meanings with its situatedness, porosity, and apparently contradictory elements, as in the example of the blurring distinctions between the debtor and creditor as well as in the example of simultaneously having inconsistent taste and good quality. The ways of allowing the ecological to exist as a living phenomenon during economic action enable the food sovereignty activists to reinvent the very concept of quality as the very element of food infrastructure through everyday experimental actions.

The experimental characteristic of the efforts of the activists is significant to understand how infrastructural politics operate in everyday life. Their labor is not assigned by strictly determined rules; rather, their labor is predominantly characterized by exploring and playing with new possible rules, and criteria as well as the elimination of them. Throughout their labor, unsurprisingly, failure is an inevitable outcome of this infrastructural politics. However, this is not only inevitable but also necessary in terms of opening up new possibilities for the attunement of the

economic and the ecological for a less cruel food infrastructure, in Berlant's sense of the expression (2011).

Nevertheless, this experimental characteristic is not peculiar to the infrastructural politics of food sovereignty activists. Instead, this is also inevitable and necessary for capitalist and anthropocentric formations of food infrastructure (see Besky 2020). Yet, what would differ within the case of the food sovereignty activism lies behind the very question of the production of subjectivity which enables enduring this labor. Then, the questions here are simple: why do activists keep doing this exhausting labor? To what extent is it possible to make this labor less exhausting while keeping doing this art of paying attention to the difference to enact the attunement between the economic and the ecological? What does it mean to think about this dilemma for infrastructural politics and the manifestations of the everyday environmentalism around it? These questions are largely waiting to be answered. Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that, during my fieldwork, the Cooperative faced the risk of permanently closing its store a couple of times. In this regard, it seems crucial to think about the possibility of enacting the practices of attuning different temporalities in less exhausting ways.

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I sought to explain how food sovereignty activists develop their refusal by engaging with the promises of economic and ecological temporalities. The activists' refusal is far from mere passivity as refusing existing promises opens up a possibility of offering new promises as a way of reclaiming the ecological through a constant labor of mediation between different temporalities. Moreover, this act is not despite but because of the partial position of the activists within capitalist and noncapitalist forms of relation on the one hand and economic and ecological temporalities on the other, through which reclaiming the ecological in general and reclaiming the elements of food infrastructure in particular becomes possible in everyday life.

The exhausting labor of mediation in food sovereignty activism does not indicate the impotency of the food sovereignty project in terms of its spatial and temporal scalability, as opposed to the postpolitical critique of local environmentalism. Rather, such labor warns us to rethink the political event and the very idea of scale where multiple human and nonhuman temporalities – and economies and labor regimes around these temporalities – are deeply entangled with each other. As Anna Tsing

(2013) points out, scalable projects can be scaled with the cost of blindness to diverse temporalities. Food sovereignty activism, nevertheless, aims to be not blind to this diversity by allowing space for attuning these temporalities toward each other. In this regard, there is no easy way to scale these practices. Although the economic practices of food sovereignty activists to a certain extent allow the activists to scale their ecological activities, constantly reclaiming the ecological as a very dynamic phenomenon largely prevents these practices from being scaled or institutionalized. It means that only by allowing subjectivities to endure these joyful but exhausting everyday activities would it become possible to temporally and spatially scale such a world-making project with its porosity, situatedness, and apparent contradictions. In the next chapter, I will explore what it means to seek spatially scaling such a world-making project without blindness to diverse temporalities.

3. SCALING THE REFUSAL

> Aren't we all sometimes guilty of feats of scalar magic that depend on our assumptions about the natural scale of things?
>
> E. Summerson Carr and Michael Lempert, *Scale*

> [L]ogistical labor can be understood not only as the production and circulation of commodities, whether material or immaterial, but also as various forms of hustling, tapping into flows, or distributive labor that spring up, and in many cases dominate, in situations where capital has done its work of dispossession.
>
> Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, *The Politics of Operations*

> The human is held up, not by Kant, but by logistics, a logistics that gives the illusion of a free-standing subject
>
> Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, *All Incomplete*

3.1 Introduction

In July 2022, the Dersim municipality organized a workshop with the theme of agriculture and the new cooperative movement in Turkey. In the day of the workshop, more than two hundred people – including small farmers, food sovereignty activists, consumer cooperatives, and academics – gathered from all around Turkey with the shared hope of building new collaborations among producers and consumer communities. After the academics and food sovereignty activists discussed their works and experiences, it was time for a more interactive session, where producer and consumer cooperatives discussed the daily difficulties they faced and searched for solutions alongside the production, provision, and consumption of agricultural products.

The hopeful but weary words of small farmers and food sovereignty activists echoed across the hall of the municipality building. The difficulties of resisting monoculture, managing bulk purchases, organizing the shipping processes, and advertising the products accompanied the hopeful narratives of the participants.

I realized during the workshop that the lack of coordination among cooperatives bothered most participants including members of cooperatives, activists, and academics. Most agreed that they should be a part of a larger cooperative movement, in which all producer and consumer cooperatives closely coordinate with each other to reduce the costs of production and provision. "The smaller we make our products, the more we work for the outside [of the cooperative network]" said a producer to indicate the need of scaling their production and provisioning activities. When it was time for offering solutions for the ongoing problems of the cooperatives, some producers asked for the floor. "All things we discussed today show the necessity of working with industrial engineers", said a member of a producer cooperative from Mersin after indicating their need of reducing the costs of shipping and packaging. An olive producer added after informing others regarding how cooperatives can work with other packaging companies to reduce costs:

> "We should take a cue from BİM's logistical model. We should rent warehouses in different regions and coordinate with each other like BİM to better initiate bulk purchases. We can also rent cold chains as BİM does. I am now working with Yuriçi Kargo and the cargo costs extremely escalated, and I barely afford to pay these prices. We should seriously think about the ways of planning as all producer and consumer cooperatives to reduce these costs."

What does the necessity of working with industrial engineers for food sovereignty activists and small farmers stand for in terms of their refusal of the existing food regime? What does it mean to emulate the logistical model of a capitalist corporate for a social movement? I argue in this chapter that the logistical experimentations – and the ethical tensions within these experimentations – constitute the food sovereignty movement's politics of infrastructure as a form of human and nonhuman communication and coordination. However, the infrastructural capacity within the movement largely depends on its partial relationships with the operations of capital which shape the existing food regime. This partialness throughout the logistical experimentations as a way of reinventing food infrastructure is both an ordinary necessity and a political strategy to be more eventful within the wholeness of the existing food infrastructure. In the first section, I explain the very constitutive rela-

tionship between logistics and the scale of capitalism and the concept of logisticality as a definitive relationality of infrastructure. In the second section, I portray how the logistical experimentations of the food sovereignty activists within the urban space ethically encounter with difference while having to consider expanding their scale of production and advocacy in time and space. And in the third section, I ask what it means to be in search of new bureaucratic promises in order to find a way of democratically planning the expansion of the everyday activities of the movement in line with the tension between constituting the common ground and securing the specificity.

3.2 Scale and Logistics

What is the scale of capitalism in general and the scale of a food system which food sovereignty activists seek to develop their refusal in particular? What are these scales made up of? As I pointed out in the previous chapter, scale is not an object to act in accordance with, but a relationality that is constantly made and remade through everyday action.[1] In this sense, I aim to frame the concept of "large-scale" in general and the concepts of "global", "regional", or "local" in particular not as given categories but as dynamic formulations made in such a way that does not allow to understand these formulations through the distinct and pure scalar categories. As Bruno Latour (1993) rhetorically asks and explains:

> "Could the macro-actors be made up of micro-actors (Garfinkel 1967)? Could IBM be made up of a series of local interactions? The Red Army of an aggregate of conversations in the mess hall? The Ministry of Education of a mountain of pieces of paper? The world market of a host of local exchanges and arrangements? [...] In following it step by step, one never crosses the mysterious limes that should divide the local from the global. [...] It is a braid of networks materialized in order slips and flow charts, local procedures and special arrangements, which permit it to spead to an entire continent so long as it does not cover that continent. One can follow the growth of an organization in its entirety without ever changing levels and without ever discovering 'decontextualized' rationality'" (121-2).

[1] Although the specific emphasis was on the temporal dimension of scale in the previous chapter, an understanding based on constantly made relationality is also applicable to its spatial dimension, which is the main concern of this chapter.

By demystifying the "myth" of decontextualized rationality of capitalism, or any "large-scale" formulations of a system, a structure, or an institution, Latour suggests empirically focusing on sets of networks among different human and nonhuman actors. This way, he also addresses how the formulations of these large scales heavily rely on misunderstandings and unintended consequences as well as successful translations and very intended actions among different knowledge practices. Similarly, Anna Tsing (2005) ethnographically demonstrates how global capitalism works through "frictions", where she empirically eliminates the distinction between universal and "culturally specific" (also see Carr and Lempert 2016).

To put it more specifically, capitalism as a form of social relation reach its largeness in such a way that frictions and clashes between difference and cultural complexities are very intrinsic to its continuity across spaces. Then, what form of technicality does it owe to spread across these spaces? I suggest that the relationality of capitalism which operates today in a "large" scale is mainly enabled by the technicality of logistics in which a constant interplay is enacted between the management, anticipation, and elimination of material-semiotic differences on the one hand and the flourishment of these differences on the other. Relying on the fantasies of frictionless profit, just-in-time production, and free-standing human subject, logistical operations enable certain "military-like" practices and algorithmic calculations in order to deal with unintended consequences and indeterminacies which might result from encounters between unexpected differences, which would interrupt the future time of capitalism and its expansion across spaces (Cowen 2014; Neilson 2012).[2] In order to manage the expansion without interruption, these military-like practices and algorithmic calculations control the processes and estimate the possible interruption to make the relevant project more scalable. As Tsing (2013) indicates:

> "When small projects can become big without changing the nature of the project, we call that design feature "scalability." Scalability is a confusing term because it seems to mean something broader, the ability to use scale; but that is not the technical meaning of the term. Scalable projects are those that can expand without changing. My interest is in the exclusion of biological and cultural diversity from scalable designs. Scalability is possible only if project elements do not form transformative relationships that might change the project as elements are added. But transformative relationships are the medium for the emergence of diversity. Scalability projects banish meaningful diversity, which is to say, diversity that might change things." (507)

[2]See Cowen 2014 for a genealogy of logistics which evolved from a "military art" to a discipline of business.

Moreover, logistics is a process that cannot be separated from the processes of capitalist production and value extraction (Hardt and Negri 2017). In other words, logistics works as a technicality for the frictionless extraction of value from the everyday existence of the living labor throughout the production and circulation of goods (Neilson and Mezzadra 2019). In this sense, an analysis of the zones of logistical operations and "subjectivities of logistics" also provides a fertile ground for an analytical understanding of this constant interplay between capitalist and noncapitalist forms of relations during the efforts of scaling capitalist forms of production and provision (Neilson 2012).

With the ideal of "human-free" logistical systems through algorithmic calculations along with production, circulation, and consumption of food, supermarkets could be seen as prominent actors in expanding the spatial scale of capitalist food production (Evans and Kitchin 2018).[3] After the 1980s, but particularly after the 2000s, İstanbul has also been a zone of logistical extraction through the supermarketization of its foodscape with the technological developments in the operations of circulation along with food supply chains. With their distribution networks expanding all around Turkey, their own establishment of cold chains, and the increased practices of industrial engineering for the optimization of circulation, the supermarkets managed to maintain their activities of food provisioning in a large scale (Türkkan 2021a; Ozgormus and Smith 2020). In addition, the provincial agents of the supermarket chains strengthen the agri-food relationships through the uses of contract farming and by benefiting from the certification and labeling processes like İTU (*İyi Tarım Uygulamaları*) (Atasoy 2013, 2017; Keyder and Yenal 2013). As such, by being involved in the relationships in the rural regions, the supermarkets adapted agricultural production to the logistical operations of supermarkets to achieve just-in-time production and frictionless profit.

In this sense, logistics constitutes a vital zone for the existence and continuation of capitalist forms of production along with the fantasies that sustain its relationality. Nevertheless, the logistical zones are also a site of flourishment of differences, indeterminacies, and unintended consequences, which result from the encounters among the diverse forms of living labor. Therefore, these zones also constitute the prominent sites of resisting and refusing the extractivist operations of capital enabled by logistical technicality. With the practices which could be called "counterlogistics", subjects of logistical networks become "a mainstay of radical organizing" for everyday emancipatory politics (Chua, Danyluk, and Cowen 2018, 623; Toscano N.d.;

[3]See Wark 2019, where she introduces the ways in which the multinational corporations like Walmart and Amazon uses detailed algorithmic systems of anticipation of consumer behavior and delivery of goods. Also see Briziarelli 2019 and Woodcock 2020 for how delivery sector and platform capitalism formulate and reformulate its abstract space of profit making through algorithmic management.

Bernes N.d.).

While the literature of counterlogistics preeminently focuses on the practices which interrupt the circulation of things, it remains limited in investigating the emancipatory potential of alternative supply chains and agroecological projects like the food sovereignty movement. Therefore, instead of being engaged in the literature of counterlogistics, I suggest considering the very concept of "logisticality", which Stefano Harney and Fred Moten proposes in *All Incomplete* (2021). With a postcolonial and a non-anthropocentric understanding, they offer the concept of logisticality in a dialectical relationship with logistics. As they indicate:

> "Logisticality is more than a counter-logistics, a countering of logistics. It is our means of movement, and our movement as means. Logistics seeks to impose a position, direction, and a flow on our movement, our pedesis, our random walk, our wandering errancy, to trap us in this oscillation, this neurotic pacing back and forth. Logistics wants to position us, to have us take a position, and fortify, and settle. And yet logistics itself also has to keep moving in its degraded way. This is where the algorithm gets to put to work" (92-3).

With this conceptualization, Harney and Moten frame logisticality as "the resident capacity to live on the earth" (57). In this sense, their understanding resonates with Paolo Virno's (2004) formulation of the commons as the living capacity of communication of the multitude. Although they prefer to use the concept of the undercommons as the politics of "hapticality" – and the concept of logistics as "a mechanics of undercommon hapticality" – instead of directly being engaged with the literature of the commons, I find it a fertile ground to think of the concepts of commons – as the capacity of existing relations on earth – and infrastructure together – or thinking of the concepts of commons and logisticality as a peculiar formulation of any infrastructure. In other words, I suggest suggest inferring the everyday logistical activities of the food sovereignty activists as the practices of experimenting with maintaining the capacity of human and nonhuman communication – in Satsuka's sense of attunement and labor of mediation as I mentioned in the previous chapter – and creating the new ways of making the living human and nonhuman labor flourish. The very link between these concepts are also pointed out by Lauren Berlant (2022):

> "In the meanwhile, occupy/common has changed into a way to describe collaboration and careworlds more generally. Critical work on ecology, states, indigeneity, political movements, knowledge, and research itself

> blazon Occupy to ally with the desire to transform infrastructures that organize specific resources and concepts necessary for life. It's a kind of dog whistle addressed to a movement dream. [...] The commons concept requires infrastructures for sustaining the mutations that emerge from the chains that are breaking in the popular resistance to austerity regimes and anti-Black and patriarchal capitalism." (113-5)

In other words, I tend to interpret infrastructural and logistical politics politics as another formulations of the politics of commons. Yet, what is crucial here to understand it that logisticality as a mechanic of commons and infrastructure operates differently than the extractive operations of logistics. Instead of relying on the fantasies and rationalities of frictionless profit, just-in-time production, and free-standing human subject, logisticality of the food sovereignty activists' everyday activities resides in the labor of mediation between economic and ecological temporalities – through which they aim to be not blind to the forms of human and nonhuman attunement. However, especially when they seek to expand the idea of food sovereignty, whether in the form of expanding the store or strengthening the coordination between cooperatives, their labor of mediation is wittingly or unwittingly attached to the logistical operation of capital and its fantasies – which makes the refusal of the food sovereignty activists laden with more frictions with the existing food system. In the next section, I aim to explain how food sovereignty activists experience these frictions in the urban space during the attempts of expanding their advocacy and the scale of ecological production and provisioning.

3.3 Logisticality in the City

During our conversations and interviews with the volunteers of Kadıköy Cooperative, I realized how nostalgic they seem while telling stories about the Cooperative's previous store. The store was in the same neighborhood, nearly in the same location as the Cooperative's current store. As the previous store was smaller by half than the present one, moving to a new store required certain transformations regarding the everyday activities of the Cooperative. To put it more specifically, the daily turnover of the Cooperative was mostly below 1000 TL before moving to a new, larger store in 2019. After moving to the new store, the Cooperative accelaratedly began to reach daily turnovers above 4000 TL even before the recent economic crisis had not started to be felt. On some days when I was doing some voluntary work in the store in the first months of 2021, the Cooperative managed to reach daily turnover above 6500 TL. Even if these amounts of turnover could be seen as very limited if we are

to compare them with those of any profit-driven market enterprises, I would like to suggest considering these amounts of turnover in their own scale. What is important to notice here is how the daily turnover of the Cooperative accelerated and at what cost – if any – this acceleration is dealt with through the forms of labor performed within and outside the store of the Cooperative.

I would like to point out some consequences of this acceleration in terms of the intensity of the labor regimes of the Cooperative. With this change, the volunteers started more closely tracking order deliveries for more products; and they needed to keep the store open more hours to sell products in time to avoid spoilage and delayed payments, to give specific examples. As a volunteer pointed out in a nostalgic manner:

> "Before *pirot*[4], we were tracking everything by writing down all sales and orders in a small notebook [laughing] . [...] Our turnover was quite low if we are to compare today's monthly turnover today; but there was nothing to complain about workload or the lack of motivation even if there were many things to do. I mean, we were not exhausted yet [laughing]. Many things were far easier than today, especially after we assured that we put the [previous] store in order."

As I inferred during our conversations with the volunteers, the need of transforming many details regarding the everyday activities of food sovereignty activists to keep the store open was – although unwittingly – overlooked when they were moving to the larger store. The consequences of expanding the scale of their activities as if nothing is necessary to change in provision activities are still felt by the volunteers of the Kadıköy Cooperative as exhaustion and the lack of motivation because of the increased and unexpected workload. As another volunteer explains in a weekly meeting of the Cooperative:

> "The Cooperative's model that we used today was not designed for today's situation, where we have lots of things to do and fewer volunteers to actively participate in cooperative activities. We designed this model in a very calculative manner, in such a way that the workload for all volunteers was considered in detail. As far as I remember, each volunteer was expected to spend 8 hours a week to sustain the cooperative activities without interruption. So, it is not surprising that we deeply suffer from a lack of motivation right now. All our efforts are now being

[4] *Pirot* is the name of the Cooperative's online tracking system that the volunteers use today.

> spent on managing the unexpected things happening in the store. [...] We became not able to find a meaningful answer for the question of why we are doing all this stuff."

A similar story was told by a worker of Ovacık Doğal in a meeting of İstanbul's consumer cooperatives:

> "From now on, we want to go beyond the shopping mentality to attach to our political agenda in a better way. To be honest, we were more capable [of attaching to our political agenda] when we were producing four or five products. Now, we maybe have fifty products and we are facing really serious difficulties. At the same time, we have to offer a good amount of payment to the producers. [...] The lack of a warehouse is another point, which affects our prices by at least ten percent. [...] Supermarkets are capable of cutting down on expenses but we cannot do that. But commercialization moves us to the way of cutting down [on expenses]"

As the worker of Ovacık Doğal says, consumer cooperatives cannot cut down on expenses as supermarkets do, as it would mean blindness to diverse temporalities which consumer cooperatives seek to consider during their everyday economic activities. All difficulties which both Kadıköy Cooperative and Ovacık Doğal have faced during the expansion of their activities are indeed a necessary consequence of attunement. Paying close attention to diverse forms of human and nonhuman relationality and economies around it requires serious amounts of transformation as new elements and encounters are added to the already existing project. The only way for the cooperatives to deal with new elements and encounters – and serious transformations that these new elements and encounters require – is to coordinate to each other as if it is "a surgical operation", as a volunteer from Beyoğlu Food Collective described in our conversation after the meeting of the consumer cooperatives.

What does it mean to apply to an analogy of "surgical operation" for the food sovereignty activism? Indeed, the food collectives' and cooperatives' attempts to initiate better coordination to reduce costs for themselves and contingencies for producers do indeed allow an analogy to a surgical operation. What has been so far attempted for coordination among consumers and small farmers is mostly called community supported agriculture (CSA) among the food sovereignty activists and in the food systems literature (Schnell 2007; Feagan and Henderson 2009). In CSA, consumers seek to share the risks and indeterminacies of harvesting and farming activities of small farmers by initiating certain methods including pre-orders and sub-

scriptions to products and bulk purchases. In that sense, it is possible to frame CSA as a constitutive paradigm for food sovereignty activism. Yet, although CSA as a paradigm seems to consider the necessity of expanding the scale of purchases through better coordination among and within consumers and producers, its "surgery-like" requirements in the lived experience of the cooperatives prevent the food sovereignty activists from initiating successful CSA practices. As a volunteer from Kadıköy Cooperative indicates when I asked whether consumer cooperatives in İstanbul rely on the practices of CSA:

> "Ideally, yes. We seek to practice community supported agriculture. I do not remember whether you were involved in the Cooperative at that time; we managed to order 500-kilogram lentils as consumer cooperatives from one of our producers. We still try to do mass purchases as much as we can. But the products we can do mass purchases are very very limited. In some cases, if nobody is concerned with the logistics of the orders, we are not able to do mass purchases even for lentils or other legumes."

In parallel with what the volunteer points out, I suggest that the ideal formulation of CSA overlooks the logistical contingencies experienced within the urban space. While it is to a certain extent possible to pre-order legumes like lentils, chickpeas, and beans without a serious effort, pre-ordering fresh fruits and vegetables in large amounts require algorithmic calculations about the processes, including organization of receiving pre-payment from consumers without exceeding the dueness of payment to producers; finding solutions when consumers take back their promises of pre-order, checking the delivery conditions for products coming from both the edges of İstanbul and distant places like the Aegean region; advertising products in a timely manner; regularly controlling and re-controlling rates of waste for each fruit and vegetable; and setting prices of each product in accordance with the rates of waste. Despite the presence of an online tracking system in Kadıköy Cooperative, controlling all these processes extends beyond its algorithmic abilities. Even if the algorithm helps the volunteers in most cases, an additional element – like working with a new producer from another distant place with different farming conditions, or unexpected changes in consumer demands – is able to transform numerous calculations made for the existing delivery order. These contingencies are experienced even if consumer collectives and cooperatives do not even try to coordinate with each other. An attempt at coordination even between two consumer cooperatives requires new algorithmic calculations – and constantly controlling these calculations – for each cooperative accordingly.

As the volunteer indicates, consumer cooperatives are more capable of coordinating with each other when it comes to organizing bulk purchases for legumes. Moreover, in most cases, expanding the order amounts for legumes is not only a strategy of reducing costs and sharing the risks between producers and consumers; instead, it is mostly a necessity to work with many legume producers. Even if they are small farmers, the lack of equipment, which are necessary to process their products, forces small farmers to use the equipment of agroindustrial factories in their regions, which in turn determines the capacity of consumer cooperatives for bulk purchases. For instance, as they previously did in their order of 500-kilogram lentils, the consumer cooperatives and collectives initiated to collectively order a large number of lentils in the summer of 2022. However, when they contacted the producer, they learned that they cannot order lentils less than 1000 kilograms as the factory no longer accepts products from small farmers less than that amount – as the factory would operate the splitting machine at a loss for lentils less than 1000 kilograms. In this sense, expanding the scale of production and provisioning is a necessity rather than merely a strategy of food sovereignty activism, as small farming is practiced not in an isolated manner but in such a way that is partially involved in conventional agribusiness practices and equipment which are mainly designed for large-scale production and processing.

Despite the efforts of consumer cooperatives and food collectives from İstanbul's nine neighborhoods to reach 1000 kilograms of lentils, the total amount could not exceed 870 kilograms, which therefore prevented them from mass purchase for lentils. The main reason why the cooperatives and collectives could not organize this purchase is, I argue, rooted in the difficulty of coordinating different labor regimes in accordance with the multiplicity of İstanbul's neighborhoods – even if they seek to coordinate purchasing one simple product which is hardly spoiled during 12 months. This difficulty of coordinating across the multiplicity of neighborhoods is most visible in the purchases in which both Kadıköy Cooperative and Anadolu'da Yaşam Cooperative are involved. The location of Kadıköy Cooperative, Moda, could be seen as a relatively privileged neighborhood, where many consumers are able to afford additive-free ecological products. Anadolu'da Yaşam Cooperative is, on the other hand, located in the Gülsuyu neighborhood, where low-income people live while trying to struggle with neoliberal urban transformation processes. A volunteer from Anadolu'da Yaşam Cooperative explained how they differ from most cooperatives in the meeting of İstanbul's consumer cooperatives:

"We do not experience the issues that most consumer cooperatives suffer

> from.[5] Our advocacy is for the very strong connection between urban poverty and the right to food. Every day we witness the linkage between cheap food and many kinds of illness. Every day we hear new people getting cancer in the neighborhood. However, we cannot offer additive-free products as you do since people in our neighborhood cannot afford that. Instead of that, we are trying to be in solidarity with producers whom we know very well."

As the volunteer from Anadolu'da Yaşam Cooperative said in our conversation, they have two different types of shelves in their store. The first is for the products that they collectively buy with other consumer cooperatives and food collectives. The second is for the products that they individually buy to offer more affordable prices for consumers in the neighborhood. In a recent meeting of İstanbul's consumer cooperatives held in November 2022, a volunteer from Anadolu'da Yaşam Cooperative pointed out how bulk purchasing with other consumer cooperatives bothers them even if they managed to order products:

> "We might not find a common solution in terms of collectively buying from producers as consumer cooperatives. Our situation and profile are quite different. Our target is low-income people. [...] We are also not able to add a "cooperative percentage" as you do. We are doing our activities only for becoming widespread among people in the neighborhood. When we bought a product with Kadıköy Cooperative, we threw away almost all of them. We made those products more visible on our shelves. But it did not work; people could not afford to pay for those products. I mean, we might not be able to order as much as you do, but we might be involved in your collective purchases as much as we can."

Throughout these logistical attempts, the activism of the volunteers in consumer cooperatives and food collectives necessarily prevents them from forcing the producers to act in accordance with the logistical difficulties experienced during food provisioning, as a capitalist corporation would do through contract farming. In this sense, the contingencies experienced during the efforts of coordinating cooperatives and collectives within the multiplicity of the city exacerbate the logistical abilities of the food sovereignty activists – who already seek to solve the difficulties resulting from the production processes of the products which they individually order without coordinating with others.

---

[5] The volunteer here refers to the complaints of other consumer cooperative about being exhausted when providing service to consumers.

3.4 In Search of New Bureaucratic Promises

All these difficulties in initiating certain forms of logistical coordination between producer and consumer cooperatives in general and among consumer cooperatives in particular lead food sovereignty activists and small farmers to being in search of new planning practices for a promise of economic and ecological stability. In the workshop which the Dersim municipality organized, both the complaints about the apathy of the existing institutions and a strong demand of organizing a new association for coordinating production and provision were coexistent among food sovereignty activists and small farmers. A volunteer from Koşuyolu Cooperative took the floor to express their frustration after a meeting that the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IBB) organized by gathering İstanbul's consumer cooperatives and some producer cooperatives around Turkey:

> "After the current administration of the IBB came into power, [IBB] gathered all cooperatives and organized a couple of meetings in order to found a logistical center in the location where *Salı Pazarı* [in Kadıköy] currently takes place. In these meetings, at least 40-50 people gathered to found this center. Unfortunately, the IBB took its steps backward thereafter. What we demanded was this: the IBB will direct two tracks. One will be toward Ankara; the other will be toward the Aegean side. These tracks will collect all products from producers throughout the route. The tracks will gather these products in the logistical center in İstanbul; then the consumer cooperatives will get these products from this center. But we could not actualize it. [...] I wish the IBB could have founded a warehouse and a packaging system in *Salı Pazarı*, which could have affected all of us in a very positive manner."

Apparently, the IBB tried to organize producers and consumer cooperatives to found a system by encouraging different stakeholders to participate in the processes of planning. Nevertheless, I would argue that the solution is not as simple as directing two tracks toward different regions and collecting all products in the logistical center. This demand that the consumer cooperatives offer to the municipality underestimates the role of contingencies and unexpected circumstances during production and provision. It was surprising to me when I realized how optimistic many food sovereignty activists were before the IBB meetings – although this optimism immediately metamorphosed into frustration.

In addition to the material contingencies during production and logistical activities,

this demand from the municipality also assumes an image of the small farmer, which does not allow to consider the heterogeneity behind this image. This heterogeneity could be observed in how expectations of small farmers differ in terms of the ways in which those small farmers frame ecological production and profit-making through agricultural activities. For instance, as an academic who participated in the meetings which the IBB organized, Candan Türkkan explains the clashes between the older generation farmers and "neo-peasants" during a meeting in her book *Feeding Istanbul* (2021a):

> "[T]he meeting ended with no consensus. The IBB did not weigh in on the discussion, nor did the older generation farmers concede to the economic sustainability of switching to organic methods, nor did the neo-peasants relent to the relevance of the profit motive. [...] [T]he disagreements within them, particularly vis-a-vis the profit motive, and the divergences in approach to farming and agriculture, are quite strong – so much so that, going forward, the possibilities for reconciliation seem slim" (208-209).

As Türkkan points out, the tension between shifting to organic production – as an ecological promise – and sustaining economic stability – as an economic promise – remained during the meetings. While the IBB and older generation farmers were more sympathetic to profit-oriented approaches, neo-peasants apparently spent more efforts to find a better solution to mediate between these promises.

Indeed, this heterogeneity was also observable for me in the Dersim municipality's workshop. While many small farmers in the workshop were proudly indicating how they spend their best efforts to mediate between ecological production and economic sustainability, a developmental nostalgia was simultaneously haunting their narratives. When they complain about the neoliberal transformation of agriculture which has made them deeply precarious, there was a narrative on the ground that their villages were developed regions before the drastic transformations which particularly happened after the 2000s. However, I suggest that this nostalgia – as an implicit appreciation of protectionist agricultural policies – relies on the invisibility of populist concerns of governments in planning agricultural processes (Keyder and Yenal 2013). Moreover, it neglects the peculiar difficulties of logistical coordination of the ecological product, where numerous forms of human and nonhuman sociality would require an ability to coordinate more than a capitalist agribusiness company would need. As a manifestation of a developmental desire, I would argue, many small farmers in the workshop demanded at the end of the day that Ovacık Doğal could lead all processes of coordination on behalf of the farmers and consumer coopera-

tives – processes including bulk purchases, logistical routes, and timing, advertising the products, managing unexpected circumstances and so on. In other words, most believed that everything could be coordinated under the leadership of Ovacık Doğal with its brand power and municipal abilities. Nevertheless, most people from Ovacık Doğal were in favor of a more participatory process of planning alongside production and provision. Moreover, they were aware of how unrealistic it is to coordinate hundreds of producers and consumer cooperatives without sacrificing any ethical and ecological concerns. As a worker from Ovacık Doğal indicates in another meeting among İstanbul's consumer cooperatives and food collectives:

> "Approximately 100-150 cooperatives gathered from all around Turkey and authorized us to initiate coordination for them. But we did not want to initiate an unwieldy and unmanageable structure. [...] We do not want a scenario in which 1000 cooperatives gathered for coordination in such a way that incapacitates their activities. Rather we need a more dynamic structure, which could be founded by maybe only 10 cooperatives. I mean, we want to work about these issues in the most democratic ways."

In other words, instead of demanding new bureaucratic promises given by a structure or institution, Ovacık Doğal encourages others to found an initiative that would create its own bureaucratic promises for itself. The tension between demanding promises and creating its own promises also reflects certain debates regarding Leninist and autonomist approaches in the post-Gezi consumer cooperatives and food collectives. As a volunteer from Kadıköy Cooperative says in our interview:

> "After Gezi, there was a kind of autonomist wave that permeated all these initiatives and cooperatives. I totally understand that. Especially when thinking of all those hierarchical structures and apathy in the existing institutions... [...] People were quite allergic to the word Leninism. [laughing] But in recent years, people started to realize that they cannot do anything when isolated from each other. [...] When we visited Hopa after years, I realized that people who had been supporting autonomist and isolated initiatives now have started seeking to establish large organizations."

Although I did not directly observe the debates going around Leninism and autonomism, I would say that the attempts of coordinating under the umbrella of a unifying organization were visibly accelerated in the last six months of my fieldwork. Nevertheless, the recent realization of the need for a large organization in

such a way that it creates its own promises alongside production and provision is not sufficient when it comes to considering the multiplicity and complexity of living labor in urban and rural spaces. The efforts of considering these multiplicities and complexities could be observed in the recent attempts of reviving the already existing association of the consumer cooperatives, called Tükobirlik. By reviving this association, it was aimed that the consumer cooperatives could be able to both demand from the state and municipal institutions on the one hand and create their own bureaucratic model in a participatory manner on the other. However, after the IBB meetings that frustrated the volunteers of the consumer cooperatives, many volunteers were hesitant to seek to find a common ground between producers and consumer cooperatives. Apart from the difficulties of coordinating different products for different neighborhoods, it was intimidating for the volunteers to think about possible tensions when trying to establish common criteria for production processes. Although "the criterion of having loose criteria" is a constitutive characteristic of many consumer cooperatives and food collectives, the possibility of sacrificing very essential criteria to be involved in an association was bothering many of them. In a monthly workshop of Kadıköy Cooperative, it was debated over what – if any – the sine qua non criteria of the Cooperative are if the Cooperative were to be involved in Tükobirlik. As a volunteer in the workshop exemplifies and semi-rhetorically asks:

> "Think of [our criteria about] child labor. Children working in fields may be considered by others as a very ordinary thing. They could think of that as children learning their business in this way. On what will we step back? When I think of collective work, these [problems] come to my mind. It would be really good if we are not to step back on [these criteria]. [...] Stepping back also requires sacrificing our emphasis on feminism, LGBTI+ rights, and so on. To what extent could we step back on our criteria?"

In this sense, while the idea of a large organization that creates its own promises seems to be an ideal solution, the material and ethical heterogeneity prevented the consumer cooperatives from finding a common ground that would enable them to expand production and provisioning activities of the food sovereignty activists and small farmers. Therefore, the search for other bureaucratic promises for democratic planning to deal with the difficulties of coordination stand for the very tension between constituting the common ground and securing the specificity. Tim Choy (2011) already paid attention to this tension in environmental activism, which could be observed: "between species and other species, between forms of life and their environs, between what is considered big and what is considered small, between particu-

lars and universals, between particular cases of a common rule, between specificities and generalizations, between grounded details and ambitious abstractions" (5-6). This tension is where the food sovereignty activism builds its politics of infrastructure, for which new imaginations for the concept of bureaucracy, or planning, could be nourished through craft-like ethical and logistical experimentations.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I aimed to explain what it means to expand the scale of the everyday practices of the food sovereignty movement as an ordinary necessity and a political strategy of the small farmers and activists. As a way of practicing an infrastructural politics, or as a way of enriching the capacity of existence of the human and nonhuman relationalities, ethical and logistical experimentations of the movement necessitates the expansion of the practices of production, provisioning, and advocacy of food sovereignty. Moreover, this expansion could be enacted only through its partial position in relation to the existing food infrastructure. While leading to very intense frictions in terms of managing ethical and logistical contingencies, multiplicities, and heterogeneities, the emergence of these frictions enables the possibility of scaling the food sovereignty movement as a world-making project. These frictions are not peculiar to emancipatory world-making projects. Instead, these are the very necessity of expanding any projects during their trajectory from the small to the big in terms of the elements which they encompass in time and space.

What differs in the food sovereignty movement is that the movement as a project allows space and time for logisticality through which encounters with difference are nourished without being directly absorbed by the aesthetics of frictionless profit, just-in-time production, and free-standing human subject. This visibility of frictions, contingencies, multiplicities, and heterogeneities explains the reason why the producer in the workshop expressed the movement's need of working with industrial engineers – as a way of invisibilizing what is very visible and exhaustive throughout their everyday activities, as the supply chains of capitalist corporations would do.

Both these solutions of emulating the corporate actors of the existing food infrastructure and the search for developing new bureaucratic promises through planning are the appearances of the exhaustive but necessary and ordinary condition of the partialness of the movement. These appearances are the relationalities where both the exhaustion of separate actors and the nourishment of the capacity of the multitude accompany each other. The practices of imagining and speculating alternative

forms of planning and coordination are the only ways that might pave the way toward being more eventful within the wholeness of the existing food infrastructure.

4. CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I basically sought to make sense of this semi-rhetorical question: how would it be possible to theorize what I observe as grounds for hope during the neoliberalization of the existing food infrastructure while it is exceedingly possible to observe these grounds as the source of disappointment and exhaustion? Indeed, the effort that I make throughout the thesis might be seen as a form of optimism, or cruel optimism in Lauren Berlant's words (2011). Nevertheless, I would not agree with this interpretation. Rather, what I sought to explain throughout the thesis is what it would look like to negate the conditions of cruel optimism in the everyday enactment of environmentalism and infrastructural politics. In other words, throughout my ethnographic study, I was in search of the possibility of this enactment of environmentalism and infrastructural politics – and observing this possibility – in less cruel ways in such a way that the apparently unproblematic elements of the existing food infrastructure could be questioned.

What is problematic and unproblematic about any form of infrastructure is a question about the partialness of description and the positionality of the observer. This is, to put it specifically, a question about the aesthetic dimension of infrastructure. It is important to note here that infrastructure does not have to be intrinsically invisible – and consequently unproblematic from the lens of the observer, or from the lens of those who experience the existence of this infrastructure. Instead, giving an infrastructure a more visible ontological status where politics could be performed. As Brian Larkin (2018) indicates:

> "[I]nfrastructures are not normatively invisible and then brought into visibility by some sort of exceptional act. Visibility and invisibility are not ontological properties of infrastructures; instead, visibility or invisibility are made to happen as part of technical, political, and representational processes. This is why the distinction between spectacular infrastructures and mundane ones should not be figured as an opposition but as representing different styles of visibility." (186)

Whether we call it a reinvention of infrastructure or a movement, what Larkin indicates is also applicable to the practices of food sovereignty. When I explained the research topic of this thesis to a friend of mine, they asked without hesitation: "Are these practices [of the volunteers of the consumer cooperatives] really the practices which could be named under the umbrella of a movement? I mean, is there a food sovereignty movement in İstanbul, really?" This is an important question in terms of demonstrating how we honor a set of practices as a movement or as a mundane everyday action. What should the volunteers do to be considered the subjects of a social movement? Or, are the volunteers the only subjects of what I call the food sovereignty movement? Without considering and problematizing the apparently invisible actions and subjects of a set of practices, it is highly possible to name these practices as impotent formulations of lifestyle politics or simulation exercises (Pellizzoni 2020).

This brings us to what Dimitris Papadopoulos (2018) conceptualizes as *more than social* movement, which could enable us to imagine and speculate the possibility of "the creation of imperceptible but durable infrastructures and ontologies of existence" (8). Throughout the chapters of the thesis, I aimed to be not blind to the nonhuman agency – or the relationality that could be seen as the material conditions – within the everyday environmental practices of food sovereignty activism. This aim was not only for demonstrating that a social movement consists of human and nonhuman relationality. By doing so, I also aimed to show what Larkin would call "different styles of visibility" which directly interrupts our understanding of what is transformative and what is not – or what is a successful social movement and what is not. The fact of existence of these different styles of visibility directly resonates with the partial characteristic of any singular event.

To put it in a very simple sense: what is deeply transformative for one could be totally irrelevant to the apparent existence of the other. Then, what is needed for an analysis of a social movement – or any forms of relations which could be believed to have transformative potential for any established orders? I believe that what is needed for that is to find out the ways of being attentive to the other – which could be the otherness of the nonhuman, the rural, or the noncapitalist forms of relations. How does the other come into existence in different temporalities and scales in a possible transformative way? How does the researcher become more able to get attuned to the possible multiplicities of the other? How could a researcher make more sense of the partial characteristic of any events in a writing project? The answers to all these questions require adopting a decolonial and nonanthropocentric standpoint for an analysis of a social movement – or any efforts of enacting world-making practices (see Rajan 2021; Nadasdy 2021).

The Anthropocene – as a definitive characteristic of the existing food infrastructure – is indeed directly related to this partial characteristic – or aesthetic dimension – of an event: that what has long remained invisible to the human community became enormously visible in such a way that interrupts human sociality. Similarly, it is possible to think of neoliberal capitalism through this partial characteristic: that what has remained invisible under the radar of economic growth, development, and progress became enormously detrimental to different segments of the human community and environment in different temporalities and spatialities.

I suggest that the only way of negating these characteristics of the existing food regime as one of the main infrastructures which enable sociality is attunement. Attunement as a praxis of infrastructural politics requires moving back and forth between different temporalities and different spatial scale-making practices. In this regard, I find the everyday environmental and economic practices of the food sovereignty activists in İstanbul's consumer cooperatives as fertile ground in terms of providing a site for observing the enactment of these constant movements between temporalities and scale-making practices. In the second chapter, I sought to explain what it means to create the possibility of the attunement of different temporalities – with the classification of ecological time and economic time – into each other. By doing so, I asked to what extent it is possible to reinvent the elements of the food infrastructure through these practices of attunement. Consequently, I argued that the relations of debt and the formulations of food quality could be reclaimed through the everyday environmentalism that the food sovereignty activists perform. In the third chapter, I specifically focused on the possibility of scaling the everyday efforts of the food sovereignty activists in such a way that capitalist and noncapitalist forms of relations as the two sources of possible scale-making practices are deeply intertwined and constitute each other. This brings us the concept of postcapitalism in Gibson-Graham's sense (2006). Instead of assuming that the postcapitalist – or noncapitalist – forms of relations are practiced as isolated from capitalist forms of relations, I aimed to explore the intertwined characteristics of these two forms of relations. Consequently, I found and asserted that this intertwined characteristic is not the weakness of postcapitalist politics – if we are to reclaim this concept to name the practices of infrastructural politics around the everyday environmentalism of the food sovereignty movement. Rather, this intertwined characteristic is what postcapitalist politics builds its struggle over. This is the necessary irony of the food sovereignty movement as a form of postcapitalist world-making politics: being partially involved in different temporalities and different forms of economic relations – predominantly the capitalist one – in a nonsovereign way.

This is what any form of the policy cannot bring into existence. In the introductory

chapter of the thesis, I aimed to eliminate a distinction between a good and a bad policy. Self-determination practices of the nonsovereign relationalities are the negation of any forms of institutional planning practices. As indicated elsewhere, these practices as forms of caring with the world cannot be institutionalized (Martin, Myers, and Viseu 2015). With this regard, it is important to understand even the apparently good examples of agricultural policies – which could be the majority of the agricultural planning practices during Turkey's protectionist era which are nostalgically affirmed – as the allocation of whose situation is more endurable and who is more grievable in time and space. This could also be applicable to institutions including municipalities, NGOs, and research centers of universities that prioritize institutionalizing participatory decision-making practices. As one volunteer of the Kadıköy Cooperative complains about the apparently participatory practices of the IBB (Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality):

> "They invite us to many meetings, events related to ecology, right to the city, etc. These are good things, actually. But is this process really participatory? Okay, they listen to us, take some notes... But that is all. The last decisions are made by a couple of people. I really do not know where their confidence comes from. They know nothing about how to maintain these provision activities, how to deal with difficulties, and so on. I mean, we cannot describe all these things by meeting once a year, o even a month. [...] We are the ones who are in the field. They [the IBB] should only provide resources if they are willing to contribute to the [food sovereignty] movement instead of deciding on behalf of us."

I find this complaint quite resonating with how Stefano Harney and Fred Moten (2013) see institutional practices and policies as the practices of correction which could be observed even in the "perpetual processing of peace":

> "Policy is correction, forcing itself with mechanical violence upon the incorrect, the uncorrected, the ones who do not know to seek their own correction. Policy distinguishes itself from planning by distinguishing those who dwell in policy and fix things from those who dwell in planning and must be fixed. This is the first rule of policy. It fixes others. [...] The ones who would correct and the ones who would be corrected converge around this imperative of submission that is played out constantly not only in that range of correctional facilities that Foucault analysed – the prisons, the hospitals, the asylums – but also in corporations, universities and NGOs. That convergence is given not only in the structures and affects of endless war but also in the brutal processes and perpetual processing of peace." (78-80)

Attunement cannot be institutionalized; it cannot be adapted to any form of policy. Therefore, it is necessary to speculate and invent the possibility of scaling the practices of attunement besides policy practices. In other words, it is necessary to be in search of new possible bureaucratic promises to imagine alternative forms of planning (see Chapter 3). In this search, the position of the ethnographer should go hand in hand with these efforts of speculating and inventing alternative forms of planning in particular and other ways of finding out the speculative and experimental infrastructures of coexistence in general. With this regard, I define ethnographic writing as a significant way of contributing to the aesthetic formulation of any infrastructural politics.

As it is a very short ethnographic project which seeks to deal with the multiplicity of its argument, this thesis has considerable limitations. First, its policy critique mainly relies on secondary sources instead of first-hand archival investigations. Future research could compensate for this lack of primary sources by delving into the archived documents of ministries, municipalities, and producer and consumer cooperatives. In this project, I did not find delving into these documents necessary as I aimed to question the concept of policy through more ontological terms instead of problematizing certain forms of policy around Turkey's food regime. Second, its everyday observation of the possibility of reinventing food infrastructure within the food sovereignty activities is only limited to the urban space. Attunement necessitates making the otherness of the nonhuman and the rural more visible as an aesthetic and infrastructural world-making practice. Within the urban space, I felt exceedingly insufficient to show this otherness which directly constitutes the everyday environmentalism of the volunteers in the consumer cooperatives. Further research is needed to explore this otherness in order to deepen the descriptions of the interplay between different temporalities and the everyday scale-making efforts of the movement. Third, this ethnographic project is designed for being in dialogue with the recent debates within the anthropology and the cultural theory of infrastructure. Therefore, it does not directly touches upon the significant debates within the food systems literature. Future research could create more analytical spaces to enable possible dialogues between these two disciplines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alaimo, Stacy. 2010. *Bodily natures: Science, Environment, and the Material Self.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Anand, Nikhil, Akhil Gupta, and Hannah Appel. 2018. *The Promise of Infrastructure.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Appel, Hannah. 2012. "Offshore work: Oil, modularity, and the how of capitalism in Equatorial Guinea." *American Ethnologist* 39(4): 692–709.

Armiero, Marco, and Massimo De Angelis. 2017. "Anthropocene: Victims, narrators, and revolutionaries." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 116(2): 345–362.

Atasoy, Yıldız. 2013. "Supermarket Expansion in Turkey: Shifting Relations of Food Provisioning." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 13(4): 547–570.

Atasoy, Yıldız. 2017. *Commodification of Global Agrifood Systems and Agro-Ecology: Convergence, Divergence and Beyond in Turkey.* London and New York: Routledge.

Aykaç, Aslıhan. 2018. *Dayanışma Ekonomileri: Üretim ve Bölüşüme Alternatif Yaklaşımlar.* İstanbul: Metis.

Barad, Karen. 2014. "Diffracting Diffraction: Cutting Together-Apart." *Parallax* 20(3): 168–187.

Bear, Laura. 2014. "Doubt, conflict, mediation: the anthropology of modern time." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* pp. 3–30.

Berlant, Lauren. 2011. *Cruel Optimism.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Berlant, Lauren. 2016. "The commons: Infrastructures for troubling times*." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34(3): 393–419.

Berlant, Lauren. 2022. *On the Inconvenience of Other People.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bernes, Jasper. N.d. "Logistics, Counter Logistics, and the Communist Project." https://endnotes.org.uk/articles/logistics-counterlogistics-and-the-communist-prospect.

Besky, Sarah. 2020. *Tasting Qualities: The Past and Future of Tea.* Oakland, California: University of California Press.

Bingöl, Olcay. N.d. "Dünyayı besleyen yüz milyonlarca çiftçinin küresel hareketi La Via Campesina ne için mücadele ediyor?" https://www.karasaban.net/dunyayi-besleyen-yuz-milyonlarca-ciftcinin-kuresel-hareketi/.

Birth, Kevin K. 2012. *Objects of Time: How Things Shape Temporality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Blaser, Mario. 2019. "On the properly political (disposition for the) Anthropocene." *Anthropological Theory* 19(1): 74–94.

Blühdorn, Ingolfur. 2017. "Post-capitalism, post-growth, post-consumerism? Eco-political hopes beyond sustainability." *Global Discourse* 7(1): 42–61.

Boratav, Korkut. 2007. *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908–2009*. Ankara: İmge Kitapevi.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. New York: The New Press.

Boyer, Dominic. 2018. "Infrastructure, Potential Energy, Revolution." In *The Promise of Infrastructure*, ed. Nikhil Anand, Akhil Gupta, and Hannah Appel. Durham and London: Duke University Press pp. 223–243.

Briziarelli, Marco. 2019. "Spatial politics in the digital realm: the logistics/precarity dialectics and Deliveroo's tertiary space struggles." *Cultural Studies* 33(5): 823–840.

Butler, Judith. 2015. *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Caldwell, Melissa L. 2004. *Not By Bread Alone: Social Support in the New Russia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carr, E Summerson, and Michael Lempert. 2016. *Scale: Discourse and Dimensions of Social Life*. Oakland California: University of California Press.

Çavdar, T. 2002. "Türkiye Tarım Ekonomisinin Cumhuriyet Boyunca Gelişimi: 1946- 1980 Donemi." In *Küreselleşme ve Türkiye Tarımı*. Ankara: TMMOB Ziraat Muhendisleri Odası pp. 39–55.

Choy, Tim. 2011. *Ecologies of comparison: An Ethnography of Endangerment in Hong Kong*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Chua, Charmaine, Martin Danyluk, Deborah Cowen, and Laleh Khalili. 2018. "Introduction: Turbulent Circulation: Building a Critical Engagement with Logistics." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 36(4): 617–629.

Çiçek, Özal. 2021. "Türkiye'de Tarımsal Üretimin Güncel Sorunları Karşısında Üretici Kooperatiflerinin Geleceğini Yeniden Düşünmek." In *Şirketlerden Kooperatiflere Rekabetten Dayanışmaya: Tartışmalar Deneyimler*, ed. Uygar D Yıldırım, and F Serkan Öngel. İstanbul: NotaBene Yayınları pp. 231–259.

Coté, Charlotte. 2016. ""Indigenizing" Food Sovereignty. Revitalizing Indigenous Food Practices and Ecological Knowledges in Canada and the United States." *Humanities* 5(3): 57.

Cowen, Deborah. 2014. *The Deadly Life of Logistics: Mapping Violence in Global Trade*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Routledge.

Dunford, Robin. 2020. "Converging on food sovereignty: transnational peasant activism, pluriversality and counter-hegemony." *Globalizations* 17(5): 782–796.

Escobar, Arturo. 2017. *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Evans, Leighton, and Rob Kitchin. 2018. "A smart place to work? Big data systems, labour, control and modern retail stores." *New Technology, Work and Employment* 33(1): 44–57.

Feagan, Robert, and Amanda Henderson. 2009. "Devon Acres CSA: Local struggles in a global food system." *Agriculture and Human Values* 26(3): 203–217.

Garfinkel, Harry. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Graeber, David. 2015. "Radical alterity is just another way of saying reality: A reply to Eduardo Viveiros de Castro." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5(2): 1–41.

Hacısalihoğlu, Elif, and Çağatay Edgücan Şahin. 2018. Looking Closer to the New Cooperativism: Practices of Agricultural and Consumer Cooperatives in Turkey. In *Current Debates in Labour Economics Industrial Relations*. pp. 75–87.

Hall, Kim Q. 2014. "Toward a Queer Crip Feminist Politics of Food." *philoSOPHIA* 4(2): 177–196.

Haraway, Donna. 1985. "A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s." *Socialist Review* 80: 65–107.

Haraway, Donna. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Harding, Sandra. 1995. "'"Strong Objectivity": A Response to the New Objectivity Question." *Synthese* 104: 331–349.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2017. *Assembly*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. 2013. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning Black Study*. Wivenhoe, New York, Port Watson: Minor Compositions.

Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. 2021. *All Incomplete*. Colchester, New York, Port Watson: Minor Compositions.

Hecht, Gabrielle. 2018. “Interscalar Vehicles for an African Anthropocene : On Waste , Temporality , and Violence.” 33(1): 109–141.

Huambachano, Mariaelena. 2019. “Indigenous food sovereignty: Reclaiming food as sacred medicine in Aotearoa New Zealand and Peru.” *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 43(3): 1–6.

Humphrey, C, and S Hugh-Jones. 1992. *Barter, Exchange, and Value: An Anthropological Approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hustak, Carla, and Natasha Myers. 2012. “Involutionary momentum: Affective ecologies and the sciences of plant/insect encounters.” *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 23(3): 74–118.

Ingold, Tim. 1993. “The temporality of the landscape.” *World Archaeology* 25(2): 152–174.

Karakaya, Emel. 2016. Agro Food System Transitions? Exploring Alternative Agro Food Initiatives in İzmir, Turkey PhD thesis İzmir Institute of Technology.

Kass, Hannah. 2022. “Food anarchy and the state monopoly on hunger.” *Journal of Peasant Studies* pp. 1–20.

Kato, Yuki, Catarina Passidomo, and Daina Harvey. 2014. “Political Gardening in a Post-disaster City: Lessons from New Orleans.” *Urban Studies* 51(9): 1833–1849.

Kentel, Koca Mehmet. 2018. Assembling ‘Cosmopolitan’ Pera: An Infrastructural History of Late Ottoman Istanbul PhD thesis University of Washington.

Keyder, Çağlar. 1999. “Türkiye’de Tarımda Küçük Meta Üretimin Oluşumu.” In *75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere*, ed. Oya Köymen. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları pp. 163–172.

Keyder, Çağlar. 2013. “2000’lerde Devlet ve Tarım.” In *Bildiğimiz Tarımın Sonu: Küresel İktidar ve Köylülük*. İstanbul: İletişim pp. 191–218.

Keyder, Çağlar, and Zafer Yenal. 2013. *Bildiğimiz Tarımın Sonu: Küresel İktidar ve Köylülük*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Kocagöz, Umut, and Caner Doğançayır. 2017. Operationalizing food sovereignty: A critical approach from an ongoing experiment in Turkey. In *The International Colloquium on the Future of Food and Challenges for Agriculture in the 21st Century*.

Köymen, Oya. 1999. “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Tarımsal Yapı ve Tarım Politikaları.” In *75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere*, ed. Oya Köymen. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları pp. 1–31.

Larkin, Brian. 2013. “The politics and poetics of infrastructure.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42: 327–343.

Larkin, Brian. 2018. “Promising Forms: The Political Aesthetics of Infrastructure.” In *The Promise of Infrastructure*, ed. Nikhil Anand, Akhil Gupta, and Hannah Appel. Durham and London: Duke University Press pp. 175–201.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Lefebvre, H. 2004. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life.* London: Continuum.

Lemeilleur, S, and S Tozanli. 2006. "A win-win relationship between producers' unions and supermarket chains in Turkish fresh fruits and vegetables sector." *International Seminar USAID Regional Consultation on linking farmers to Markets. Cairo, Egypt* 28(December 2015).

Liboiron, Max. 2021. *Pollution Is Colonialism.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Loftus, Alex. 2012. *Everyday environmentalism: creating an urban political ecology.* Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Lorey, Isabell. 2015. *State of insecurity: Government of the precarious.* London and New York: Verso.

Lyall, Angus, Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld, and Malena Rousseau. 2018. "Development, Citizenship, and Everyday Appropriations of Buen Vivir: Ecuadorian Engagement with the Changing Rhetoric of Improvement." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 37(4): 403–416.

MacGregor, Sherilyn. 2021. "Finding transformative potential in the cracks? The ambiguities of urban environmental activism in a neoliberal city." *Social Movement Studies* 20(3): 329–345.

Marder, Michael. 2018. "Ecology as Event." In *Eco-Deconstruction: Derrida and Environmental Philosophy*, ed. Matthias Fritsch, Philippe Lynes, and David Wood. New York: Fordham University Press pp. 141–163.

Martin, Aryn, Natasha Myers, and Ana Viseu. 2015. "The politics of care in technoscience." *Social Studies of Science* 45(5): 625–641.

Mauss, Marcel. 1969. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies.* London: Cohen and West.

Mcgranahan, Carole. 2016. "Theorizing Refusal: An Introduction." *Cultural Anthropology* 31(3): 319–325.

Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2013. *Border as Method, or, the Multplication of Labor.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2019. *The Politics of Operations: Excavating Contemporary Capitalism.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Millar, Kathleen. 2017. "Toward a critical politics of precarity." *Sociology Compass* 11: 1–11.

Moore, Jason W. 2015. *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital.* London and New York: Verso.

Morton, Timothy. 2013. *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Morton, Timothy. 2016. *Dark Ecology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Muehlebach, Andrea. 2012. *The Moral Neoliberal: Welfare and Citizenship in Italy*. Vol. 85 Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Nadasdy, Paul. 2021. "How many worlds are there?" *American Ethnologist* 48(4): 357–369.

Naegler, Laura. 2018. "'Goldman-Sachs doesn't care if you raise chicken': the challenges of resistant prefiguration." *Social Movement Studies* 17(5): 507–523.

Neilson, Brett. 2012. "Five theses on understanding logistics as power." *Distinktion* 13(3): 322–339.

Neilson, Brett, and Ned Rossiter. 2008. "Precarity as a Political Concept, or, Fordism as Exception." *Theory, Culture and Society* 25: 51–72.

Nelson, Sara, and Bruce Braun. 2017. "Autonomia in the anthropocene: New challenges to radical politics." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 116(2): 223–235.

Öz, Özlem, and Zuhre Aksoy. 2019. "Challenges of building alternatives: the experience of a consumer food co-operative in Istanbul." *Food, Culture and Society* 22(3): 299–315.

Ozgormus, Elif, and Alice E. Smith. 2020. "A data-driven approach to grocery store block layout." *Computers and Industrial Engineering* 139(xxxx): 1–12.

Pamuk, Şevket. 2015. *Türkiye'nin 200 Yıllık İktisadi Tarihi: Büyüme, Kurumlar ve Bölüşüm*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Papadopoulos, Dimitris. 2018. *Experimental practice: Technoscience, Alterontologies, and More-Than-Social Movements*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Peebles, Gustav. 2010. "The anthropology of credit and debt." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39(February): 225–240.

Pellizzoni, Luigi. 2020. "Prefiguration, subtraction and emancipation." *Social Movement Studies* pp. 1–16.

Peterson, Marina. 2021. *Atmospheric Noise: The Indefinite Urbanism of Los Angeles*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Poças Ribeiro, Ana, Robert Harmsen, Giuseppe Feola, Jesús Rosales Carréon, and Ernst Worrell. 2021. "Organising Alternative Food Networks (AFNs): Challenges and Facilitating Conditions of different AFN types in three EU countries." *Sociologia Ruralis* 61(2): 491–517.

Portman, Anne. 2018. "Food Sovereignty and Gender Justice." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 31(4): 455–466.

Portwood-Stacer, Laura. 2013. *Lifestyle Politics and Radical Activism*. New York and London: Bloomsbury.

Postero, Nancy, and Eli Elinoff. 2019. "Introduction : A return to politics." *Anthropological Theory* 19(1): 3–28.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2017. "The ends of humans: Anthropocene, autonomism, antagonism, and the illusions of our epoch." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 116(2): 293–310.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2021. *Between Gaia and Ground: Four Axioms of Existence and the Ancestral Catastrophe of Late Liberalism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A, Mathew Coleman, and Kathryn Yusoff. 2017. "An Interview with Elizabeth Povinelli : Biopolitics and the Anthropocene.".

Puar, Jasbir. 2012. "Precarity Talk." *TDR: The Drama Review* 56(4): 163–177.

Puig de la Bellacasa, Maria. 2017. *Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Rajan, Kaushik Sunder. 2021. *Multisituated: Ethnography as diasporic praxis*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Rancière, Jacques. 2001. "Ten Theses on Politics." *Theory and Event* 5(3): 1–16.

Ray, Sarah Jaquette. 2013. *The Ecological Other: Environmental Exclusion in American Culture*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Ringel, Felix. 2016. "Beyond temporality: Notes on the anthropology of time from a shrinking fieldsite." *Anthropological Theory* 16(4): 390–412.

Roman-Alcalá, Antonio. 2013. Occupy the Farm: A Study of Civil Society Tactics to Cultivate Commons and Construct Food Sovereignty in the United States. In *Food Sovereignty: A Crtical Dialogue*. pp. 1–45.

Rosset, Peter M, and Valentine Val. 2019. "The 'Campesino a Campesino' Agroecology Movement in Cuba: Food Sovereignty and Food as a Commons." In *Routledge Handbook of Food as a Commons*. London and New York: Routledge pp. 251–264.

Roy, Parama. 2010. *Alimentary Tracts: Appetites, Aversions, and the Postcolonial*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sakınç, Mustafa Erdem. 2009. 'Maybe our children can see better days': A brief history and analysis of farmers' cooperative organizations in Turkey PhD thesis Middle East Technical University.

Satsuka, Shiho. 2019. "Rhapsody in the Forest." In *How nature works: Rethinking labor on a troubled planet*, ed. Sarah Besky, and Alex Blanchette. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press pp. 191–209.

Savransky, Martin, and Isabelle Stengers. 2018. "Relearning the Art of Paying Attention: A Conversation." 47(1): 130–145.

Schnell, Steven M. 2007. "Food with a farmer's face: Community-supported agriculture in the United States." *Geographical Review* 97(4): 550–564.

Scott, Dayna Nadine, Jennie Haw, and Robyn Lee. 2017. "'Wannabe Toxic-Free?' From precautionary consumption to corporeal citizenship." *Environmental Politics* 26(2): 322–342.

Seymour, Susan. 2006. "Resistance." *Anthropological Theory* 6(3): 303–321.

Shotwell, Alexis. 2016. *Against purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Solomon, Barry D. 2021. "Solving a Wicked Problem in Deep Time: Nuclear Waste Disposal." *Science and Engineering Ethics* 27(2): 1–3.

Soysal Al, İrem. 2015. Organic Food and Mothers: Techniques of Neoliberal Governmentality and Negotiation of Multiple Discourses of Motherhood, Risks, and Organic Food. Master's thesis Sabancı University.

Soysal Al, İrem. 2020*a*. "Kolektif Ekolojik Tüketici İnisiyatiflerinin Alternatif Dayanışma Ağı ve Dönüşürken/Dönüştürürken Kadın Üretici Örgütlenmeleri." In *Yaşamı Örgütleyen Deneyimler: Kadınlar Dayanışma Ekonomilerini ve Kooperatifleri Tartışıyor*, ed. Özlem S Işıl, and Selma Değirmenci. İstanbul: NotaBene Yayınları pp. 197–233.

Soysal Al, İrem. 2020*b*. "The Promising Momentum and Collective Practices of the Recently Expanding Network of Consumer-Led Ecological Food Initiatives in Turkey." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi* 40(1): 129–162.

Standing, Guy. 2011. *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. Longon: Bloomsbury Academic.

Swyngedouw, Erik. 2013. "The non-political politics of climate change." *ACME – An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 12(1): 1–8.

Toprak, Zafer. 1994. "Altıncı Daire-i Belediye." In *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, ed. İlhan Tekeli. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları pp. 220–223.

Toscano, Alberto. N.d. "Lineaments of the Logistical State." https://viewpointmag.com/2014/09/28/lineaments-of-the-logistical-state/.

Trauger, Amy. 2017. *We Want Land to Live: Making Political Space for Food Sovereignty*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2013. "On Nonscalability: The Living World Is Not Amenable to Precision-Nested Scales." *Common Knowledge* 18(3): 505–524.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2015. *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt, Andrew S. Mathews, and Nils Bubandt. 2019. "Patchy anthropocene: Landscape structure, multispecies history, and the retooling of anthropology: An introduction to supplement 20." *Current Anthropology* 60(S20): S186–S197.

Tuana, Nancy. 2008. "Viscous Porosity: Witnessing Katrina." In *Material Feminisms*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Turkkan, Candan. 2021*a*. "Feeding Global Istanbul." *Feeding Istanbul: The Political Economy of Urban Provisioning* pp. 126–186.

Türkkan, Candan. 2021*b*. "What is the 'alternative'? Insights from Istanbul's food networks." *Food, Culture and Society* 00(00): 1–21.

Virno, Paolo. 2004. *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Wark, McKenzie. 2019. *Capital is dead: is this something worse?* London and New York: Verso.

White, Sam. 2011. "From globalized pig breeds to capitalist pigs: A study in animal cultures and evolutionary history." *Environmental History* 16(1): 94–120.

White, Sam. 2017. "A Model Disaster: From the Great Ottoman Panzootic to the Cattle Plagues of Early Modern Europe." In *Plague and Contagion in the Islamic Mediterranean*, ed. Nükhet Varlık. Kalamazoo: Arc Humanities Press pp. 91–116.

Woodcock, Jamie. 2020. "The algorithmic panopticon at Deliveroo: Measurement, precarity, and the illusion of control." *Ephemera: Theory Politics in Organization* 20(3): 67–95.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2004. "The Ongoing "Soft Revolution"." *Critical Inquiry* 30(2): 292–323.

İnal, Onur, and Yavuz Köse. 2019. *Seeds of power: Explorations in Ottoman environmental history*. The Old Vicarage, Winwick, Cambridgeshire: The White Horse Press.