

SOLIDARITY ECONOMY: A CASE STUDY FROM BOĞATEPE VILLAGE

Çiğdem Boz¹

Abstract

Solidarity economy leads us to think about alternative types of economy in which productive activities meets social needs rather than profitability of the capital. In other words, it can be seen as an utopia against the capitalism and this utopia shows that production and consumption relations could be arranged in different ways. Being based on mutual willingness, beside it enlarges the scope of economic relations, it also allows the contribution of the citizens. Since activities of solidarity are carried out in physical territories, they establish commercial relations in large scale which attributes permanent development of that territory. By providing goods and service production which is based on the contribution of men and women both, populations could participate in their own development. Thus, they can define for themselves the economic programmes that are best suited to their needs and the territories they occupy. Moreover solidarity economy comprises public debate about the mode for economic regulation of a community. So, it builds local, national and international social networks based on consensus and cooperation. As a humanist and democratic economy, solidarity economy could renew our approach to sustainable development.

The case study which focuses on the effects of solidaristic tourism on Boğatepe village located in Northeast Turkey, uses interviews with local people to understand the these development effects. The findings imply that economic relations based on solidaristic perspective has provided significant benefits to the community.

Keywords: solidarity, eco-museum, Boğatepe village

DAYANIŞMA EKONOMİSİ: BOĞATEPE KÖYÜ ÖRNEĞİ

Özet

Dayanışma ekonomisi bizi, kar odaklı üretim yerine toplumsal ihtiyaçları gideren üretim aktivitelerinin olduğu alternatif ekonomileri düşünmeye yönlendirir. Başka bir deyişle, kapitalizm karşısında bir ütopya olarak görülebilecek bu anlayışta üretim ve tüketim ilişkilerinin farklı şekilde de düzenlenebileceği gösterilir. Dayanışma ekonomileri, karşılıklı gönüllülük üzerine kurulu olduğundan, iktisadi ilişkilerin alanını genişletmesinin yanında yurttaşların katılımına da olanak sağlar. Dayanışma etkinlikleri fiziki alanlarda gerçekleştirildiği için geniş ölçekli ticari ilişkiler kurmak suretiyle bölgenin kalıcı kalkınmasına da katkı yapar. Mal ve hizmet üretimi kadınlar ve erkekler tarafından birlikte yapıldığından, yurttaşlar kendi kalkınmalarının da rol sahibi olmuş olurlar. Böylece, yaşadıkları bölgenin ihtiyaçlarına uygun bir ekonomik program inşa etmiş olurlar. Dahası, dayanışma ekonomisi topluluğun ekonomik

¹ Assoc. Prof., Fenerbahçe University, Department of Economics, cigdem.boz@fbu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0464-5725

regülasyonuna dair bir kamusal tartışmayı da içerir. Böylece, uzlaşa ve işbirliğine dayalı yerel, ulusal ve uluslar arası sosyal ağlar ortaya çıkar.

Bu çalışmada, dayanışma ekonomisine bir örnek olarak Boğatepe köyü örneği analiz edilmiştir. Türkiye'nin Kuzeydoğusunda bulunan bu köyde dayanışmacı turizmin kalkınmaya olan etkilerini anlayabilmek için, yerel halkla yapılan mülakatlar yapılmıştır. Dayanışma perspektifine dayalı iktisadi ilişkilerin köy halkına önemli faydaları olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dayanışma, Ekoloji Müzesi, Boğatepe Köyü

1. Introduction

Immanuel Wallerstein discusses capitalism as a historical system and claims that, just like every historical system, capitalism will exist for a while and will eventually find its end because of a structural crisis caused by internal strife (Wallerstein, 1983, pp.77-78). Wallerstein claims that it is no longer possible to accumulate capital with market processes because the world has been in a systematic-structural crisis for the past 50 years, he also emphasizes that what needs to be done now cannot be presented in the form of "revolution or reform?" (Wallerstein, 2003, p.12). Wallerstein asserts that we can be sure of only one thing after 2050 or 2075 which is that we will no longer be living in a capitalist global economy (2000, p.51), alleges that there are two alternatives regarding what kind of system will take the place of the global capitalist order upon its collapse, and named "those who see the dream of hierarchy and privilege and the dreamers of democratic equality" the spirit of Davos or Porto Alegre, respectively.

The struggle between these two spirits, according to him, started with the global revolution in 1968 and is something that can't be resolved until the 2050s. What he referred to as the spirit of Davos are the neoliberal policies that have maintained their dominance since the 1980s. Porto Alegre, however, indicates a paradigm of more egalitarianism, protection for minority, and concern for ecological balance. The World Social Forum, which is known to have been held since 2001, is the annual meeting that parties to the alternative globalization movement organize to arrange campaigns to be conducted around the world, determine strategies, and inform individuals about movements around the world, and it was first held in Porto Alegre. No matter Wallerstein does not use the concept of solidarity economy, what he wants to explain with the spirit of Porto Alegre is a more egalitarian, more environmentally friendly, and more solidarist world.

Multiple global crises and heightened concerns about the social and environmental consequences of economic growth and liberalization have increased interest in alternative production and consumption patterns and ways of organizing enterprise activities. In recent years, considerable attention has focused on Social and Solidarity Economy. The term is increasingly used to refer to organizations and enterprises engaged in the production and exchange of goods and services, which are autonomous from the state and are guided by objectives and norms that prioritize social well-being, cooperation and solidarity. They include for example cooperatives and other social enterprises, mutual associations,

women's self-help groups, unions of informal economy workers, fair trade networks and solidarity finance schemes.(Utting, et al., 2014, p.v)

The most important constraint of the capitalist approach is that top-down decisions are made without getting the opinions of local communities and that growth based on industry is seen as the motor for development. It can be seen that as the malfunctions in the capitalist economy become more frequent, interest in local organizations and what is societal becomes more intense. Santos (2006) defines the solidarity economy as an alternative to the dominant understanding of development in the capitalist global economy. Alternative development is based on local, ecological, and democratic principles.

Increasing alternative models of organization reflect a tendency of change on a global scale, although scattered and limited. This situation doesn't mean that the capitalist state will be removed through revolution or that a new structure will replace it. It offers an option to those aspiring to leave a system to which they are dependent (Aykaç, 2018).

The solidarity alternative doesn't emerge as belonging to a single format, a single corporate structure, or a typical economic space. It develops using local human and natural resources in different ways. It is incredibly unique in the solutions that it produces for social and economic issues of the local from which it emerges. We can assert that a revolution that is loose, not structural, and even fluid in this context advances towards the foundations for the current structures. This is a process that is geographically scattered and whose speeds of development are determined based on different local contexts. The fundamental characteristic of these is that they are a non-state and non-market model of societal organization that holds societal welfare before material welfare.

According to Qijano (2006), solidarity economies offer structural innovations in three basic areas:

- It offers alternatives to capitalist means of production beyond seizing value, unequal exchange, and the infinite accumulation of capital.
- It stands against the state that exists within the capitalist system.
- It emerges against the relationships between private property, domination, and subjugation.

The most general and descriptive characteristics of the options that emerge after globalization are that exit points are local and organized using local practices, resources, and relationships. This exit point rejects the imposition of any top-down model and gets its strength from global movements coming from the foundation.

Solidarity economies recommend ways of direct intervention for spontaneous economic problems rather than removing capitalism. Consequently, it is more transformative than being revolutionary; it develops based on the collaboration between different societal movements and requests instead of organizing the interest of unified masses.

We can compare the key concepts of global capitalist framework and solidaristic one as follows;

Mainstream (Capitalist) view	Solidarity economy view
Globalization	locality
Profit maximization	social well-being
Individual action	Collective action
Natural destruction	Nature friendly
Inequality	equality
Efficiency	Ethic and morality
Representative democracy	participatory democracy
State or market owned	non-state and non-market
Unlimited consumption	responsible consumption
Market actor	agency
Competition	collobaration

As in most developing countries, the neoliberal policies implemented under the discourse of “globalization” after 1980 in Turkey brought along greater dependency on and borrowing from developed countries. These policies also led to greater economic and social degradation. Like Turkey, the rural segment received the harshest damage in developing countries that opened to the global economy rapidly and without preparation as of the 1980s.

It is clear that there is a need for alternative organization for animal husbandry and agriculture to rise again. It is possible to encounter sample initiatives in our country in terms of vitalizing rural segments through solidarity economies and of making local production attractive. I want to open the discussion of the opportunities and gains that this initiative presents for the local community and to tell the store of the Boğatepe village as an example for a local solidarity initiative in this study. The study presented here adopts two methods for collecting qualitative data: in-depth interviews and observations.

2. Agricultural Cooperatives and Rural Development in Turkey

Neoliberal policies led to the single typification of agricultural production by increasing external dependency in the agricultural sector, just as in every sector. While the prices of agricultural inputs change based on currency exchange rates and increase farmers’ costs, the farmer can sell a product at a low cost because of the profit margins of the intermediary merchants. This situation gradually lost the charm of agricultural production because it led to production to the harm of farmers, and it spread to

populous cities that unloaded their land. That is why we propose and support the cooperatives for solution.

When examining the strengths and weaknesses of agricultural cooperatives, Muradian (forthcoming) noted that collective action can be a key mechanism for overcoming the high level of transaction costs typically experienced by small-scale agricultural producers, often operating in highly unfavourable conditions in terms of the size of holdings, location and infrastructure. Referring to Colombia, Bateman (forthcoming) pointed out that the key issue is not only better prices for farmers, but also the possibility of restructuring value chains by linking producers and consumers more directly and by-passing intermediaries or connecting producers with firms and consumers that adhere more explicitly to ethical or fair trade principles. In other words they restructure the exchange relations. (Utting et al., 2014)

The goal of cooperatives is not just to improve the individual lives of workers but also to minimize dependency on the capitalist economy as a collective economic initiative. For the modern system cooperatives, this includes getting products from local producers, financing through cooperatives, and keeping cooperative networks within their own networks as much as the capital will allow. (Doğan et al., 2016, p.68)

These principles may exhibit some differences in practice based on the worldview and ideologies of various cooperatives and can generally fit into this frame. Cooperatives that differentiate with the modernization over time of production and the market are representatives in the economic field for the third sector that generally assimilates into civil society organizations today (p.68).

The cooperative movement, which laborers fighting with different challenges including the unsecuritization of the labor market in the 1980s, is developing many different experiences and reflexes at the turn of the century. Cooperatives are the foundation of the solidarity economy thanks to the organic fields they established with different societal movements of the era (Doğan et al., 2016, p.70).

The agricultural production and consumption cooperatives of which various examples exist in Turkey are primarily trying to establish a different relationship with food. They constitute an alternative to the use of seeds imposed by global corporations and chemicals like insecticides/herbicides, to monocultural agriculture that destroys the structure of the soil and degrades its fertility, and the need to consume the products that confront us without having any idea about their processes of production (Ertör and Akyazı, 2015; Kocagöz, 2015).

But unfortunately, many positive aspects of agricultural cooperatives and producer unions have been liquidated pertaining to solidarity and cooperatives within the past 20 years in Turkey. These institutions assumed the roles of life preservers to balance the market in periods of crisis and need. On the other hand, one of the important halos of the food supply chain, the process of the privatization of instances of municipal supervision, are ongoing. However, we don't require a food system under the control of corporations or the incorrect practices that use public infrastructure that is rotten or that assumes a role of life preserver. We must find an alternative way for a food system that is public, participatory, and democratic, that is based on solidarity against competition, in which the subjects of planning are the residents of cities and rural areas, and that is based on living together with nature.

The food initiatives that citizens from different segments created with their own initiative are in an effort to define such a need and to take concrete steps towards this need. The food movement in Turkey focuses on topics like becoming a cooperative, establishing communities, developing models of working collectively and in solidarity, unmediated product supply, ecological agriculture, planned and sustainable use of resources, local seeds, and healthy food. From this perspective, it produced a series of discourse aimed at overcoming these problems and indicating the current problems of the agriculture-food system. This discourse has effects in various segments of society as well. The various actors of the food movement have perpetuated and popularized this effect within the framework of their own limits and feasibilities.

We can say that different segments suffering from food problems constructed their own independent, democratic, and participatory organizations by coming together. At the same time, we can add that another food system is being constructed with its own network of logistic mechanisms, farmers, and distribution that is limited and humble to the segment that it covers today against the present *incorporated system of food*. In this sense, the food movement that exists over initiatives based mostly on volunteerism have an alternative model recommendation for the socialized food crisis.

It's possible to list the results of the neoliberal policies implemented in Turkey after 1980 on the agricultural sector as follows:

- 1- The privatization of agricultural state-owned enterprises
- 2- The defunctionalization of agricultural sales cooperative unions
- 3- The dominance of multinational corporations in seed markets
- 4- The sovereignty of the importation lobby in the chemical fertilizer market
- 5- The increase of the foreign share in agricultural financing

Within the framework of the commitments made to the IMF and World Bank, a period occurred in which the attack of privatization towards agriculture accelerated after 2000. Privatization in agriculture brought forth results to the detriment of both producers and consumers. The areas that agricultural state-owned enterprises empty out are filled up by local and foreign monopolies; the farmer can't even sell the product at its cost while consumers are forced to pay higher prices for the food.

These results left small producers entirely defenseless. Small producer expresses the social category that is either under a variety of union (cooperative, labor union, chamber) or is independent and solitary, that has its own means of production, that has been situated outside of a relationship of income, and that mostly works in its own means of production. In this regard, the small producer is different than the laborer, merchant, landlord, and corporation in terms of them possessing their own means of production and their own labor forces. Farmers, boss-less factories, cooperatives, collectively working workshops, and boutique producers can be thought of in these categories.

Small producers can collaborate with different producers to develop their production capabilities and strengths. They can even develop mechanisms with which they can manage their production terms and relationships in their own scale in the instance of large cooperatives. In many situations, they are open

to the challenge and intervention of societal relationships and market relationships, and they face their impositions and terms. Despite this, they have the possibility of creating and developing their own distribution-consumption networks because they have their own means of production. When this probability is considered as a possibility, the direct relationship between the producers and the people who will use the products can be considered as the fundamental procurement of another type of relationship.

A consumption cooperative that works directly with a small producer primarily works with the principle of supporting small producers. Supporting small producers means supporting the conditions of being able to continue possessing the means of production by people who possess their own means of production. At first glance, this “support” activity can be viewed as a sort of “defense”. Small producers are constantly liquidated in societies based on the capitalist style of production, and a vast majority of the population is “laborized”; the terms of sovereignty for their own labor disappears. The company hegemony that replaces small producers determines what will be produced, how it will be produced, and how it will be consumed as we expressed above. In other words, the incorporation of the society or the spread of company logic in society means the determination of how large companies, the company mentality, and people will live. “Supporting” small producers opens opportunities to resist the sovereignty of corporations in this sense.

For example, supporting farmers against the incorporation of food and company sovereignty in the field of food means defending the terms of production for cheap and healthy food. The farmers can maintain their status of maintaining wise village agriculture, using local and ecological seeds, and producing based on soil fertility and their needs as long as they have the opportunity to produce outside of the sovereignty of companies and the market. This situation can be thought of as a condition for confronting the statuses of farmers making production for borrowing and corporate interests and also for people who are not food producers procuring needs for healthy and cheap food.

It can be predicted that the development and popularization of food initiatives against the deepening of the current crisis will create a serious opportunity about finding effective and permanent solutions. For this purpose, it is necessary to support the different segments of society to develop their own opportunities and capacities and to encourage and strengthen the new practices of organization. It has become clearer today that the food movement must grow and be strengthened to reinforce a model in which the public is not obliged to an incorporated food system and manages its own resources.

The rural-urban migration problem that Turkey faces doesn't just reduce the quality of life in cities but creates a serious food-supply problem because of people who work in agriculture distancing themselves from the villages. Therefore, initiatives that vitalize local economies must be valued and supported. The Kars Boğatepe Village and the local economic organizations that form in its framework in this context are a small opening model. The solidarity initiative that the village public initiated is more valuable than a more participatory, fairer, and more environmentalist producer shows is possible beyond the state and market.

3. Boğatepe Village

Boğatepe is a village in Turkey, 45 kilometers from the city of Kars near the Armenian border, and sits at an altitude of 2,300 meters. The cheese culture of the village was shaped by immigrants from Caucasia who were Molokans as well as Austrian and Swiss that came at the end of the nineteenth century when the area became part of the Russian Empire (Torun, 2014). Kars remained under Russian sovereignty for approximately 30 years and during this time families introduced a variety of cheese making to the city and its environs. While the surrounding villagers became engaged in animal husbandry and handicrafts, the families in Boğatepe concentrated on milk and dairy products and in the early years of the Turkish Republic, the village pioneered the development of cheese-making in the region (Doğan 2015). Most notably, a Swiss family established a cheese production company called “zavot” in Russian, known as gravy, which became famous over time (Doğan, 2019, p. 541).

The history of cheese-making in Boğatepe began with a Swiss cheese producer establishing a cooperative in the village in 1880. (When Kars passed into the hands of the Russians, Swiss, German, and Russian business men came to Kars to produce cheese; the first person who came from Switzerland to establish the first dairy farm and who planted the seeds for today's gruyere was the Swiss David Moser). Cheese-making continued with the Malakan community coming from Russia. The Malakans, known for their adversity to the war at the time in Russia, migrated to Kars because they didn't want to be called to arms by the Czarist state.

The new community of the Boğatepe Village took the Karapapakhs (Terekemes) who lived in the Tbilisi Borchali Region with the passage of the Malakans, who made the decision to return to Russia after the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, replacing Turkish sovereignty in Kars. The Karapapakhs took over cheese-making in the 1920s and started making cheese by establishing four cooperatives. These were also the first cooperatives in the Republic of Turkey.

The first sales of these cheeses were made to Russia until 1928, while agricultural machines were purchased in exchange. A type of exchange, that is. After 1938, the cheeses were sent to Istanbul because Russia cut off goods acquisitions. Acceleration dropped because of shipment challenges, and train shipment began after World War II. The 1960s can be described as the golden age, like all over the world. They are experiencing challenges in the 1980s, which is the symbol of the transition to a free market economy. There were more than 10 dairy farms in the village at the start of the 1980s, while this number dropped to 2 in the 2000s. The most important reason for this is that people who were aware of the cooperatives together were removed from the village with the 1980 coup. After the 1980 coup, cooperative operations were halted with the excuse of “There is significant opposition in the villages”, and a mosque was constructed in place of the cooperative building.

İlhan Koçulu, who sought out remedy to rejuvenate the local economy and traditional culture, is an activist who constantly produces projects, and whom we can call the head actor in the Boğatepe development initiative, made the decision to return to the village in the 2000s and opened a dairy farm in 2004. He proposed partnerships to the people of village at the rate of milk they provided to the raw milk producers. On the one hand, rural production organized while on the other hand urban consumption also organized. It is necessary to note that İlhan Koçulu is the founder of many of the consumption cooperatives in the cities. The number of business centers in the village dropped in the 2000s to 40, and 500 animals and 1 dairy farm remained. Everyone living in the village intended to migrate to large

cities. Education, subsistence problems, and socialization, as can be guessed, were the primary problems of village life. Koçulu was aware that the solution for these problems passed through rejuvenating production and started a local economic initiative that covered 10 villages. In this local economy, which comprises 2 villages with an altitude of greater than 2000 meters and 8 villages with an altitude of less than 2000 meters, the high-altitude villages start to work with cattle while the other 8 villages cultivate feed for cattle. Mountain villages took their feed from the lower villages. Beside these shared equipment usage began to vitalize agriculture. Namely, these villages jointly bought agricultural machinery and started using them in order. In this regard, it became easier to purchase new equipment by increasing efficiency by 30% in local seeds.

The university-supported botanic and ethnobotanic education provided in the village start to distribute remedy to the surrounding villages by gaining a social status for women thanks to these herbs as well as solving the health problems of women. The village women began to earn money with the varieties of herbs they made themselves and turned into a social asset by producing. Thirty varieties of cheese were identified in a project conducted together with Ardahan University. A portion of the cheeses produced in the village are sent to larger markets in Istanbul, while a portion is given to consumption cooperatives. The remainder is sold at the Women's Market established in the village.

Then, the Boğatepe Environment and Life Association (BELA), was founded in 2007 under the leadership of İlhan Koçulu and grew with the support of the village women. As a result of this initiative there appears to have been no migration to or from the village in the last decade. The association's work became an example in rural development. It created a huge difference in both the rebirth of the village and in the lives of the village women. The main goals of this association can be summarized as; protect the local seeds, improve the organic agriculture, training of farmers, finding out and introducing the cultural heritage of the region and increase the quality of life.

The Boğatepe cheese museum initiative and its focus on local specialist cheeses from the village was started in 2010 by BELA and residents. The eco-museums found by civic initiatives in order to protect local values have been debated since 1960s in France.

It opened in 2012 and all its activities came under the umbrella of the Boğatepe-Zavot Ecomuseum. These activities not only related to cheese production and did not just cover the village but also the surrounding area. Previously since 2008, tourism related projects had been carried out with the TAMADI Association of France, a nongovernmental organization that helps to develop tourism in rural areas in France and Belgium (<http://www.tamadi.org/>). Now the TAMADI and BELA associations organize all the tourism plans and tours with the profits being shared with residents (Doğan, 2015) (Doğan, 2019, p.542).

Cheese Museum was established to rescue types of cheese that are starting to be lost, to preserve production processes, to find what kind of flavor it gives to food in this process, to tell the story of cheese in the Kars region, and to introduce products to the world; and that in this regard the number of tourists visiting the village has exceeded 1,000 a year.

4. Local economy and Solidarity Outputs for Boğatepe Village

Solidarity economy is a set of practices and theories promoting democratic, just and sustainable development to address persistent poverty, social inequalities, environmental ills related with capitalist

relations of production and exchange. So, solidarity economy is consistent with democratic and transformative approaches to community development. The village of Boğatepe, as an example of solidarity economy, provides positive outputs.

As a result of depth interviews consisted of villagers who had hosted foreign and local tourists in the own homes and made in May 2019, the outputs summarized below.

In addition to the direct income obtained from these activities (accommodation, food, and other services), the villagers also have other revenues earned from selling cheese, medicinal herbs and herbal creams which they produce. These developments not only improve the local economy but also create a new valuable income resource in the village.

One of the important effects of tourism on social life is experienced through the mutual recognition of different cultures and the learning, interaction and communication processes involved. Notably, the positive effects of foreign guests in this respect are observed to be high.

The dependency of women on their husbands decreased and their participation in the social life of the village and their social visibility markedly increased. This process helped them to gain a more confident and self-sufficient attitude.

The social life that has changed by tourism leads to a diversification and improvement (socially and economically) in the lives of people in this rural area and can be seen as a major motivating factor in the villagers continuing to welcome tourists. The villagers are particularly pleased to host foreign tourists. In fact, they say they like foreign visitors more than local ones and despite the language problems get along better with them.

The familial relations of women have experienced many changes and transformations as a result of tourism, in particular the relation between their husbands and children. Women have become more independent, more enterprising and there is a greater equality between women and men in the family (Doğan, 2019, pp. 544-546).

While the villagers had intention to migrate before BELA, in 2000s the village started to become more crowded because of the increase in quality of life. They could earn more, be more healthy and social by staying in their region.

Doğan (2019, p. 547) summarizes the core components of this solidaristic tourism as encountered in Boğatepe as follows:

- The majority of the local income is shared fairly among the villagers who join in the BELA activities.
- Tourism supports the local economy directly and indirectly and contributes an unexpected revenue for the villagers who engage in the tourist activities.
- Only the Association is allowed to organize tourism.
- Tourism is well controlled and planned by the Association. The decision-making process is clear and decisions are based on as much participation of the members as possible.
- Mass tourism and the uncontrolled movement of tourism is not permitted, allowing the villagers to maintain their usual daily life.
- The package tours focus on the sharing in and learning about the local heritage.

- The social dialog, interaction and solidarity between tourist and residents is high.
- Tourist and residents mutually share knowledge about their lifestyles and culture.
- Tourism has influenced the socioeconomic structure positively and transformed some traditional relations. In particular it has provided some special benefits to the women who have taken part in providing tourism services.

5. Conclusion

Since the global financial crisis, in particular, there has been increasing calls for a profound shift in development strategy. Such a shift recognizes the social, environmental and developmental failures of market-centred approaches that have promoted economic liberalization, financialization, privatization, commodification, corporate control of global value chains and business models that externalize environmental costs. This market-centred or neoliberal approach is seen by many to lie at the root of four today's major development problems. The first is the inability of the conventional formal sector of the economy to generate more and better work. Second, inequalities of income, wealth and location within countries have risen significantly. Third, recurring and multiple crises linked to finance, food and fuel have heightened levels of human insecurity. Fourth, industrialization and consumerism have resulted in patterns of environmental degradation and climate change that enhance shocks and vulnerability (Utting et al., 2014, pp.5-6).

Agricultural programs implemented on a global scale today liquidate small- and medium-scale businesses and prioritize industrial agricultural and contract models of production that are imposed by multinational agriculture-food corporations in their place. Thus, both a market is created for agricultural inputs like seeds, medicines, and fertilizer that are produced/marketed by multinational corporations and the dominance of monopolies in agriculture is strengthened. After the 1980s, a series of changing and transformative process occurred with the implementation of neoliberal policies in agriculture. The attitudes of states that support agriculture between 1950-1980 changed, and the role that comprised supporting acquisitions, inputs, and credit subsidies shrank

Considering all these, the recent course of food inflation in Turkey is not surprising at all. It is necessary to underline that the crisis into which we are slowly falling is not natural or cyclical but formed as the result of concrete political and economic choices and practices. That's why it should be our priority to organize solidarity and community economies that are not capitalist instead of a program that promises to fix the malfunctions of capitalism in the face of crisis. In other words, it is necessary to make green and increase alternatives to capitalism and to the ways of life established over interests for economic benefit and harm calculations that capitalism imposes. The solidarity option means a system of production that is focused on needs, based on solidarity, environmentally sensitive, and fair against capitalist market rules (supply, demand, full competition, etc.) because it is a new way of thinking that focuses on a policy and economic organization that prioritizes societal issues (Madra, 2019).

The most general and descriptive characteristics of the options that emerge after globalization are that exit points are local and organized using local practices, resources, and relationships. This exit point rejects the imposition of any top-down model and gets its strength from global movements coming from

the foundation. These local options might not have as strong a discourse as a global revolution, and they might not unify within a single model of development, but they follow their own roads and determine their own speeds of development. It might not have universal representations or always be unifying, but it can create a revolutionary spark by setting out from their own singular individualities.

As a post-capitalist project, solidarity economy emphasises on agency and democracy, sustaining people and planet. Therefore it necessary develops in real places with real people, collectively negotiating and enacting values and aspirations. It is also an effort of integrating productivity with morality.

In addition to socioeconomic and environmental advantages, SSE also has significant emancipatory potential, given its association with political empowerment and identity politics via contestation, active citizenship (Utting et al., 2014, p.6). Various forms of SSE, notably those associated with solidarity economy relate more explicitly to emancipatory dimensions such as ethnic and gender equality. The advantages of collective action or group behaviour relate to economic empowerment, social capital, political empowerment, participatory governance, solidarity and ethicality. Organized groups of workers or farmers often have easier access to consultative and decision making processes at local, national and other levels, can makes their voice heard through various forms of contestation, dialogue and bargaining (Utting et al., 2014, p.8).

Boğatepe case provides a proof for a model of transformative change that is rooted in real world practices and possibilities rather than utopian idealism or blueprints. It is an excellent model of local and solidarity economy. While it began with a volunteer movement, it includes all aspects such as the organization of the local community, the formation of civil initiatives, joint decision-making processes and the existence of participation and consensus.

References

- Aykaç, A. (2018). *Dayanışma Ekonomileri: Üretim ve Bölüşüme Alternatif Yaklaşımlar*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Doğan, M. (2015). Ecomuseum, community museology, local distinctiveness, Hüsamettindere village, Boğatepe village, Turkey, *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 5(1), pp.43-60.
- Doğan, M. (2019). The ecomuseum and solidarity tourism: a case study from northeast Turkey. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 9(4), 537-552. DOI 10.1108/JCHMSD-12-2017-0086
- Doğan, P., Ertor, I. & Baybarset, K. (2016). Katalunya'da Kooperatifçilik Tarihinden Güncel Sosyal Ekonomi ve Dayanışma Ekonomisi Pratiklerine, *Birikim Dergisi*, 321.
- Ertör Akyazı, P. (2015). Bir alternatif iktisadi model olarak BÜKOOP. <http://www.bukoop.org/?p=976>. 8
- Kocagöz, U. (2015). Tüketici Topluluklarından Gıda Egemenliğine: Tüketim Kooperatiflerinin İmkânı. <http://www.karasaban.net/tuketici-topluluklarindan-gida-egemenligine-tuketim-kooperatiflerinin-imbkani-umut-kocagoz/>

- Madra, Y. (2015). Kapitalizmin Krizine Karşı Dayanışma ve Topluluk Ekonomileri.
- Qijano, A. (2006). "Alternative Production Systems", in *Another Production is Possible: Beyond The Capitalist Canon*, (ed.) Boaventura de Sousa Santos, 417-45, London: Verso.
- Santos, B. (2006). *The Rise of The Global Left: The World Social Forum and Beyond*. Londra: Zed Books.
- Torun, O. (2014). *Alplerden Kafkaslara Kars Peynirin 150 Yıllık Tarihi*. İstanbul: BELA and History Foundation.
- Utting, P., Nadine, V.D. & Marie-Adelaide, M. (2014). Social and Solidarity Economy: Is there a New in the Making?, UNRISD Occasional Paper 10 Potential and Limits of SSE.
- Wallerstein, I. (2000). *Essential Wallerstein*. New York: The New Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (2002). *Tarihsel Kapitalizm*. (çev. Necmiye Alpay). 3. Basım. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Wallerstein, I. (2003). *Liberalizmden Sonra*. (çev. Erol Öz). 2.basım. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.