HOMELESSNESS AT THE DINING TABLE:

NEEDS-TALK IN THE *HAYATA SARIL* RESTAURANT

ŞEYMA DURSUNOĞLU

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2020

HOMELESSNESS AT THE DINING TABLE:

NEEDS-TALK IN THE *HAYATA SARIL* RESTAURANT

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Social Policy

by

Şeyma Dursunoğlu

Boğaziçi University

2020

Homelessness at the Dining Table:

Needs-Talk in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant

The thesis of Şeyma Dursunoğlu

has been approved by:

Prof. Biray Kolluoğlu _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Volkan Yılmaz _____

Assist. Prof. Alpkan Birelma _____
(External Member)

June 2020

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Şeyma Dursunoğlu, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date .....06.08.2020.....

ABSTRACT

Homelessness at the Dining Table:

Needs-Talk in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant

This thesis is based on a year of ethnographic research in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant which is a soup kitchen serving free food for the homeless in Istanbul. It scrutinizes how, from what perspective, and for what aim the needs of the homeless are interpreted by the volunteers working there. 'Needs-talk', conceptualized by Nancy Fraser, refers to the ways needs are interpreted and it is an institutionalized part of the political discourse in welfare states (1989). This thesis indicates that for the *Hayata Sarıl*, homelessness is a process starting as a familial and social exclusion. It is deepened as a psychological problem through traumas. Then, it results in a lifestyle where finding a socially meaningful job does not matter to the homeless anymore. Accordingly, homeless people are considered in need for sociality, psychological support, and discipline the most. The state is responsible for creating concrete, human rights-based solutions, society is responsible for socially including the homeless, and the homeless are responsible for giving efforts to be housed again. This needs-talk aims for the homeless to change and become citizens who can exercise their rights. The study also shows that volunteers use victim-blaming and structure-blaming discourses of homelessness at the same time, which indicates that these discourses may well coexist. The thesis concludes that having more homeless people in the positions of volunteerism or jobs can help the relationship between 'housed' volunteers and homeless diners to be stronger and also the homeless to politicize their unspoken needs claims.

ÖZET

Sofradaki Evsizlik:

Hayata Sarıl Lokantası'nda İhtiyaç Söylemi

Bu tez, İstanbul'da evsizler için ücretsiz yemek servisi yapan bir aşevi olan Hayata Sarıl Lokantası üzerine yürütülmüş, bir yıllık bir saha çalışmasının ürünüdür. Bu araştırma lokantada çalışan gönüllülerin, evsizlerin ihtiyaçlarını nasıl, hangi perspektifle ve ne amaçla yorumladıklarını irdelemektedir. 'İhtiyaç söylemi' Nancy Fraser tarafından kavramsallaştırılmış olup, ihtiyaçların nasıl yorumlandığına işaret etmektedir ve refah devletlerindeki siyasi söylemin kurumsallaşmış bir parçasıdır (1989). Bu tez, Hayata Sarıl'a göre evsizliğin aileden ve toplumdan dışlanma ile başlayan bir süreç olduğunu gösterir. Evsizlik, travmalar yoluyla psikolojik bir sorun olarak derinleşir. Ardından, artık toplumsal olarak anlamlı bir iş bulmanın evsizler için önemli olmadığı bir hayat biçimini meydana getirir. Buna uygun olarak, evsizlerin en çok sosyalleşmeye, psikolojik desteğe ve disipline ihtiyaçları olduğu düşünülür. Devlet, insan hakları odaklı, somut çözümler üretmekle; toplum, evsizleri sosyal olarak içermekle ve evsizler ise yeniden bir eve yerleşebilmek için çaba harcamakla yükümlüdürler. Bu ihtiyaç söylemi, evsizlerin değişmesini ve haklarını kullanabilen vatandaşlar olmalarını amaçlar. Araştırma ayrıca gönüllülerin kurbanı suçlayan ve yapıları suçlayan evsizlik söylemlerini kullandıklarını ve dolayısıyla da bu söylemlerin birlikte var olabildiğini gösterir. Tez, gönüllülük veya iş pozisyonlarına daha çok evsizin alınmasının 'evli' gönüllüler ile evsizler arasındaki ilişkinin güçlenmesine ve evsizlerin konuşulmayan ihtiyaç taleplerini siyasallaştırmasına yardımcı olabileceği sonucuna varır.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe a great debt to people who made completion of this thesis possible. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Professor Biray Kolluoğlu. Her endless academic and emotional support has been invaluable. She has always encouraged me patiently during the hardest times and gave me a light of hope again. Without her academic guidance, this process would be even harder.

I am also thankful to Professors Zafer Yenal, Volkan Yılmaz, and Alpkan Birelma for their invaluable contributions and comments. Thanks to their guidance, I found my way in this work and found out my academic areas of interest. I also wish to express my gratitude to Professors Ayşe Buğra, Ayfer Bartu Candan, and Berna Yazıcı for their enlightening class discussions. Also, I would like to thank Professor Lütfiye Zeynep Beşpınar, who made me love this discipline, for her guidance and encouragement.

I owe a great debt to the *Hayata Sarıl* team for their invaluable help and cooperation. Particularly Nilgün, Sevim, and Hamza made this research possible and easier for me. I am grateful to all the volunteers, workers, and diners in the restaurant for the time they spared for me, their patience and understanding.

Lastly, I would like to thank my parents Alptekin and Huri Nur Dursunoğlu and my sister İkbal Zeynep Dursunoğlu for being so motivating and considerate. Without them, I could never write this thesis. They did more than their best to comfort and help me during this whole process as well as throughout my whole life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION……..…..……1

1.1 The aim and the research questions of the thesis……...……...1

1. 2 Fieldwork and methods……..…….....3

1. 3 Overview of the chapters…….…….....19

CHAPTER 2: DISCURSIVE AND SOCIOPOLITICAL CONTEXT OF HOMELESSNESS……..……..……..13

2. 1 The history and discourses of poverty…..……..…….....14

2. 2 Homelessness as a concept and experience ……..….....33

CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL RIGHTS, NEEDS, AND HUMAN BEINGS…….....50

3. 1 Citizenship, rights, and duties……..……50

3. 2 The politics of needs and human beings……...……...…....56

CHAPTER 4: FOOD, BODY, AND SPACE…….…….....70

4. 1 Food and power……..…..…….70

4. 2 Food and ‘homeless body’…….……..……80

4. 3 Eating spaces...…….86

CHAPTER 5: HUNGER FOR TOUCH: NEEDS-TALK IN THE *HAYATA SARIL* RESTAURANT.....…….……...…….....97

5. 1 Homeless assistance in Istanbul…….….97

5. 2 The volunteers and diners……...……..……103

5. 3 The perception of homelessness in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant….....107

5. 4 The hybridity of the discourses of homelessness……...……113

5. 5 Needs-talk in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant …….....……119

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION…….....135

REFERENCES……140

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The aim and research questions of the thesis

This thesis is based on a year of ethnographic research in *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant which is a soup kitchen serving free food for the homeless in Istanbul. I aimed to compare needs-talk of the restaurant's volunteers to the way diners describe their own needs. I also aimed to investigate the perception of homelessness of the NGO volunteers and offer a critical perspective to the literature regarding discourses of homelessness. 'Needs-talk', conceptualized by Nancy Fraser, is an institutionalized, major part of the political discourse in welfare states (Fraser, 1989, p. 291). The dominant needs-talk around homelessness is largely maintained by governments, scholars, and reformers (Romano, 2018, p. 61) and nourished by several resources such as by whom the needs in question are interpreted "and from what perspective and in the light of what interests" (Fraser, 1989, p. 294). Accordingly, in this research, I trace the answers to the questions of how the restaurant's volunteers interpret the needs of homeless people, from what perspective and to what end.

Considering the increasing role of private charity in challenging with poverty since the beginning of the JDP period in Turkey (Buğra, 2008; Göçmen, 2014) and the absence of the state in providing an organized system of housing support and social services for the homeless, it would not be wrong to state that a considerable level of needs-talk around homelessness is maintained by the NGOs. Homelessness in Turkey is almost an invisible problem which is not addressed by the central welfare administration, but left to the initiative of the NGOs and local governments.

Thus, understanding the NGO perspective is important to gain an insight into the discourses of homelessness in Turkey.

While which actors should undertake satisfying the needs of the poor is often asked and it is a critical question, as Fraser argues (Fraser, 1989, p. 145), we often take the definition of needs for granted and miss out how the needs in question are interpreted. Fraser discusses needs interpretation through women's rights and suggests that social welfare programs applied around official needs-talk are deeply ideological and system conforming rather than aiming at transforming ender inequalities (Fraser, 1989, p. 145). Therefore, reducing welfare reinforces 'private patriarchy', while defending it often results in enhancing 'public patriarchy' (Brown, 1981). Similarly, needs of the homeless are ideologically interpreted by the NGOs and the way needs interpreted may challenge the system or conform the system and support the dominant discourses of poverty and homelessness.

I conclude this study arguing that the dominant needs-talk in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant prioritizes sociality, psychological support, and discipline for the homeless. It is to a large extend maintained by people with the experience of homelessness. It intersects and differs with the way diners describe their own needs at several points. Needs-talk in the restaurant aims for rendering the homeless' entrance in system possible. This study shows that discourses of homelessness that seem competing can coherently coexist. What differentiates this thesis from the others is that it is the first study relying on discourse analysis examining needs interpretation around homelessness in Turkey. The next section will explain the fieldwork processes and ethnographic methods that I used. I will also describe my interlocutors and also discuss ethical dilemmas.

1.2 Fieldwork and methods

Ethnography is an 'iterative-inductive' method that involves representing and respecting the "irreducibility of human experience", explaining human agents within their own context and culture, watching, listening to, and communicating with them, using an 'unstructured' way of data collection and producing an in-depth written account (O'Reilly, 2005, pp. 2-3; Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 3). This section will involve how I have experienced this process during my research in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant. First, I will describe my field and interlocutors. Then, I will explain how my field relations developed and how I overcame ethical issues.

1.2.1 Ethnographic field and interlocuters

The *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant was founded in 2017 as the first soup kitchen with an aim for serving for homeless people in Turkey. The founder of the restaurant, Nilgün,[1] is also the first person who gave a start for an organized, civil system of food assistance for the homeless in Istanbul. She has experienced homelessness a few times in her life. Yet, today, she works in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant, living in a house as a tenant and her story is told in many newspapers and TV programs.

The restaurant works as a regular place serving for the customers until 7:30 PM. Income earned from the day-shift is used to pay for the workers' wages and also to invest in future projects such as a laundry room and a therapy center for the homeless. At 8:00 PM it starts to serve for the homeless people who already queued up before the outdoors. The night-shift works through the participation of the volunteers. The main purpose of the restaurant is integrating the homeless into

[1] All names in this study have been replaced with pseudonyms in order to maintain confidentiality and protect privacy of the interlocutors.

society by providing them 'job, food, and life' (*iş, aş, yaşam*). For this aim, once in every six months, someone among the homeless diners is employed as a waiter.

The chosen person learns how to prepare food from a professional chef. He also regularly receives psychological support and participates in several free pieces of training such as kitchen hygiene education and budget planning taught by some professors from the *Gelişim* University. After six months, he is encouraged to switch to another restaurant as a regular chef.

I did formal and informal interviews with nine volunteers and eleven homeless people.[2] There are three veteran volunteers: Nilgün, a chef and also the 'gatekeeper' of the field as the project owner; Hamza, a veteran volunteer; and Sevim, the president of association. They are the 'sponsors' (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007) that make my access and build my rapport with the others easier and the main figures in my study. I also interviewed with the other volunteers. Most of the volunteers are people who heard or read about Nilgün's 'success story' on media, got impressed by it, and this way they became engaged with the restaurant and the dominant needs-talk in the restaurant. I made informal interviews with the volunteers Cengiz, Nilgün, Hamza and Sevim, and also with a novice volunteer, Doğan.

The homeless interlocuters stay in different places such as shelters, hostels, streets, coffeehouses or internet cafes. Almost all of the diners are male. Sude is the only regular female diner. At the beginning of my research she was staying in a library. It was January when I interviewed her and she had already moved into a shelter due to cold. When I interviewed Cengiz, the waiter, he was staying in a

[2] When I formally interviewed Nilgün, I asked her similar questions that I asked the homeless. Thus, she is included in the eleven homeless people I interviewed even though she is not homeless anymore. I find her past experience important because homeless women experience it differently and they have different needs. Also, time to time she still calls herself homeless. She says that she never turns her heaters at home on because she does not want to forget her past. So, she is one of the two homeless women I interviewed. Yet, I informally interviewed her as a volunteer or worker as well.

mosque. Later, he moved into a permanent house. I interviewed him twice, as a homeless person and also as a volunteer. I used a voice recorder during all formal interviews except for homeless Ahmet's because he rejected.

The veteran volunteers, Cengiz and homeless diners were the "[i]nformants who are especially sensitive to the area of concern." The veterans were "reflective and objective" people who have worked in the emergency food assistance for years and they had close relationships with many of the homeless people. Cengiz was "the nouveau statused, who is in transition from one position to another", from homelessness to being housed. He was in the process of enacting the needs-talk of the restaurant instead of describing his needs in a homeless way (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 106). I have expected the homeless diners to be 'needy' informants, "who fastens onto the interviewer because he craves attention and support. As long as the interviewer satisfies this need, he will talk" (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 107). Yet, not all were that much interested to talk to me. The homeless diners rather represent those "who sees things from the vantage point of another culture", hence, who view their homelessness in a different way than the workers do (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 106). Other volunteers are mostly the 'needy' (2007, p. 107) interlocutors who are willing to interview because they viewed interviewing like volunteering, like something they do for homeless people. Some of them told me how important my research was for homelessness and they looked happy to make a contribution.

Aside from formal and informal interviews, I benefited also from participant observations by volunteering in the restaurant. I usually worked in the dining area where the homeless diners eat and interact with volunteers. Working in the dining area includes preparing the tables, serving food and cleaning the tables. I also

worked in kitchen a few times, washed the dishes, directed the plates to the volunteers working in the dining area and cleaned the kitchen at the end of the night. Lastly, I did observations outside where the homeless people wait in queue and listened to their conversations. In the first four months of my field research, I volunteered mostly for two or three nights in every week. After January, I decided to decrease it to once in a week, because what I was observing in the field was repeating itself and I needed more time to think and make transcriptions. On May, I went there only once to see the atmosphere during Ramadan. Overall, I stayed in the field from October 2018 until November 2019.

While observing "[y]ou want to learn from the group so you have to mentally stand back and notice things, and note them down" (O'Reilly, 2005, p. 97). I have rarely found the time to take notes during night-shifts, because we have to work fast since there are homeless people out there waiting for food. I usually wrote my research diary when I came back home. Directing emptied plates to the kitchen was isolating me from the dining area where the main interactions were revolved and needs-talk was shaped. Hence, time to time I missed some important talks among workers and diners. Yet, because water is in the tea section, I could use the task of filling the water into decanters to my advantage for staying in the dining area longer and observe.

During the first interviews I made in the restaurant, my sponsors were interfering and I needed to gain independence from them. To avoid interference, I started to communicate with the volunteers beforehand and we met in other places like cafés or their workplaces. Making 'arranged interviews' (O'Reilly, 2005, p. 123) outside the restaurant became much more productive. Yet, I could not do this with the homeless. As I will detail below, veteran volunteers did not want me to

communicate with the homeless freely, because they were afraid I may harm the trust relationship they built with them. Built trust appeared as a key entitlement before me for accessing some certain contexts including insights of the homeless, however, as a master's student my time period was too short to build such relationships because it needed me to volunteer for some years, like Sevim, Nilgün and Hamza did, to be able to achieve that entitlement. Thus, this remained as a barrier that I could not pass completely during my research.

1.2.2 Ethical dilemmas

I adopt an activist ethnography approach in my research. Gupta and Ferguson see activist ethnography "as a way of pursuing specific political aims while simultaneously seeking line of common political purpose with allies who stand elsewhere" (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997, pp. 38-9). Instead of claiming to be one who tells the "truth", "we need to analyze how particular understandings and practices are constituted and come to make sense to those embracing and enacting them" (Lyon-Callo, 2000, p. 329). This point of view gives me the chance to honestly disagree, conflict and also work closely with my interlocutors on a more democratic and equal platform (Scheper-Hughes, 1992; Lyon-Callo, 2004). Therefore, I discussed the issues that I disagreed with my interlocutors.

Such discussions helped me to improve my field relations too. When they sense that I disagree with them, they are more motivated to explain themselves. As Lyon-Callo (who also benefits from activist ethnography) observes in his research (2004, p. 23), people are less tended to share with the researcher when it is a hierarchical relationship. Nilgün referred to this reality when we met as well. When I told her that I wanted to conduct a research in the restaurant, she answered me

“without eating a slice of bread after a homeless person touched it and without getting the smell of sweat when inside is full of homeless people your research will never be complete” and this is how I started to work there as a volunteer.

For the veteran volunteers, maintaining their established relationship with the diners are very crucial. Thereby, they did not want me to approach the homeless and interview them independently, because they were worried I may harm the trust relationship they built with their diners. Most of the time, they chose the person I will interview themselves and they did not want to leave me alone during the interviews. Although I warned them that it should be done one-to-one, without a third person’s interference, and they said that they acknowledged it, that almost never happened. One night, after an interview with a homeless man, a veteran volunteer corrected my way of talking with the homeless. I thought being formal would be more respectful to them, but, on the contrary, it apparently sounded irritating. Then, I completely gave up on taking the risk of approaching to the homeless diners without the restaurant’s approval and I decided to interview only the diners they chose for me, because I was also afraid of harming their relationships.

My experiences in the field provided me data regarding the needs-talk in the restaurant. They showed me how important building trust is in access to both the homeless’ accounts and also some certain contexts. Building and maintaining trust with the diners were crucial also because the volunteers saw it as a necessary step to the solution of homelessness. I will elaborate this in the last chapter.

1.2.3 Access and Field Relations

O’Reilly suggests that researchers sometimes are “actively seeking access to certain groups and certain situations that another participant might not access” (O'Reilly,

2005, p. 97). Although my access to volunteering was remedied, I have failed to access to a certain context. Especially during autumn and winter, conflicts frequently occurred among the veteran workers and diners on the question of which diners were really homeless and who did not actually need food. To be able to see the identity of the deserving poor, veteran workers decided to make a 'field research' at one night and walk from Taksim to Beşiktaş. The aim was determining the people who really lived on the street. It would be a great opportunity for me to be able to observe what kinds of discourses were going to be included in the dominant way of needs interpretations. Two times, I told Nilgün that I wanted to participate too. She did not answer me properly for either times, so I thought that maybe it was early to talk about this. After some weeks, I texted to Sevim and told her about my willingness to participate in the field research. In an apologizing manner, she told me that only those who already built a trust relationship with the homeless could participate. Thus, trust relationship has again emerged as an important entitlement in the field.

Ghodsee defines insider status as being "[a] recognized member of a particular community" and one is insider "especially if the ethnographer self-identifies with that community" (Ghodsee, 2016, p. 18). I do not self-identify with the *Hayata Sarıl* community, thus, I do not think I can ever 'overraport' (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 87), but the restaurant's doors are open to anyone who wants to volunteer, so once I am a volunteer, I was accepted. They are accustomed to the researchers as well. Especially in the beginning, I was almost the same as the other new volunteers. They were novices like me who also needed to

> watch what other people are doing, ask others to explain what is happening, try things out for themselves – occasionally making mistakes – and so on. But, in an important sense, the novice is also acting like a social scientist: making observations and inferences, asking informants, constructing hypotheses, and acting on them (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 79).

I think these factors minimized my 'reactivity', the effect of my presence in the field, to a large extent (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 16), because I was not different from them. My questions did not stand out by disturbing.

To the volunteer interlocuters, I gave both oral and written full accounts (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, pp. 97-98) about my research topic by saying that "I am studying the perspectives regarding the needs of the homeless and homeless people's description of their own needs." They also read the University Ethical Committee's Informant Form involving a detailed data regarding my research topic and what happens to the data they will provide to me. I briefly told homeless people that I conduct research about the needs of the homeless. Both groups were not really curious and interested in my research though. For many times, volunteers forgot that I was writing a thesis. They assumed that I already completed my "homework" and I continued to come only as a volunteer. Hence, from time to time I needed to remind them of the fact I was there still as a researcher as well as a volunteer.

Building rapport with the volunteers went quite well due to my frequent presence in the restaurant. It was also easy thanks to my 'facilitative relationships' (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 58) with the veteran workers. They were making it easier for me to communicate with the other volunteers. They also introduced me to my homeless interlocutors, although they were also 'obstructive' in that case (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007, p. 59) because, as I stated above, they were afraid I may harm their trust relationship.

I see my research experience itself as an important source of data. As I will discuss in Chapter 5, building trust with the diners is very important for the restaurant. I observed how important it is for the restaurant volunteers precisely through my field relations with them and homeless diners, my mistakes in the ways

of communicating with the homeless. In fact, trust is closely linked with needs-talk, because the volunteers think that rebuilding the sense of trust is the key point for reviving the willpower in homeless people and convincing them to find paths out of homelessness (See, Chapter 5). If my field experience did not teach me these, my research would remain lacking.

1.3 Overview of the chapters

Hayata Sarıl Restaurant is a project that aims for bettering the homeless' lives. As Alan Hunt argues, all projects that act on social agents have five elements: (1) Agents, (3) discourses, (2) sociopolitical context, (4) targets, (5) tactics or techniques (Hunt, 1999, p. 28). The outline of this thesis also roughly follows these five elements.

In the previous section, I roughly introduced the agents as the *Hayata Sarıl* volunteers and targets as homeless diners. The second and third chapters aim at discussing discursive and sociopolitical context of homelessness. In the second chapter, I will discuss different approaches to homelessness and poverty throughout the history of developed capitalist countries in comparison to Turkish history of poverty. I will review how the discourse of poverty evolved from a perspective that puts the moral character of the almsgiver of the medieval period in the center to another one that emphasizes on the morality, culture, and health of the poor. In this chapter, I also discuss meanings of home and homelessness and how the homeless experience the life on streets. In the third chapter, I discuss citizenship and needs. The former part of the chapters elaborates the elements of citizenship, approaches to citizenship, and contested citizenship of the homeless. I will argue that the basis of citizenship in Turkey is property focused, thus, discriminating those who are

deprived of property. The latter part of the chapter will discuss the theories of needs and capabilities and Fraser's concept of 'the politics of needs interpretation' (1989). These two chapters are important in terms of providing insights into the discursive resources of the needs-talk revolved in my field.

The fourth chapter will review the theoretical background of the techniques used for challenging with homelessness in Istanbul, primarily, food provision and eating practices. I will argue that food is a social concept beyond merely a physical need. I will discuss what kinds of power relations governs providing and receiving food, how deprivation of entitlements leads the homeless to hunger, how eating practices become a part of civility or primitivity, and how they are used for channeling certain behaviors into a middle-class lifestyle.

Chapter five will include the data I received from my field and the analyses of them. I will argue that the way needs of the homeless diners are interpreted in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant prioritizes sociality, psychological support, and discipline for the homeless. This needs-talk aims for the homeless to change and become citizens who can exercise their rights. Another argument of the research states that victim-blaming and structure-blaming discourses of homelessness can coherently coexist in the same context. The thesis concludes that having more homeless people in positions of volunteerism or jobs can help the relationship between 'housed' volunteers and homeless diners to be stronger and also enable the homeless to politicize their unspoken needs claims.

CHAPTER 2

DISCURSIVE AND SOCIOPOLITICAL CONTEXT OF HOMELESSNESS

Introduction

This chapter is an introduction to poverty and homelessness and it aims to situate needs-talk around homelessness within its sociopolitical and discursive context. In this thesis, I examine homelessness within its inextricable relationship to poverty. Becoming homeless is a form of impoverishment and dispossession. On the other hand, homelessness may not always stem from poverty but also from micro factors such as health problems, familial problems, domestic violence, and/or the use of alcohol and substance. These factors often intersect with the way society is hierarchically organized through institutions, political and economic structures, and normative value systems that reinforce gender, sexuality, race, and class inequalities and make homelessness a complex issue where the conventional agency-structure duality remains inadequate to explain (Bourgois & Schonberg, 2009, p. 16; Bourgois, Holmes, Sue, & Quesada, 2017, p. 300). Yet, due to constraints of time and space, in this thesis, I was not able to discuss micro reasons of homelessness in detail and mostly focused on the poverty side of it.

The first section briefly tells the history of poverty and the discourses around it in developed capitalist countries as well as in Turkey by focusing on the certain stages where poverty and the poor came into sociopolitical agenda world-wide. Despite the variety in the answers why some people are poor, dominant discourses of poverty have been largely maintained around individualizing explanations while the answers questioning structural context have remained weaker (Buğra, 2008, p. 14). Each historical stage contained its unique discourse that was nourished by structural

context, as Teresa Gowan and Michael Katz argue (Gowan T. , 2010; Katz, 2013). I will discuss each of them based on the political economic changes in history.

In the second section, I will discuss the concepts of home and homelessness and also the experience of being homeless. Home is a heterogenous concept involving cultural, social, economic and political meanings and values. The deprivation of home leads also to the deprivation of these values. Yet, homelessness is not easy to define only through dispossessions. The second section also discusses how today's homelessness differs from the way it was experienced before 1970s. I will also briefly mention the aspects of experiencing homelessness mainly in the US and Turkey under four subtitles: Interpersonal relations, moneymaking, health, and safety.

2.1 The history and discourses of poverty

Gowan conceptualizes forms of poverty discourses as sin-talk, sick-talk, and system-talk while Katz categorizes them based on morals, culture, and biological 'inferiority'. I benefit from their conceptualizations through slight changes. Firstly, Gowan starts her analysis with the late nineteenth century. I will start with the medieval period, namely, twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Secondly, she considers culture of poverty rhetoric as a part of sin-talk, but I will separate them as Katz separates discourses of morals and culture. Thirdly, instead of Katz's biological inferiority discourse that focuses on the relationship between poverty and race in the context of the US, I will include Gowan's sick-talk and system-talk. Therefore, I start the review with (1) medieval poverty and the religious discourse surrounding it. Then, I continue with (2) poverty and approaches to the poor in early capitalism and

its sin-talk, (3) poverty in 1960s-70s and its culture-talk, and (4) poverty in neoliberal times and its sick-talk prominent today.

The historians studied medieval poverty mostly from the perspective of the almsgivers due to limited resources regarding the experience of being poor at the time. Nevertheless, there are research giving insights into it (See, for instance, Scott, 2012). Historians show health problems and famines as the prevalent causes of medieval poverty (Cohn, 2016; Dyer, 2012). Samuel K. Cohn states that the mid-1300s were the time poverty in Medieval Europe was at catastrophic levels until 1470s due to the outbreaks of black death and plague. Also, The Hundred's Years' War and brigandage deepened it (Cohn, 2016, p. 145). Mental breakdowns or accidents could cause peasants to sell most of their belongings and impoverish. Yet, Dyer shows that community was strong and supported the poor peasants while many landlords also cleared their debts as charity (Dyer, 2012).

Except for the involuntary forms of poverty, there were also the poor, such as monks, who sacrifice their material well-being for religious reasons. In biblical beliefs, poverty was a blessing obtained by renouncing economic power voluntarily as a virtue (Geremek, 1997, p. 19; Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 46), very similarly to the philosophy of owning nothing except for a bite of food and a piece of clothing (*bir lokma bir hırka*) of Islamic culture. The voluntary poor were those who were seen as the worthiest of charity.

Charity played an important role in the relations of the poor and the rich. It basically pointed at the moral character of the rich. Geremek describes the reciprocal relationship between the rich and the poor of the Middle Ages through a concept what he calls 'the economics of salvation'. As Marcel Mauss's celebrated work on gift giving depicts, the economics of salvation is based on a dynamic of exchange

where the poor receives material benefit while the rich receives their prayers in return (Davis A. J., 2016, p. 40). Thereby, Geremek claims, beggars were an indispensable part of the society. The rich believed that they guaranteed their soul's salvation by almsgiving (Geremek, 1997, pp. 17-18) and the economics of salvation worked to the advantage of both sides.

According to Adam J. Davis, almsgiving in Medieval Europe was not only a matter of self-interest, but it was "viewed as a way to imitate the charitable examples of Christ and the saints, and it was believed that in doing works of mercy one was simultaneously imitating and caring for Christ" (Davis A. J., 2016, p. 41). Thus, it was rather a culture of compassion that promotes the love for Christ to encourage the love for the needy (Davis A. J., 2016, p. 38). Even though they advocate for different sides, in both Geremek and Davis's approaches, we see that the discourses of poverty revolved around the almsgiver's moral and religious character rather than the poor's.

By the enclosure movement this image changed. In the sixteenth century, the lands were marked as a part of the private property of the landlord and peasants became landless. As the principle of private ownership became the norm, the impoverishment and the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few were increasing (Geremek, 1997, pp. 102-3). Many free peasants were employed as waged labor, and by the eighteenth century many were compelled to work under the harsh conditions of industrial capitalism as free labor. Impoverishment had become a crucial prerequisite for the first accumulation of capital (Geremek, 1997, p. 102), because only if some sections of the population starved it was possible forcing them to sell their labors (Polanyi, 2001, pp. 172-173). Urban population has rapidly grown due to the massive migration, so have poverty, vagrancy and beggary (Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 22).

Polanyi conceptualizes the social transformation that the development of self-regulating markets bring about through the concept of embeddedness. Labor power turned into a commodity which was "universally bought and sold at a price called wages" (Polanyi, 2001, p. 137). As Polanyi argues, before its definition as a commodity, the organization of labor and economy used to be embedded in the society. A worker's relations with his master and wage used to be regulated by social customs and the rule of the town (Polanyi, 2001, p. 73). What commodification of labor did was to liquidate organic social relations and "to replace them by a different type of organization, an atomistic and individualistic one" (Polanyi, 2001, p. 171). Therefore, society became embedded in the economic system (Polanyi, 2001, p. 60).

> The vital importance of the economic factor to the existence of society precludes any other result. For once the economic system is organized in separate institutions, based on specific motives and conferring a special status, society must be shaped in such a manner as to allow that system to function according to its own laws. This is the meaning of the familiar assertion that a market economy can function only in a market society (Polanyi, 2001, p. 60).

The ways to deal with poverty were also changing, as the composition of it. First efforts were given to exclude all hungry peasants without lands, beggars and vagrants from the cities through policing (Buğra, 2008, p. 36). A population of 'transient poor' was rising. They had to shunt from city to city where their settlement rights were repeatedly denied. (Rossi, 1991, p. 17). However, due to extreme levels of poverty, the politics of exclusion did not solve the problem and voluntary basis charity was not enough. The new urban poor who are not a part of agriculture work anymore were seen responsible of the social disorder in the cities and they should have been integrated into the industry (Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 21). Eventually, both Catholic and Protestant worlds came to realize that a public charity reform was needed (Buğra, 2008, p. 37). Relief arrangements in England supported

the care of the destitute while local responsibility for care work was spelled out more than ever (Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 15). Besides the state benefits, the poor were employed "in a labor yard, or in a workhouse; or work is provided in the private market, whether by contracting or indenturing the poor to private employers, or through subsidies designed to induce employers to hire paupers" (Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 23). Also Factory Acts that decreased working hours to humane levels came into force in England (Marx, 1974, p. 257). As Escobar describes, this transformation of public regulation of the poor was the 'modernization of poverty' (Escobar, 1995, p. 22).

Therefore, the composition of poverty and philanthropy have changed and became distinct from the rural forms of it (Geremek, 1997, p. 102). Similarly, the discourses of poverty have changed as well. As I stated above, in medieval period, they revolved around the moral character of the rich. By the eighteenth century, the poor was the workforce rather than only a means of good deeds. The unemployed poor were associated with pollution, contagious diseases and crime and this created tension among the ones with property (Buğra, 2008, p. 25). Working was defined as the core of salvation in the protestant ethics (Geremek, 1997; Weber, 2005). Those who do not work hard enough were condemned for being lazy. Thus, the poor's moral character was situated at the center of the discourse of poverty at the time and constituted what Gowan calls *sin-talk* (Gowan T. , 2010). Sin-talk defined poverty as something disturbing, polluting and inevitably "the obvious consequence of sloth and sinfulness" (Bremner, 1956, p. 16 referenced in Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 46).

Morality grounded explanations constitute the basis of 'sin-talk' that frames poverty within the victim-blaming notions of laziness, personal failure, idleness, deviance, crime and damnation of the poor (Gowan, 2010). This perception had two

consequences. First, the poor became the target of accusations for their own poverty, and welfare was denied to them. In the simplest term, a man who cannot find a job due to the lack of education can be accused of being lazy, but whether the public facilities of education were equally accessible or not is not a matter of question. For instance, in the late nineteenth century US, the transient poor who were called bums, hoboes or tramps were employed as temporal railroad workers, but if they cannot work they were warned out of towns (Rossi, 1991, p. 20). Many of the homeless people whose labor was not needed were spending their nights outside and they were not a central target for public relief at all (Rossi, 1991, p. 19). Second consequence is that the poor relief introduced new opportunities for social intervention and regulation. Those who resist the system had the risk of withdrawal of social assistance (Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 32). This punishing and rewarding system functioned as "a societal reminder of acceptable social values" (Romano, 2018, p. 3). The poor have been exposed to prove themselves as moral and worthy of help.

The scholars explore the prevalence of sin-talk in Ottoman rhetoric explicitly during the time when *Darülaceze* Institution was founded (Buğra, 2008, pp. 131-2). Beggary was a phenomenon that was vigorously condemned since the seventeenth century, but the methods of dealing with it have majorly changed in the late nineteenth century. Those who have begging certificate were allowed to beg before (Buğra, 2008, p. 131). Starting from the 1870s, it was entirely prohibited in İstanbul and people who came to beg from other cities were deported. In 1896, *Darülaceze* was founded for the care of those who were unable to work. Rallying, deporting, and forcefully shutting them up in *Darülaceze* became the common methods to regulate the poor, very similarly to the methods applied in Europe. It can be argued that the

main motive behind this change was the influential understanding of 'work as salvation' which was advocated by the Shadhili Tariqa. It was a religious Muslim group that emerged in North Africa and also supported by Abdul Hamit II. According to Shadhili doctrines, everybody should be able to stand on their own legs and this is possible by working hard (Buğra, 2008, p. 132). Similarly, during the single-party period of Turkish Republic, there were many supporters of the modern work ethic among the intellectuals. An outstanding example to this was *Yardım Sevenler Derneği*, a philanthrophic association established on voluntary basis of the time. It adopted a modern understanding of welfare, giving benefit only in return for labor. In this respect, one of the most important activities of the association was having poor women worked in workplaces in return for economic support and imbued them with Republican values (Buğra, 2008, pp. 136-138). Similarly, many newspaper columnists asserted that both the beggars who lost their "sacred passion for work" (*mukaddes çalışma ihtirası,* my translation) and citizens who gave charity to them should be punished. Yet, 'those who were poor, but proud' were an exception (Buğra, 2008, p. 134); they were deserving help.

While a large part of the population was poor, the idea that resources were too limited to assist them all was creating the basis of the classification of deserving and undeserving poor (Katz, 2013, p. 1). Normatively, the undeserving poor can be described as "all those who should not be eligible for welfare benefits (regardless of whether they actually receive the payments or not) because their behavior, condition or socio-economic characteristics are considered unworthy of public support" (Romano, 2018, p. 2). The poor relief mechanisms took morality grounded explanations at the center (Escobar, 1995, p. 22; Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 16; Romano, 2018, p. 14; Gowan, 2010, p. 28-9).

Tocqueville is one of the vigorous advocates of sin-talk. For him, a peasant does nothing to improve his life conditions and he is not interested in working and saving money. “He therefore remains idle or thoughtlessly squanders the fruits of his labours” (Tocqueville, 1835/1997, p. 55). Tocqueville acutely stands against public assistance and claims that it makes the poor lazier and immoral.

> Any measure which establishes legal charity on a permanent basis and gives it an administrative form thereby creates an idle and lazy class, living at the expense of the industrial and working class. This, at least, is its inevitable consequence if not the immediate result. It reproduces all the vices of the monastic system, minus the high ideals of morality and religion which often went along with it (Tocqueville, 1997, p. 58).

He describes several difficulties the deserving poor face with “such as the helplessness of infancy, the decrepitude of old age, sickness, insanity.” He views these risks as “inevitable evils” that are out of the control of human beings and public assistance as necessary at this point. Yet, he feels great anxiety in regards to any permanent assistance system that will cause more harm and damnation (Tocqueville, 1997, pp. 69-70).

A similar point of view is often supported through religious values, in Islam as well. The historian Rıfat discusses poverty around Islamic rhetoric, ‘innocent’ poverty and ‘evil’ poverty, in 1888. For him, the primary reason for poverty is the factors indicating sacred providence such as misfortune and diseases. Human beings are not capable of understanding these kinds of providences. Secondly, laziness and leading a life of pleasure cause poverty. According to Rıfat, “even dogs are hostile to the poor.” By referring to Prophet Muhammed, Rıfat states that what a deserving poor should do is to love their poverty without complaining and be shameful (Rıfat, 1888 cited in Çiğdem, 2002, pp. 215-6). Çiğdem argues that this discourse views poverty as a temporal and occasional phenomenon rather than continuous and institutional (Çiğdem, 2002, pp. 216-7).

Sin-talk was the prevalent discourse of poverty at the time, yet, there was also opponent approaches of the nineteenth century. Gowan names the opponent discourses that blames political economic system for the roots of poverty *system-talk* (Gowan, 2010). A major part of it was socialist movement that explains poverty through capitalist exploitation of working class and criticize the systemic problems that cause poverty. There were also liberal scientists who point at structural roots of it. According to Briggs, the victim-blaming in Europe was shaken in the late nineteenth century when empirical sociologists indicated through research they conducted that a large number of poor people were poor because of the market economy, not of their incapacity or laziness (Briggs, 2006, pp. 23-4). Hence, system-talkers of the time supported that "[p]overty, in short, was not the fault of the poor: it was the fault of society" (Briggs, 2006, p. 24).

Nineteenth century Germany differed than Britain in terms of rights given to the poor. Bismarck's government was worried about rising socialist movement and preferred keeping the working class satisfied through compulsory insurance against sickness, accidents, and ageing (Briggs, 2006, pp. 19-20). German legislation set an example for other European countries, especially during the Great Depression years where the rates of 'involuntary unemployment' reached peak (Briggs, 2006, pp. 24-25). The 1930s witnessed some significant increases in relief-giving, health services and social benefits in the developed capitalist countries.

However, the aim of increases was rather related to "the rising surge of political unrest that accompanied this economic catastrophe. Moreover, once relief-giving had expanded, unrest rapidly subsided, and then aid was cut back" (Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 45). Thus, the general position to poverty still viewed it as a

problem that could be handled through traditional methods such as "individual self-help and local charity" (Fox-Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 49).

The same understanding was prevalent also in Turkey during the same years. After the World War I and War of Independence, vast majority of the population was comprised of the rural poor (Buğra, 2008, p. 99). Although Turkey did not fight in World War II poverty harshly grew during those years as well (Buğra, 2008, p. 101). Thereby, the idea that a poor state of a poor country cannot help its peasants was preconceived (Buğra, 2008, p. 100) and the methods of challenging with poverty were merely directed towards making peasants stay in their villages as long as possible (Buğra, 2008, p. 105). Poverty was perceived as a matter that can be solved through philanthrophy and communal relations. Any discussion regarding challenging with destitution through social rights was stigmatized as supporting communism. Thus, it was a period where it was difficult to bring poverty into discussion while poor state of poor people and private charity rhetoric continued to exist until the 1960s (Buğra, 2008, pp. 158-160).

Nevertheless, after the corrosive outcomes of the Second World War across the world, developed capitalist countries and the developing ones to some extent adopted

> an acceptance that the state should focus on full employment, economic growth, and the welfare of its citizens, and that state power should be freely deployed, alongside of or, if necessary, intervening in or even substituting for market processes to achieve these ends (Harvey, 2005, p. 10).

This acceptance paved the way for welfare policies which are usually called 'Keynesian' and the regulatory organization of the economic system called 'embedded liberalism' (Harvey, 2005, pp. 10-11). The key feature of this period could be summarized well by the embeddedness of liberal economic system within "a web of social and political constraints and a regulatory environment that

sometimes restrained but in other instances led the way in economic and industrial strategy" (Harvey, 2005, p. 11). Embeddedness of the economic system within social relations once again brought about a sense of collectivity and solidarity (Sennett, 1998), when it is the case, the blame of being poor and homeless became less individualizing.

By the 1950s public assistance for some groups has been guaranteed as a right through social insurance (Katz, 2013, p. 8). Redefinition of unemployment as an involuntary problem has somewhat moved poverty out of sin-talk. Reforms regarding economy and industry aimed at regulating the system for the first time, rather than regulating "the moral character of the poor" (Romano, 2018, p. 30). It was even thought that poverty was no longer a social problem.

However, it was. By the 1950s, we see that poverty has not disappeared, but changed forms. From the nineteenth century until the formation of welfare states, poverty was an 'in-system' problem (Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001, p. 68, *my translation*). As Marx argues, for system to be able to reproduce itself it needs a working class population that is compelled to work for very low wages. Those who cannot enter the system are, in Marxist terms, *lumpen proletariat* who are deprived of "productively usable labor-power" and, that is why, excluded from social and political processes (Wright, 1994, p. 48; Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001, p. 68-69).

While their numbers were not significant in the nineteenth century, the formation of welfare states changed this picture substantially. The life conditions of the poor in-system started to be better through rising wages and higher rates of employment and people were able to move up the social ladder, while the new poor started to be comprised of those who were out of system, remained unemployed, and

experienced social and spatial exclusion. However, their numbers were not significant until 1970s either (Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001, p. 69).

Steady growth of economy and myths of wealth concealed 'out-system poverty' (Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001, p. 68, *my translation*) until it was rediscovered in the US alongside the issue of race in the late 1960s (Katz, 2013, p. 9). Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan released a report on *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* where he suggests that three centuries of oppressive structures in the life of the black American result in behaviors and values learnt in a black family at a young age and becomes more effective in impoverishment than today's white racism does (Moynihan, 1969 referenced in Gowan, 2010, p. 20). This approach blaming the community culture originated from Oscar Lewis's studies. In the 1970s, Lewis's 'culture of poverty' perspective gained great attention from policy-makers and social scientists (Coward et al., 1974, p. 622). He describes "culture of poverty" as

> the lack of effective participation and integration of the poor in the major institution of the larger society . . . a minimum of organization beyond the level of the nuclear and extended family . . . an absence of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected stage in the life cycle . . . a strong feeling of marginality, of helplessness, of dependence and of inferiority (Lewis, 1966, pp. 51-53 quoted in Glasser, 1988, p. 6).

Lewis has meticulously systematized 70 traits of the poor people which he claims are rooted in their culture (1966 referenced in Glasser, 1988, p. 6) such as unemployment, lack of privacy, resorting to violence in educating children, a tendency to authoritarianism, marginality, and distrust of government (Coward et al., 1974, p. 622). The culture of the poor continuously reproduces itself through transmitting these traits to the children and turn into a barrier to the integration of the poor in society (Chilman, 1966, p. 75 as cited in Coward et al., 1974, p. 622). Therefore, the individualizing explanations of poverty were not disappeared, but reshaped from sin-talk into *culture-talk*.

Obviously, morality is a central part of culture-talk too, but I prefer differentiating it from sin-talk, differently than Gowan's approach (2010) and similarly to Katz's (2013). The reason why is that the responsibility of being poor is not attributed to the moral character of individual anymore, but to the culture that individual grows in. Hence, Lewis and Moynihan acknowledge that poverty has a structural dimension, but the theory is still stigmatizing and discriminating the poor even if the point of departure is not particularly individual herself.

Moynihan's report in the US became highly publicized and made system-talkers furious. Civil rights activists and young social scientists criticized the report arguing that black people were institutionally excluded and their poverty was the outcome of the economic system beyond their control. Thus, according to them, advocating for culture of poverty was to work in tandem with white racism (Gowan, 2010, pp. 20-21).

1960-1980 Turkey was similarly a period where an emphasis on social state over private charity was embraced even by the right wing politicians. Yet, Lewis's approach to poverty has been embraced in Turkey too, especially by the nationalist-conservative milieus (Çiğdem, 2002, p. 213). According to Can, nationalist thought views nation almost as a homogenous mass without classes. The poor are the barriers to national well-being. Poverty is an internal matter which should be challenged through authoritative ways (Can, 2002, p. 177). The reasons for poverty are mostly about economic traps of external powers having hostile aims (Can, 2002, pp. 178-9). Orhan Türkdoğan's work on culture of poverty in Erzurum stands at the intersection of Lewis's thoughts and nationalistic views of poverty. He is a nationalist scholar who thinks that the capitalist ideology of external powers lies in the roots of poverty in Turkey (1974, pp. 68-71). The developments occurred in the sixteenth century

Europe influenced Ottoman's durable and strong structure and brought economic and social problems to the country (1974, p. 70). For Türkdoğan, the first reason why poverty became an important problem in Turkey is Europe, and the reason why it grew and turned into a culture is urbanization that emerged without an industrial development and left many people unemployed (1974, p. 84).

For Türkdoğan, culture of poverty is an island distinct from the national culture. Different ways of thinking and living occur within the culture of poverty. Because they are transmitted from generation to generation, an isolation from the national culture emerges (1974, pp. 4-5). Türkdoğan expresses his worries regarding the numbers of people who adopted the culture of poverty. Because, for him, these people lack creative knowledge and moral values, and they are only after filling their stomachs. Increasing number of them would be a barrier to the well-being of society. Even if you eliminate poverty, this culture will continue to reproduce itself for long years (1974). Türkdoğan does not problematize how accessible public facilities are or how just the redistribution of resources is, but he describes the life in *gecekondu* (slums) as a form of acculturation which is developed detached from national values as a result of urbanization. The main issue is portrayed as a homogenized national culture, rather than ensuring social justice that is the biggest flaw of the study. He describes social isolation and alienation, but not social exclusion by the mainstream society.

When culture of poverty is studied in a blaming way it assumes that the individuals can resolve their problems only through individual methods (Glasser, 1988, p. 6-7). According to Çiğdem, Türkdoğan sees culture of poverty "as a source of evil" and "a criminal site" (Türkdoğan, 1996 referenced in Çiğdem, 2002, p. 213) while it does not have to be studied with a culturalist perspective, but it can be

situated within the structural framework without denying the concept completely (Çiğdem, 2002, pp. 213-4). In this manner, contrary to Türkdoğan's discriminating approach, Snow and Anderson's association of homeless subculture with the political-economic organization of society as below is a good example for a study of culture of poverty:

> The political climate with respect to the homeless affects how they spend their days. The matrix of social-service and control agencies and commercial establishments that deal directly with the homeless also shapes their routines and options. In addition, the ecological distribution of these institutional facilities and what we term marginal space within the community helps to define the contours of street life. And, finally, the texture of street life is further influenced by a kind of emergent moral code that provides a tenuous guide to the elaboration of behavioral routines and interpersonal relationships (Snow & Anderson, 1993, pp. 76-7).

By focusing on the social context where the relationships of the homeless with institutions and the mainstream society were shaped it is possible to study homeless subculture without discriminating them (Johnson & Middendorp, 2010, p. 275). This approach is closer to system-talk rather than culture-talk.

I have argued above that culture-talk had a dimension partly removing the blame of impoverishment from the poor. It was related to the historical conditions that embedded liberalism brought about. However, by the 1980s, liberalism became dis-embedded. Human well-being started to be framed within an excessive liberation of "individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade." This theory underlies the political economic system of neoliberalism (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). Inspired by Marx, Harvey describes neoliberalization as a 'creative destructive' process. It creates its own welfare policies, social relations, scientific principles, life styles, ideas, moral values (Harvey, 2005, p. 3), even time orientation and citizenship regime (Jenson J. , 2009).

Jenson states that Keynesian welfare regimes used to be present-oriented. The focus was on spending money for satisfaction of the current needs. By neoliberalization, spending in the present is now *risky* for the future well-being of the citizens. What matters is "behaving like a good business would", investing in present and spending for the future (Jenson, 2009, p. 37; Jenson & Saint-Martin, 2003, p. 83). Thus, risk management through knowledge and planning (Beck, 1992, pp. 23-24), individual responsibility and self-discipline emerge as important values of neoliberalism (Coveney, 2006).

In previous times, people would eventually find a job and employment would bring along the systemic integration. In the cases where it does not work, state intervention and social policies would pave the way for integration (Buğra & Keyder, 2003, p. 21). By the 1980s, the connection between economic growth and employment cracked (Buğra & Keyder, 2003, p. 20) and the out-system poverty has grown (Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001). The phenomenon that Keyder and Buğra call 'new poverty' has emerged. The groups affected by new poverty came under the risk of social and cultural exclusion and "increasing difficulty of integration in terms of economic relations" (Buğra & Keyder, 2003, p. 21).

By the 1990s, behavior based explanations of poverty have started to revolve around psychopathological risks (Carr, 2003, p. 2). Medicalization of poverty refers to the dominant ideology of health promotion that treats poverty which is primarily a political economic problem "as a psychiatric symptom" (Moreira, 2003, p. 69). "Rather than investing in structural interventions to protect the health of its citizens, the state frames health as the individual's moral responsibility to choose a lifestyle that avoids risk" (Bourgois & Schonberg, Righteous Dopefiend, 2009, p. 109). Hence, 'sick-talk' (Gowan, 2010) does not view health care as a citizenship right, but

as a matter of individual responsibility and self-discipline (Coveney, 2006; Biltekoff, 2013). “Unhealthy behaviours result from individual choice, the ideology implies, so the way to change such behaviour is to show people the error of their ways and urge them to act differently” (Tesh, 1988, pp. 161-162 referenced in Coveney, 2006, p. 17). Ill-health causes a sense of hopelessness that kills willpower and individual responsibility. The main purpose is to revive them through medicine and psychological counselling, and give the courage to the poor for bettering their own life conditions as active agents (See, for instance Lyon-Callo, 2000; Bourgois & Schonberg, 2009; Gowan, 2010). Thereby, sick-talk holds primarily the physical and mental health responsible for poverty, neither the moral and cultural character of the poor nor political-economic and social inequalities.

Medicalization of homelessness is embodied in social assistance as a disease model. Substance abuse, alcoholism, traumatization, depression and schizophrenia are defined as the main causes of the homelessness and a health care approach is embraced to response to the problem (Lyon-Callo, 2000, p. 330). According to Vincent Lyon-Callo, who conducts a comprehensive research on pathologizing the homeless, the disease model has two different impacts. First, increased efforts to “reform, treat and retrain” improve life conditions of some of the homeless individuals. But on the other hand, it does not address the structural roots of the problem and does not problematize “distribution of resources in the community.” On the contrary, he argues, medical discourse conceals alternative discussions that would challenge with “class, race or gender dynamics” (Lyon-Callo, 2000, p. 330).

> I have come to agree that systemic inequities contribute to the production of many behaviors that are commonly read as pathological disorders in people without permanent shelter. Reading these behaviors as individual disorders certainly plays a role in silencing work against exploitative social conditions (Lyon-Callo, 2000, p. 331).

In the shelters embracing sick-talk, information about the homeless' medical history, education, employment history and counseling experiences are used to "determine what issues she should 'work on' while at the shelter" (2000, p. 334). The homeless person who already learnt to approach her homelessness from a self-blaming perspective gets her problems detected in a range including mental problems and employment training (2000, p. 334). The key issue is that the homeless person should make a self-inquiry by asking herself "how did I come to be this way?" to have diagnosis made. If she does not behave in line with the program prepared for her, it means that she will not be able to find paths out of her homelessness and there is no meaning to try helping her (2000, p. 339).

Around ten years later Lyon-Callo made his ethnography, Gowan conducted her research in San Francisco shelters and observes medicalization of poverty too, but in a slightly different way. The shelters are rather overwhelmed by a "life-skills approach" as Gowan calls it. Although the prevailing discourse in the shelters is still pathologizing, "empowerment" through several types of education such as language or computer are increasingly promoted (Gowan, 2010, pp. 217-18). Gowan states that "clients were encouraged to see themselves as potential workers who needed only to raise their skill level to integrate into mainstream society" (2010, p. 218). To put it another way, increasing employability through personal responsibility is the key feature to be employed and socially integrated. "The 'competitive society' remained a given" and no burden was to be put on economy (2010, p. 220), but the homeless needed to change (Lyon-Callo, 2004).

Although Gowan does not mention, I think the main reason of this shift in the shelters may be related to the impacts of the debates on "a new welfare state" (Esping-Andersen, 2002) shaped around social investment and individual life-course

paradigms in the last twenty years. I will broadly discuss them in the next chapter, but briefly, these new paradigms have two concerns. The first is investment in human capital through education and lifelong training. The second is the aim of maximization in the labor market participation (Pinteloni, Cantillon, Van den Bosch, & Whelan, 2013, p. 53). So, the new welfare state prepares individuals to make themselves empowered instead of providing a "safety net" for them (Jenson, 2012 referenced in Cantillon & Van Lancker, 2013, p. 554).

Social investment and individual life-course paradigms' excessive focus on the employability and their assumption that individuals can be socially included only by the labor market participation reveal their far position from a rights-based perspective. These paradigms intrinsically support, what Polanyi describes as a social disaster, the reduction of human into workforce and labor into commodity (Polanyi, 2001). They also ignore the fact that situation of a person who is unable to work is systemically problematic (Buğra, 2008, p. 49). Ignoring systemic problems inevitably leads any of these mainstream discourses (sin-talk, culture-talk and sick-talk) that blame the homeless and the poor for what they are unable to change. As Buğra states, not human labor, but a human rights centered discourse can revive "the social" in human who was dispossessed. If the more the emphasis is shifted from the issue of employment to human rights (Buğra, 2008, p. 49) the more embedded liberalism will be.

So far, I have discussed how individualizing approaches to poverty and homelessness were shaped in different discourses through history, while the core idea that the poor are responsible for their own problems remain the same. In this respect, the poor have been perceived as sinful beggars, children of a bad culture or those with ill-health. Even if a structural dimension in poverty is affirmed by the

dominant discourses, response to the problems is again searched in the poor's behaviors, agency, responsibility and individuality.

2.2 Homelessness as a concept and experience

2.2.1 The concepts of home and homelessness

House is a building entailing a certain territory, walls and a roof. Contrarily, home is not only about these concrete features, but it is a multidimensional concept which implies some certain values, feelings and practices (Mallett, 2004, pp. 65-67; Watson, 1984, p. 61). The controversial meanings of home makes defining homelessness difficult as well. This section will discuss the meanings of home and, with respect to this, being homeless, and why definitions matter in social policies.

The meanings of home and homelessness are socially constructed in some sense. The number and size of the rooms, comfort, cost of a flat, nature and minimum standards for a customary dwelling differ historically (Watson, 1984, p. 62), and also personally (See, for instance Rossi, 1991, pp. 8-9; Arnold, 2004; Marx, 1976, p. 33). Marx explains the relativity of home with a class comparison:

> A house may be large or small; as long as the surrounding houses are equally small it satisfies all social demands for a dwelling. But let a palace arise beside the little house, and it shrinks from a little house to a hut ... and however high it may shoot up in the course of civilisation, if the neighbouring palace grows to an equal or even greater extent, the occupant of the relatively small house will feel more and more uncomfortable, dissatisfied and cramped within its four wall (Marx, 1976, p. 33).

So, the hut owners may consider themselves homeless in a richer society (Watson, 1984, p. 62).

For many, home refers to a sphere of "self-expression, a vessel of memories, a refuge from the outside world, a cocoon where we can feel nurtured and let down our guard" (Marcus, 1995, p. 4 quoted in Arnold, 2004, p. 57). It is the basis of

private, intimate and comfortable space where one is protected from worrisome uncertainties of the outside life (Madanipour, 2003, p. 62). It is “a point of reference through which the individual finds a place in the world” (Madanipour, 2003, p. 65). Home is important in terms of personal and social development (Arnold, 2004, p. 61). It is where necessity items for survival are consumed and where the continuity of human species is remedied. Thus, private sphere guarantees the existence of individuals as “a specimen of the animal species man-kind”, rather than as an exact human being (Arendt, 1958, p. 46).

Feminist waves protested against this idea of home as a site of full consumption and privacy with the argument ‘the personal is political’ (Ashley et al., 2004, p. 123). They suggest that this image “imposes a ‘masculine’ frame of reference on the housing debate” (Madigan, Munro, & Smith, 2009, p. 626). It is female unpaid work what fills home with the positive features and it is mainly a site of production through female unpaid labor, not of consumption. While men enjoy it, home is a sphere of oppression for many women, and certainly not of freedom (Ashley et al., 2004, p. 124). Many women live under the threat of marital rape and violence at home, thus, the notions of privacy, comfort and safety become questionable (Lister, 2003, p. 121; Fraser, 1989).

Home is also viewed as a precondition of citizenship, integration into the economic and political relations. It refers to economic values (Dupuis & Thorns, 1996, p. 485) such as benefiting a homeownership through investment and immediate consumption of a home as being a tenant or a landlord (Madigan, Munro, & Smith, 2009). Home also implies political values indicating citizenship, nation-state (Arnold, 2004), and also gender relations (Lister, 2003; Ashley, Hollows, Jones, & Taylor, 2004, pp. 123-139). Having a space mediates between private and civil life

(Arnold, 2004, p. 61). In contrast with the peaceful image of home, Arendt considers it in deeply negative terms. It is public space where everything is apparent: Visible and audible. Thus, it is where constitutes the reality (Arendt, 1958, p. 50). On the other hand, living a private life poses a risk of deprivation of the reality. The private person "is as though he did not exist" as long as he does not appear or make himself heard. He does not exist, as long as "[w]hatever he does remains without significance or consequence to others" (Arendt, 1958, p. 58).

Home is "a site of privilige and exclusion" in terms of class too (Arnold, 2004, p. 58). For Marx, the idea of home involving a sense of control and freedom corresponds to the bourgeois ethic. In the case of layoffs, unemployment and low wages, the resident's state of housing is never under control and security (Arnold, 2004, p. 59). For instance, if one is a tenant, he lives in

> *someone else's* house, in the house of a *stranger* who daily lies in wait for him and throws him out if he does not pay his rent. Similarly, he is also aware of the contrast in quality between his dwelling and a human dwelling—a residence in that *other* world, the heaven of wealth (Marx, 1978, p. 100).

Hence, meaning of home corresponds to a limited freedom in relation to economic power and alienation.

In this respect, Dumm argues that homelessness may be a condition we all need where we can live without boundaries that the understanding of modern nation state and territoriality impose on us (Dumm, 1993 referenced in Arnold, 2004, p. 59). Similarly, Marin praises homelessness by defending the right to be marginal. He states that "many of the homeless are not only hapless victims but voluntary exiles, 'domestic refugees,' people who have turned not against life itself but against *us*, our life" (Marin, 1987, p. 41). However, aside the problematic view of home as a site of full comfort, control and privacy, the idea of homelessness as a way to freedom is at least as problematic as the former. By exoticizing the street life, it substantially

ignores the unbearable life conditions the homeless are compelled to suffer. Rather, if the homeless continue suffering despite all the negative meanings home is attached to, it is because there has never been an "economic and social demilitarized zone to which people could escape" (Wallace, 1990, p. 12). The fact that they do not live at home does not mean that they lead free and bohemian lives in public space, but their activities are exposed to several restrictions only even for meeting their most basic physiological needs such as sleeping, urinating, and eating (as I will detail in Chapter 3). As Wallace states, assuming a frontier between 'our world' and 'their world' does not go beyond an "exploitative, elitist and the exotic side of imperialistic" approach. More precisely, "[o]ur world is their world too" (Wallace, 1990, pp. 12-13). Thus, the deprivation of home means deprivation of the values home is attached with and exclusion from the wider society where being housed is the norm.

To sum up, I consider home as a 'heterogenous' concept (Arnolds, 2004, p. 60) involving both positive and negative meanings and as an indispensable need for the homeless as it is for all humans. So far, I have mentioned the relative and multidimensional quality of home. As it can be seen, it is not simple, but a complicated concept that simultaneously involves opposing notions within itself. When it is the case, defining homelessness becomes contested too, because it does not refer only to a condition stemming from an absence of house. The rest of this section will focus on the meanings of homelessness and social policies.

I observe that until the early 2000s definition of homelessness was more frequently debated than in late 2010s in the academic literature (see, for instance Watson, 1984; Rossi, 1991; Neale, 1997). Debates were roughly related to the boundary between being unhoused and 'precariously housed' where both conditions refer to some forms of extreme poverty (Rossi, 1991, p. 9). Is a domestic laborer

woman who spends most of her time at home and lives in a poor house homeless? (Neale, 1997, p. 40; Watson, 1984, p. 64) Should we still call someone who lives on the street and does not define herself as a homeless person, but a hippie tramp homeless? (Snow & Andersen, 1987, p. 1355) Should nomads be evaluated in the category of homelessness? There is still no consensus on the answers of these kinds of questions (Watson, 1984, p. 60; Baron, 2004, p. 277; Ravenhill, 2008, p. 5).

Defining homelessness and setting some standards for a conventional dwelling are important to determine social policy goals. In this way, it is possible to see who lives in a place where certain standards are met and who does not (Rossi, 1990, p. 12). It is also easier to count homeless people, see whether it is a growing problem or shrinking (Baron, 2004, p. 274), make policies under the light of demographic data, and give monetary or other support for those who correspond the defined criteria. In her article written in 1984, Watson stated that "the lack of public concern" regarding homelessness was stemming from definitional uncertainties (Watson, 1984, p. 72). Thereby, it is a "politically sensitive" problem (Springer, 2000, p. 476).

Defining homelessness may not determine only who the target of policy response is, but also who is excluded from welfare. Conceptually speaking, how it is defined indicates the homeless person's place on the deserving-undeserving poor duality. For instance, governments may divide the situations where homelessness is defined as 'intentional' (Evans & Dowler, 1999, p. 180) or accidental. If they lose their accommodation because of natural disasters they are entitled to benefit from state assistance because they become homeless 'accidentally'. However, if they are single and working age individuals they are expected not to be lazy, work in a decent job and earn money to pay rent. Laziness is viewed as an indicator of 'intentional'

homelessness. While according to the former definition the homeless person deserves help, in the latter she is viewed as an undeserving poor (See, for instance, Housing Acts in the UK referenced in Pleace, Burrows, & Quilgars, 1997; Evans & Dowler, 1999, p. 180).

For Gowan homelessness is "all about being deprived of claim to place" (Gowan, 2010, p. 80). According to Caplow, "homelessness is a form of alienation from the rest of society, caused by the loss of an 'affiliative bond' (work, family or home) that links or connects the individual with society" (Caplow referenced in Ravenhill, 2008, p. 6). Rossi defines homelessness as "not having customary and regular access to a conventional dwelling" (Rossi, 1991, p. 10). Despite the relativity in the definition, in our common sense knowledge, we all sense what homelessness refers to. Even if we can debate on what a "customary and regular access" or "conventional dwelling" means, we have the grounded knowledge of "conventional dwellings" as homes, apartments, mobile homes, and rented rooms. An unconventional dwelling is any structure that is not intended to be used as a sleeping place, including public areas such as bus stations, abandoned buildings, dormitory arrangements (as in shelters), cars, and parks (Rossi, 1991, pp. 11-2). This knowledge is indeed enough for making rights-based social policies and doing an academic research on homelessness.

Correspondingly, by the 2000s, the definition of homelessness debate has become outdated in the academic literature to a major extent. I think studies of The European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless (FEANTSA) have been influential in this change. FEANTSA which was founded in 1989 is the only European NGO aiming at preventing and dealing with homelessness. In 2005, the NGO prepared a categorization of homelessness which is

called European Typology of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion (ETHOS). ETHOS is based on the idea that a home is a home when the three domains are contained:

> having an adequate dwelling (or space) over which a person and his/her family can exercise exclusive possession (physical domain); being able to maintain privacy and enjoy relations (social domain) and having a legal title to occupation (legal domain) (Edgar, Doherty, & Meert, 2004, p. 5).

In order to cover all forms of homelessness in Europe, four main conceptual categories as (1) roofless, (2) houseless, (3) insecure and (4) inadequate emerged in the latest version of the typology (FEANTSA, 2017). The absence of any of those domains can lead to one of these forms of homelessness (Edgar, Doherty, & Meert, 2004, p. 5). Following ETHOS, instead of proposing a single statement, categorization is now preferred by policy-makers in many countries. For instance, Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) homeless assistance in the US uses a similar form of categorization (HUD, 2012).

Based on varying categories, the United Nations (UN) estimates that 1.1 billion people today lack adequate housing (Speak, 2019) and at least 150 million of them have no place to live (Chamie, 2020). To count the homeless HUD uses the categories of sheltered and unsheltered. HUD's statistics indicate that 552,830 people are homeless in the US and approximately 65% of it are sheltered while the other 35% live on the streets, "in places not intended for human habitation, such as sidewalks, parks, cars, or abandoned buildings" (The Council of Economic Advisers, 2019). As for Europe, the only European country where long-term homelessness declined is Finland. Finland succeeded to achieve a decrease of 18% in seven years. On the other hand, an increase of 25% between 2014 and 2016 in the numbers of homeless people in Germany is estimated. Thus, about 420,000 homeless people live in Germany in total according to the census taken in 2016. England has 4751 people

sleeping rough (with an increase of 169% from 2010 to 2017) and 78,170 people living in temporary houses (with an increase of 62% between 2011 and 2017). 10,206 people in Hungary were identified as homeless including sleeping rough and emergency shelter residents in 2016 (FEANTSA, 2018, pp. 98-99). Lastly, it was recorded that 141,500 homeless people lived in France in 2012 (OECD, 2020).

Even though the research on homelessness in Turkey is limited, it is estimated that homelessness is a growing problem, especially in the globalizing context of Istanbul (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018; Birelma, 2014). The exact numbers of homeless people are not known by authorities, however Şefkat-Der, which is one of the rare NGOs working for homelessness for more than fifteen years, estimated that number of homeless people in 2011 might vary between 7,000 and 10,000 in Istanbul and they are more than 70 thousand across Turkey (Emek ve Adalet Platformu, 2011, p. 7).

2.2.2 The new homelessness and 'lumpen abuse'

In this section, I discuss what old and new homelessness are and how today's homelessness is experienced. I will benefit mostly from American and Turkish literature. I also discuss Bourgois and Schonberg's 'lumpen abuse' concept to address how macro and micro factors engendering homelessness become intertwined (2009).

Peter H. Rossi examines the experience and typology of homelessness in a historical perspective and describes two different compositions of the issue before and after 1980s (Rossi, 1991; Rossi, 1990). In the 1960s, he states, while the urban elite was already discussing about the effective use of lands and renovating the unattractive buildings, what to do with the alcoholic men in skid row aroused an

interest among social scientists (Rossi, 1990, p. 954). The meaning of homelessness used by the researchers of the time mostly referred to people living outside family units rather than those who live literally on the streets. Most homeless people studied by them were about 50 years old white men who stayed in cubicle hostels and flophouses. The other common points of all skid row studies conducted throughout the US during the 60s and 70s indicated that homeless people at the time worked in low-paid jobs, received low benefits, had disabilities stemming from old age, alcoholism, or pshysical or mental diseases, and lost their social and familial bonds (Rossi, 1990, p. 955). Additionally, these studies agreed on the estimation that homelessness will be shrinked and eradicated by the middle of the 70s. Indeed, a decline in skid row populations was observed (1990, p. 955).

However, by the early 1980s, affordable chances for housing enormously decreased due to growing role of financial markets in housing sector (Rossi, 1991, pp. 181-182). Also, the demand in muscle power and unskilled labor have declined as well and left a large part of the poor unemployed (Rossi, 1991, p. 186). These factors sharply triggered a change in the composition of homelessness.

The greatest difference between the old and new homeless is that a major part of the new homeless live in streets while the old usually found a place to shelter. Secondly, the typology of the homeless is different. Today's homeless people involve great numbers of women and young people as well as entire families who start a life on the street. Also, homeless people from different ethnic and racial minorities show up more and more while the old homeless were mostly white. Lastly, the new homeless people suffer unemployment much more often and survive "on 40% or less of a poverty-level income" when they are employed (Rossi, 1990, p. 957). On the other hand, physical and mental illnesses, alcoholism, and extreme

poverty are the common points between the two types of homelessness. Yet, still, Rossi describes today's homelessness as "a more severe condition of housing deprivation" (Rossi, 1990, p. 957) due to the remarkable differences.

Homelessness is a multidimensional issue that is engendered by many factors effective in macro and micro levels. Macro factors are mainly economic conditions, changes in social policy applications, and financialization of housing that leads to urban transformation and gentrification projects and ends up with depriving the poor of their right to housing. On the other hand, being subjected to physical and sexual violence since early age, having mental and physical health problems, using alcohol and substance, having familial problems, and growing up in poor households are some of the micro factors (Birelma, 2014, p. 297; Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018).

Homelessness is a form of extreme poverty and poverty has often been studied through the conventional structure-versus-agency dicothomy. However, the complex composition of homelessness needs a more hybrid lens. To bring a new analytical perspective to this, Bourgois and Schonberg redefine the term *abuse* within a structural frame by combining it with Marx's concept *lumpen*. Abuse refers to the misuse of power that violate human rights in interpersonal relations and brings out physical and/or psychological suffering. Also, the authors see lumpen "as a vulnerable population that is produced at the interstices of transitioning modes of production" and leave out its moralizing use (2009, p. 18). Hence, their theorization of lumpen abuse

> sets the individual experience of intolerable levels of suffering among the socially vulnerable (which often manifests itself in the form of interpersonal violence and self-destruction) in the context of structural forces (political, economic, institutional, cultural) and embodied manifestations of distress (morbidity, physical pain, and emotional craving) (2009, p. 16).

Lumpen abuse is created and exacerbated by law enforcement, corporate neoliberalism, and social hierarchies based on gender, class, sexual, and ethnic differences. Therefore, victims of lumpen abuse are those who are subjected to intimate as well as structural violence like the homeless. They are "the human cost of neoliberalism in the twenty-first century" (2009, pp. 17-18).

2.2.3 The experience of new homelessness

Homelessness is not a singular experience, but we can roughly emphasize on some prominent common points that give an idea for how it is experienced. Birelma uses three main points to explain the life conditions of the homeless: Material welfare, physical and mental health, and safety (Birelma, 2014, pp. 294-295). Similarly, I will briefly mention the common aspects of experiencing homelessness under four subtitles: (1) Interpersonal relations, (2) moneymaking, (3) health, and (4) safety. The discussion below will be majorly based on the findings take place in two ethnographies, Bourgois and Schonberg's *Righteous Dopefiend* (2009) and Theresa Gowan's *Hobos, Hustlers, and Backsliders* (2010). On the other hand, Birelma (2014) and Bekaroğlu-Doğan (2018) will be the main sources I will benefit for reviewing the experience of homelessness in Turkey.

(1) Common patterns in the early lives of the homeless people often involve domestic violence and abuse. Bourgois and Schonberg explore the homeless drug users' survival strategies, daily lives, moments of deep sorrow and happiness they received by injection in San Francisco. They observe the effects of extreme poverty on the homeless' personal relationships comparatively to their families. The authors see a transgenerational cycle instead of a change. All interlocutors grow up in poor families. The members of these poor households are exposed to violence during their

childhoods by either their parents or other relatives. When they grow up and build new families they start to use violence against their children and wives. They use drugs and heroin as their fathers, brothers or sisters did (2009, p. 311). Some of them keep distance from their children to break this cycle of violence and drugs (2009, p. 205). Bourgois and Schonberg do not depict this cycle in a culture of poverty rhetoric, but they argue that the extreme forms of interpersonal abuse are emerged through class, gendered and racial hierarchies, cultural and ideological forces within the households (2009, p. 145). Interpersonal abuse is reinforced also because of the social services that legitimize violence as romantic love and prioritize maintaining children in these houses (2009, p. 311).

Even though homeless people can maintain vulnerable friendships based on small groups, relationships on the street are tough too. Bourgois and Schonberg describe an "ethical wasteland" imposed by structural forces where the homeless are often forced to be cruel against each other, betray, and abuse each other with the hope for living a bit longer. The authors argue that heroin injection under the harsh conditions of poverty and police repression create "a morally ambiguous space that blurs the lines between victims and perpetrators" (2009, p. 20). Gowan tells about a similar image of homelessness in San Francisco, Tenderloin. She states that the homeless living there never trust each other because they steal even from each other. There is an unending rhetoric of everyone being "a potential predator" (2010, XVI) reflecting a "Hobbesian war" (2010, p. 87) in the district. Except for their relationships to each other, indeed, the homeless have relationships with social workers and 'housed' people as well. I elaborate it in the last section of the fourth chapter, where I review three different ethnographies of homelessness based on places homeless people go to eat.

In Turkey, a noteworthy trigger creating paths into homelessness is the loss of familial relationships (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, pp. 269-70). As the other Mediterranean welfare states, Turkey has a *familialist* welfare structure (Buğra & Keyder, 2006, p. 15). The normative script of the Turkish family depicts an idealized, romantic institution and sees family as the primary authority for social protection (Yazıcı, 2012, p. 104). In the societies where social protection is built upon family, individuals who lose their communal networks come to be particularly vulnerable against social suffering (Bekaroğlu Doğan, 2018, p. 270). Hence, individuals deprived of such relations have higher risk of pursuing a life on the street if there is no alternative mechanism for social protection. A significant number of the homeless Bekaroğlu-Doğan interviewed has a traumatic history of domestic violence and abuse and the figure of a repressive father (Bekaroğlu Doğan, 2018, pp. 267-9). Escaping from home and school as a child and stepfamilies are some of the frequent themes occurs in the interviews Bekaroğlu-Doğan made with the homeless (2018, p. 181).

Personal relations of the homeless in Istanbul are embodied also in the spatial relationships. Those who lost their spatial bonds often lost their intimate bonds as well. Homeless people who migrated to Istanbul from rural areas of Anatolia with their families years ago could receive support through social networks in the suburb areas they moved (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, p. 174), but those who migrated alone eventually lost their former networks in their hometowns and failed to build strong ones in Istanbul (2018, p. 183). Additionally, according to Gümüş, the urban transformation projects in the city led to the loss of social capital neighborhoods provided and isolated the homeless even more (Gümüş, 2016, p. 45). Thus, as in the

studies made in the US, in Turkey too, the theme of loss of intimate and social relationships come to the front.

Again, similarly, on the street, the homeless usually maintain vulnerable friendships based on small groups and they often hang out as pairs (Birelma, 2014, p. 314; Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, p. 234). At the beginning of homelessness, these friendships are usually short-termed because people are mobile. Yet, they can receive help from each other for making life easier. In time, strong friendships based on shared districts and spaces can be built (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, p. 234-235).

(2) As for moneymaking, the homeless can engage with licit or illicit sectors or they engage simultaneously with both. For Gowan, how the homeless people make job choices is determined by several conditions: How accessible the job opportunities are at the local level; how police, public officials and local sub-cultures affect these opportunities; and lastly what kinds of collective meanings the available jobs are attached to (Gowan, 2009, pp. 233-234). Many homeless people work at legal jobs, for example, as a cyclist, book vendor, tree seller in Christmas time or manual workers in shipyards, steel mills, and the like (Gowan, 2010; Bourgois & Schonberg, 2009; Duneier, 1999). Yet, moneymaking is rarely the only reason for working, but homeless people build an identity through it (Gowan, 2009; Duneier, 1999). For instance, panhandling is a good option because it brings good money in return for much less effort compared to recycling (Gowan, 2009, p. 238-9). However, Gowan states that many homeless people prefer recycling job because they think that it keeps one active and productive and also keep them away from consuming drugs (2009, pp. 239-246). They build an identity of blue-collar worker for themselves and “create a space for self-respect and solidarity” (2009, pp. 234-235).

The homeless also resort to illicit sector such as panhandling, drug dealing, and thievery. Bourgois and Schonberg state that the white homeless interlocutors pretend they do not commit crime while the African-American exaggerate their skills in thievery and drug dealing (Bourgois & Schonberg, 2009, p. 172). Similarly to the cyclists, many of the homeless hustlers build an identity through the economy they are engaged with. Their bravado draws a heartless, hedonistic, and wild image (Gowan, 2010, p. 71). Even though many of them start to lose self-respect, use more drugs, and turn into dispirited panhandlers in time, many others continue to hold onto "the strong agency of the willful sinner" (Gowan, 2010, p. 73).

Lastly, legal and illegal sectors exist side by side. Duneier tells how the homeless steal books from the book vendors and sell them. He states that selling stolen books at a price way below than the usual is a common practice not only among street vendors, but also in well-known book stores in the district (Duenier, 1999, p. 220).

Vending, being a waiter, working in a construction, recycling, drug dealing, and sex work are some of the jobs homeless people do in Turkey. Those who are not able to work can also sell paper tissues or second hand goods (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, p. 239). However, Birelma argues that having no permanent address always appears as a major problem before the homeless when the employers ask where they live. Thus, finding a regular legal job is very difficult for them (Birelma, 2014, p. 313).

One of the most common illegal ways of moneymaking for the homeless is *sinyalcilik* which is a kind of panhandling, but it involves a threatening element because *sinyalci* ingests thinner before starting to work. Thinner provides two advantages: First, the *sinyalci* who gets high does not feel emberassed when he wants

money from others in the way he would before ingesting it. Second, people who see him high feel threatened and become more inclined to give him money (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, p. 231). There are also those who steal cars, rob supermarkets, and deal drugs. Those who commit crimes have difficulty in finding legal jobs later on although crime should be associated with desperation caused by homelessness instead of homeless people themselves (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, pp. 240-242).

(3) The homeless people, especially single ones, are more likely to have health problems than 'housed' people. Difficulties in seeing and hearing, chronic breathing, heart, and digestive problems, tuberculosis, loss of consciousness, depression, anxiety, and frequent headaches are only some of them reported by homeless people in the UK (Bines, 1997, p. 133). HIV infection is another health risk especially for the homeless youth, and women who work in the sex industry (Hwang, 2000, p. 231). Despite the fact that their health is utterly fragile, the homeless face many barriers to health care. In the US, lack of health insurance is a critical barrier before the poor. In Canada, even though they have insurance, if they lose their identification they cannot prove that they have coverage. Health care is also hard to maintain because of harsh life conditions on the street. For example, people with diabetes cannot follow a necessary diet and arrange what they eat accordingly because their chances to access healthy food are very limited (Hwang, 2000, pp. 231-232).

Interpersonal violence in the street and shelters is also a constant threat to the health. Especially in the US where guns are cheap and easily available among the homeless as well, violence is disproportionately condensed in urban poor. Bourgois and Schonberg state that nobody who spends a long time on street where drug dealers flock together can escape from facing violence. Yet, also many homeless

people are physically weak because of age and the long-term use of alcohol and substance, so they prefer avoiding any physical fight (Bourgois & Schonberg, 2009, p. 31). As for the police, they bring more anxiety to the homeless instead of security. Bourgois and Schonberg argue that many incidents with the police end up with a "survival crisis mode" in the homeless' lives. The dispossession process of police evictions causes strong feelings of humiliation, fear, and anger on the homeless. In the end, they accelerate their drug-using (2009, p. 112).

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the dominant discourses around homelessness, namely sin-talk, system-talk, culture-talk, and sick-talk, throughout history, from medieval period until today. How homelessness and homeless people are perceived by governments and mainstream society is dominant in policy making and crucial in bringing a solution to the problem. Definitions are closely related with perceptions. Thus, this chapter also briefly discussed the heterogeneous content of the concept home and homelessness. Accordingly, it has focused on their complicated meanings and why defining being homeless politically matters. This chapter also discussed how today's homelessness differs from the past and the factors influencing their lives on the street.

CHAPTER 3

SOCIAL RIGHTS, NEEDS, AND HUMAN BEINGS

Introduction

In this chapter, I critically review the perspectives regarding the elements constituting the contemporary understanding of citizenship and theories of needs. I will discuss how property-oriented the definition of citizenship is, hence, how exclusionary it is for the homeless. Even though the homeless are deprived of citizenship rights, as Baron argues (Baron, 2006, p. 1429), they are still expected to do their duties as a citizen. The concept citizenship inevitably coexist with the issue of needs (Fraser, 1989). In the second section of the chapter, I will discuss different approaches to needs. I will also discuss how capabilities theory turned into an *employabilities* theory and why the politics of needs interpretation and struggling for recognition of different need claims are important in this case.

3.1 Citizenship, rights, and duties

Citizenship is a political identity reflecting individual's relationship with the state and the wider society (Lister, 2003, p. 14; Arnold, 2004, p. 3). The contemporary understanding of citizenship is mainly shaped by T. H. Marshall (Lister, 2003, p. 14) who defines it as "a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed" (Marshall, 1950, pp. 28-9). In his conceptualization, rights are divided into three as civil, political, and social. The civil element includes rights regarding liberties such as free speech, freedom of thought and faith, and the right to justice. Political rights refer to participation into exercising political power as an

elector or a politician. By social rights, he means, right to access to economic welfare and social security (Marshall, 1950). In this section, I will discuss each of these elements.

Neo-liberal theories assume that citizenship rights have to be related with freedoms. In this respect, social rights are not legitimate as civil and political rights are. For instance, if I am free to speak, it is because my civil rights guarantee it. If I am free to be elected, it is because my political rights guarantee it. On the other hand, social rights have nothing to do with freedoms but they are merely about abilities and resources. Yet, there is no relation between freedoms and abilities as well as *being free to speak* and *being able to speak* (Plant, 2010, pp. 230-2). Thereby, neoliberal theories support that liberties and resources are absolutely separate (2010, p. 232).

Raymond Plant disproves this thesis in his book, *The Neo-Liberal State* (2010). He argues that if I want to be *free* in my speech, it is because I want to be *able* to live my life in my own way (Plant, 2010, p. 232). If I do not have resources, I do not have freedom to pursue my life goals either.

> That is why freedom is valuable to me. However, if the value of freedom is explained in terms of what I am able to do with it, then it becomes quite difficult to maintain that freedom and ability are totally separable … If rights protect freedom and freedom has to be understood in terms of choice and agency, then rights have to protect these capacities. It is through unpacking our understanding of these capacities that we will come to the argument that there can indeed be genuine social rights (Plant, 2010, pp. 232-3).

Thus, social rights are not distinct from civil and political rights at all. More precisely, where social citizenship is weak and inequalities are strong, civil and political citizenship will also be undermined (Lister, 2003, p. 17), as it is in homeless people's experiences. Once someone loses her access to a customary dwelling, she may also lose her right to vote, for instance (I will detail this further later below).

According to Marshall's definition of citizenship, membership of a community, rights and duties comprise the important elements of the concept (Lister, 2003, p. 14). They can be framed within two main principles which, Arnold argues, shape contemporary citizenship (Arnold, 2004, p. 17). One of them is the idea of a homogenized community, national family, that rests on the duality of self and other (Arnold, 2004, p. 18). According to Arnold, emotions that one felt for her village and town are now attributed to the notion of homeland which is a more abstract place while self-identity is now attributed to citizenship (2004, p. 53). It is possible to claim that this principle, membership of a community, is guaranteed by the elements of rights and duties, in fact, because these elements ideally equalize the citizens on the same platform. Those who fall out from the community are most of the time those who cannot correspond the balance of rights and duties that I will discuss below. The uncanny presence of immigrants and the homeless (other) constitutes a threat as much as outside invaders against the state and the active citizens (self) in the homeland (2004, pp. 52-4).

The other principle is economic contribution. According to Arnold, the key point of citizenship for the early liberals is the idea that every individual has "the right to self-preservation" and duty for "the preservation of all, as God's children." This encompasses a range of rights and moral obligations from resisting the absolute monarchy to helping the poor (Arnold, 2004, p. 21). This was the democratization of political power and it was guaranteed by a "socially meaningful labor". She underlines that not property, but work was situated at the center of citizenship. It is required for political power, while property is in fact a result and symbol of this contribution, so home is. In the end, the understanding of citizenship based on a

socially meaningful labor inevitably excluded the poor, slaves and women who do not make an economic contribution (2004, p. 22).

Arnold's argument is important, but disputable, because there are some cases where propertylessness is more exclusive than unemployment, thereby more determinant on one's status as a citizen. An unemployed but housed individual may find easier ways for political participation through a unionized movement in public space. But it will not be the same for a homeless person who does recycling job (which is one of the most legal jobs that the homeless can find relatively easier) because their position in public space is not equal. Plus, propertylessness may be the greatest barrier before one's work opportunities. Employing in a socially meaningful job is often impossible for the homeless because they do not have a permanent address where they can get rest and ready to work next day. The homeless' denied right to claim a space which is related to absence of property is an important factor that makes their citizenship contested, while it is double or triple contested for those at the intersections of disadvantaged identities based on ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. As Fraser and Gordon argue,

> [c]ivil citizenship made property rights the model for all other rights, thereby encouraging people to translate all sorts of claims into property claims. It is not surprising, then, that those excluded from civil citizenship were usually those who did not own property, including those who were unable to get their resources defined as property, as well as those who <u>were</u> property (Fraser & Gordon, 1992, p. 12).

Therefore, we can think of the elements of rights and duties around property and space. If person X has a *right* to prohibit anyone to do action Y in *her land*, it is person Z's *duty* not to do Y in X's land and stay away from the land. This logical reasoning is affirmed by liberal thinkers such as Hayek.

> Those shares [property] are the outcome of a process the effect of which on particular people was neither intended nor foreseen by anyone when the institutions first appeared—institutions which were then permitted to continue

> because it was found that they improve for all or most the prospects of having their needs satisfied. To demand justice from such a process is clearly absurd, and to single out some people in such a society as entitled to a particular share evidently unjust (Hayek, 1976, pp. 64-5).

Similarly, a homeless person who does not own a private space for herself cannot sleep or urinate in a house owned by X, because such an action would be unjust while according to the laws, that house is only for X to satisfy her needs or those X permits to do (Waldron, 1991, p. 316). As the homeless cannot use another person's private space, only place where they could live in seems to be public spaces. To live surely includes realizing some biological activities for survival as well, such as sleeping and urinating. Having a bath is also necessary for maintaining a hygiene standard. Yet,

> [l]egislators voted for by people who own private places in which they can do all these things are increasingly deciding to make public places available only for activities other than these primal human tasks. The streets and subways, they say, are for commuting from home to office. They are not for sleeping; sleeping is something one does at home (Waldron, 1991, p. 301).

Then, what about the homeless? Public lavatories may be suggested as a solution for urinating, of course, if how dignifying they are not questioned (Waldron, 1991, p. 321) and they are most of the time not free. As for sleeping, only place in İstanbul that is offered for the homeless to spend the night is gyms only for the duration of winter. Thus, the homeless have neither private nor public space and they do not have any political-economically neutral zone that they can escape to (Wallace, 1990, p. 12).

The relationship between property and citizenship has further been consolidated in the seventh article of *Nüfus Hizmetleri Kanunu* (The Civil Registry Services Act) very explicitly. The regulation that was approved by The Council of Ministers in Turkey necessitates a settlement address as a prerequisite information for genealogy to be able to be recorded in the system (Nüfus Hizmetleri Kanunu,

2006, pp. 9735-6). Thus, those who do not have an address are deprived of the status of citizenship too. TURKSTAT does not include them in statistics, thus the numbers of the homeless without an ID is not known and they increasingly become invisible and excluded. The regulation in question have reduced the legal existence "into being at somewhere in the property relations." Citizenship is reduced to registry while registry is reduced to an address (Gümüş, 2016, pp. 28-30, my translation). *Nüfus Hizmetleri Kanunu* clearly indicates that citizenship is based on having some property and private space; having a home, either as a tenant or an owner. Nevertheless, although they are not counted as proper citizens, the homeless are still obliged to pay the taxes of the products they buy and they are expected to do other citizenship duties while they cannot benefit from the rights to education, shelter, vote, health (except for emergency visits) and the like. (Gümüş, 2016, p. 31).

Duties are regarded as the absolute musts by different perspectives. The neo-conservative discourse of citizenship responsibility assumes welfare claimants to employ in a decent job or have a training to continue to get state benefits (Lister, 2003, p. 20). Similarly, communitarianist approaches prioritize duties over rights by supporting that "a citizen has responsibilities not merely toward the political entity (e.g. obeying the state's laws), but also toward the national community (e.g. supporting its core of shared values)" (Etzioni, 2011, p. 345).

Therefore, rights and duties are always reciprocal. If Z is under the duty for not to do Y in X's land (because X is a right-holder), likewise, X cannot do Y in Z's land either if she does not permit (Hohfeld, 1913, p. 32). However, Baron argues, the situations where some are never right-holders, but "*only* owed duties to right holders, had no-rights against privilege holders, were subject to liabilities created by the holders of powers, and were under disabilities because of others' immunities" are

never problematized. For Baron, those who own little and, this is why, live within "a position of extreme vulnerability to the power of property owners and of the government" are these duty owners, such as the homeless (Baron, 2006, p. 1429).

I have discussed in this section that it does not seem possible for the homeless to be viewed as real right-holders as long as the ideas of citizenship "assume a certain degree of privacy and a certain amount of private property of which the citizens dispose and through which they can participate in the public sphere" (Amon, 2013, p. 2). Eventually and inescapably, the homeless are excluded from citizenship. In the next section, we will see that the consequences of this exclusion expands to the perception of and discussions about needs of the homeless, thus, what Nancy Fraser calls and what constitutes my primary concern in this research, 'needs interpretation' (Fraser, 1989).

3.2 The politics of needs and human beings

Citizenship and human rights inevitably coexist with the issue of needs and interests even if uneasily. Thus, needs constitute a major vocabulary within the political discourse (Fraser, 1989, p. 162). They are widely used to justify and criticize social policies (Doyal & Gough, 1991, p. 1). The welfare state "preempts to define and satisfy people's needs" and we usually take the official interpretation of needs for granted and treat it unproblematic (Fraser, 1989, p. 156). This section is devoted to discuss some of the needs theories from different perspectives, Amartya Sen's capability approach (2000), Hartley Dean's criticisms regarding it (2009), and, finally, Fraser's concept of politics of needs interpretation (1989).

Needs are usually described (1) through the statements confirming the classic structure, "A needs X in order to Y", that Fraser calls 'in-order-to relations' (Fraser,

1989, p. 163). For instance, a homeless person needs money in order to guarantee her housing security. She needs a job in order to earn money. She needs education in order to have a job. All these in-order-to relations constitute a chain and "thick definitions of people's needs" in this way (Fraser, 1989, p. 164).

Needs are also described (2) through their relations to the avoidance of serious harm. It is considered that if needs are not satisfied within a time period individuals will be affected by harmfully (Doyal & Gough, 1991, p. 50). The definition of harm here depends on the approach to the needs. These approaches are often shaped around the question of whether needs are subjective or objective. They also differ in line with their relations to the theories of rights. I will review some of them below.

The basic needs approach (BNA) have been quite popular during the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s. It mainly assumes that there are universal basic human needs that are vital for human integrity.

> A need is 'basic' in BNA terms if it is a necessity for a fundamental life function, like physical survival, or participating in the community as a citizen, worker or parent. Only of such 'basic' needs was it claimed that we have a political obligation to meet them (Reader, 2006, p. 338).

One of the most famous works regarding basic needs is Maslow's 'hierarchy'. He considers needs as motivations and drives constituted in five category in the following order from down to up: Physiological needs, safety needs, love needs, esteem needs and the need for self-actualization (Maslow, 1943). Once an individual satisfies her physiological needs, the safety needs emerge; once she meets her safety needs, love needs emerge and the organization of needs continues this way (1943, p. 374).

However, these kinds of hierarchical pre-fixed descriptions lead many social systems to paternalism and authoritarianism, because they assume that some needs

should be met before the others (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, p. 189; Feher, Heller, & Markus, 1983). They fail to see that individuals' requirements are not always that straightforward. For instance, why sometimes the homeless children prefer video games over a good meal (Marquez, 1999, p. 5) cannot be explained through a needs hierarchy or drives. Also, Maslow's theory's connection with the principle of avoiding harm is problematic. For instance, someone may have an urgent need in smoking weeds, but "the drive is not linked to preventing serious harm in some universalizable manner, even if harm can accrue in the individual if it remains unsatisfied" (Doyal & Gough, 1991, p. 36).

For the orthodox economists the objectivity of needs are controversial. It assumes that 'needs are preferences', they are relative and individuals themselves are the only authorities over their preferences and wants. "[W]hat is to be produced, how it is to be produced, and how it is to be distributed should be determined by the private consumption and work preferences of individuals" (Doyal & Gough, 1991, pp. 9-10), thereby individuals' satisfaction with what they have is important. The neo-liberal versions of this approach also view that the idea of human needs are controversial. They support that needs discourses are dangerous based on the assumption they are tended to be authoritarian. Similarly to orthodox economics, they support that individuals should plan their expenditures in line with what they perceive as needs (Doyal & Gough, 1991, pp. 10-11).

As it can be seen, these approaches use the terms of wants and needs interchangeably, despite they are not synonyms of each other regarding the goals they refer to. According to Doyal and Gough, "[n]eed refers (implicitly if not explicitly) to a particular category of goals that are believed to be universalizable, whereas wants are goals that derive from an individual's particular preferences and

cultural environment" (Gough, 2004, p. 292). Thus, Doyal and Gough support the idea of objective needs on the contrary to orthodox economist and neoliberal approaches. Objectivity of needs can be proved through the relationship between needs and wants by Buğra and Irzık's arguments. As I told above, needs are described through the in-order-to relations: A person needs X in order to Y. With this structure we can justify that A wants the result Y. However, the reverse is not always possible, in other words, what one wants may not always be something she needs. "Hence, need-claims have a built-in normativity (and hence objectivity) that want-claims lack" (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, pp. 196-7). To sum up, while there are objective needs, these relativist approaches put barriers before a potential consensus on the ways of welfare redistribution (Doyal & Gough, 1991, p. 11).

Secondly, neoliberal approaches to needs discourses supplement the neoliberal approaches to social rights as being illegitimate (Section 3.1). As social rights are not seen legitimate and eventually social citizenship remains as a 'passive form of citizenship' (Fraser, 1989, p. 156), needs should be also off-topic to the political agenda (Fraser, 1989, p. 162). Yet, this thesis can be disproved in the same way as Raymond Plant does (Plant, 2010) as I discussed in the previous section. First of all, we need *freedom* to be *able* to live our lives in our own ways. This is why we need social rights. Our social rights guarantee necessary goods and services to have freedom to be able to pursue our life goals. Thus, needs discourses are precisely important for our liberties.

The relationship between needs and freedom is positively correlated by many scholars such as Sen (2000), Nussbaum (2002), Doyal and Gough (1991), and Buğra and Irzık (1999).

> The basis of this tradition is a conception of the human being as a species being in terms of her needs and capacities. Such a conception implies that

> individuals become more complete human beings, that is, fulfill their nature and flourish to the extent to which their various (cognitive, sensual-emotional, practical) capacities are exercised and their diverse needs (such as food, health, shelter, education) are satisfied. Thus, the final goal of every person is to realize her species-nature and flourish (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, p. 188).

However, humans cannot flourish their nature without a "basis of successful interaction" with others and participation in social life (Doyal & Gough, 1991, p. 50). Thus, humans are intrinsically social beings (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, p. 188). In this sense, *needs* can be defined "as those universal preconditions that enable such participation in one's form of life" (Gough, 2004, p. 292) and as those bring us to "a goal or 'end we pursue in our actions which we wish for because of itself'" (Aristotle, 1985, pp. 1094a-15-20 referenced in Buğra & Irzık, 1999, 188). Also, *harm* is anything blocks the way that essential activities take place for reaching goals, such as social exclusion (Doyal & Gough, 1991, p. 51).

Fixing these definitions, Doyal and Gough identify the most basic and universal needs of human beings as physical health and autonomy. Physical health is basically necessary for survival and for the capacity of acting, thereby, for social participation. Yet, health alone is not enough (Doyal & Gough, 1991; Gough, 2004). Autonomy provides individuals to initiate, make informed choices, be critical against cultural rules, and have opportunities to engage in "participation in any form of life, no matter how totalitarian" (Doyal & Gough, 1991, p. 67). Without these, "the ability of human societies to adapt to changes in their environment would be gravely weakened" (Gough, 2004, p. 292). Even though Doyal and Gough acknowledge that needs are dynamic and a list cannot be arbitrarily prepared, they suggest that an overarching list of needs, physical health and autonomy, is necessary for setting a bridge between theories and policies (Doyal & Gough, 1991).

Nevertheless, there are needs theories that do not necessitate a list while also resulting in social policies. Amartya Sen's theory of capabilities that became influential in both United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UK's domestic Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) may be the best examples of it (Dean, 2009). Amartya Sen's capability approach is developed somewhat as a response to John Rawls' principles of justice. Rawls claims that there are two principles that can guarantee justice in our unequal world. Firstly, principle of equality implies that the basic liberties, freedoms and equal basic rights should be compatible for everyone. Secondly, principle of difference is related to the social and economic inequalities and it is realized under two conditions. (1) Positions should be equal for every person to access. (2) The least advantaged members of the society should get the greatest benefit (Rawls, 1998, p. 56).

Amartya Sen's criticism begins right at this point. Sen accuses Rawls's first principle of prioritizing personal liberties, political and civil rights too highly. He claims that very basic needs and capabilities which can be a matter of survival should not be less important than basic liberties. (Sen, 2000, p. 64) Nevertheless, he is not late to add this explanation of himself following to his criticism: "The critical issue, I would submit, is not complete precedence, but whether a person's liberty should get just the same kind of importance *(no more)* that other types of personal advantages - incomes, utilities and so on- have" (Sen, 2000, p. 64).

Secondly, Sen sees poverty as actually a matter of deprivation of basic capabilities rather than of lowness of income. He strictly emphasizes that income is not the only way for generating capabilities and its impact is conditional. (Sen, 2000, p. 87) This fact is highly important especially in taking a public action towards reducing poverty and inequalities. (Sen, 2000, p. 88) For instance, trying to eliminate

established inequalities through cash transfers would not be effective where a disabled person cannot participate in different forms of life because of her unequal position. Sen criticizes Rawls by stating that social rights should not be only on paper, however people should be capable of realizing their rights in their lives. For example, despite all people have a right to have a proper education on legislation, many women in many countries do not have a capability to do that because of the social domination mechanisms. Even if the public actions transfer cash for her education expenditures, patriarchal authority in the household may not use it to open channels for education for woman. So, his capability approach provides a shift from means (income) to ends in analysis of deprivation (Sen, 2000, p. 90). In that sense, capability approach won great appreciation by international institutions such as UNDP and capabilities became a measure while evaluating human development.

On the other hand, there are criticisms regarding the point capability approach arrived today. The one I want to emphasize on in this section is Hartley Dean's position because she criticizes it with a comparison to Fraser's needs interpretation which constitutes the basis of my research. Dean claims that capability approach is liberal in core and conceals the ways to challenge class inequalities.

First of all, she argues that capability approach frames equality within freedoms, not solidarity. Hence, it inevitably disregards human interdependency and the fact that an ethical life includes love as well as rights (Honneth, 1995 referenced in Dean, 2009, p. 269). Dean reminds that the main question feminist ethic of care asks is "How can I achieve some freedom, yet remain connected?" (Hirschmann, 1997, p. 170 referenced in Dean, 2009, p. 268) Similarly, Andrew Sayer argues that "we are *beings whose relation to the world is one of concern*". We care about how others see us, how they treat us and how it feels like. An approach that disregards

human interdependency is alienated to social life (Sayer, 2011, p. 2), because human beings care about their connections to the society, community and family as much as their freedoms (Dean, 2009, p. 268).

In that sense, Buğra and Irzık's theory of needs views human beings as social creatures "*whose relation to the world is one of concern*" (Sayer, 2011, p. 2). They claim that every person can satisfy their needs only by being connected to others in society and participating in a form of life (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, p. 188), as I already reviewed above. In this respect, consumption practices constitute a very important channel for sociality. Hence, Buğra and Irzık consider highly of them in consideration to needs.

> When, for example, a person buys and wears certain clothes, she does not merely make a material use of these goods in order to satisfy her need for warmth, but also a symbolic use of them by revealing her taste and position in society, by sending a 'message' to others concerning her presence in it. Loaded with symbolic meaning, her choices relate her, as an individual, to others. This suggests that consumption is not only a relatively autonomous activity, but also a rational one in that it always involves an attempt to participate in social life (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, p. 198).

Nevertheless, as Buğra and Irzık also admit, consumption sometimes fails to provide such participation and it can be very exclusionary. When it is the case, it is fruitful to analyze the reasons of failure and view consumption as not only a dynamic exchange regarding market relations, but also considering the "non-market ways of allocating resources" (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, p. 200). Therefore, considering needs in their relation to consumption of goods and services can help us to discuss needs through human reality.

Dean continues to criticize capabilities approach also because it does not challenge with class inequalities. She approaches EHRC's mission to support "an equal society [that] recognises people's different needs, situations and goals and removes the barriers that limit what people can do and can be" (Equalities Review,

2007) critically, because EHRC takes only inequalities based on identities -gender, sex, ethnicity, and disability- into consideration while class inequalities are almost out of agenda (Dean, 2009, p. 266). According to Dean, capability approach in the way it is applied today is also far from a human rights-based understanding, but it views humans as economic agents.

> The prevailing establishment discourse – that is evident in other parts of the *Human Development Report 2000* – assumes that human development and the reduction of poverty self-evidently require economic growth, not human empowerment. Poor countries, it is supposed, should avail themselves of the opportunities that capitalist globalization can provide. In later chapters of the *Human Development Report 2000* the term 'human capital' is insinuated as if it were a synonym for Sen's notion of 'human capabilities'. Sen, in fairness, has remarked upon the limitations of the term human capital on the grounds that 'human beings are not merely means of production, but also the end of the exercise' (Dean, 2009, pp. 264-5).

We see that this transformation of the human capabilities approach into a human capital approach shows itself in a new paradigm, *social investment*, which started to be commonly valued since especially early 2000s. It is a perspective regarding the reconstruction of welfare states and integration of social and economic policies in line with today's social risks (Peng, 2011, p. 42; Jenson, 2009, p. 27). It has two main concerns. The first supports individuals to invest in their human capital through education and lifelong training, so that they will guarantee their stay in the market for the longest time. The second is the aim for maximization in the labor market participation (Pinteloni et al., 2013, p. 53), because it is viewed as a prerequisite of social inclusion and sustainability of future social policies in terms of financial processes (Cantillon & Van Lancker, 2013, p. 553). Individuals themselves are responsible to be protected from social risks and getting necessary skills through life (Ellison & Fenger, 2013, p. 547). Welfare states should empower the disadvantaged citizens and prepare them for the market through flows and buffers (Hemerijck, 2018, p. 817; Jenson & Saint-Martin, 2003), rather than emerging a

safety net against the market (Jenson and Saint-Martin, 2003) and this way, they will minimize welfare dependency too (Cantillon & Van Lancker, 2013, p. 553). To wrap it up, new welfare regime has three key features as Ellison and Fenger describes: (1) State expenditure focuses on human capital development in order to ensure economic growth. (2) Citizenship is redefined around individual responsibility ("no rights without responsibilities" (Giddens, 1998, p. 65 quoted in Lister, 2003, p. 428)). (3) A public-private partnership is encouraged to pave the way for investment in the social economy (Ellison & Fenger, 2013, p. 547).

Even if some risks are dependent on the individual choices, we should not ignore that choices are made in the context where political economic factors have a great role (Snow & Anderson, 1987, p. 1364). Our choices and our position that was obliged to take risks are not independent from the structures that we cannot control. So, individual risks are not individual in this sense, I argue, but they are the products of structural inequality itself that remain with us as long as capitalism remains. This paradigm is criticized also because it supports human for the market, instead of an understanding of the market for human, as Dean argues (Dean, 2009). For instance, although the main purpose of work-family reconciliation policies was to pave the way for gender equality, it has turned into a means for strengthening the labor market (Knijn & Smit, 2007, p. 28). While Amartya Sen's aim was situating capabilities approach into the understanding of social citizenship (Morel & Palme, 2017, p. 152), these paradigms in fact redefine social policy through not decommodification, but recommodification. Therefore, capabilities approach in the way it is applied today appears to be too liberal to bring a solid solution for populations living under housing and food insecurity.

Dean continues her article by referring to Nancy Fraser's call for a 'politics of needs interpretation' (Fraser, 1989). Fraser suggests that our need claims connect to each other with chains, as in-order-to relations, as I reviewed at the beginning of this section. The question of how a homeless person should be protected from cold is usually followed by many subsequent questions (Fraser, 1989, p. 163). How such chains are unraveled depends on the background assumptions of those who make needs claims and interpret those needs (Fraser, 1989. p. 163). She argues that theories that do not ravel out such networks of questions are only interested in whether some predefined needs will be met or not. They often take needs for granted as if they are self-evident and conceal politicized ways to challenge with inequalities. For instance, the benefits or services state introduces in order to meet specific needs of a disadvantaged group are often system conforming rather than challenging with established inequalities (Fraser, 1989, p. 145).

> As a result, they deflect attention from a number of important political questions [such as] … who interprets needs in question and from what perspective and in light of what interests ... where in society, in what institutions, are authoritative need interpretations developed, and what sorts of social relations are in force among the interlocutors or co-interpreters? (Fraser, 1989, p. 164)

According to Dean, Fraser's call for a politics of needs interpretation is not only a premise for a social justice and social citizenship based theory of needs, but also political participation to the needs-talk, "publicity for the needs of the poor" and all disadvantaged populations (Dean, 2009, p. 271).

> Fraser therefore makes the case for a different ideal; for a public sphere or realm in which there would be parity of participation and an end to systemic inequalities; in which diverse publics would be able to communicate across lines of difference; in which 'publicity' – in its literal and deepest sense – would be accorded to 'private' concerns where these are held in common; in which the boundaries between state and civil society would be permeable as more open forms of democracy develop (Dean, 2009, p. 271).

In her book, in a way, Fraser actually critically analyzes human capital programs. In order to discuss the therapeutic needs-talk of welfare state, Fraser gives an example regarding how social workers treat poor single young mothers. Municipal programs targeting pregnant teenage girls do not only include prenatal care, but also psychological counselling, mothering instructions, and tutoring. Such pieces of training aim for avoiding future pregnancies in order to close the gap between culturally shaped experience and 'moral' behaviors affirmed by state apparatuses. In this case, state "positions its subjects in ways that do not empower them. It personalizes them as 'cases' and so militates against their collective identification" (Fraser, 1989, p. 155) through a therapeutic needs-talk.

As Lyon-Callo (2004), Gowan (2010), and Bourgois and Schonberg (2009) have also observed in their field research (See, chapter 2), these kinds of training sessions are very prevalent in today's homeless assistance that aim for making the homeless housed and employed. These training sessions are provided as a part of human capital increasing program, namely, generating employabilities. They can help the homeless in the short-run and save many from the streets. As in Culhane and Metraux's comparison, they can act as lifeboats and they can save many people from Titanic, but Titanic *will* hit the iceberg without a structural change (Culhane & Metraux, 2008, p. 112). For a long termed solution, my position is close to Dean's. Dean suggests that the way to turn needs into claims and claims into rights "in the course of a struggle for human emancipation" is not to make a consensus with capitalism, but "struggle for the recognition of unspoken needs" (Dean, 2009, p. 274). Thus, we should pull the politics of needs back into a social rights and decommodification debate.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the elements of citizenship and why citizenship of the homeless are full of flaws. According to Marshall (1950), the main elements of citizenship are rights (social, political and civil), duties, and membership to a community. Referencing to Plant (2010), Lister (2003), and Fraser and Gordon (1992), I stated that social rights are deeply connected with civil and political rights because only through social rights, we can achieve the resources for the effective usage of political and civil rights. For instance, when the right to housing is not recognized, a homeless person cannot exercise her political right to vote because contemporary understanding of citizenship necessitates a place of residence, in a sense, property.

Rights and duties are reciprocal in definition. However, it does not work reciprocally for everyone. Even though the rights of those without property are denied, duties such as paying taxes, working in a socially meaningful job, and improving employabilities are expected to be done. Thus, the homeless are never right-holders, but only owners of duties (Baron, 2006, p. 1429).

Rights and duties ideally guarantee the last element of citizenship, the membership of a community. However, in the case of homelessness, the element is problematic as well because they are socially excluded. The homeless who fall out from the community cannot correspond the balance of rights and duties (Arnold, 2004) and become even more isolated.

This chapter also discussed the approaches to needs and the politics of needs interpretation. As Doyal and Gough (1991) and Buğra and Irzık (1999), I see needs as universal preconditions that make participation into the social forms of life possible and, this way, that make flourishment of human nature possible. Sen's

capability theory aims to open a path for this flourishment. Sen views poverty as a matter of deprivation of basic capabilities rather than material deprivation. His capability approach provides a shift from means to ends (Sen, 2000, p. 90) and emphasizes that what matters is providing not the material aid, but the opportunities for one to be able to achieve her needs by herself.

In the rest of the section, I discussed how Dean criticizes, through Fraser's conception of the politics of needs interpretation (1989), the point capability approach arrived today (2009). According to Dean, capability approach has two main problems today. First, it disregards the fact that humans are interdependent beings and they need solidarity as much as freedoms. Second, capability theory has turned into an employability theory today and it basically serves for capitalism instead of challenging with it.

On the other hand, in the same way as Dean does, I view debating on needs through a politics of needs interpretation can bring about policies based on social justice and social citizenship. It is also a premise for "publicity for the needs of the poor" and all disadvantaged populations (Dean, 2009, p. 271). Because Fraser's concept questions the reality of predefined needs and calls to challenge with the system-conforming ways of needs interpretations (1989). In this way, we can pull the social citizenship and needs issues back into the decommodification debate.

CHAPTER 4

FOOD, BODY, AND SPACE

Introduction

The main concern of this chapter is to analyze food through its social meaning in line with Buğra and Irzık's theory of needs (1999). As I reviewed with a reference to Buğra and Irzık in the previous chapter, consumption practices do not only refer to obtaining goods necessary for survival, but also a level of social participation and an aim for flourishing one's nature. Thus, food is a complex issue beyond being an object for physical satisfaction. In my research, it is important to understand what the meaning of serving food is for the homeless other than eliminating hunger, how food assistance becomes related to needs interpretation, and how food becomes a tool for interpreting also the other needs of the homeless.

For making such an analysis possible, in this chapter, first, I discuss (1) the quality of power-food relationship that also bonds the homeless and social worker and making the distribution of food possible, (2) the way homeless body is perceived in relation to its hunger, and finally (3) the space and organization where the service is provided. In general, I discuss how class inequalities are socially produced through eating practices, specifically in the case of homelessness. This chapter will also include a review of several ethnographic studies conducted on homelessness and food assistance.

4.1 Food and power

Food is a very core element of the human social organization (Beardsworth & Keil, 1997, p. 1). It "is an expression of who a person is, what they are worth, and of their

ability to provide for basic needs" (Dowler & Leather, 2000, p. 200). Food shapes our daily activities, relationship with our own bodies, spatial and hierarchical relations stemming from political, economic and social distinctions. On the other hand, these relations are not passively influenced by food, but they also transform our eating practices. So, what does this interplay tell us about food and power? In this section, I will discuss how Mintz (1985) and Counihan (1988) analyze food and power relations. Then, I will suggest an alternative conceptualization that can merge their approaches. Lastly, I will mention, through Alan Warde's discussion (1997), the approaches explaining how individuals' eating practices are shaped in line with the contemporary transformations in social distinctions.

Sydney Mintz's analysis of eating practices strongly focuses on social distinctions. He claims that, "[f]ood choices and eating habits reveal distinctions of age, sex, status, culture, and even occupation. These distinctions are immensely important adornments on an inescapable necessity" (Mintz, 1985, p. 3). Hence, people's food preferences emerge and alter "within the rules of their society and culture" (Mintz, 1985, p. 4). Food choices in his analysis are primarily structural, thus, they are not freely made.

Mintz argues that two sorts of meanings that change in content depending on the context (1985, p. 153) are determinant in consumption patterns. *Outside meanings* refer to the first appearance, accessibility and availability of a product by the political economic conditions and actors (Mintz, 1985, pp. 156-171). In his example, sugar plays the main role as a key product symbolizing "strength and solidity" of the British Empire and ruling class for several centuries (1985, p. 157). Class transformations in the eighteenth century emerged a remarkable example of the outside meaning of sugar consumption. According to Mintz, freed peasants who

comprised proletariat through industrialization had a new daily schedule. This schedule and urban life made it possible for the proletariat to taste new opportunities intersecting wealthy classes' consumption practices (1985, p. 165). The more sugar was consumed by laboring masses, the competition between sucrose sellers got stronger. In this way, the availability and accessibility of sugar were expanded.

Outside meanings do not only work through supply-demand mechanisms, but also through distribution of goods and services by governments. For instance, Brownell claims that food is an important indicator of social hierarchy in China (Brownell, 2004, p. 255). Top leaders guarantee their access to the best quality of food while those who are at the bottom of food hierarchy suffer several diseases stemmed from malnutrition (2004, p. 252). Through provision of food, state posits itself at a superior place while making citizens dependent on itself (2004, p. 256). For Brownell, this is one of the "ways in which the Chinese state is symbolically constructed as provider, superior, incorporated part of the self" (2004, p. 256).

Amy Singer's study that examines Ottoman soup kitchens (*imaret)* also constitutes an example for outside meanings of food. For her, what created social distinction was not related with food itself, but the act of distribution (2002, p. 60). Singer states that hosting diners equally as their ranks was not corruption, but an original part of the *imaret* (2002, p. 61). The quantity of food and the order of service reflected the distinction between the members of a class, gender and occupation. *Imaret* workers used to get the greatest quantity. "Labor was recompensed with food, workers recognized as more deserving and needy than residents or guests" (2002, p. 63). Ottoman elites used to have great portions within decorated bowls while there were simple bowls for the rest. Students from the prestigious schools used to eat two loaves of bread and their tutors would eat twice amount of them (2002, p. 62).

Finally, whatever was left was for the poor among the learned, then for the rest of the poor and lastly for women and small children (2002, p. 63).

Providing food for people was what legitimized imperial sovereignty. Food was a key factor in the creation and preservation of Ottoman imperial power. The ability of the Ottomans to supply and distribute food to their subjects in turn fed their own power, constituting a source of legitimacy for the Ottoman dynasty and reinforcing its claims to sovereignty (Singer, 2002, p. 131). Hence, similar to what Brownell argued for the Chinese state, the Ottoman Sultan constructed himself as the superior and provider ruler. The symbolic meaning of this construction is provided through outside meanings.

Differently than outside meanings, according to Mintz, *inside meanings* are shaped within the course of everyday life and in social settings such as weddings and Christmas banquets by a range of actors including the poorest and the wealthiest (1985, p. 152). Through the intensification of its usages, sugar turned into a ceremonial and meaningful product unique to special settings (1985, p. 173). For instance, even though cakes are widely available, a wedding cake is valuable due to its special context. Distinctive ways of interpretation of sucrose uses emerged in the lives of different social classes. Mintz states that imitation was a common tactic.

> What laboring Englishmen did by way of imitation in this regard was to drink tea with sugar and milk (usually inferior tea, sometimes twice-used tea, or even hot water poured over bread crusts, sweetened with treacle), as did others more privileged than they (1985, p. 182).

Montanari gives also the reverse examples where popular culture was adopted by the elite classes by reference to Scrappi, the most important cook in Italy of the 16th century (Montanari, 2006, p. 39). Scrappi favors the simple preparations of fish meals believing that the fishers "succeed better than other cooks because they cook them at the very moment the fish were caught" (2006, p. 40). Simple "peasant

ingredients" were civilized and enriched with the addition of spices (2006, p. 38). Montanari claims that many of the peasant recipes shaped within oral culture were transmitted by the ruling-class through the written documentations (2006, p. 40).

So far, I have discussed, through Mintz, Brownell and Singer, how political economic conditions are determinant in our eating practices and similarly eating practices are determinant in power relations. These readings are primarily related with control over food provisioning and the uses of food based on class distinctions. Yet, the role of women as one of the most important food provisioners remain absent. Carole Counihan's analysis of food and power relationship is precisely based on this issue.

Counihan introduces two forms of power in relation to food: One is *coercion* where essential resources are under the control of rulers who usually consist of men. It typically arises in class societies where the resources can be denied to the some part of the population. The second form of power is *influence* which is based on the power of gift giving, feeding the tribe, community or family within a solidarity relationship. Users of this form of power are usually women. In this way, women can manipulate "the symbolic language of food" (Counihan, 1988, pp. 52-3). For instance, the screams of a hungry infant can be calmed easily with her mother's power to feed which Counihan calls 'the power of life' (Counihan, 1988, p. 53). Similarly, some mothers give enormous efforts for their children's birthday parties and endow the birthday cakes with their affection for children (Charles & Kerr, 1988, p. 33 cited in Lupton, 1996, p. 48). This is also an example for influence in Counihan's conceptualization.

However, women are deprived of coercion and influence itself does not create an empowering area of authority either. Interestingly, while it is quite normal when

politicians deny food to the citizens, it is never acceptable for women to starve their families, but they are expected to care and love unconditionally (Counihan, 1988, pp. 52-3). It is assumed that women already "receive *their* gratification through nourishing others" (Bordo, 1993, p. 123). Women who participate in the labor market obtain a status potentially equal to men's, but their new role may not provide them economic independence, moreover they experience a loss of their traditional power of influence as food-provisioners too (Counihan, 1988, p. 59). For Counihan, this "difficult position of women can only change if society changes". Hence, what is needed is an equal division of labor among sexes in both paid and unpaid work (Counihan, 1988, p. 59).

Although what Counihan calls coercion and Mintz calls outside meanings seem to be corresponding to the same processes of distribution, inside meanings and influence differ from each other. For Mintz, inside meanings make some certain uses of food an inevitable part of our lives. If influence is what fills a birthday cake with love, it is inside meanings what make baking cakes on birthdays a tradition. On that aspect, the users of inside meanings have a larger area of authority than those of influence. The second important difference between the two is surely that influence brings gender inequality into discussion.

Nevertheless, neither Mintz nor Counihan tell us much about those who fall out of food hierarchy. Food and power relations do not regulate only who provides food, but also who starves or who are deprived of the entitlements guaranteeing food security. According to Amartya Sen, exchange entitlements determine this. Exchange entitlement refers to one's lawful ownership of commodities that are exchangeable in return for food in a market economy. For instance, I can obtain a loaf of bread in return for some money (Sen, 1981, pp. 1-3). On the other hand, there is also social

security entitlements as a supplement to exchange entitlement. They pertain to state reliefs that might undertake where resources are not secure. For example, unemployment benefits, pensions for the old, and cash or in-kind benefits for the poor are such social security entitlements (Sen, 1981, p. 6). These entitlements and hunger are inversely correlated, hence, as long as I have enough resources to exchange, I will not starve. However, in case where these resources decline, hunger and famine increase especially "in the absence of non-entitlement transfers" such as charity (Sen, 1981, p. 3). Although the bridge Sen builds between hunger and exchange is very productive and helpful to understand how economic structure, individuals' purchasing power and famines are connected, I find his approach to reciprocal relations such as charity weak in order to grasp power-food interplay throughly. I argue that such relations are not non-entitlement transfers, but they are tied to exchange entitlements as well.

I think that these approaches can be more effective when they are combined. Thereby, my suggestion for a conceptualization of food-power relationship is nourished from three of them and also Polanyi's economic systems because his concepts help us to understand provisioning and receiving well. In his influential book, *The Great Transformation* (1944), Polanyi describes three kinds of principles prevailed in economic systems in history. The first is *exchange* that refers to the principle based on trading priced goods in line with supply and demand. It is based on personal interests (Polanyi, 2001, p. 48). Self-regulating market we have today is where exchange becomes the most effective (Polanyi, 2001, p. 59). The second is *reciprocity*. It refers to the economy of gift giving within a familial and communal mechanism of solidarity. Social interests are essential rather than individuals'. Great disasters pose a risk not only for individual, but for the whole

community/tribe/family. “The broad principle of reciprocity helps to safeguard both production and family sustenance” (Polanyi, 2001, p. 50). The third principle is *redistribution*. This principle is based on the idea that a major part of the goods produced are stored up and the ruler redistributes them. “Economically, it is an essential part of the existing system of division of labor, of foreign trading, of taxation for public purposes, of defense provisions” (Polanyi, 2001, p. 50).

I argue that we can think of these principles as what constitute the relationship between food and power. Each form of power comes with an entitlement to be able to exercise it (See also the service provisioning approach in Warde & Martens, 2000; Section 4.3). As the outside meanings and coercion, exchange and redistribution too refer to the availability of food. One is based on market. Property entitles you with using your power of exchange food or making food available in the market. For instance, in Mintz’s work, those who have exchange power are the sugar planters who make sucrose accessible in the market and bourgeois class who can purchase sugar. The power of redistribution refers both to the state’s power to redistribute goods and services and also citizens’ power to receive them. What entitles you to receive state’s services and goods is mainly citizenship which regulates your relationship with state and the wider society. For instance, state that determines sugar’s accessibility and availability by taxing it is the main figure who uses redistribution power. Similarly, in Brownell’s article we see that Chinese state is determinant in the circles of food hierarchy. Thirdly, as it is in Counihan’s influence, the power of reciprocity is based on solidarity and gift-giving stemming from intimacy. Mutual relationships are the entitlements for this form of power. As a mother feeding her infant, a mafia leader who feeds his members too uses reciprocity power relying on the mutual and hierarchical relationships. I will call these three

forms of power (of exchange, redistribution and reciprocity) *the outside forms of power.*

Lastly, I argue that inside meanings are diffused in each of these forms of power. At each level they are attached with their own symbolic meanings. Hence, inside meanings basically determine how we interpret different kinds of food products. They are "the meanings people indicate when they are demonstrating they know what things are supposed to mean" (Mintz, 1985, p. 151). For instance, consider food stamps or supplemental nutrition assistance. It is a way of using redistribution power for welfare state. Commonsensically, nutrition assistance means welfare dependency and it is viewed as a moral failure and degeneration (Morris, 1994, p. 13). On the other hand, breast milk has the connotations of a mother's love and responsibility towards her child depending on the reciprocal relationship between them. As for the exchange products such as instant noodles or frozen meals, they are liberating for teenagers from constraining family meal while they are viewed as 'improper' (See, Section 4.3.1) and doubtful in terms of health by adults.

What endow these products with the related meanings is *the inside forms of power.* They flow within the course of everyday life discursively, while outside ones refer to more concrete interventions. Anyone can reproduce inside forms of power, although to be able to exert outside forms one should have the related entitlements. Those who cannot exert any of the outside forms of power are the ones who live under the risk of food insecurity, such as the homeless.

Let us think of this Polanyesque conceptualization of food-power relationship in the case of homelessness in Turkey. As I have already explained in the section 3.1, one needs property in order to be employed in a socially meaningful job which is necessary to have food security guaranteed without social support. Yet, homeless

people are deprived of property. In order to be able to receive an organized official nutrition aid, one needs to be a citizen. However, because they do not have property the homeless are also deprived of citizenship. Finally, the third channel they can obtain food through, reciprocity, is also closed for them, because most of them lose their intimate relationships in consequence of abuse and betrayals which is one of the main reasons of homelessness in Turkey (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018).

Therefore, homeless people who are deprived of entitlements to feed themselves inevitably end up with food insecurity unless charity organizations feed them. These organizations can establish mutual relationships with the homeless based on reciprocity. Many welfare association workers in Istanbul distribute soup by walking street by street without expecting anything from the homeless themselves in return. Reciprocity in this case works within an 'economy of salvation' (See Geremek, 1997; Section 2.1), not necessarily religiously, but the almsgiver eases her consciousness by means of charity. On the other hand, some NGOs aim to create an acceptable poor out of the homeless (See, Section 4.3) in return of emergency food they provide. In this way, a hierarchical, reciprocal mechanism of solidarity emerges. In brief, I believe this Polanyesque conceptualization of food-power interplay can help to analyze the homeless-food assistance relations thoroughly.

In this section, I briefly discussed food and power. The relationship between food and agent can be understood more clearly when we consider food and body together. Thus, the next section will turn that. I will discuss how the ways of eating are correlated with how one's body is perceived. I will also discuss Kawash's concept of 'homeless body' as a form of the contemporary grotesque and its place in soup kitchen settings.

4.2 Food and 'homeless body'

Mouth is often referred as a 'gateway' linking inner parts of the body and outside world, but, as Fischler argues, it rather works as a guardian that controls intakes. Food goes through an inspection of safety before being taken into the mouth and swallowed (Fischler, 1988, p. 282). Fischler calls the process "in which we send a food across the frontier between the world and the self, between 'outside' and 'inside' our body" *incorporation* (Fischler, 1988, p. 279). [3] Incorporation is an important part of our identity because what we eat or what we do not eat are closely linked with who we are (Fischler, 1988; Logue, 2004; Bell & Valentine, 1997).[4] For instance, on the personal basis, suffering malnutrition during early childhood influences cognitive abilities (Logue, 2004, p. 130), thus how individuals think. On the social group basis, eating no meat constitutes the identity of vegetarianism and many people adopts this identity. Incorporation gives clues also about the character of a society (Farb & Armelagos, 1980). For instance, consumption of only *kosher* foods refers to the religious identity of a society.

Incorporation is a control mechanism that has a potential to create a self and other duality due to its ability of identifying (Fischler, 1988). This mechanism is used by governments, diet campaigns, mass media and public discourse in order to crystallize the distinction between self and other and attribute the self all features regarding civility and good citizenship, while the other remains grotesque and contaminating. As Biltekoff claims (2013, p. 112), "all forms of dietary discourse … have the potential to do violence to 'bad eaters.'" Thereby, incorporation can emerge

[3] Although Fischler does not state so, in this study I think of incorporation as an action also about what we do *not* send to our inside body as well as those we do send. Thereby, incorporation is also about hunger. Enlarging its meaning will enable me to discuss hunger and over-indulging in the same pot.

[4] As the German proverb affirms: *Mann ist was Mann isst*, "Man is what Man eats" (Farb & Armelagos, 1980, p. 228).

as an instrument of symbolic violence with destructive effects on human bodies. Symbolic violence is a Bourdieusian concept that refers specifically to the mechanisms that lead those who are subordinated to "misrecognize" inequality as the natural order of things and to blame themselves for their location in their society's hierarchies. Through symbolic violence, inequalities are made to appear commonsensical, and they reproduce themselves preconsciously in the ontological categories shared within classes and within social groups in any given society (Bourgois & Schonberg, 2009, p. 19).

In this section, I will discuss 'homeless body' (Kawash, 1998) as a contemporary form of 'grotesque' (Bakhtin, 1984) in its relationship to risk and control. The discussion I will generate in this section is important because I argue that the ways eating practices are shaped can be the indicators of violence and inequality the homeless are compelled to experience. Discussion here will help to understand how and why the self enacts a civilizing role towards the homeless during social assistance and how it is associated with the needs-talk.

The conceptualization of the 'grotesque body' appears in Mikhail Bakhtin's study where he analyzes Rabelais's narrative of carnivalesque banquets (Bakhtin, 1984). According to Bakhtin, grotesqueness is consisted by the traits of humiliation, inappropriateness, excessiveness and bodily pleasures. Great excessiveness "is most strongly expressed in picturing the body and food" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 303).

> These traits are most fully and concretely revealed in the act of eating; the body transgresses here its own limits: it swallows, devours, rends the world apart, is enriched and grows at the world's expense. The encounter of man with the world, which takes place inside the open, biting, rending, chewing mouth, is one of the most ancient, and most important objects of human thought and imagery. Here man tastes the world, introduces it into his body, makes it part of himself (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 281).

In Bakhtin's analysis, the grotesque body "acquires an extreme, fantastic character" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 306), but this does not make it unreal. Norbert Elias describes the atmosphere in a German inn by referencing Basel's study from the 16th century as below:

> Some eighty or ninety people are sitting together, and it is stressed that they are not only common people but also rich men and nobles, men, women and children, all mixed together … Garlic smells and other bad odours rise. People spit everywhere. Someone is cleaning his boots on the table. Then the meal is brought in. Everyone dips their bread into the general dish, bites the bread and dips it in again. The place is dirty, the wine bad (Basel, 1523 referenced in Elias, 1939/2000, p. 62).

Because this is not a carnivalesque scene, it is not the fittest example, but it gives hints regarding the grotesque characteristics of devouring in real life. It is also attention taking that all people from different economic and social classes sit and eat together. As Yumul states, it is an important characteristic of the carnival. The carnival is a liberating and revolutionary banquet with a crowd of grotesques bodies, it is where social order becomes upside down. A king can be toppled down from his throne only after some minutes he was crowned. So, everybody is equal (Yumul, 2000, p. 48).

I argue that the grotesque body which was once a symbol of social equality, explicitly displays different forms of inequalities today. As soon as the self sees it on a street, she senses that something is unequal between them; the grotesque is the inferior, marginal and *other*. One of the best examples for the contemporary forms of grotesque bodies is the 'homeless bodies' (Kawash, 1998). 'Homeless body' is Kawash's conceptualization representing an antithesis of moral order and signaling pollution and danger. In public gaze, the homeless bodies' basic instinct is to satisfy their hunger. Due to the absence of a private bathroom, they urinate in public space. The orifices of their body are covered under the private sphere of blanket, but they

still threaten the social order (Kawash, 1998). They are fed with wasted food (Dickinson, 2017). The intimate space of many shelters around the world are noisy, contaminating, stinky and dangerous (See, for instance Gümüş, 2016; Davis, 1992; Arnold, 2004, p. 2; Kawash, 1998). I have already stated in the beginning of this section that once the self sees the grotesque on the street, she senses the risen wall between them. It is the same for the homeless body and the other citizen. The difference is so visible that a gaze is enough to comprehend this. Then, the self passes the homeless body by as if she did not see it at all. This is an example for 'the social production of indifference' (Bourgois & Schonberg, Righteous Dopefiend, 2009, pp. 16-17) to brutal inequalities experienced every moment in our ordinary lives (Scheper-Hughes, 1993).

Kawash relates emergency food with the homeless body's social value. Soup kitchens are one of the crucial options where the homeless can feed themselves. Kawash interprets soup and soup kitchen culture implying that they create a distinction between receiver and provider.

> Soup is the puritan's response to poverty: I will give you enough to prevent you from starving, soup says, but I will not reward you for your condition by satisfying your hunger. Although one is just as likely to be served a hot dog or a doughnut in a contemporary "soup kitchen," the message remains, a sign of the persistent connection between soup and extreme poverty. Soup is insubstantial, a texture more than sustenance. Soup warms without filling, sustains without satisfying. Soup is associated with the delicate, the invalid; it requires little effort to consume, little effort to digest. The body fed on soup is unlikely to thrive. The less food the body consumes, the less waste it produces (Kawash, 1998, pp. 331-2).

Thereby, for her, soup creates a distinction between the homeless and other citizens by devaluation of the homeless body. Yet, this way of reading soup may be too reductionist. Serving soup by itself does no harm for the homeless. When Amy Singer mentions the ingredients used in soups in Ottoman soup kitchens, contrarily to Kawash, she states that "[w]hile simple, the soups, together with the bread, offered

a sound composite of basic nutrients—protein, carbohydrates, vitamins, fat, etc." (Singer, 2002, p. 59). She explains usefulness of cooking soup in public kitchens as below:

> Soup was both a real and symbolic dish. It represented the most basic form of nourishment, the minimal meal of subsistence, and the food to which even the poor could aspire daily... it is the very elasticity of soup that makes it such an appropriate dish for a public kitchen. When pressed, the cooks could easily increase the quantity of soup to feed more people (Singer, 2002, pp. 59-60).

However, we see discrimination rather in repulsive food and the acts around distributing soup (Singer, 2002). I will exemplify it by Cohen et al.'s research in several soup kitchens in Israel. They aim at understanding othering mechanisms against the diners shaped in the physical space of soup kitchens, distribution of chosen food, and interactions between provider and receiver (2017, p. 399). They observe that setting boundaries is a way of creating distance between two groups. There is almost an unspoken taboo about eating together. Staff eat their meals either on foot or do not eat at all for the reasons of being full or dirty kitchen, or because "it is for needy people" and avoid eating with the diners (2017, p. 403). Another othering mechanism is to serve repulsive food that is about to rot, and also with the low-quality parts of food such as meat's skin, legs, internal organs etc. (Cohen et al., 2017, p. 405). For Cohen et al., repulsive food makes the distinction between the staff's (self) healthy bodies and socially unvalued bodies of the diners (other) clearer (2017, p. 405). While staff perceives diners as grotesque and primitive who can eat anything and anyhow, and provide food with this mentality; in fact, the diners really care about how food is served and combined as any other person does. They care about which food is on the same plate as another food and they prefer real plates rather than plastic ones (2017, p. 406). However, their singular opinions and preferences are ignored. "Their space of influence is reduced to what they will eat

and what they will leave on their plates" (2017, p. 407). According to Cohen et al., even though a feeling of solidarity in the soup kitchen could be possible, all the concealed messages of othering transmitted through attitudes and discourse make it impossible (Cohen et al., 2017, p. 410). Cohen et al. shows us how the perception of grotesque body harms a chance of equality and deepens food hierarchy. It also prevents the homeless to speak for their own needs and politicize their needs claims as equal citizens as the soup kitchen staff.

I have briefly discussed the contemporary grotesque image of the homeless above. This image is most of the time perceived as disgusting and something to avoid for the civil. Yet, there are some other times when they become quite useful, for instance in commerce and philanthropy. Öncü argues that our feelings, emotions and desires are controlled by the images of primitivity and grotesqueness. Discipline mechanisms work through provoking and revealing our instincts (2000, pp. 15-16). The image of 'homeless body' everybody avoids because it represents immorality and pollution (1998) and it is used by charity associations to reveal compassion in people. For example, a photo from the Instagram account of an aid association serving food for the homeless in Istanbul depicts a body that is lying on a cardboard on the ground. It is covered with a blanket, so we do not have any clue regarding its gender, age or color. Some soup and bread in a bag are left nearby. The caption reads: "What can we do when we see someone sleeping on streets? We can ignore, we can pass away feeling pity, and the most merciful among us wants to do something, but does not know what to do… If you want, you can do something this Saturday." These kinds of images motivate us to donate money or voluntarily work to help poor people. This is how images discipline our sense of philanthropy.

I discussed how inequalities are reproduced and legitimized in everyday life through incorporation based on the example of homelessness and soup kitchens. Similarly, social inequalities are reproduced in their relations to food and space. We witness this especially in the association of spaces with the paid and unpaid labor, and being housed and unhoused. The next section will include the related discussion.

4.3 Eating spaces

Eating is not a practice independent from the meanings the space we eat in is attached to. Consuming food refers also to the consumption of the relevant experience lived in the space, thus, *eating that space* (Cones, 2013; Bell & Valentine, 1997, p.125; Ashley et al., 2004, p. 143). Correspondingly, the contemporary response of welfare state and NGOs to food insecurity also reflects "food preparation in the reproduction of 'family' and 'home'". By providing food aid as a reflection of family meal, homeless assistance introduces homeless people to a particular way of life underlying an acceptable, deserving poor. Teaching how to eat 'properly' and cook hygienically comprise "fragmented experiences of 'home'" and the way to acceptibility (Veness, 1994 referenced in Bell & Valentine, 1997, p. 67). Thus, in this section, I will discuss the spatial dynamics of eating particularly through the dining places of the homeless. First, I will roughly describe the practices of eating at home. Then, I will discuss some homeless ways of eating spaces.

I find two main issues to keep in mind important while examining the food-space relationship. First is about the private-public sphere divide. Some studies revolve around different sets of eating practices inside (home/private sphere) and outside (market/public sphere). For instance Zeldin asserts that "[t]he restaurant is the tank in the warfare of cookery because it has always been a major instrument for

smashing old eating habits. Take-away food is the guerrilla of cooking" (Zeldin, 1983, p. 147 referenced in Beardsworth & Keil, 1997, p. 100). This approach has been criticized from different aspects before too (Beardsworth & Keil, 1997; Bell & Valentine, 1997). By affirming this method of analysis, one takes the public-private divide for granted and considers "eating out will present major contrasts with the patterns of eating at home" (Beardsworth & Keil, 1997, p. 100). On the one hand, it has an advantage that makes it easier for us to examine totally different experiences of eating a 'proper meal' (Charles & Kerr, 1986) at home and eating a meal cooked by a stranger in a restaurant. Yet, on the other hand, it assumes that some other eating forms are attached to either public or private features, or it remains incapable to explain them. For instance, communal ways of eating in 'institutional dining rooms' (Forero O. , Ellis, Metcalfe, & Brown, 2009), like soup kitchens, are accepted as eating in public spaces, but sometimes they are too private to be public because soup kitchens are visited only by a certain segment of society and they have rules and regulations that all diners are expected to follow. Thus, the structural organization of the space and the roles actors enact are effective in the quality of space.

The second issue is about the modes of 'service provision' (Warde & Martens, 2000). Warde and Martens suggest that "all items consumed, whether goods or services, incorporate a residue of labour" which is sometimes paid and sometimes unpaid "and that the form of the labour affects the meaning and status of the product" (Warde & Martens, 2000, p. 10). They are governed by different forms of relations, such as "money, citizenship, family obligation and mutual reciprocity", that entitle the individual to access those services (Warde & Martens, 2000, p. 10). For instance, consider the different modes of service provisions between a soup

kitchen, McDonald's and a family meeting at a ramadan dinner. Each involves different forms of labor, entitlements and different meanings that we should not ignore. The modes of service provision take place in home and commercial places are examined by many scholars (See, for instance Sobal, 2005; Charles & Kerr, 1986; Warde & Martens, 2000). This is why, what I want to focus on is rather the places homeless people go to eat.

4.3.1 Eating at home

First of all, a meal eaten with family members at home is a 'social event' that regulates the protocols regarding who will sit where and how one should behave at the table. It distinguishes between insiders and outsiders; household members who have a reciprocal relationship and the strangers (Bell & Valentine, 1997, p. 62). What is eaten at home is usually a 'proper meal'. According to Charles and Kerr, proper meal plays an important role in "the process of reproduction of the family as a cohesive social unit". For a meal to be proper it should be consumed by family members and some essential ingredients containing meat and vegetables should be cooked by a woman (Charles & Kerr, 1986, p. 412).

As I have argued in the second chapter, the realm of home is not always that private, cozy or secure. It also includes gender and age hierarchy, oppression and discipline. Thus, cooking and eating experienced within a family atmosphere articulate these inequalities (Bell & Valentine, 1997; Beardsworth & Keil, 1997; Bourdieu, 2012). The idea that women are responsible for ensuring a nutritionally and socially adequate diet for the family by preparing proper meals (Charles & Kerr, 1986, p. 412) is basically relied on the family model that is known as 'the male breadwinner-female caregiver'. This model relies on certain assumptions about one's

contributions to the household: Men ought to work outside to 'bring home the bacon' for his dependents (but not to cook) while women ought to do house work inside and care for children and elderly (Hook, 2006, p. 639; Lupton, 1996, p. 39).

As for children, they are the main targets of civilizing process at the dining table.

> Rules around food within the family context mark the boundary between acceptable and non-acceptable behaviour. Parents' attempts to shape their children's food consumption habits, including table manners, may also be regarded in the wider context of the acculturation of the young into the adult world, in which the rules of 'civilized' behaviour are established and maintained (Lupton, 1996, p. 52).

Sweets are used as regulatory tools for punishment and reward (Lupton, 1996, p. 54). The food chosen for child represents the parental authority which may relax on birthdays and parties (Lupton, 1996, p. 52). Yet, today, parental authority is in a competition against media, commercials, and school. Thus, a traditional, coherent culinary pattern is not as prevalent as before anymore. On the contrary, adults are also fond of 'junk food' such as chips, sweets and the like (Fischler, 1980, p. 949).

Since for a few past decades, women's increasing search for employment and demands for autonomy and equality have started to change the gendered structure of unpaid work (Esping-Andersen, 2009). The division of responsibility for care has been questioned and 'care as a rights of citizens' has raised as an important debate, not only as an issue of gender equality but also as a matter of responsibility of welfare state (Boje & Leira, 2005, pp. XVI-XVII). Men's role at home is now questionable and male unpaid workload has increased (Esping-Andersen, 2009). There is a variety in family forms today. Dual earner family model has become the norm in the most of the contemporary Western societies (Lewis, 2001, p. 156). There is also an increase in single parent families, single individual households and gay and lesbian families (Boje & Leira, 2005, p. XV) with their own culinary patterns.

In parallel with the changes in family structure and developed technologies in production of ready-made food, nowadays people are tended to eat out increasingly more often than before in many countries (Ashley et al., 2004, pp. 142-3; Bell & Valentine, 1997, p. 80) as well as in Turkey (Yenal & Kubiena, 2016, p. 66). The process starting with McDonald's and suchlike fast food chains and the proliferation of Southeast Asia cuisine emerged an eating-out scene with a very heterogeneous and cosmopolite character (Yenal & Kubiena, 2016; Yan, 2012; Ashley et al., 2004). Consequently, people today share less meal at home and taste more food on the street (Bell & Valentine, 1997, p. 80).

I have discussed what kinds of meanings eating at home have above. Parallel with these meanings, we see that homeless assistance creates a family atmosphere in order to discipline the homeless and direct them into a particular way of life that a deserving poor would have (Veness, 1994 referenced in Bell & Valentine, 1997, p. 81). The rest of this chapter will include the discussion regarding the relationship people without homes establish with dining places.

4.3.2 Homeless ways of eating spaces

In this sub-section, I will discuss three places where homeless people go to eat: a soup kitchen, the dining room of a shelter, and a donut shop. They present a comfortable, sometimes private and secure, but also a disciplinary habitation for the homeless (Glasser, 1988; Forero et al., 2009). They are also places where they can socialize and enact a patron identity (Perry, 2012; Glasser, 1988). I will discuss each place through three ethnographic studies conducted by Glasser (1988), Forero et al (2009). and Perry (2012).

Glasser conducts her ethnography in Tabernacle Soup Kitchen that was located in the US, Middle City as a part of Saint Mary's Church in 1981 after the alarmingly increased poverty in the area. It serves for 80-100 people who are either homeless or extremely poor (Glasser, 1988, p. 23). Glasser's aim is to describe culture of the soup kitchen that is shaped through the interactions of guests and staff, and show that soup kitchens are not the places only serving food for needy, but also having social functions which are effective on guests' decision to go there.

She analyzes three different, but also related cultural themes "that permeate the social interactions of the guests in the soup kitchen": sociability, acceptance and social network (1988, p. 8). The safe and nondemanding atmosphere of the place creates sociability. Guests can stay inside for several hours, play solitaire, smoke cigarettes and have a chat with each other (1988, p. 69). Majority of the soup kitchen guests among Glasser's respondents state that they come to the place "for the company" (1988, p. 70). Chronic loneliness is the primary factor to go to the Tabernacle Soup Kitchen (1988, p. 69).

The Tabernacle Soup Kitchen's second function is providing an ambience of acceptance. Almost all of the guests have 'deviant' behaviors contradicting with the social norms (talking or laughing to himself, pacing the floor or contradicting with the norms in physical health) and they take attention in the public (1988, p. 86). In the soup kitchen, due to the atmosphere of acceptance, they are not exposed to the bothering gaze of people, but everyone seems to accept each other's 'defects' (1988, p. 87).

The last function of soup kitchen is creating social networks. Some tables are dominated by certain strong friendship groups which give them a sense of support, belonging, help and acceptance (1988, pp. 100-103). Glasser states that once, one of

the women, Alice, came and announced to her table that her daughters were sent away from school because of lice in their hair. All guests at the table shared her pain and condemned the school. One of them suggested Glasser to accompany Alice to persuade the school authority. Glasser did this and children went back to school. In this way, tables comprise social networks where people act in solidarity (1988, pp. 103-105).

Glasser's choice of word to call her respondents *guests* whose practice of visiting is kind of similar to visiting a friend's home where one can find comfort, fun and acceptance as well as food is also important in terms of reflecting Tabernacle Soup Kitchen's intimate atmosphere. In conclusion, for Glasser,

> the Tabernacle Soup Kitchen has gone well beyond the modest goals of offering coffee and a hot meal prepared with food salvaged from the discards of the rest of society. It has succeeded in providing a social center for a group of people who are demonstrably impoverished by all contemporary American definitions of poverty (1988, p. 150).

The 1980s, when Glasser conducted this research coincides with the period before the discourses of medicalization of poverty and morality of eating right have become very prevalent. Thus, we do not see health related disciplinary practices in the Tabernacle Soup Kitchen. This will change when we shift our gaze to a homeless shelter located in the UK. In the 2000s, Forero et al. studied the dining hall of a shelter that is comprehensively monitored by CCTVs and the staff. According to the authors, the organization of institutional dining rooms documents the "essential components of 'food ideologies'" (Forero et al., 2009, p. 226). 'Food ideologies' refer to "what different social actors think of the food provided, what effect they think such foods will have on their health and well-being, and what are the criteria for considering the appropriateness of foods offered" (Eckestein, 1980 referenced in Forero et al., 2009).

The risk discourse of nutritionists and UK government revolves around the idea that strict regulations in healthy eating are important to protect the rights of vulnerable populations such as the homeless (Forero et al., 2009, p. 227). Accordingly, the shelter managers and the staff closely surveil the behavior and eating of user-clients. One of the workers state that "If people are not eating as well, they're then kept an eye on. They're marked off on a sheet" (Forero et al., 2009, p. 240). Wednesday has healthy options involving home-made meals instead of chips. Especially young residents complain about it (2009, p. 239). Risk discourse is used to justify the menu when there is such conflicts about food between user-clients and staff (2009, p. 241).

Forero et al.'s field is different than Glasser's in terms of sociability too. Socialization is not that possible in the shelter, "because there is a continual turnover of residents". Friendships are usually short-term (2009, p. 241). Still, social networks can emerge based on the tables. "Seating arrangements are subject to change as the dining hall fills and residents move the table's chairs to enable themselves to sit in friendship groups" (Forero et al., 2009, p. 240).

Authoritarian, lonely and insecure atmosphere of the shelters may push homeless people to search for new alternatives. Perry's ethnography examines precisely such an alternative. His field is not a charity institution, but a business establishment which is a 24-hour donut shop in the US. Every night, especially during cold winter, it is possible to see several homeless people in Daylight Donuts (DD). They either socialize by playing chess and having a chat or sip their coffee, read newspaper and try to sleep before morning-shift worker send them away (Perry, 2012, pp. 431-432).

Perry calls these kinds of spaces that serve as both a business establishment and homeless habitation 'urban hybrid space' (Perry, 2012). They can be donut shops, cafes, gas stations and libraries (2012, p. 432). According to him, there are several reasons why the homeless prefer spending their nights in these places instead of shelters. First, shelters are too far away. They are not accessible if one does not pay for public transportation. Second, the shelters are authoritarian and dangerous while DD provides them an area of autonomy. And the third reason is the homeless people's will to "distance themselves from a homeless identity and express certain aspects of a patron identity (namely, personal autonomy and privacy)" (2012, p. 435). The main argument of the article is based on this third reason.

For Perry, DD provides three strategies for the homeless to adopt a patron identity: Verbal and symbolic distancing, defending personal privacy and autonomy, and having relationships with non-homeless people. Many homeless people Perry interviewed with do not prefer calling themselves homeless. Homeless Pierre says "I'm not *homeless*, homeless. I consider myself displaced, because my dad died and I'm waiting on my attorney to get my apartment back." Andrew and Mike claim that they stay with an acquaintance at least one night of the week. Donovan and Dwayne assert that they in fact have a flat even though they sleep on the street. They know that being a homeless is stigmatizing and they want to get away from this stigma by producing some excuses (2012, p. 440). They also put a symbolic distance. When Perry offers coffee for Donovan, he says that when he gets his money from social security check he will offer him something too. The ethnographer argues that this kind of fictitious promises of repayment are a way of affirming them as two friendly patrons who buy coffee for each other (2012, p. 441).

Secondly, the homeless respondents state that in contrast to shelters, as long as they buy something they are autonomous and free in DD. Shelters demand health check from them and take their personal belongings away to establish control. Environment of DD is freeing in this sense too. Homeless people are equal as patrons, they do not have to answer every question, and they have their privacy (2012, pp. 445-46). Finally, the homeless respondents proudly identify themselves with some religious social networks or non-homeless DD patrons. Perry argues that this enables them to establish their patron identity through socialization with "decent" and "respectable" people (2012, p. 447). While self-blame may pull them into chronic homelessness deeper, stigma avoidance strategies of the homeless may support their motivation to exit homelessness. Thus, urban hybrid spaces play an important role for them (2012, p. 448).

At the beginning of this section, I have stated that dining is "a total consumption package" (Bell & Valentine, 1997, p. 125) including also the consumption of experience and space. As Glasser states, the diners of soup kitchens, shelters or urban hybrid spaces do not visit these places only to satisfy their hunger, but also to consume the space; to socialize, to feel autonomous, and to respect themselves. The intimate and disciplinary atmosphere of some dining spaces (such as Tabernacle Soup Kitchen and the shelter in the UK) evokes with the experience of eating at home. These places are too 'private'[5] to be 'public' and they mark the distinction between insiders and outsiders as a home would do. Urban hybrid spaces differently present a more freeing and empowering atmosphere which is more public.

[5] Here, I use the words of private and public to refer to the normative concept, the spatial duality, which is usually taken for granted. However, I consider home as a space which is the least private and most open to surveillance (Bell & Valentine, 1997), while public space is often more liberating.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the relationship between food and power/body/space by associating them with homelessness and food aid. I discussed that food is a need not only for physical survival, but also for being a part of a collective identity. I have argued that there are three ways for one to be able to engage in control over food provisioning and receiving: Exchange, redistribution and reciprocity. Considering the homeless in Turkey are deprived of the required entitlements (property and citizenship), they cannot benefit from the power of exchange and redistribution. Their only option is to use the power of reciprocity by the means of mutual relationships they establish with the NGOs providing food.

Thereby, how the NGO workers perceive them is critically important for guaranteeing their food security. Unfortunately, the grotesque image that is connotated with danger, pollution, indulgence, primitivity and immorality is already associated with the homeless. This image may prevent a democratic relationship between soup kitchen workers and the homeless to occur and socially reproduces indifference to 'symbolic violence' (Bourdieu, 2001).

Eventually, food aid turns into an ideological instrument used for raising awareness to willpower and reviving a sense of self-responsibility and discipline in homeless people. Disciplinary, authoritative and intimate connotations of a proper family meal is reflected on some food provision services. In the cases where surveillance mechanisms become unbearable, the homeless are compelled to search for some 'urban hybrid spaces' (Perry, 2012) where they can use their exchange power and feel relatively more liberated. Thus, the quality of the reciprocal relationship turns into one where the self conducts a civilizing mission on the other.

CHAPTER 5

'HUNGER FOR TOUCH': NEEDS-TALK IN THE *HAYATA SARIL* RESTAURANT

Introduction

This chapter analyzes the data received from the interviews with volunteers and homeless people and observations made in *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant as part of a year-long ethnographic research. First, I discuss how the volunteers perceive homelessness and homeless people. This is important, because, as Fraser states, how discourse positions the subjects (as victim, deviant, normal, individual, member of a group or the like) and the capacities subjects are endowed with are deeply related to how needs are interpreted (Fraser, 1989, pp. 164-165). Then, I will analyze the needs-talk dominating the restaurant at two steps.

5.1 Homeless assistance in Istanbul

There is still no nationwide policy aiming at supporting the homeless and tackling homelessness in Turkey. One exception is the positive obligation of municipalities to open women's shelters. According to Municipalities Act No. 5393 metropolitan municipalities and municipalities with a population more than 50 thousand have to open a shelter for women and children. However, in the whole country there are only 62 shelters for women and 91 shelters for children. Some of them have been built by local governments and some others belong to NGOs. These numbers seem to be symbolic and far from meeting legal obligations (Gümüş, 2016, pp. 81-82).

In Meneviş's book, The Homeless (*Evsizler*) published in 2006, he states that a relief agency in Ankara founded by the Social Services and Children Protection

Institution (SHÇEK) provided assistance for the homeless as well and supplied shelter with twenty beds and food (Meneviş, 2006, p. 64). The agency stopped working after it was shut down for renovation (Emek ve Adalet Platformu, 2011). In 2009, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality (Ankara *Büyükşehir Belediyesi* - ABB) opened Daily Shelter (*Günlük Barınma Evi*) with 45 beds where 928 homeless stayed temporarily, received food, took shower, and got protected from cold until it was shut down in 2010 (Emek ve Adalet Platformu, 2011).

Sheltering homeless men in gyms during winter is the most known assistance provided by Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (*İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi* - IBB). When air temperature hits minus four degrees, the municipal police bring homeless women and children to shelters and men to the gyms. Two courses of food and clothing are provided in these places where 40 people are employed as staff. According to IBB in 2011, 2187 homeless people stayed in and left *Alibeyköy Tevfik Aydeniz* Gym on their free will (Gümüş, 2016, p. 85; Emek ve Adalet Platformu, 2011, p. 8). On the other hand, Beyoğlu Municipality supplies clothing, blankets, and shoes for the homeless with three months intervals since 2009. Additionally, they provide bath and food in Tophane and Dolapdere. Around 70-80 homeless people benefit from food services of these places. Most of them are middle-aged and divorced or single. Around 25% of them have disabilities and a few of them are ex-convicts. Municipalities do not necessarily to make an effort to publicize their services to the homeless in city, but they expect homeless people to be informed through the word-of-mouth (Bektaş, 2014, p. 73).

Gümüş argues that municipal police, train security workers and bus drivers are the decision makers for the homeless' escape to gym-shelters from death. If they do not care, it is almost impossible for the homeless to access these gyms because of

the long distance, freezing cold, and transportation expenses. Besides, homeless respondents Gümüş interviewed frequently state that when they arrive in gyms, staff have them bathed without their permission. Moreover, respondents claim that media is not permitted to enter those gyms when the homeless stay, because there are violent incidents which sometimes conclude in deaths (Gümüş, 2016, p. 86). Gümüş argues that this assistance model has turned into a mechanism of humiliation for the service receivers. This is why many homeless people prefer protection of self-respect and limited safety conditions in the streets over having a full stomach in a gym (Gümüş, 2016).

Due to state's absence in homeless assistance, NGOs try to fill the gaps in Istanbul. Yeter's research conducted with five different NGOs (namely *Şefkat-Der, Umut Çocukları, Erdemliler Dayanışması, Hayata Sarıl,* and *Çorbada Tuzun Olsun* associations) working for the homeless gives a remarkable insight into this work. Yeter states that all these associations aim at, beyond supplying only aid, helping the homeless to be rehabilitated and become social, autonomous and productive individuals who can stand on their own legs. Almost all of them provide the following services: (1) Food, (2) shelter, (3) aid in kind, (4) psychological support, and (5) employment (Yeter, 2018, pp. 42-43).

According to Yeter, (1) food service is provided in the busiest districts at night such as Taksim, Kadıköy, Üsküdar, and Ataşehir by four of these NGOs. Three of them do it in Taksim where the homeless population is said most crowded. Food service is the first step of social assistance and it helps to build homeless-volunteer relationship based on trust (Yeter, 2018, pp. 45-46). (2) Shelter services are seen as the precondition of a regular life. Thanks to shelters, homeless people can find a job and they can wear clean clothes. Also, if they have a residence address, they can

benefit from the aids Social Assistance and Solidarity Foundation (SYDV) provided (Yeter, 2018, pp. 44-45). (3) Aids in kind include underclothes, coats, sleeping bags, shoes, and blankets. NGOs also try to meet expensive health needs of the homeless like prostheses and treatment costs through donations (2018, p. 49). (4) All NGOs provide psychological support through help of the voluntary psychologists. The aim of this service is to help homeless people to resocialize again and start a new, healthy life (2018, p. 47). Ex-homeless people who still continue their relations with the NGOs or who are at the important positions in the NGOs help to strengthen the homeless psychologically and socially as well. Volunteers think that the homeless can trust them easier because the ex-homeless do not exclude them (2018, p. 48). (5) Finally, the NGOs provide career training. Most of the homeless benefit from these trainings are old or unhealthy psychologically or physically. Thus, these trainings are aimed to have a rehabilitative quality and most of them are art activities such as wood painting and knitting that provide them some pocket money. Other than these, NGOs use their social networks to find proper jobs in line with the homeless' skills who are healthy enough to work. Volunteers also try to give them courage to look for jobs (2018, p. 48-49).

One of these NGOs, the *Hayata Sarıl* Association, is a prominent example and their soup kitchen the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant is my ethnographic field. The restaurant was founded in 2017 as the first soup kitchen with an aim for serving for homeless people in Turkey. The founder of the restaurant, Nilgün, is also the first person who gave a start for an organized, civil system of homeless food assistance in Istanbul. The restaurant is situated in Taksim where the homeless population is estimated one of the highest in Istanbul. Those who sleep at Gezi Park and receive

food from Şefkat-Der hear about the *Hayata Sarıl* and they become a regular diner of the restaurant.

The *Hayata Sarıl* provides all services Yeter explains, except for shelter. It works in coordination with some other homeless assistance providers such as another soup kitchen the *Deliler* Coffeehouse in Balat, *Şekfat-Der*, and Hasan, the imam of a mosque in Beyoğlu, who provides breakfast, aids in kind, shaving, and bathing services in the mosque. Nilgün states that homeless people go to the *Deliler* Coffeehouse first, then come to eat in *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant, and they go to Gezi Park at night where *Şefkat-Der* provides food. So, the workers choose the menu of the day in coordination with the menu prepared by others. Hasan often comes to the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant as a volunteer, sometimes cooks, and announce the diners about the services he provides in the mosque.

The *Hayata Sarıl* also tries to work in coordination with municipalities. They contact the officials and stress on the needs of the homeless people. Because gym-shelters are opened only on demand of the homeless in winter Nilgün tries to encourage the homeless to submit petitions to the municipalities. Volunteers often complain about inactivity of the municipalities. However, municipalities view the NGOs having the main responsibility for helping homeless people. One night, when I was volunteering in the restaurant a young homeless guy came and wanted to talk to Nilgün. He said that he went to Beyoğlu municipality and demanded aids, however the officials directed him to the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant saying that Nilgün can help him. Bekaroğlu-Doğan also indicates in her research that municipality officials define homeless assistance of the municipalities as a favor, rather than framing it within social rights (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, p. 147). Therefore, the *Hayata Sarıl* fills an important gap in the absence of public sector.

Cooking training *Hayata Sarıl* provides differentiates it from the other NGOs. Once in every six months, someone among the homeless diners is employed as a waiter. The selected person learns how to prepare food from a professional chef. He also regularly receives psychological support from voluntary therapists and participates in several free pieces of training such as kitchen hygiene education and budget planning taught by some professors from the *Gelişim* University. After six months, he[6] is encouraged to switch to another restaurant as a regular chef.

Nilgün herself has experienced homelessness several times since her childhood. Hence, she is the closest example of the homeless for volunteers of the restaurant. She was born as the daughter of a family who migrated from Turkey to Germany. She was exposed to sexual and psychological violence when she was a child. She spent her teenage years in an orphanage after she taken away from her abusive family. Upon leaving the orphanage, she lived on the streets for some time and then got married in Turkey. Her husband forced her to work in the sex industry. She experienced another form of homelessness in the prostitution houses for two years. Nilgün managed to quit sex work when she finally married one of her customers, yet, she was exposed to violence by him too. When he forced her to go back to sex industry, she divorced from him and came to Istanbul in 2002. However, she could not find any permanent housing, because as soon as landlords learnt about her past as a sex worker they showed her the door. She spent four months on the streets on and off and worked in different jobs as a cleaning lady in mosque lavatories or a dish washer in restaurants. She lives in a house as a tenant in Beyoğlu since 2007 and works in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant since 2017.

[6] Except for two-three regular women diners of the restaurant, all of the diners are male. Thus, in this thesis I refer to all diners as he.

Almost twenty years have passed since Nilgün's experience of homelessness. In the meanwhile, Turkey has underwent several political economic changes. Urban renewal implementations and gentrification processes started in the 2000s in Istanbul replaced many poor people throughout the years, exiled them to the outskirts of the city, and prioritized middle classes' right to housing first. They rendered informal support mechanisms to arise even harder (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018, p. 105). A wave of migration from Syria has started in 2011 An economic crisis arose in the aftermath of the the coup attempt in 2016 and the switch to presidential system in 2017,. The unemployment rate which was 10.6% in 2005 (TURKSTAT, 2020) has increased to 13.8% in 2019 (DİSK-AR, 2019, p. 4). Youth unemployment rate which was 16.5% in 2006 has increased to 23.3% in 2019 (DİSK-AR, 2019, p. 9). Finally, due to corona pandemic started in 2020, many people lost their jobs and the economic crisis is expected to deepen . Thus, even though many of the homeless diners of the restaurant were homeless during the same time when Nilgün was homeless in Istanbul, their opportunities to find paths out of homelessness seem to have been further restricted. Today's conditions render homelessness a structurally deeper and a more difficult problem to eliminate through only individual efforts.

5.2 The volunteers and diners

In this section, I briefly describe the profile of volunteers and diners coming to the restaurant. There are three veteran volunteers in the restaurant and they are the most foremost people of the place: Nilgün, Sevim, and Hamza. While Nilgün and Sevim are authorized in the restaurant's management, Hamza has authority only in food distribution during night shifts. Cengiz is the homeless waiter. During the time I was in the field, he moved into a permanent house. Most volunteers are young students or

middle-aged adults. Among my interlocutors, Selim, Zeynep, and Aslı are university students who have volunteered in the restaurant almost every week for at least a year. Behzat is interested in the issue of homelessness for many years both in the US and Turkey and he tries to help them through donations and social support except for volunteering in the restaurant. Leyla works in the restaurant during the day as a chef. Özge started volunteering in the restaurant after me, she came almost every week, and quickly adapted to the environment. She says that she attended seminars about homelessness abroad and she has been interested in the issue for a long time. Nilgün, Leyla, and Cengiz work in the restaurant during day shifts as well.

The profile of the diners is diverse. In the first months I started volunteering, there were some housed diners who come every day even though they were told to leave. As Sevim says, "If they can crack two eggs in a pan" at home they are expected not to come, otherwise what they eat is seen as waste. At some point they stopped coming. Similarly, children are not allowed to eat in the *Hayata Sarıl* because it is the restaurant's policy that homeless children should be taken care of by state. Thus, I witnessed children who wanted to enter were sent back.

Immigrants constitute another problematic category. In winter, so many immigrants from different countries such as Syria, Pakistan, and Iran started to come. Except for a few ones who are certainly known as homeless, they are encouraged to get support from their own communities. One day, a few Syrian guys attended in queue to eat. When we were standing at the door, one of the veteran workers said that they had iPhones. This group's 'undeservingness' was detected before, during a soup distribution of another NGO working for the homeless. One of the volunteers said, "when the staff asked what time it was, these guys drew their iPhones out of their pockets to check the clock. This is how they learnt." After the group came in

and sat on their chairs, Hamza talked rigorously in Turkish: “It doesn’t matter where you are from, but what matters is whether you are homeless and poor. You don’t have the right to leave any remains on your plates and take the bread out of a needy person’s mouth anyway (*başkasının rızkını yemek*).” After he left, Nilgün made a similar speech too by conflicting with Hamza’s remark “this place is for Turkish homeless people.” A volunteer said that we had an Egyptian volunteer working in the kitchen at the moment and he could translate. Egyptian man was called out and he started to translate what was told into Arabic. The foreigners smiled and said, “We need food too. We are poor.” Egyptian volunteer opened his hands and answered smiling, “C’mon guys, we saw that you have iPhones.”

Immigrants’ visit in the restaurant can cause problems with Turkish diners as well. On another evening, around at 7:00 PM it was too early to prepare tables, so we were sitting on the chairs outside in front of the restaurant and having a chat. Suddenly, a regular Turkish diner of the restaurant came and talked to Hamza: “Come and look at these guys, they are jumping the queue!” Hamza went to the corner where the diners were waiting in a que. A few minutes later, he came back. “Syrian people are here again and the others are complaining, because they believe those guys are here even though they are not needy. One of them said ‘I never eat extra food because I think other needy people should eat. But it is wrong if these guys keep on coming.’” Sevim answered, “Well, if they say so because of xenophobia, this is quite wrong too.” Despite the rhetoric of anti-xenophobia, it seems that there are various form of latent anti-immigrant views among the people who run the restaurant.

There are exceptions among the immigrants whom are allowed to regularly eat in the restaurant. One day, during an informal interview where I asked Nilgün

about immigrant diners she told me that she can differentiate the kinds of clothes someone seriously poor wears. She gave an example of a deserving homeless guy.

> There is an Arab man coming here since the last year with an orange coat, remember him? He wears that coat all the time. During summer I saw that he carries it in a package. He either sells perfume or does translations. He stays in a hostel room with fifteen people. This is homelessness too. Somebody uses toilet and comes back to the room without washing hands. Somebody farts while someone else burps. I understand if a person has never stayed in such a place … The difference between the one who washed his hands the last time on the previous day and the one who didn't are clear, you would understand (Nilgün, project owner).

Except for housed people, children, and immigrants with some exceptions, everyone is allowed to eat in the restaurant. People who are drunk or high do not enter but a take-away meal is prepared for them. In winter, they come in crowded groups which can be also read as the most diners of the *Hayata Sarıl* do not stay in gym-shelters. Most of the diners are male. There are old, middle-aged, and young people. They stay in different places. Three of the diners I interviewed live on streets, four of them live in hostels, one of them lives in a coffeehouse, Sude lives in *Şefkat-Der*'s shelter, and Cengiz used to live in a mosque when I interviewed with him. Nilgün used to stay in hospital emergency sections usually. Only Mehmet and Ahmet are unemployed and Kemal is retired. Others work in recycling jobs, film sets, metro stations, or work as a vendor. Only one of them is mentally ill. Among the others there are those who have psychological health problems and physical disabilities.

Some factors can cause tensions between volunteers and diners. For example, weather conditions are determinant on the atmosphere in the restaurant. When it rains or snows homeless people in the queue are more impatient and they can start to knock on the door saying, "it's raining, let us enter earlier!" Yet, the veterans are strict about timing and they let only women or people who are very old in before the

opening time. Some days, instead of working in the restaurant I did my observations outside in front of the restaurant where the diners wait and I listened in to their conversations. Waiting there creates a social environment for them and they can talk about anything. When dinner time is close, they get impatient and watch inside behind the glass door. Every night, just before opening the door, volunteers take a selfie to share it on social media. If shooting takes long I listened to the homeless' silent complains and worries about meal getting cold. If it is crowded, diners can fight in the queue and atmosphere can be tense, but on Saturdays, it is usually not crowded at all because homeless people go to do *sinyalcilik*, a kind of beggary, to benefit from lively streets.

5.3 The perception of homelessness in *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant

In this section, I discuss how the volunteers perceive homeless people and homelessness. We will see that the volunteers' perceptions of the homeless focus on the relation between psychological state and social forces that exclude the homeless. I will present findings both from interviews and also from my observation notes on food service in the restaurant. I will expand on the discussion of some of the points that I raise in this section in the ensuing sections.

When I ask the volunteers to describe the image that comes to their mind when I say homeless, most of them, including the homeless waiter Cengiz, describe someone who is dirty, wear torn clothes and have a long beard and someone living on the street. This person is usually male and migrated to Istanbul from another city or Syria at some point of his life.

> I imagine men usually, not women for some reason and, indeed, someone with shabby clothes like we see when we walk on the street. I see them especially in Taksim, like he laid his bed [on the ground]. His beard is long. I see such people … Because Istanbul gets immigrants from so many places I

> don't imagine someone from Istanbul. Probably he is someone who migrated to Istanbul later on to work or something, I think (Zeynep, a volunteer).

The veterans state that it is difficult to describe for them because they have seen so many different homeless people for whom it is hard to tell whether they are homeless or not. This is also related to the homeless profile in the restaurant. Because most diners receive free clothing and hairdressing service from the NGOs it is often true that they do not look any different than people with homes. According to Sevim, the president of the association, what distinguishes homeless people is their psychological state rather than their appearance. She states the following when I want her to describe a homeless person:

> I saw so many homeless people and I saw people that you wouldn't believe they were homeless. But, when you say homeless, rather than describing something physical [I imagine their] psychological state. Whatever he did in his life and whatever level he reached in terms of social success, someone who feels strongly unsafe and worthless for some reason, someone who made himself believe that having lost is not important anymore and someone who doesn't have a hope for future appears before my eyes. And I think this is about how a person is *made* feel that way. It reminds me of the people who have been made feel that way … homelessness is not a chosen identity, it is a process and a result (Sevim, the president of the *Hayata Sarıl* Association).

There are three important points in Sevim's answer. These points also intersect with the other volunteers' opinions. First, the homeless feel down. They feel unsafe and worthless, as Sevim says. Selim, a volunteer, states that they are fragile and anxious. Leyla, one of the chefs, says that they need their zest for life back.

Second, anyone can be homeless. The possibilities that lead one to homelessness are valid for everybody.

> You know, they say we are all candidates of disability. When you reflect on it, we are also candidates of homelessness. His spouse might leave. His family might leave. He might be fired from job. He might run out of money and streets come. None of us can know how life will [change]. These people weren't born homeless. Everyone had a home and family. Who knows [what happened]? Everybody has their own stories (Özlem, a volunteer).

Hence, homelessness is viewed as a risk that threatens everyone when life matters go wrong. As Sevim states, the "level he reached in terms of social success" does not matter in starting a life on the street. Leyla thinks similarly and for her, this risk is independent from social status.

> If you have a family that doesn't stand with you, everyone has the possibility to become homeless. The level and opportunity for education starts with family and then middle school, high school, and elementary school – don't matter. Many *Yeşilçam* artists can become homeless too, for instance (Leyla, a chef).

Therefore, the risk of becoming homeless is seen related to the loss of family. When I asked Zeynep, a volunteer, why people become homeless, she said it is mostly a matter of loneliness which is related to losing familial bonds.

> I rather imagine people without a family. If he has a family I think somebody helps somehow. So, I think even extremely poor people find somewhere to shelter, even if it's like a hovel or a shanty … I mean, there must be also people who live on streets as the whole family, but… I don't know, I think there is this – People are usually alone. I don't see any family really. Only individuals. I think it's loneliness. Exclusion (Zeynep, a volunteer).

The restaurant does not only recognize problems of emotional distress and loss of intimacy of homelessness, it also tries to bring compatible responses to the needs of the homeless to solve their problems. It aims to provide an intimate and social environment for the homeless and gain their trust. They also encourage the homeless to take psychological support. I will discuss these in the next sections in detail.

Emphasis on loneliness in the reasons of homelessness intersects with the third point in Sevim's argument. As I stated above, Sevim argues that homeless people are *made* feel that way. Other volunteers also depict the homeless as people who were excluded and isolated due to prejudices. In a sense, they become homeless because they are isolated. Social exclusion covers a remarkable space in their answers.

> It reminds me of people who were trampled, crushed by life, who were scorned, otherized, and those who suffered in life and became lowly. This is what occurs to my mind first when said homeless (Selim, a volunteer).

This refers to the relational quality of homelessness. Becoming homeless, in this sense, occurs in relation to the others as both a psychological and social process.

Similarly, Hamza, a veteran volunteer, explains the causes of homelessness by emphasizing loneliness. He argues that while homelessness in the US is a matter of choice as the reflection of a sort of political stance, in Turkey, people end up with living on the streets because of prejudices regarding their marginality starting firstly at familial and then societal levels.

> But in our country, [homelessness] occurs as a result rather than a [matter of] choice. So, psychological state, the impositions of the self, family and society; having different sexual preferences and thinking and acting about life differently automatically push the person in different directions and make him isolated. In this isolation, he who moves away from his family [enters the state of] loneliness - This is loneliness, but it is shaped as homelessness in our country, because our social environment outside our family [pays more attention to] face-value. [Social environment] cannot accept the things that are incompatible with its logic and excludes them. In the end, this leads to the process of becoming homelessness. (Hamza, veteran volunteer).

This quotation from Hamza is important because it reflects the restaurant's discourse regarding the relation between the loss of intimacy and homelessness very well. It does not argue only that homelessness is a result of loneliness, but also homelessness *means* loneliness in the context of Turkey. I will discuss needs-talk of the restaurant around intimacy thoroughly in the next section, yet, we can conclude here that homelessness for the volunteers, is a relational process starting with the loss of intimate bonds, deepening through social exclusion because society does not accept anything against its norms, and causing the homeless person to feel strongly unsafe and worthless. Additionally, it is a risk that threatens everyone independently from their social status.

One of the best indicators regarding how the volunteers perceive homeless people is food service. As I have discussed in Chapter 4, meal is beyond being a need for physical survival, but it "is a kind of prism which channels various messages, intentions, concerns and emotions, all of which add to the contextuality of the meal situation" (Lalonde, 1992, p. 69). Therefore, it is also "a social event that creates meaning for its participants" through its structured relationship with social reality (Lalonde, 1992, p. 70). To emphasize the equality between the homeless and us as 'housed people', the veteran volunteers often say "You should taste what you serve" and give us a plate of meal cooked for the homeless. Similarly, Hamza often sits at table of the homeless and have a chat with them while they are eating. These actions aim channeling the message of equality and gaining the homeless' trust while empathizing with them.

On the other hand, the type of service in the night-shift differs from the one for customers in day-shift. The customers are served a glass, knife, fork, spoon and brown bread with walnuts while the homeless diners are served paper cups, only a spoon and white bread. Sevim says that it was the same kind of service in the past, but then they changed it seeing that the homeless did not know how to use knives and forks and felt uncomfortable. Forks and glasses are not served anymore either, because veteran volunteers fear the homeless may start a fight and wound each other by using them. Then, Nilgün adds immediately, "I should give them credit though, something like that never happened here yet."

Nilgün also says that the homeless did not like brown bread with walnuts, but they preferred the standard white bread themselves even though veteran volunteers do not find it healthy. Leyla, one of the chefs of the restaurant, thinks that serving bread for the homeless is not healthy for the capacity of thinking:

> In fact, bread is not good to consume for the diabetic, patients with blood pressure, and even for the healthy person. It is something slowing us, also the brain, down. It slows our cerebral factors down (Leyla, a chef).

Still, considering the changes in service provision, we see that the volunteers pay attention to the preferences of the homeless.

Another difference between meals of customers and the homeless diners is that the level of spiciness of the night-shift meals. Nilgün always adds more spice in the meals she cooks for the homeless because spice keeps body warm in cold weathers. On the other hand, Hamza says, "It is sometimes too spicy for the homeless and some of them can't eat. I tell Nilgün to reduce it, but… eh." One of the nights I volunteered in the restaurant also a diner did not finish his food and when he was asked why he said "it is too spicy." Another night Nilgün was scolding the diners: "Some of the housed ones among you complain about spice while those who sleep on the streets need it!" Hence, there are conflicting needs claims both among the homeless diners and veteran volunteers.

When I noticed that this is a significant issue in terms of needs interpretation, I asked the volunteers about conflicts on spicy meal in my last four interviews. While Behzat answers that meals are not spicy at all, Özlem and Zeynep suggest adding pepper cups on tables instead, so that the diners can add them in their plate if they want. Aslı suggests using an equivalent:

> Me: So, what do you think should be done? Should they continue adding more spice considering [the homeless] may be cold or…?
>
> Aslı: No, I think they shouldn't. Actually, it depends on how it is complained. If it is something like "I don't like this [food]!" then he shouldn't come there anyway. But, on the contrary, maybe he has reflux. [Spice] is a big problem for the people with reflux. He has nothing else other than his health anyway. He lives outside … If he has a health problem like this he has to say it properly. This can be done: Nilgün cares for them, that's why she is doing this, but something equivalent can be used instead. Well, a kind of spice that prevents him to be cold, but nothing peppery and harmful for the stomach.

For solving the conflict, she suggests a third way privileging the homeless' health needs as Özlem and Zeynep. Nancy Fraser borrows Bakhtin's concept to describe such discursively plural environments and alludes to them as 'internally dialogized.' Internally dialogized claims about needs explicitly or implicitly refer to alternative needs interpretations (Fraser, 1989, p. 165). As I will discuss also in the next section, the way volunteers see homelessness and their needs can include competing claims. One of the discursive resources that fosters needs interpretation is how the conflicting need claims are adjudicated (Fraser, 1989, p. 165). We see in the examples regarding the form of service that Nilgün is the main authority figure in determining such conflicts. Her hybrid identity as homeless-volunteer makes her the expert of the restaurant, in a sense.

In this section, I gave an insight into the volunteers' perception of homelessness and the homeless people before detailing it in the analysis of needs-talk in the next sections. Briefly, the volunteers think that homeless people start a life on the street when they become socially isolated and this is a kind of experience that everyone might have. Thus, we are not different than each other as eating the same meal at the same table represents it. On the other hand, our needs are different. The homeless need precautions to keep their bodies warm as well.

5.4 The hybridity of the discourses of homelessness

As I mentioned in Chapter 2, Theresa Gowan conceptualizes the discourses of homelessness as sin-talk, sick-talk, and system-talk. In her ethnography, *Hobos, Hustlers, and Backsliders* (2010), she claims that homeless hustlers who live in Tenderloin district of San Francisco adopt sin-talk and believe they have always been tended to be criminals. Sick-talk is rooted in homeless shelters where the homeless

are seen as psychiatric cases rather than agents. Finally, homeless cyclers who live in their encampments adopt system-talk and perceive poverty as a structural problem (2010). Gowan states that the homeless can shift from one type of discourse to another in special cases such as hustlers' shift from sin-talk to system critique when they get old (2010, p. 116) but roughly she depicts three separate groups who adopt three different types of discourse which are spatially segregated as well.

Unlike Gowan's arguments, my findings show that discourses are not homogenous. As I discussed in the previous sections, the volunteers view homelessness as a relational process starting with the loss of intimate and social bonds that leads to exclusion, concomitantly, loss of trust and falling into depression. Even though all volunteers unite around the opinion that social exclusion and psychological problems are the main determinants of homelessness, their approaches differ. They include a wide range of factors in their arguments and the level and the composition of system-talk or victim blaming differ from individual to individual and context to context. In this brief section, I discuss the hybridity of the discourse of homelessness in the restaurant. Even though I think that they somewhat reduce the accounts of the volunteers into categories, I will use Gowan's concepts to be able to show how they merge easier.

The discourse of homelessness in the *Hayata Sarıl* can be a mix of sick-talk and system-talk which is often the case in most of the volunteers' accounts such as Sevim, Behzat, Hamza, and Nilgün's. They usually revolve around factors like social exclusion, domestic violence, and economic problems and the effects of these factors on the homeless' psychology. For example, Aslı depicts the relationship between psychological problems and sexual violence as the following:

> She or he may have to prefer [homelessness] because of a repression … Especially women. Men too, actually it can happen to men too. As a child—

> Nilgün's story for example, there are also male versions of it. I mean… it's catastrophic. They are more terrible, they [people] experienced such things. He is excluded and exiled by his family because he is male, I mean, there is no way he can stay healthy. What can he do? He will go, sleep in a park, ingest thinner or, I don't know, he will want to die maybe. I think psychological reasons are very highly [effective] (Aslı, a volunteer).

On the other hand, Behzat, having the strongest system-talk among the volunteers, states that homelessness is a socioeconomic problem which cannot be solved without prerequisite economic changes in the country. He also thinks that it should be handled through a governmental intervention.

> Homelessness and poverty are social problems. Indeed, as the members of society we can't remain insensitive to this … But this social problem is also an economic problem of this country. None of us has a right to speak or do something in the governance of this country officially. Homeless and poor [people] we talk about are not as few as we can point at. They are at high rates. So, it's not possible for us to respond to such a large mass as individuals. It needs a serious economic infrastructure and project. Consider it like it needs a brain to establish a management, a brain that maintains that management, and psychologists who can rehabilitate the homeless for that environment. Its sales process, housing, following social activities etc. It needs a collective or public mind to design all these in a multifaceted way and sustain (Behzat, a volunteer).

For Behzat, the main actor for the solution of homelessness is the governors of the country who are responsible for meeting the needs of the homeless. The actors and methods to meet needs and solve homelessness are also related to the socioeconomic quality of the problem.

The veterans stress more on the society's exclusionary role in creating homelessness. For instance, Sevim argues that society is responsible for the homeless.

> If you can provide that rehabilitation, if you can convince him to believe that he is valuable in society [he can be housed again] … He definitely needs that social support mechanism. Alone they are already ignored. Since society ignored them, it has to build this support mechanism to regain them. Because you [society] had kicked them out of circle (Sevim, the president)

As I will mention in the next section, Sevim thinks that homelessness emerges as a problem regarding loss of trust and intimacy because of the collapse of family and exclusion of society. Thus, for her, society is responsible for compensating for making one homeless.

In terms of responsibilities, according to Aslı, members of society and state can work collaboratively. She states that generation z is comprised of people with high emotional intelligence and they would be voluntary to help people if municipalities and state design a social assistance project for the homeless based on voluntary work.

> [State] doesn't even have to use its budget for that. Once you generate this project, you find thousands of businessmen to support it, you find students like us to support it, and you find people who voluntarily spare time and try to do their best. It's not rocket science (Aslı, a volunteer).

On the other hand, it can be a mix of sick and sin-talk, as it is in Leyla's account who thinks that psychological problems lead not working. During the whole interview, she emphasized on the importance of work and self-responsibility.

> When people get detached from life they feel exhausted. They don't want to do anything. I see such people that they don't even want to look for food and they want to die … But I learn from [the experiences of] Nilgün -she is the most outstanding example of this in Turkey I think- that a hard-working person, someone who works, even if he never got education, even if he suffered the worst of life, once he wants to hold onto [life], if he really works, nobody would be homeless nor hungry. I'm sure of that (Leyla, a chef).

Likewise, Aslı thinks that psychological factors may prevent homeless people from struggling for a better life:

> Basic needs are those I counted a while ago: Food, shelter, warmth... These are their basic needs but I think their psychological needs are more than these. His belly is full for that day, yes, and he can also stay in a hostel. But this guy might not want to get rid of this situation, because it might result in factors affecting him that he does not want (Aslı, a volunteer).

It can be a mix of sin and system-talk as well. The veterans define the homeless' lifestyle as 'slowpoke life' (*hantal yaşam*). Nilgün states that giving money to

beggars confines them into a slowpoke life where they do not want to look for jobs and stand on their own legs. Sevim argues that this lifestyle makes the homeless demanding but it is imposed on the homeless by society.

> We always push them to live in a slowpoke way and they think that they deserve the slowpoke life. Then, maintaining that slowpoke life, they [say] "gimme, gimme, gimme" [and want] what they couldn't get from life. Whose fault is this? His fault? Sometimes you get angry and fed up with the same thing every day, but this is not actually his fault. This is what society imposed on him and made him believe for years (Sevim, the president).

Also, it can be sick-talk mixed a bit with familialism as it is in Selim's case. For instance, Selim claims that homelessness stems from psychological reasons such as "miscommunication, [and] being unable to get along well" with families. Due to psychological problems, they are not compatible with their families and they find themselves on the street.

> Me: Do you think they can get along well with their families once they are rehabilitated?
>
> Selim: Of course, we can bring them back in the family and society easily, because these people are physically healthy people. But they are naïve, sensitive and some can have anxiety disorders, some have excessive stress, some struggle with difficulties, financial difficulties. He stops struggling right away and leave the family. As far as I saw, the stories of all the homeless is about what we call 'the inability to stand being sheltered' (*barınamama*), hence, they actually have somewhere to be sheltered but they do not want to be sheltered. Therefore, psychological factors lie behind.

Selim's expression of 'the inability to stand being sheltered' (*barınamama*) coincides with sick-talk well. *Barınamama* in this sense is not only about shelter, but being able to belong and adopt to somewhere. This ability collapses when psychological problems and conflicts with family members occur, and eventually, *barınamama* leads to homelessness. Accordingly, Selim claims that there are two solutions for homelessness: Therapy and reconciliation with family.

This point shows that the volunteers' discourses of homelessness can separate from each other as much as they intersect at many points. After stopping voice

recording,[7] I told Selim that I disagreed with him: "What about the victims of domestic violence? What is the use of reconciling these people with their families?" He said that it must be a small minority, however, many of the homeless are subjected to domestic violence since their early ages (Bekaroğlu-Doğan, 2018), as Aslı, Nilgün, and Sevim argue. Abusive relations within some families can make it unbearable for some to live under the same roof with their families, as it was in Nilgün's case. When she was a child, school was a shelter for her to escape from physical and emotional violence she was subjected at home. When it was revealed that she was raped, the level of emotional violence was even stronger even though she was staying in state's children protection agency at that time.

To conclude, the discourses in the restaurant are 'internally dialogized' (Fraser, 1989). The volunteers have conflicting points in their approaches to homelessness as well as intersecting. We do not see a homogenous group of volunteer and their system-talk revolved in the same restaurant like a homogenous group of cyclers who think and talk in the same way in the same regions as in Gowan's work (2010), but we see different actors and their enriched discourses in action and language nourished from different resources. If we need to describe a main body of discourse output out of the accounts of volunteers, we can say that for the *Hayata Sarıl*, homelessness is a process starting as a social problem, deepening as a psychological problem, and resulting in a lifestyle where finding a socially meaningful job does not matter to the homeless anymore. The state is responsible for creating concrete solutions, society is responsible for socially including the homeless, and the homeless are responsible for giving efforts to be housed again.

[7] I took his permission for using the off-record data.

5.5 Needs-talk in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant

According to the volunteers, sociality, and psychological support are the most urgent needs of the homeless for them to be able to find paths out of homelessness. These needs are followed by self-responsibility, discipline, and training. In this section, I will discuss volunteers' insights on these needs as well as homeless diners' of the *Hayata Sarıl*.

5.5.1 Needs-talk around 'hunger for touch'

"They are not hungry for food, they can find food anywhere. They are rather hungry to touch, to see, and to hear." This statement is repeated by veteran volunteers to the novices almost every night before diners come to eat in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant. It implies that nowadays it is easy for homeless people to feed themselves due to many NGOs and soup kitchens serving free food in Istanbul at different times of the day, but they are still hungry for other things such as love and trust. In this section, I discuss how 'hunger for touch' is interpreted and tried to be satisfied by the volunteers and how the homeless diners respond that.

According to the volunteers, 'hunger for touch' precisely refers to the homeless' desperate need for trust occurring as a result of failed families. For those who lose their familial networks, the basis of homelessness emerges. What is lost is not only a house, but also the feeling of trust and plans for the future.

> What does family mean? It is where the sense of trust emerges, where you find unconditional love. Whatever happens to you in this life it is where you can come back and it is the first place you learn that there are people who can love you unconditionally. It is what makes you, your sense of belonging, your self-confidence and it is what provides you to make future plans … I see that the possibility of becoming homeless is higher for people who lost that unconditional love in their childhood. I think it is related to the lack of feeling of trust and being unable to have dreams (Sevim, the president).

Trust and love nourished by intimate relations are what make a house home. Once people lose intimacy, they lose home too. The homeless who get psychological problems due to their failed families find themselves in a deeper depression on the street. He cannot trust anyone anymore.

Some homeless interlocutors express that their familial relations ended due to violence. Rıza who is homeless for thirty years says that he was subjected to "torture" at home and he has escaped to streets several times when he was a child. Similarly, Emre says

> Why I live on the street is for familial reasons. After mom and dad got divorced, I stayed with my dad for some time. I was exposed to violence. Finally, I couldn't stand to it and left home. This is why I'm on the streets for sixteen years (Emre).

Homeless people experience betrayals also by their circle of friends. They may exclude the homeless and turn their back, like in Murat's case or their betrayals may result in the homeless to withdraw into their shell, like in Emre's case.

> You know, they say 'he who falls has no friends.' When you fall everybody escapes from you. By falling I mean… um, when they see that you are in a difficult situation- they didn't talk [to me] thinking like 'will he want something from us, will he want money from us, or will he want us to treat a meal for him?' They didn't even greet! (Murat)

> I'm my own friend now. I got cold from people. By cold, I mean, how should I put it, by getting hurt on and on, on and on, I got fed up with people … By hurt, I mean, like I was deceived a lot. So much money I had was stolen by the circle of friends. It was said 'this will be done, that will be done', but they were never done, [I mean] like, about jobs. So, I'm my own friend now (Emre).

Nevertheless, trust can be built through other forms of networks and social support as well. A volunteer, Özlem, explains how homeless people can be saved by touch with a reference to a novel she read. The story revolves around a man who grew up in a children protection institution because his mother killed his dad and went to prison. When he is eighteen years old, he is compelled to leave the institution

and starts to leave on street. Some shopkeepers around offer jobs to him, but he rejects them all. One day, he runs into a girl and begs money. Girl says that she does not have money but she can give a hug instead. After being touched, the guy feels enlightened and decides to pull himself together. He starts to believe that it is possible to feel that warmth again and starts to work at one of the jobs he had rejected before. This story is significant because it represents how the volunteers posit themselves in relation to their influence on the homeless very well. The volunteers believe that once the homeless, like the boy in the novel, notice that there are people who care for them, they can start to give efforts for findings paths out of homelessness by reconsidering the opportunities they once let slip. In this manner, hunger for touch and trust is considered to be the first needs to be satisfied.

In all interviews I conducted with the volunteers, I asked their opinions on the capabilities of the homeless. The answers had two shapes: (1) They can do everything once opportunities are given to them.

> In fact, he can do everything. I mean, those related to belief- as long as he believes he can do everything. Yet, there will be limitations in line with his education level, well, he can't be a nuclear engineer. He can be in the future if he wants, but, today, when he starts on the first day, he can't be a nuclear engineer. But if he has serious traumas and trust problems, he can't start to work the next day. He can't start to plan his future on the very next day (Sevim, the president).

(2) They cannot do anything because the lack of opportunities.

> He cannot do anything, I mean, he has potential but he still can't because he has neither a shelter to stay nor the financial and physical opportunities. He doesn't have incorporeal opportunities [either] because he has psychological problems (Selim, a volunteer).

The lacking of opportunities they mention are roughly education, psychological health, and material goods such as clean clothes, food, and housing. According to the volunteers, the homeless are able to do only jobs based on muscular power such as cleaning and working in constructions and they can only obtain what is given to them

as charity. However, they believe that this image can change once somebody touches them. This is also why the restaurant serves food. If the homeless are not hungry for food, I wondered why then the association runs a restaurant instead of conducting their other projects such as a laundry room or rehabilitation center. Sevim answered me, "we should build trust first." Thus, as in the other NGOs providing food for the homeless in Istanbul (Yeter, 2018, p. 46), in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant as well, serving meal is a vital way of building trust which is the first step of saving someone on the street and increasing his opportunities in life.

Food also sets diner-volunteer relationship as a familial one. On the second anniversary of the restaurant's foundation, in her speech, Nilgün said

> People living on the street didn't have a family, but you became our family. Not only mine, you are family of everyone living on the street. You are family of our friends, those 100 people we give food every night here. Not me. I'm their sister.

Similarly, Hamza refers to dining at the restaurant as a family meal. Also, when Nilgün or Hasan scold diners to maintain discipline too (See the next section), volunteers see it as a parent's scolding children or a teacher's disciplinary behavior towards pupils.

Food service aims at improving not only volunteer-homeless relationships, but also diners' relationships with each other. Leyla expresses her wish for the homeless to socialize as the following:

> Actually, here, it's a social environment that they can be engaged with. You know many people who don't want to get homeless people in their restaurants even if they have money. There are people who don't trust [the homeless]. Here, it's a social environment where they can come together. I want to think positively. [I want to think that] they establish a dialogue and motivate each other (Leyla, a chef).

Socializing is seen as a part of the process of becoming 'housed' again. When I asked Leyla if she has ever seen diners who become friends at the restaurant, she replied:

> I saw people who became homeless even though he didn't have fault in that much, give efforts [to get rid of it] little by little, and try to establish dialogues (Leyla, a chef).

Longing for intimate relations and trust was expressed by the homeless in different ways. Most of the answers to my question of what they feel the deficiency of the most as a homeless person, they answered as the subsequent:

> Family. If there is no family, it's meaningless. For most of the people living on the street it is the same (Mehmet).

> It's friendship, I can say, fellowship. You get away from everyone unavoidably. So, rather than food or drink, you expect people to approach you friendly. You… You want them to ask after you. You become happy even if they say 'how are you', 'are you doing well?' (Murat)

Thus, the homeless describe their most urgent need as intimacy as well. Accordingly, when I asked what they like the most about *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant, most of the diners told that they like chitchatting with Nilgün, and the polite and altruistic volunteers of the restaurant. A homeless person said during the interview that he can receive the energy of happiness that the volunteers feel while serving food and he likes the service. One night, I heard one of the diners telling Nilgün once, "food is just an excuse, we actually come for your beautiful heart." Sevim says the following about diners' trust in Nilgün:

> They trust Nilgün so much. So so so much. Because she is one of them. For [the new volunteers] Nilgün may look strict to the homeless, but she knows the names of all, where they come from, what their problems are, what diseases they have, what their shoe size is, if they have coats or not, where they stay, at which corner they sleep… she knows them all. I don't know these. You don't know these. Those who know these are precious. Otherwise, it's like you hug them, give them roses and violets etc. Well, life is already so harsh for them, they don't need roses and violets. They need someone who understands their problems, it doesn't matter how strict she is (Sevim, the president).

The facts that Nilgün often refers to herself as homeless even now, diners see her as someone among them, and she understands them render the organization of the restaurant almost non-hierarchal. Not only Nilgün, but also other homeless people actively work in the *Hayata Sarıl* as well as the other NGOs. Murat and Kemal who are homeless themselves often participate food distribution in streets. Kemal joins press releases about the problems homeless people face. Deniz, who was homeless in the past, manages his own soup kitchen, the *Deliler* Coffeehouse, now. Murat looks for funding to open a soup kitchen that provides breakfast for homeless people. This non-hierarchical landscape gives the homeless an opportunity to be visible in public space "as agents involved in interpreting their needs and shaping their life conditions" (Fraser, 1989, p. 174).

Therefore, the restaurant helps satisfying homeless people's need for sociality and it creates a friendly and supportive atmosphere similar to the Tabernacle Soup Kitchen in Glasser's research where the main reason for eating there was chronic loneliness of the diners (See, Chapter 4). The *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant's veteran volunteers' wish for building trust and intimacy through meal service appear to be successful. To conclude, the volunteers' needs-talk around sociality coincides with the homeless' description of their own needs for social relations.

What differs is that the volunteers' sociality discourse is followed by a needs-talk around therapy. According to the volunteers loneliness people feel on the street brings about psychological problems and these problems show up in the behaviors of the homeless. Nilgün explains the thievery activities of the diners through psychological diseases. One night, during a conversation she said "They steal from each other in even that queue [before the restaurant]. This is a sickness too. I used to be homeless. Why did I never steal?" Another night, Hamza said "You see many

homeless people coming here to eat, but none of them wants to use the restroom to wash their hands." Because, for him, they cannot think of the routine practices in the way we do.

The needs for intimacy and sociality are where a rehabilitation center becomes necessary, because the volunteers believe a rehabilitation center can bring the sense of trust back. In this respect, it is almost a home to the homeless.

> What makes a house (*ev*) home (*yuva*) [is love]. You know the saying 'men make houses, women make homes' (*yuvayı dişi kuş yapar*), he needs someone who will love him unconditionally and be happy with him. Issue is not the house in fact, it is the need for a home. This is why, a rehabilitation center [is important]. It is not a home or not a nursing home, but *one step* closer. This is the advantage (Hamza, a veteran volunteer).

Hence, home and rehabilitation centers are similar kinds of safe heavens providing trust and pave the way for development of intimate relations. While psychological support can make sociality to emerge possible, social support can make psychological support possible as well. Selim explains how social support is related to the psychological as the following:

> Society won't otherize. It won't exclude those people. It won't stigmatize them behaving[8] as if they are different, as if they are not normal. So that, these people will feel like 'what am I doing? Yes, I can go back to life, I'm a normal person too, I'm not other' and they will accept that treatment process, they will accept that rehabilitation, reconciliation, and adaptation process again (Selim, a volunteer).

So, according to Selim, social inclusion can help homeless people to raise self-awareness and question his own homelessness. This way, he can choose to be rehabilitated. As the relation between social-psychological supports, psychological support and the homeless' self-responsibility are related by the volunteers. For instance, Aslı thinks that psychological treatment can help the homeless to pull himself together.

[8] Or "It won't stigmatize them based on the behaviors of the homeless." It is not clear here whom he refers to.

> Human is a spiritual being and his psychological state should be evaluated to [detect] the reason that pushes him into distress, I think. It needs support and this is a need stemming from a psychological deficiency. What can it be? For example, this person might have a trauma. It needs to be treated, it is a need for him. Maybe he's not aware of this. Maybe, needs are defined differently for him, but for him to be able to pull his weight, I think, it should be… I mean, he should put a check mark on his instincts for sustaining his life at least, I think (Aslı, a volunteer).

I elaborate self-responsibility and psychological support relation in the next section.

A few homeless people referred to the psychological effects of homelessness in their relation to work. For example, Ahmet,[9] agreeing with the volunteers, says that homeless people have psychological disorders because they do not meet their families. Because of their disorders, he argues, food aid does not help. On the contrary, it causes the homeless to get used to receive something for free. Thus, it leads to a 'slowpoke life'.

Murat talks about his sleep disorder stemmed from his past traumas and depression. He was "weary of life" and he considered suicide often, but gave up each time. He says that psychological problems occur when people do not work.

> [Homelessness is] people's own responsibility. You know, they say 'you live in the way you want to live'. Actually, I don't really [mind] people who say that they are unemployed. Look (shows a recycler man outside), this guy collects paper, [he makes] at least 70-80 liras, 100 liras in a day. If unemployed, I mean, you need to find a job man, you need to search for it. 'I'm unemployed', [so what?] Job won't find you man … If you don't work you [start to] think of everything. Evil things occur to your mind all the time. 'I shall die, kill myself, die because of this, revolt at that, revolt at this. You get mentally depressed (Murat).

Likewise, Mehmet says that the homeless make a psychological problem out of everything and they do not work. For him, there are enough jobs, enough food, and enough clothes for anyone who wants to be housed.

Yet, the homeless I interviewed do not mention psychological support as a need. Only Murat says that he had support before. He has seen doctors for twenty-

[9] He did not want me to record his voice. I took notes while he is answering my questions.

five years and used pills for his depression, but he thinks that it did not help. Murat says that once one is mentally depressed it is almost impossible to fix it. At the end, he stopped using pills thinking that they were useless.

5.5.2 Needs-talk around self-responsibility and discipline

As I discussed in Chapter 2, some approaches to poverty suggest that poverty can be eliminated when people are guided to a better lifestyle where individuals make informed choices as active agents (Coveney, 2006). Needs-talk in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant somewhat agrees with this approach. I heard a few times Hamza telling new volunteers that we can just hold their hands, but we cannot make them walk. As long as he does not want it, he cannot get rid of homelessness. Self-responsibility and discipline are important values for finding paths out of homelessness as the name of the restaurant, *Hayata Sarıl* (Embrace Life), points too. In this section, I discuss the common and different points in the needs-talks around self-responsibility and discipline of the veterans, novice volunteers, and the diners.

The volunteers believe that self-responsibility can emerge once the homeless are given a chance and instilled hope, just like the story Özlem told about a guy who was vacuously walking street by street, then touched and enlightened by a girl's compassion, and decided to work in a job (See the previous section). The same is valid for those who do not share the same moral values or work ethic as the middle class. For Sevim, the criminal history of the homeless does not matter, once the homeless are touched by the given chance, they can stand on their legs.

> There are many thieves, pedophiles and the like among the homeless. There are those who do bad things as well as good things. There are good homeless people and also bad homeless people. But, when you [society] make that person homeless, when you don't assuage his anger towards life, then you doom that person to that life. Another life, another alternative is possible. Once you plant this [idea] in his mind, once he starts to dream about life,

> maybe he won't steal and he will want to do something better and stand on his legs (Sevim, the president).

According to Sevim, it is society's responsibility to eliminate one's hunger for life and motivate the homeless for imagining a better life because it is society's fault if someone is homeless. Once society gives him hope, it is his turn to take a step towards an alternative life. Cengiz tells about the importance of giving efforts and being determinant in becoming housed.

> He should give efforts. He should think like 'I don't want to be homeless, I don't want to stay outside', so that he can start to think like he wants to find a job and move into a house. For example, I was thinking to myself, like, when I used to live on streets I would think like 'I will find a job and rent a house.' And I believe I achieved this (Cengiz, the waiter).

So, one should decide that he does not want to be homeless anymore and then, he should start looking for jobs and houses.

The belief that 'if the homeless give efforts they can save themselves' is embodied in a certain practice. Every night, when the volunteers are done with preparing tables and serving meal, the first twenty-six diners are let in. After everybody is seated, the veterans call the other volunteers to the front of the place, and everybody starts to introduce themselves: "Hello, I am Şeyma. Bon appetite everyone!" Sometimes the veterans want us to give more details such as the place where we study or work. Nilgün sometimes points at me and tells the diners that I conduct a research in the restaurant. She sometimes points at Yaşar, an elderly volunteer who works in kitchen, and tells them that despite of his age he comes to volunteer every week. Also, she points at Cengiz telling them he was homeless in the past but now working in the restaurant.

On the second day of my participant observations, I asked Nilgün why we do this every time each group of diners come in. She said that she wants them to see that they can get rid of such a life when they give efforts. She wants them to see what

people who are at the ages of their children do. Then, she adds: It is just psychological. The fundamental reason of homelessness is just psychological. As for Sevim, when we introduce ourselves, we build a relationship with them and a light of hope is risen for the homeless. We constitute the positions of where the diners could be if they are self-disciplined and give efforts. Thus, the volunteers' introduction works both as a way of communication with the homeless in order to build trust and also showing the possibility of an alternative life.

Teaching self-discipline starts with 'behaving well' during queuing up before the restaurant and during dining. Both are a part of service provision and eating practices. The form of service provision and the quality of labor shape the symbolic meanings of meal. In institutional dining rooms, such as soup kitchens, these meanings can take an ideological form channelizing diners' behaviors into a particular way of life (See, Chapter 4, Veness, 1994 referenced in Bell & Valentine, 1997; Forero, Ellis, Metcalfe, & Brown, 2009, p. 226). Similarly, the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant aims to crystallize the difference between good and bad behavior and create a good community and a respectful climate in the restaurant.

Regulating the behaviors of the diners has two aims: (1) teaching discipline and (2) being fair to everyone. Good behaviors are coded mainly as finishing the food in the plate, being respectful to the other diners and volunteers while queuing up in front of the restaurant, and sitting at the tables the veteran volunteers choose for them. To be able to maintain discipline Nilgün often scolds the diners and sometimes tells them that she will close the restaurant for a week if they do not behave. If a diner leaves half of his plate full, veteran volunteers can tell him not to come again because leaving food in plate means wasting the meal of a hungry person outside and this is seen unfair. Additionally, Nilgün prefers choosing the seats of the diners

herself because she wants the elderly to sit before the plates with more food. These two examples refer to veteran volunteers' effort for being fair and prioritizing the disadvantaged groups in a disciplinary way. This is similar to what Forero et al. observed in their field. Strict regulations are used to secure rights of the vulnerable population (as I have reviewed in the Section 4.3.2). Accordingly, veteran volunteers surveil eating practices and differentiate deserving and undeserving diner.

One night, before the diners came, Sevim told volunteers about the importance of discipline in the restaurant: "You *have to* maintain discipline here. There is something I've learnt even though I hated it: Being fair is more important than having conscience (*Hakkaniyetli olmak vicdanlı olmaktan iyidir*). Otherwise he abuses it. He says, 'oh, this is my right, then I'll have it' and he is right. But I can't provide this always. That's why psychological support is important. For example, it was raining the other day, I felt bad for an old woman and took her in first. The next day she says 'take me first again.' But I can't do it always, I have to be fair."

A volunteer replied her by giving an example from the *Deliler* Coffeehouse which is ran by Deniz, who had also experienced homelessness in the past. "I know. For instance, Deniz treats them too harsh and I used to think like it's even better if he didn't serve at all. For example, if someone stays long at his table, Deniz says 'it's not a five-star-hotel, leave already.'"

"Because he is worried about people who wait for food in front of the door." said Sevim. "Both Nilgün and Deniz experienced homelessness and they know about the importance of discipline." The hybrid identity of Deniz and Nilgün as volunteers and homeless strengthens their position again in decision-making.

The new volunteers' interpretation of needs in terms of discipline cannot always suit with the veterans'. At first, new volunteers are bothered by how the

diners are scolded and taught discipline, then, they start to agree with the veterans' point of view, as the volunteer who worked at Deniz's soup kitchen. The novices think that the homeless need compassion more than discipline. For instance, at another night, service had ended and we were on our way back home in train station with a volunteer, Doğan, who volunteered at the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant only twice. He was not pleased with how diners were treated. He said that fairness is stemmed from compassion anyway and an altruistic work should involve a better treatment to the service receivers. Hence, conflicting interpretations of needs can occur among the volunteers.

On the other hand, the poor have unique ways of dealing with their own poverty and many of them see themselves self-responsible in their survival. For instance, Rıza, a homeless person sleeping on the streets and recycling, says that he steals clothes the municipalities provide the poor as a part of their social assistance program.

> I get clothes from here and there and sell them, because I have to. Because *I have to*. It's not a good thing actually … I get [those clothes] from municipalities. But I don't do it always. Just once in a thousand times. Rarely. [I do it] only if I have to. Consider, a man who is hungry in a wild and remote place. Example: He goes to a wild place and he is hungry or at war, for example, a man who goes to a war and he is hungry. There is no food or something. What's he gonna do? He has to eat some part of a snake (?) there, but with the condition of not going too far. This is also in Quran. You can find it also in the verses in Quran (Rıza).

Therefore, in a way, Rıza is self-responsible. He cares about his health and he steals whenever he thinks he needs to. He also religiously legitimizes his thievery. He deals with his poverty as an active agent. Similarly, Mehmet who stays in a hostel and does not see himself as homeless says that he is unemployed at the moment because he cannot find a job as he likes yet. Then, he stresses: "People like us make job choices too." He implies that he evaluates the opportunities before him and wants to

choose the best for him. On the other hand, Hamdi describes himself as a responsible citizen who works and deserves aids by comparing himself with the Syrians who represent an irresponsible citizen example.

> Y'know, when people see us they get away from us. But when they see the Syrians they give them aids. As for us, no aids. Why? We are Turks, they aren't Turks. They come here by leaving their war. What about us? We earn our keeps by collecting cardboards (Hamdi).

The homeless' accounts refer to a level of self-responsibility that keep them motivated to survive and choose the best for their lives on the streets, yet, for the volunteers what matters is a kind of hope for a different life and they want the homeless to believe that they are not obliged to live on the streets or anywhere that is not intended to be home. On the other hand, both volunteers and diners that I interviewed agree with the opinion if the homeless achieve better opportunities, they would not steal and they would live under better conditions.

Besides learning discipline, learning how to budget is seen as a part of being self-responsible as well. According to volunteers, it is an important capability to develop for homeless people to be housed again. As we see in Sevim's statements regarding losing the ability to make future plans and have dreams (See the previous section), the volunteers think that the homeless do not have plans and they spend money arbitrarily due to their 'hunger for life'. This is why all homeless people who work at the restaurant as a waiter takes budget planning courses. For instance, Leyla states that one should be careful in his budget planning if he wants to find paths out of homelessness.

> We all, in fact, give efforts and work hard for a month not to be homeless and at the end of the month we cut our coat according to our cloth. We maintain a certain life-style to be able to sustain the same standards every month. We buy a half of a kilo of something, but not a kilo. Some people work as hard as to buy a kilo. So, we all give efforts to have a home, a shelter, a roof over our heads. He [the person who wants to get rid of homelessness] also struggles for this (Leyla, a chef).

This rhetoric is also framed within the hunger for touch.

> It is not that only his belly is hungry, but also his eyes are hungry, his heart is hungry, his body is hungry. He is hungry for life and within such a hunger, he uses the first opportunity for satiation and gets full for that moment. [He has no thought like] "I shall keep some of this for the next day and get full in the next day too." It is the same for spiritual satiation. No future planning. Therefore, the main reason for this is in fact losing the sense of future (Sevim, the president of the association).

The restaurant aims at teaching waiters budget planning while paying them as well. For instance, once, Sevim who is a banker said that she pays a half of Cengiz's (the homeless waiter) wage on the first part of the month, and then the second half on the latter. In this way, she prevents Cengiz to spend his money 'carelessly'. Hence, the restaurant aims at directing the habits of the homeless to a particular lifestyle.

I asked the homeless how they spend their money. Some homeless people like Ahmet and Rıza spend on cigarettes. Mehmet spends all day in internet cafes, and similarly, Rıza pays for internet cafes to be protected from the cold. As for Emre, another homeless person, he answered me as below:

> Emre: For example, I earn 20 liras in a day? I go - what do I want? *Çiğ köfte*? I go and buy it. For example, what do I want today? I go to BİM, I want chocolate or something else, I go and buy it. Or I go, for example, I want pasta? I eat pasta.
>
> Me: So, food.
>
> Emre: Kinda. For example, I sometimes go and buy books. I read a book.

Sevim thinks that people like Emre can budget too. During our informal interview, she says:

> Four homeless people can come together and rent a house, but they don't do it because they already hit rock bottom and they don't make plans anymore … Consider him earning 30 liras in a day. That makes 900 liras in a month. He lives alone right? Then, consider a family of four that earns minimum salary. Family members share that money and they plan their incomes and outcomes accordingly. If they can do it, a homeless person can do it as well (Sevim, the president).

She also mentions a homeless waiter the restaurant hired some time ago. He spent all his money he had earnt on the first month for buying a smart phone. Sevim says that she understands if he wants to have a phone like anybody else, but budgeting is more important for him to remain housed.

As Buğra and Irzık state, expenditures that seem to be irrational might indicate a fear of social exclusion and urgent needs for more respected positions in social hierarchies. Consumption of goods and services have a potential to make communication between different social groups easier and help individuals to realize themselves as social beings (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, pp. 195-196). Therefore, buying a smart phone can be interpreted as an urgent need for social inclusion and higher social status as well. For those who consume conspicuously during transition from homelessness to being housed, budgeting might help. Yet, I believe it would not make a big difference where one lives on streets and earns just 20-30 liras in a day. Interviews I did with the diners show that those living on the street already develop strategies for making homelessness more endurable.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This ethnography analyzed how the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant volunteers interpret the needs of homeless people, from what perspective and to what end. I compared the needs-talk of the volunteers working in the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant to the way diners describe their own needs. I also investigated the volunteers' perception of homelessness and offer a critical perspective to the literature of discourse analysis on homelessness and food-power relations. The main argument of the thesis is that the restaurant volunteers perceive the primary needs of the homeless as sociality, psychological support, and discipline. The need for sociality intersects with the homeless' description of their own needs. The second argument of this thesis is that forms of discourse that might *prima facie* seem competing can, in fact, coherently coexist. Lastly, I argue that charity relations are entitlement relations too and they have power to determine who receives food and who deprives food as much as exchange entitlement relations do. However, in charity relations, entitlements are defined in relation to the perceived deservingness of the receiver.

In her ethnography, Teresa Gowan describes homogenous and singular forms of discourse adopted by different groups of homeless people. Her conceptualization is useful, yet, on the other hand, it remains weak to explain, for example, how people can simultaneously and coherently blame the system for creating poverty but also blame the victims for being lazy. My research results indicate that the ways volunteers of the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant explain homelessness are internally dialogized and plural. They include a wide range of factors and these factors differ from one to another. This thesis indicates that for the *Hayata Sarıl*, homelessness is a

process starting as a familial and social problem, deepening as a psychological problem, and resulting in a lifestyle where finding a socially meaningful job does not matter to the homeless anymore. Accordingly, homeless people are considered in need for sociality, psychological support, and discipline the most. The state is responsible for creating concrete, human rights-based solutions, society is responsible for socially including the homeless, and the homeless are responsible for showing effort to be housed again. Therefore, the composition and level of sick-talk, system-talk, and sin-talk differ from context to context and individual to individual.

The accounts of volunteers in a way are coherent with some theories of needs that I discussed in Chapter 3 (See, for instance, Buğra & Irzık, 1999; Doyal & Gough, 1991; Gough, 2004; Dean, 2009) as those theories argue that people are interdependent beings and needs are what make participation to social life possible. According to the volunteers, this participation is possible if (1) society supports the homeless and opens channels of their inclusion, (2) if homeless people receive psychological support in order to eliminate mental barriers that isolate them, and (3) if they develop the senses of future, discipline and responsibility towards themselves and the wider society for becoming citizens who struggle for better life conditions. These steps are interconnected and if one of them is lacking, the process of becoming housed will be interrupted as well.

According to the volunteers, to satisfy the hunger for touch, the homeless need society to hold their hand and psychological support to rebuild their trust in themselves and others. How homeless diners describe their own needs intersects with the volunteers' concept of the 'hunger for touch' because diners also express that they need intimacy and sociality the most. Almost all diners I interviewed stated that they felt excluded and despised by their old community as well as the larger society.

Yet, they do not relate their longing for intimacy with their own psychological state, they rather focus only on social exclusion. The restaurant presents a social environment and the diners like interacting with the volunteers there. Sometimes homeless people themselves volunteer as well and Nilgün often stresses her own experience of homelessness while talking to the diners. This hybrid environment creates a great potential for an equal and democratic platform where the homeless can politicize their unspoken needs claims and address their life conditions as active agents. To strengthen this, I suggest, the restaurant staff can hire more workers among the homeless especially for the future projects (laundry room and therapy center).

The volunteers perceive autonomy and sociality very much connected. This perspective is coherent with Amartya Sen's capability approach (Sen, 2000). Sen also depicts an ideal where individuals become autonomous by having their capabilities developed by means of increased opportunities and they are able to avoid social risks and participate in society this way. In this respect, for the volunteers, homelessness is a relational process but it is also about one's relation to oneself. The homeless should have the willpower and motivation to save themselves by using every opportunity. The restaurant tries to give that motivation to be self-responsible and disciplined.

One of the ways to discipline oneself, according to volunteers, is budget planning: Not spending in present and investing in the future. This is particularly important because losing the sense of future is perceived as what differentiates the homeless from the other poor. While the housed poor accommodates themselves to economic circumstances even if it is a crowded family, the homeless spends arbitrarily even though he is alone. 'Irrational' consumption practices, as Buğra and

Irzık state, might indicate a need for higher social status (Buğra & Irzık, 1999, pp. 195-196). Thus, the consumption choices of the diners relate them to the others in society and 'arbitrary' expenditures can refer to a need for social inclusion as well. For those who spend arbitrarily during transition from homelessness to being housed budgeting might help, while, I believe, those living on the streets have their own ways to deal with poverty and they need more structural solutions rather than only individual methods of avoiding economic risks.

Analyzing the form of food service helps to understand to what end the volunteers' needs interpretation works. In Chapter 4, I adapted Amartya Sen's concept of exchange entitlement to reciprocal relations. I argued that reciprocal relations are not non-entitlement relations unlike Sen claims (Sen, 1981), but they require entitlements as well because the power of reciprocity can determine who receives food and who does not. It also influences what kinds of meanings food gains and how one engages with providing and receiving food. I argue that the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant's relationship to its diners is reciprocal and the entitlement that makes it possible is the mutual trust between the concerning parts. Similar to children who cannot receive sweets when they violate rules at home, those who cannot be disciplined in the restaurant or conform to the rules of the restaurant may not be given food. If a diner does not finish his meal it harms trust relationship and food may be denied him next time. The motivation behind food service is not only salving one's conscience (See Chapter 1, Geremek's concept of "economy of salvation") through helping, but also changing the homeless to render them citizens who can exercise their rights through instilling trust and hope and disciplining their behaviors in the restaurant.

It is hard to make an inference about how the homeless describe their own needs because my access to their accounts was limited and the data I collected does not seem enough. I found out that especially the part of fieldwork related to the accounts of homeless people needs more time to build a trust relationship with the diners to receive more reliable data. In this sense, this thesis remains limited in understanding the diners' needs descriptions. This thesis is also limited in understanding the difference between the way current homeless people describe their needs and the ex-homeless people describe their needs.

As Behzat said during our interview, organizations like the *Hayata Sarıl* Restaurant can solve short-run problems such as hunger, clothing, and hygiene. They can also help a limited number of individuals to find their path out of homelessness through employing them and providing training and psychological support. However, where the whole economic and welfare system work to the disadvantage of the homeless and the homeless are not even seen as citizens, individual methods for avoiding economic risks cannot give rise to mass success stories. In this case, without state's intervention it does not seem possible to save homeless people through individual methods. The veterans constantly get in contact with politicians, call them to take an action and undertake their duties by force of social state. Yet, local and central governments seem to expect the NGOs to take the main responsibility. It is crucial for the state to adopt a holistic, continuous, and human rights-based approach to solve homelessness. A minimum step it can take is mobilizing enough resources to the NGOs for them to be able to expand their projects effectively.

REFERENCES

Alptuğ, B. (2014). *Evsizlik olgusu ve evsizlere yönelik sosyal politikalar: Hükümlü evsizlere ilişkin bir araştırma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arnold, K. R. (2004). *Homelessness, citizenship and identity: The uncanniness of the late modernity.* New York: State University Press of New York.

Ashley, B., Hollows, J., Jones, S., & Taylor, B. (2004). *Food and cultural studies.* London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Baron, J. (2006). Property and "no property". *Houston Law Review, 42*(5), 1425-1449.

Beardsworth, A., & Keil, T. (1997). *Sociology on the menu: An invitation to the study of food and society.* London: Routledge.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: towards a new modernity.* London: Sage Publications.

Bekaroğlu-Doğan, Y. (2018). *Küreselleşen İstanbul'da evsizliğin sosyal hizmet perspektifinden analizi (Beyoğlu örneği)* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Bell, D., & Valentine, G. (1997). *Consuming geographies: We are where we eat.* New York: Routledge.

Biltekoff, C. (2013). *Eating right in America: The cultural politics of food & health.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Bines, W. (1997). The health of single homeless people. In R. Burrows, P. N, & D. Quilgars, *Homelessness and social policy* (pp. 132-148). London: Routledge.

Birelma, A. (2014). Türkiye'de evsizlik: Genel bir değerlendirme. In P. Akkuş, & Ö. Aktükün-Başpınar, *Sosyal hizmet ve öteki: Disiplinlerarası yaklaşım* (pp. 291-327). İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.

Boje, T. P., & Leira, A. (2005). Introduction. In T. P. Boje, & A. Leira, *Gender, welfare state and the market: Towards a new division of labour* (pp. xiv-1). London: Routledge.

Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable weight: Feminism, western culture, and the body.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination.* Stanford, CA: Standford University Press.

Bourgois, P., & Schonberg, J. (2009). *Righteous dopefiend.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourgois, P., Holmes, S. M., Sue, K., & Quesada, J. (2017). Structural vulnerability: Operationalizing the concept to address health disparities in clinical care. *Academic Medicine, 92*(3), 299-307.

Briggs, A. (2006). The welfare state in historical perspective. In C. Pierson, & F. G. Castles, *The welfare state* (pp. 16-29). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brown, C. (1981). Mothers, fathers, and children: from private to public patriarchy. In L. Sargent, *Women and revolution: a discussion of the unhappy marriage of marxism and feminism* (pp. 239-268). Montréal: Black Rose Books.

Brownell, S. (2004). Food, hunger, and the state. In J. Watson, & M. Caldwell, *The cultural politics of food and eating: a reader* (pp. 251-258). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Buğra, A. (2008). *Kapitalizm, yoksulluk ve Türkiye'de sosyal politika.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Buğra, A., & Irzık, G. (1999). Human needs, consumption and social policy. *Economics and Philosophy, 15*(2), 187-208.

Buğra, A., & Keyder, Ç. (2003). *New poverty and the changing welfare regime of Turkey.* Ankara: UNDP.

Buğra, A., & Keyder, Ç. (2006). *Sosyal politika yazıları.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Can, K. (2002). Yoksulluk ve milliyetçilik. In N. Erdoğan, *Yoksulluk halleri: Türkiye'de kent yoksulluğunun toplumsal görünümleri* (pp. 175-202). İstanbul: İletişim.

Cantillon, B., & Van Lacker, W. (2013). Three shortcomings of the social investment perspective. *Social Policy and Society, 12*(4), 554-564.

Carr, S. C. (2003). Poverty and psychology: An introduction. In S. C. Carr, & T. S. Sloan, *Poverty and psychology* (pp. 1-18). New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Chamie, J. (2020, January 21). *As cities grow, so do the numbers of homeless*. Retrieved from YaleGlobal Online: https://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/cities-grow-so-do-numbers-homeless

Charles, N., & Kerr, M. (1986). Eating properly, the family and state benefit. *Sociology, 20*(3), 412-429.

Cohen, Y., Krumer-Nevo, M., & Avieli, N. (2017). Bread of shame: Mechanisms of othering in soup kitchens. *Social Problems, 64*(3), 398-413.

Cohn, S. K. (2016). Rich and poor in Western Europe, c. 1375–1475: The political paradox of material well-being. In S. A. Farmer, *Approaches to poverty in Medieval Europe: Complexities, contradictions, transformations, c. 1100–1500* (pp. 145-174). Turnhout: Brepols.

Cones, B. (2013). Ingesting places: Embodied geographies of coffee. In E.-J. Abbots, & A. Lavis, *Why we eat, how we eat: Contemporary encounters between foods and bodies* (pp. 255-270). Surrey: Ashgate.

Counihan, C. M. (1988). Female identity, food, and power in contemporary Florence. *Anthropological Quarterly, 61*(2), 51-62.

Coveney, J. (2006). *Food, morals and meaning: The pleasure and anxiety of eating.* London: Routledge.

Coward, B. E., Feagin, J. R., & Williams, J. A. (1973). The culture of poverty debate: Some additional data. *Social Problems, 21*(5), 621-634.

Culhane, D. P., & Metraux, S. (2008). Rearranging the deck chairs or reallocating the lifeboats? Homelessness assistance and its alternatives. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 74*(1), 111-121.

Çiğdem, A. (2002). Yoksulluk ve dinsellik. In N. Erdoğan, *Yoksulluk halleri: Türkiye'de kent yoksulluğunun toplumsal görünümleri* (pp. 203-248). İstanbul: İletişim.

Davis, A. J. (2016). Hospitals, charity, and the culture of compassion in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In S. A. Farmer, *Approaches to poverty in Medieval Europe: Complexities, contradictions, transformations, c. 1100–1500* (pp. 23-46). Turnhout, Belgium: Bropols.

Davis, M. (1992). *City of quartz: Excavating the future in Los Angeles.* New York: Verso.

Dean, H. (2009). Critiquing capabilities: The distractions of a beguiling concept. *Critical Social Policy, 29*(2), 261-278.

Dickinson, M. (2017). Free to serve? Emergency food and volunteer labor in the urban U.S. *Gastronomica, 17*(2), 16-25.

DİSK-AR. (2019). *İşsizlik ve istihdam Raporu.* İstanbul: Author.

Doyal, L., & Gough, I. (1991). *A theory of human need.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duneier, M. (1999). *Sidewalk.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Dupuis, A., & Thorns, D. C. (1996). Meanings of home for older home owners. *Housing Studies, 11*(4), 485-501.

Dyer, C. (2012). The experience of being poor in late medieval England. In A. M. Scott, *Experiences of poverty in late medieval and early modern England and France* (pp. 19-40). London: Routledge.

Edgar, W., Doherty, J., & Meert, H. (2004). *Third review of statistics on homelessness in Europe. Developing an operational definition of homelessness.* Brussels: FEANTSA. Retrieved from feantsa: https://www.feantsa.org/download/en-16822651433655843804.pdf

Elias, N. (2000). *The civilizing process: Sociogenetic and psychogenetic investigations.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Ellison, M., & Fenger, M. (2013). Introduction: 'New' welfare in practice: Trends, challenges and dilemmas. *Social Policy & Society, 12*(4), 547-552.

Emek ve Adalet Platformu. (2011). *Türkiye'de evsizlere dair rapor.* İstanbul: Author.

Equalities Review. (2007). *Fairness and freedom: The final report of the equalities review.* London: Cabinet Office.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Esping-Andersen, G. (2002). *Why we need a new welfare state.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *Incomplete revolution: Adapting welfare states to women's new roles.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Etzioni, A. (2011). Citizenship in a communitarian perspective. *Ethnicities, 11*(3), 336-349.

Farb, P., & Armelagos, G. (1980). *Consuming passions: The anthropology of eating.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

FEANTSA. (2017). *European typology of homelessness and housing exclusion.* Author.

FEANTSA. (2018). *Third overview of housing exclusion in Europe.* Brussels: Author.

Feher, F., Heller, A., & Markus, G. (1983). *Dictatorship over needs: An analysis of soviet societies.* Oxford: Blackwell University Press.

Fischler, C. (1988). Food, self, and identity. *Social Science Information, 27*(2), 275-292.

Forero, O., Ellis, K., Metcalfe, A., & Brown, R. (2009). Institutional dining rooms: food ideologies and the making of a person. In P. Jackson, *Changing families, changing food* (pp. 226-245). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fox-Piven, F., & Cloward, R. A. (1993). *Regulating the poor: The functions of public welfare.* New York: Vintage Books.

Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly practices: Power, discorse, and gender in contemporary social theory.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fraser, N., & Gordon, L. (1992). Beyond contract-versus-charity, toward participation and provision: On the concept of social citizenship. *CSST: Working Papers*, pp. 1-41.

Geremek, B. (1997). *Poverty: A history.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Glasser, I. (1988). *More than bread: Ethnography of a soup kitchen.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Gough, I. (2004). Human well-being and social structures: Relating the universal and the local. *Global Social Policy, 4*(3), 289-311.

Gowan, T. (2009). New hobos or neo-romantic fantasy? Urban ethnography beyond the neoliberal disconnect. *Qual Sociol, 32*(3), 231-257.

Gowan, T. (2010). *Hobos, hustlers and backsliders: Homeless in San Francisco.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Göçmen, İ. (2014). Religion, politics and social assistance in Turkey: The rise of religiously motivated associations. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 92-103.

Gümüş, G. (2016). *Evsizlik: Yeni bir metropol yoksulluğu deneyimi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Hammersly, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice.* London: Routledge.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hayek, F. A. (1976). *The mirage of social justice.* London: Routledge.

Hemerijck, A. (2018). Social investment as a policy paradigm. *Journal of European Public Policy, 25*(6), 810-827.

Hohfeld, W. N. (1913). Some fundamental legal conceptions as applied in judicial reasoning. *Yale Law Journal, 23*(1), 16-59.

Hook, J. L. (2006). Care in context: Men's unpaid work in 20 countries, 1965-2003. *American Sociological Review, 71*(4), 639-660.

HUD. (2012). *Homeless definition.* Retrieved from Hud Exchange: https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/HomelessDefEligibility%20_SHP_SPC_ESG.pdf

Hunt, A. (1999). *Governing moral: A social history of moral regulation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hwang, S. W. (2000). Homelessness and health. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 229-233.

Işık, O., & Pınarcıoğlu, M. M. (2001). *Nöbetleşe yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli örneği.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Jenson, J. (2009). Redesigning citizenship regimes after neoliberalism: Moving towards social investment. In N. Morel, B. Palier, & P. Joakim, *What future for social investment?* (pp. 27-43). Stockholm: Institute For Future Studies.

Jenson, J., & Saint-Martin, D. (2003). New routes to social cohesion? Citizenship and the social investment state. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology, 28*(1), 77-99.

Johnson, G., & Middendorp, C. (2010). The culture of homelessness. *Housing, Theory and Society, 27*(3), 274-276.

Katz, M. B. (2013). *The undeserving poor: America's enduring confrontation with poverty.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kawash, S. (1998). The homeless body. *Public Culture, 10*(2), 319-339.

Knijn, T., & Smit, A. (2009). Investing, facilitating or individualizing the reconciliation of work and family life: Three paradigms and ambivalent policies. *Social Politics, 16*(4), 484-518.

Küçük, M. (2014). *Kent yoksulluğu ve evsizlik (İstanbul-Zeytinburnu spor kompleksi barınma evi örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Lalonde, M. P. (1992). Deciphering a meal again, or the anthropology of taste. *Social Science Information, 31*(1), 69-86.

Lang, T. (2012). Food industrialisation and food power: Implications for food governance. In P. Williams-Forson, & C. Counihan, *Taking food public: Redefining foodways in a changing world* (pp. 11-22). New York: Routledge.

Lewis, J. (2001). The decline of the male breadwinner model: Implications for work and care. *Social Politics, 8*(2), 152-169.

Lewis, O. (1966). *La vida: A Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty.* San Juan and New York: Random House.

Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: feminist perspectives.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Logue, A. W. (2004). *The psychology of eating and drinking.* New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Lupton, D. (1996). *Food, the body and the self.* London: Sage Publications.

Lyon-Callo, V. (2000). Medicalizing homelessness: The production of self-blame and self-governing within homeless shelters. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 14*(3), 328-345.

Lyon-Callo, V. (2004). *Inequality, poverty, and neoliberal governance: Activist ethnography in the homeless sheltering industry.* New York: University of Toronto Press.

Madanipour, A. (2003). *Public and private spaces of the city* . London: Routledge.

Maddern, P. C. (2012). 'Oppressed by utter poverty': Survival strategies for single mothers and their children in late medieval England. In A. M. Scott, *Experiences of poverty in late medieval and early modern England and France* (pp. 41-62). London: Routledge.

Madigan, R., Munro, M., & Smith, S. J. (2009). Gender and the meaning of the home. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 14*(4), 625-647.

Marin, P. (1987). Helping and hating the homeless: The struggle at the margins of America. *Harpers Magazine*, 39-49.

Marquez, P. C. (1999). *The street is my home: Youth and violence in Caracas.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K. (1974). *Capital* (Vol. 1). London: Penguin Classics.

Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Toward a psychology of being.* New York: Van Nostrand.

Meneviş, B. (2006). *Evsizler.* Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı ve Türk Ulusal Ajansı.

Mintz, S. (1985). *Sweetness and power.* New York: Penguin Group.

Montanari, M. (2006). *Food is culture.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Moreira, V. (2003). Poverty and psychopathology. In S. C. Carr, & T. S. Sloan, *Poverty and psychology: From global perspective to local practice* (pp. 69-86). New York: Springer Science+Business Media .

Morel, N., & Palme, J. (2017). A normative foundations for the social investment approach? In A. Hemerijck, *The uses of social investment* (pp. 150-157). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Morris, L. (1994). *Dangerous classes: The underclass and social citizenship.* London: Routledge.

Nüfus Hizmetleri Kanunu. (2006, 4 25). *7. Madde.* Retrieved from Mevzuat Bilgi Sistemi: http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/Metin.Aspx?MevzuatKod=1.5.5490&MevzuatIliski=0&sourceXmlSearch

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Capabilities and social justice. *International Studies Review, 4*(2), 123-135.

OECD. (2020, March 3). *Homeless population.* Retrieved from OECD Affordable Housing Database: https://www.oecd.org/els/family/HC3-1-Homeless-population.pdf

O'Reilly, K. (2005). *Ethnographic methods.* London: Routledge.

Öncü, A. (2000). Elias ve medeniyetin öyküsü. *Toplum ve Bilim, 84*, 8-17.

Peng, I. (2011). Social investment policies in Canada, Australia, Japan, and South Korea. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy, 5*(1), 41-53.

Perry, S. L. (2012). Urban hybrid space and the homeless. *Ethnography, 4*, 431-451.

Pinteloni, O., Cantillon, B., Van den Bosch, K., & Whelan, T. C. (2013). The social stratification of social risks: The relevance of class for social investment strategies. *Journal of European Social Policy, 23*(1), 52-67.

Plant, R. (2010). *The neoliberal state.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polanyi, K. (2001). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Rawls, J. (1998). Justice as fairness in the liberal polity. In G. Shafir, *The citizenship debates* (pp. 53-72). Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota.

Romano, S. (2018). *Moralizing poverty: The 'undeserving' poor in the public gaze.* New York: Routledge.

Rossi, P. H. (1990). The old homeless and the new homelessness in historical perspective. *American Psychologist, 45*(8), 954-959.

Rossi, P. H. (1991). *Down and out in America: The origins of homelessness.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sayer, A. (2011). *Why things matter to people: Social science, values and ethical life.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scheper-Hughes, N. (1993). *Death without weeping.* California: University of California Press.

Scott, A. M. (2012). *Experiences of poverty in late medieval and early modern England and France.* London: Routledge.

Sen, A. (1981). *Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sen, A. (2000). *Development as freedom.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism.* New York: W. Norton & Company.

Singer, A. (2002). *Constructing Ottoman beneficence.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Snow, D. A., & Anderson, L. (1987). Identity work among the homeless: The verbal construction and avowal of personal identities. *American Journal of Sociology, 92*(6), 1336-1371.

Snow, D. A., & Anderson, L. (1993). *Down on their luck: A study of homeless street people.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sobal, J. (2005). Men, meat, and marriage: Models of masculinity. *Food & Foodways, 13*(1-2), 135-158.

Speak, S. (2019). *The state of homelessness in developing countries.* Nairobi: United Nations.

Türkdoğan, O. (1974). *Yoksulluk kültürü: Gecekonduların toplumsal yapısı.* Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi Basımevi.

The Council of Economic Advisers. (2019). *The state of homelessness in America.* Washington: CEA.

Tocqueville, A. d. (1997). *Memoir on pauperism.* Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.

TURKSTAT. (2006). *Zaman kullanım istatistikleri.* Ankara: Author.

TURKSTAT. (2015, 12 04). *Zaman kullanım araştırması, 2014-2015.* Retrieved from Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu: http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=18627

TURKSTAT. (2020, March 18). *İşgücü istatistikleri*. Retrieved from TÜİK: http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1007

Wacquant, L. (2002). Scrutinizing the street: Poverty, morality, and the pitfalls of urban ethnography. *American Journal of Sociology, 107*(6), 1468-1532.

Waldron, J. (1991). Homelessness and the issue of freedom. *UCLA Law Review, 39*(1), 295-324.

Wallace, M. (1990). *Invisibility blues: From pop to theory* . New York: Verso.

Warde, A., & Martens, L. (2000). *Eating out: Social differentiation, consumption and pleasure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson, S. (1984). Definitions of homelessness: A feminist perspective. *Critical Social Policy, 4*(11), 60-73.

Weber, M. (2005). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* . London: Routledge.

Wright, E. O. (1994). *Interrogating inequality: Essays on class analysis, socialism and marxism.* London: Verso.

Yan, Y. (2012). Of hamburger and social space: Consuming McDonald's in Beijing. In C. Counihan, & V. P. Esterik, *Food and culture* (pp. 449-471). New York: Routledge.

Yenal, Z., & Kubiena, M. (2016). Culinary work at the crossroads in Istanbul. *Gastronomica: The Journal of Critical Food Studies, 16*(1), 63-78.

Yeter, A. (2018). Sivil toplum kuruluşlarının evsizlere yönelik hizmetlerinin değerlendirilmesi: İstanbul örneği. *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8*(17), 34-60.

Yumul, A. (2000). Bitmemiş bir proje olarak beden. *Toplum ve Bilim, 84*, 37-50.