

Neo(liberal) citizens of Europe: politics, scales, and visibilities of environmental citizenship in contemporary Turkey

LEILA M. HARRIS

Corresponding Author: lharris@ires.ubc.ca

University of British Columbia, September 2011

Final version: .*Harris, L. (2011) Neo(liberal) Citizens of Europe: Politics, scales, and visibilities of environmental citizenship in contemporary Turkey. *Citizenship Studies* 15, 6/7: 837-859. DOI: [10.1080/13621025.2011.600095](https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2011.600095)

Citations of this work should use the final version as noted above

Table of Contents

SUMMARY	2
I. Introduction: Partialities and Spatialities of Knowledge	Error! Bookmark not defined.
II. Assessing sustainability, Diverse Knowledges, and Narrative/Discursive Approaches to Environmental Change	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Conditions of Possibility for Assessing Sustainability ..	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Engaging multiple knowledges: attention to the 'local'.	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Environmental Studies	Error! Bookmark not defined.
III Irrigated Agro-Ecologies: Narrations of Change in Southeastern Turkey	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Assessing Sustainabilities: Techno-Scientific Knowledges and Adaptive Capacities	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(In)Appropriate Knowledge, Farmer Training, and Irrigation Mishaps	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Peasant Scientists: Finite Possibilities and Partial Mobilizations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
IV Divergences and Convergences: Learning from Different Natures ...	Error! Bookmark not defined.
V. Conclusion: Environmental Calcabilities/ Assessing Sustainabilities	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Acknowledgements:	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Bibliography	Error! Bookmark not defined.



SUMMARY

The aim of this article is to critically interrogate articulations of environmental citizenship in contemporary Turkey. Specifically, I analyse articulations of environmental citizenship through citizen and activist narratives taken from interviews and focus group discussions. I argue that first, scalar focus on local spaces and individuated responsibility for action that emerge from the narratives are crucial to understand future environmental politics and possibilities in this context. Invoking recent discussions related to the politics and performativities of scale, in particular, allows consideration of the politics of visibility and other consequences of these scalar foci. Second, themes from narrative analysis show key convergences with Europeanization- and neoliberalization-related discourses and shifts. The resonance and overlap between these discourses and practices is significant, particularly as it shows citizen receptivity towards broader ideas related to increased citizen responsibility. As such, the research contributes to efforts to move away from theorization of processes such as neoliberalism as top-down, instead enabling examination of ways that these ideals are taken up, expressed, and refashioned by everyday citizens. The third argument that emerges from the analysis, following from the first two, is the need to theorize power more fully in discussions of environmental citizenship. Bridging with neoliberalism discussions is one possible way to move such a project forward.

Keywords: subjectivity, neoliberal, citizenship, scale, environmental citizenship

I. INTRODUCTION: POLITICAL ECONOMIC CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZENSHIP IN AN ERA OF EUROPEANIZATION/ NEOLIBERALIZATION

Turkey is currently undergoing a suite of important political economic changes, from privatization of industries and efforts to promote growth and investment consistent with neoliberalization processes,¹ to civil society development, administrative restructuring, and other reforms promoted as part of European Union accession (Bac, 2005; Kubicek, 2005). Scholars have highlighted the importance of these ongoing changes for democratization possibilities (e.g. Keyman and Onis, 2007) and for changing civil society and citizenship practices (e.g. Kubicek, 2005). As others have shown, neoliberalization and EU accession have together created new possibilities for changing environmental politics in Turkey, including a proliferation of ENGOs,² and enhanced ability to forge transnational activist networks (see several contributions in Adaman and Arsel, 2005). Even with rapid growth of environmental civil society in Turkey, several have noted that nonetheless, environmental issues have been slow to capture the political imagination in this context (Adem, 2005). Consider for instance that cross-national comparisons suggest that while people in Turkey have a relatively high degree of interest in environmental issues (Adaman and Arsel, 2005), they have relatively low degrees of participation in environmental activism—with only 1.9% of citizens participating in environmental organizations in Turkey, compared with 23.8% in the Netherlands, 8% in Nigeria, or 4.3% in Latvia (2004 data, cited in Adem, 2005).³

This paper seeks to unravel some of the complexities of environmental citizenship in this dynamic context. I ask: How do everyday citizens, and environmental activists, narrate environmental issues and responsibilities at this important juncture? What are key themes that emerge from various articulations? What significance might these have for environmental politics and possibilities, and for changing citizenship practices, particularly given the broader context of neoliberalization and Europeanization?

While a focus on environmental citizenship provides only one lens through which to evaluate broader shifts and changing citizenship practices, there are several reasons why this focus may be particularly fruitful. First, the European Union has invested millions of Euros to enhance Turkish civil society over the past several years, with environmental civil society and environmental non-governmental organizations as

¹ The term neoliberalism commonly operates as shorthand for the ideologies, networks and institutions that further implementation of market-oriented politics. This often includes dismantling of state institutions, marketization and commodification of goods and services, or devolution of governance (see Peck and Tickell, 2002 for an overview).

² Environmental non-governmental organizations.

³ For overview on issues and challenges related to civil society in Turkey, including data related to relatively low levels of formal participation in civil society organizations generally, see Bikmen and Meydanoglu's (2006) Civil Society Index Report for Turkey. They cite the figure that less than 6,000 per every 100,000 citizens in Turkey are registered in formal associations or civil society organizations.

specific targets for priority investment (STGM, 2008).⁴ EU funds have been used to finance partnerships between Turkish and European NGOs, to enable capacity building and training, and to encourage networking among civil society organizations (*ibid*, Göksel and Güneş, 2005; Diez and Agnantopoulos 2005). Second, in environmental and sustainability realms, attention has increasingly focused on individual behaviors, attitudes, and citizenship practices—as reflected in emergent environmental and environmental citizenship literatures, discussed below. Third, there have been some suggestions made related to possible links between environmental citizenship and democratization more generally (see Adaman and Arsel, 2005 for discussion specific to Turkey), or to enhance theories of citizenship. As Gabrielson (2008) argues, work on environmental citizenship has made several key contributions to citizenship studies including a focus on scalar issues,⁵ although more work is needed. Building on all of these insights, a focus on environmental citizenship in contemporary Turkey has potential to improve understandings of a range of issues, from democratization and theories of citizenship, to discussions of civil society and environmental politics, or enhanced appreciation of outcomes associated with neoliberalization or Europeanization shifts.

To proceed, I first offer a discussion of methods and approach, as well as a brief overview of several relevant literatures. In section III, I investigate citizen narratives related to environmental politics and activism. Analyzed in greater detail in section IV, I argue that the shared focus on the *local* and on *individual responsibility* across the narratives is particularly significant. Specifically, contemporary narratives appear to naturalize local and individuated scales as sites of appropriate action, potentially conditioning environmental politics and possibilities in key ways. As I detail in the analysis and conclusion, attention to the resonance between these narrative threads and neoliberalization and Europeanization related discourses and practices is also potentially significant. At a minimum, these narrative threads suggest that citizen articulations share elements of broader calls associated with these processes, potentially reinforcing those shifts. Although more difficult to substantiate, there is also the possibility that convergences across these narratives are suggestive of the ways that neoliberalism or similar processes ‘travel’, and become naturalized, and indigenized in various contexts (McNeill, 2005), as well as ways that individual identities and subjectivities respond to and constitute these processes (Larner, 2000). Taken together, the analysis provided suggests that we must necessarily situate environmental narratives and citizenship practices in relation to broader processes and political economic contexts. Further, the work here substantiates other scholarship by arguing for the need to theorize power more fully, and attend to key ambiguities, with respect to practices and expressions of environmental citizenship in the contemporary moment.

⁴ Izci (2005) estimates that over 23M Euros have been granted for environmental capacity building in Turkey as part of the accession process.

⁵ Scale debates have been central to political ecology studies (see Paulson and Gezon, 2005, Neumann, 2009), as well as debates in geography more generally (e.g. Delaney and Leitner, 1997). Most notably, scholarship on this issue has focused on ways that certain geographic scales are defined and invoked (e.g. local, national, regional, global) as well as ways that scales are deployed for particular ends (e.g. invoking the idea of ‘global environmental issues,’ Taylor and Buttel, 1992, or similar discussion in McCarthy, 2005a). Gabrielson argues that scalar issues constitute a central contribution of environmental citizenship debates to theories of citizenship generally.

II. INTERROGATING ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZENSHIP: CONTEXT, METHODS, AND SCOPE

Understanding Emergent Environmentalisms in Contemporary Turkey

Even with growing interest in environmental issues in the global South, there are relatively few examples of works that analyze environmental attitudes from lesser-developed contexts (Gardner, 1995, Haynes, 2009 for overviews). Among available works, many employ broad-scale quantitative methods, for example cross-national comparisons of environmental attitudes or surveys (e.g. Ignatow, 2006 for cross-national analysis, or Tuncer and Ertepinar, 2005, Gökşen et al, 2002 for examples of surveys conducted in Turkey). Outcomes of this scholarship have suggested that citizens in Turkey demonstrate a high degree of environmental concern generally, but that concern for local issues is significantly higher than for global or more distant, abstract issues (e.g. global warming, See Gökşen et al, 2002). The edited collection on environmentalism in Turkey by Adaman and Arsel (2005) represents another significant contribution to a range of questions relevant for this study, exploring tensions between environmental politics and economic development, the role of transnational activism in contemporary environmental politics, or the impact of the European Union on environmental policy and administrative restructuring. Even as the collection deals centrally with issues of environmental civil society and politics,⁶ citizen understandings and expressions of these issues are nonetheless absent. This article fills these gaps through analysis of citizen narratives to better understand current expressions of *environmental citizenship*—understood as how citizens understand environmental issues, as well as express state-society roles and responsibilities in dealing with environmental challenges.

This study adds a qualitative evaluation of environmental meanings and narratives,⁷ drawing from interviews and focus groups conducted in Turkey's largest cities of Ankara

⁶ With respect to recent environmental policy in Turkey, there has been some attention to the policies of the ruling AK party, but this also remains an important topic for consideration. Among those who have considered this issue, Duru (2006) suggests that under AK party rule, there have been significant policy changes in line with the European Union accession process, and a fair degree of ecological discourse among party representatives during the election phase, but there has been less focus on policy implementation. Further, he suggests that many policies of the current government would be best characterized as market-oriented, for instance, with examples of the government opening forests or coastal areas to private investment.

⁷ My exploration of environmental citizenship here relies on narrative analysis to explore ideas of responsibility for environmental care as well as notions of what environmental issues and solutions might be. This examination thus offers only a partial lens on how people may understand themselves, and others, as 'environmental subjects/citizens.' A broader theoretical discussion about the links between narrative and subjectivity is beyond the scope of this paper. However, Bickerstaff, Simmons, et al. (2008), Szerszynski (2005), and Linnros (2001) provide examples of studies that use focus groups to query environmental narratives, perceptions, and values, while Yeh (2007) and Secor (2004) provide examples of works that engage narrative analysis to consider issues of identity, subjectivity, and citizenship.

and Istanbul, as well as in and around Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa in Turkey's southeast.⁸ The use of focus groups is particularly helpful to better understand interest in these questions among everyday citizen subjects. As others have noted, focus groups can shed light on the analysis of contemporary discourses and politics, as narratives emerge in a social context through conversation with others.⁹ The examination offered seeks to decipher themes and narrative threads across the transcripts to better understand the connotations, meanings, and valences that 'environment', 'environmental responsibility', and 'environmentalism' hold in these contexts. Research of this type is crucial to more fully understand environmental citizenship possibilities; as it is only through qualitative analyses that we might gain a richer appreciation of why citizens may or may not engage in environmental activism, or how and why certain policies may or may not find support among the citizenry.

While the study sites and research design allow for consideration of many important questions,¹⁰ including examination of important axes of difference (e.g. urban-rural divides) or the salience of the Kurdish question (Diyarbakır is an important site among Kurdish areas of Turkey), a more careful examination of socio-spatial difference in relation to contemporary environmental questions is the focus of another paper (Author, in process). Here the primary aim is to illumine shared narrative threads from across the study sites and to put these in conversation with theoretical discussions of environmental citizenship/ environmentality and ongoing political economic shifts.

Environmentality, Ecological Citizenship, Subjectivities and Power

Arun Agrawal's *Environmentality* (2005) is often credited with bringing enhanced

⁸ The analysis draws on interviews with activists and non-governmental organizations in all locations (carried out in 2005 and 2007), and also from nine focus groups conducted in three different cities of Turkey (Istanbul, and Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa in the southeast). Focus groups in Istanbul were conducted through the Sosyal Araştırma Merkezi (SAM), and research assistants moderated those conducted elsewhere. Interviews and focus groups were held in urban areas, with the exception of two focus groups and several interviews that were conducted in rural areas around Şanlıurfa. Participants in Istanbul were drawn from the SAM database of over 10,000 people living and working in Istanbul. One focus group was held with women, and two with men (all participants were aged 20-40 years). Participants in the southeast region were drawn primarily from NGOs and informal social networks (with a slightly broader age distribution, ages 18-60 years).

⁹ In Istanbul, the focus group participants were strangers; while for the focus groups in the southeast participants were more likely to know each other. This is because the groups in the southeast were organized through NGOs operating in these cities, as well as through social networks (see footnote 7). The focus groups in Diyarbakır were organized through a women's group that works on economic opportunities, through an NGO focused on new migrants who moved to the city (largely from rural mountainous areas in the southeast, primarily as a direct result of the Kurdish conflict and associated violence in the region), and the third included environmental NGO participants. The focus groups in Urfa were organized through a network of employees at a restaurant, with a group of men in a coffee shop, and through neighborhood networks in rural villages.

¹⁰ The inclusion of sites in the southeast is important because this region is relatively understudied, because it is a region of intense interest for the European Union, and also given the region's low indicators of civil society activism and development. The Kurdish context in the southeast and other key geographic differences are also important. For instance, many more participants in the southeast tied environmental inaction to the context of war, illiteracy, and other problems of underdevelopment.

attention to the question of how subjects come to associate with, and feel a sense of responsibility for the environment. In his study, he attributes such a shift to changing modes of forest governance, and argues that Indian villagers developed an increasing ethic of environmental care as responsibility for forest management was devolved to communities (see also Haggerty, 2007 for a similar example). Related literatures on ‘ecological’ or ‘environmental citizenship’ are similarly interested in the conditions, motivations, or processes that produce environmental citizens. This literature is often more prescriptive, exploring educational or policy efforts that might engender notions of citizenship that are thought to be more consistent with sustainability challenges (see Dobson, 2003, or Dobson and Bell, 2006 for an overview).

While certainly distinct,¹¹ I consider questions of environmental citizenship and subjectivity together in that they both are linked to the research goal of understanding how citizens in contemporary Turkey narrate environmental challenges and solutions, and how they discuss their own role and responsibility with respect to these issues. Even with their very different lineages, these approaches also share several key similarities. Among them, both approaches share a weakness with respect to understanding power dynamics,¹² and there remains an imperative for both subfields to be more attentive to broad-scale political economic changes that necessarily refashion state-society interactions, identity, citizen responsibility, and notions of the self. Even as Agrawal argues that to “ignore changes in environmental subjectivities is to miss an entire domain of politics and practice implicated in the making of environmental subjects” (2005, p 23), there still appears to be considerable room to bring issues of power and questions of subjecthood more centrally to these discussions. As Rutherford (2007) notes, while governmentality and nature studies have focused on questions of resource calculability, or on power dynamics related to discourses of environmental degradation and regulation (e.g. Yeh, 2005; Goldman, 2001), “considerably less work has been done on the ways in which governmentality works to produce normalized subjectivities” (Rutherford, 2007, p 298).

One notable case study example that engages more fully with issues of power and political economic context in relation to environmental subjectivities is Robbins’ book, *Lawn People* (2007). Drawing on Althusser’s concept of interpellation, Robbins asks how, and why, suburbanites in the United States come to *care* about their lawn. A key insight from Robbins is the need to attend to the historical, economic, cultural, social and even ecological contexts in which people come to recognize themselves as particular types of ‘environmental subjects.’ In his case, capitalist imperatives of the lawn industry bring questions of power and political economy to the fore. Further, the paradox he introduces—whereby those who best understand the negative effects of lawn chemicals are those who are most likely to use the treatments—also invites attention to key ambivalences and tensions that might be caught up in various

¹¹ Environmental citizenship connotes more responsibilities and rights vis-à-vis the environment, including attention to state-society relations, while subjectivity connotes more questions of identity and sense of self in relation to the environment.

¹² Others have waged this critique (e.g. Robbins, 2006). Arguably, Agrawal’s formulation leaves room for such issues, but this has not been a focus of work on environmental subjectivity to date. As such, a disconnect exists between this emergent literature and other works on green governmentalities.

expressions of environmental subjectivity.¹³ Following up on these threads is critical to move beyond assumptions that environmental citizenship is desirable socially or ecologically; or that instilling individuals with a greater sense of environmental responsibility will serve ‘sustainability’ aims (see expressions of this type in Dobson 2003, Agrawal 2005, Haggerty 2007). I return to these issues following on the case study analysis from Turkey to argue that these themes—political economic context, power dynamics, and key tensions—remain crucial, and must be examined more centrally with respect to environmental citizenship and subjectivity.

III. CITIZEN AND ACTIVIST NARRATIVES: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPERATIVES AND SUBJECTIVITIES

Focus groups with citizens (non-activists) across three sites in Turkey (Istanbul, Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa)¹⁴ reveal several themes significant for how ‘environmental citizenship’ is understood and narrated in this context. Respondents were asked to discuss important environmental challenges facing Turkey, or the city where they live, and how these might be overcome. Among other key themes that emerge, narratives emphasize (1) *The need for citizen subjects in Turkey to change*, and to take on environmental issues more fully, even as barriers to doing so were frequently recognized and discussed, (2) *Local scale issues and challenges* (with predominance of environmental imaginaries focused on very local/neighborhood spaces, and on socio-cultural attributes), (3) linked to this, there was also considerable emphasis on *aesthetic issues* related to the environment, with an associated privileging of notions of *visibility*, *cleanliness*, and *domesticity* as central to environmental issues and solutions. Connected to all of the above, (4) respondents repeatedly insist on the need to instill a greater sense of *self-care*, and *individuated responsibility* among contemporary citizen subjects, at once de-emphasizing other actors or scales of intervention. I substantiate these interlinked narrative threads before analyzing their potential significance in sections IV and V.

Local-scale issues and socio-cultural attributes

Among environmental issues that were noted, respondents raised concerns related to

¹³ This can also be read as consistent with Ignatow’s (2006) argument that we need to attend more to the multidimensionality of environmental concerns (e.g. based on spiritual, ecological, or other models, rather than assuming that there is one environmentalism with consistent social and educational bases).

¹⁴ Focus group transcripts were iteratively read and coded for themes to create discursive tables that summarized the most important story lines (cf. Linnros, 2001). Focus group analysis typically does not include ‘counting’ or quantitative assessment of narratives, but rather relies on the analyst to characterize frequency and extensiveness of focus on particular issues (Barbour and Kitzinger, 1999). However, I do provide some indicators to substantiate claims with respect to the relative emphasis on certain themes (Table 1).

shipping in the Bosphorus, industrial accidents (with comparisons made with Chernobyl), the use of pesticides in agriculture, and issues of noise and air pollution—of increasing concern in many of Turkey’s urban areas. These issues are not at all surprising to someone familiar with the news of the region over the past few decades. In fact, many of these issues relate directly to Turkey’s geography and recent history: proximity to Chernobyl; location of Turkey’s largest city along the highly trafficked straits of the Bosphorus; and several decades of pronounced rural to urban migration that has resulted in considerable infrastructural challenges for Turkey’s burgeoning cities.

While one would expect that these types of issues would merit mention, what is surprising from the transcripts on the whole is *the lack of emphasis* on these types of issues. Each of these concerns was noted only once or twice. Analyzing narrative threads that emerge from the entire set of transcripts, what is striking is the considerable emphasis placed on *local* environmental issues in contrast to the relatively little attention paid to transnational or broad scale challenges.¹⁵ Indeed, *very local*—and arguably inconsequential—actions such as spitting on the ground or throwing garbage on the street were discussed much more often than Turkey’s energy challenges, soil erosion, or industrial pollution. Table 1 provides a summary of the relative mention of several of these issues, with illustrative examples. While trash throwing was mentioned approximately 40 times (linked to ‘pollution,’ which also received considerable mention), transnational issues were mentioned only on several occasions. Spitting was also a recurring theme, receiving nearly a dozen mentions.

¹⁵ Once overarching themes were isolated upon initial reading of the transcripts, transcripts were re-read to identify all relevant exchanges and quotes related to these themes (local scale v. transnational, citizen responsibility v. state role, etc). Re-reading the transcripts, I also sought to identify any counter-examples related to my arguments.

Table 1. Summary of relative mention of different issues among focus groups.

	Number of mentions	Example	Notes of interest
Throwing trash (including sunflower/ fruit seeds)	~40	'When you throw trash, think of how it looks, think about the germs it spreads, (it does) damage in all respects.' (05FC4, 10) 'In Europe, people warn others who throw trash in the street. We don't do that. Here, in Turkey...one can throw a coke can from the window of his car ...' (05FC7, 8)	Several times this issue was also linked to municipal responsibilities, such as the need to provide trash bins so that people will not throw trash in the street.
Spitting on streets	~10	'In Diyarbakır, spitting on the streets is a serious problem, I am not happy to say this, but it is indeed a problem. People do this because they don't think it would affect them in the long run, they are simply unaware of its effects.' (05FC1, 8)	Often spitting was mentioned in the context of other undesirable behaviours (e.g. trash throwing, not caring for the neighbourhood, lack of education, etc.)
Pollution (including sea, air, noise)	~20	'(There are) Factories polluting the sea, beautiful areas... Factories dump their waste into the sea. The sea is part of the environment (isn't it?) It is polluted. Trash ... one by one, (it) also pollutes the environment.' (05FC4, 13)	Pollution was often linked to trash throwing (e.g. trash in sea was also referred to as 'pollution'). For this reason, a number of the mentions were not as clear as the example provided here that links pollution directly to industry.
Climate change	0		No mention was made during citizen focus groups, though this issue did come up in interviews and in discussions with activists. Ozone depletion was mentioned once.
Transnational issues	~2 to 3	'(There is an issue with) Russian chemical waste tankers that pass through the (Bosphorus) straits. We make money, but our sea is being polluted ... Our people are lacking awareness (we) throw bottles, trash bags into the sea when a ship passes it leaks chemicals.' (05FC8, 10)	There were several examples where people specifically mentioned ocean dumping, or industrial pollution by European entities, but these mentions were few, and often were not picked up by other respondents as part of focus group discussions.

Even during the focus group conducted with environmental activists in the city of Diyarbakır, the list of environmental issues discussed was consistent with the general emphasis on local-scale challenges evidenced in the citizen discussions. Issues noted by environmental activists and ENGO leaders in Diyarbakır include: garbage; traffic problems; pollution in the Tigris river; lack of green space; people not having a sense of ownership for the environment; air pollution; lack of education in the region; and the harsh living conditions in the city—including histories of violence, village burnings, and resultant difficulties associated with the huge influx of people who moved to the city from surrounding areas (05 FC1). While some broad scale environmental issues are mentioned (e.g. pollution in the Tigris, histories of regional conflict, or infrastructural challenges with migration), by and large, the emphasis is on very local concerns, such as the throwing of trash or the lack of green space. Also, there was considerable weight given to the idea that individual citizens lack the education or the sense of responsibility that is needed to care for the environment, an issue I pick up below.

To provide an additional example of the relative emphasis on local scale issues and challenges, in one Istanbul focus group (05FC9) respondents raised the following environmental concerns: problems at a local gas station; a nearby stream that smells bad; trash being thrown; watermelon seeds being spit from balconies; crooked (corrupt)

urbanization; concretization (*betonlaştırma*, the paving over of things); squatter settlements; and the lack of green space for gardens. Later in that discussion people debated whether these were issues that stem from lack of education, or from culture, adding complaints of neighbors who shake out carpets and throw trash in the street. They also contrasted these behaviors to what they believed to occur in spaces to Turkey's west, suggesting that in Europe throwing trash or spitting is forbidden and highly regulated. Despite mentioning several broader scale issues (sea pollution and garbage dumping in the ocean, chemical wastes, or lack of trash bins provided by the municipality), overall the citizen discussions focused primarily on issues that residents experience in everyday spaces and senses, and much of the back and forth of the discussions focused on explaining why these issues/behaviors might exist—often highlighting socio-cultural attributes among residents.

To provide a few illustrative quotes that emphasize socio-cultural attributes of the citizenry: “Çevre kültür çok zayıf”: “the environmental culture is very weak,” “From a moral perspective, everyone throws trash, there is a big social problem” (05FC1). Or, after a detailed discussion among activists related to the range of environmental issues in Diyarbakır, one participant noted: “people do not actively participate in civil rights organizations, in fact, very few people do that... Secondly, people are not yet aware of environmental issues, there isn't even education at the school level” (05FC1). Or as an Istanbul resident noted, “we do not understand the language of nature” (05FC7). I revisit the issues of focus on the local and on socio-cultural attributes in the sections that follow arguing that both are of considerable interest given consistencies with neoliberalization and Europeanization shifts and discourses. Before moving on, it is also noteworthy that a survey of over 1500 residents in Istanbul conducted by Gökşen et al (2002) validates elements of the results presented here, as it showed much higher concern for local issues than global issues across the sample (using examples such as sea pollution and global warming as proxies for local and global issues, respectively).

Visibility, cleanliness, and aesthetics of environmental care

Other themes that stand out among the narratives include emphasis on the aesthetic qualities of what makes a suitable environment, as well as repeated invocation of ideas of cleanliness and linked notions of domesticity. These threads are very tightly coupled to the emphasis on the local, as many issues that were noted are things that are readily apparent, and visible, in the everyday spaces in which people work and live (in contrast with far-off, or invisible issues, as with many types of pollution). As part of the aesthetic emphasis notions of ‘green’ and ‘cleanliness’ were frequently mentioned.¹⁶ For example, at the conclusion of one focus group, we asked, “Of all the things we discussed, what is

¹⁶ Perhaps not surprisingly, narratives also directly connected cleanliness and green space to Islam. For instance: “Islam is cleanliness”, or “planting a tree is emphasized in our religion. [When you plant a tree] you get prayers of those who enjoy its shade and fruits. Despite that we don't give much importance to the environment” (05FC9, 19). Another said, “We learned cleanliness at school... cleanliness comes from faith, it is good to be clean always” (05FC6, 30). Others suggested links with all religions, “A man of religion doesn't pollute, he is educated. Christian, Muslim [it doesn't matter], cleanliness is at the heart of all religions” (05FC6, 50).

the most important?” One participant responded, “green”, another echoed this response, “*yeşillik*” (green). “Cleanliness” followed, again with another immediate echo, “*temizlik*” (cleanliness). The moderator continued, “Of everything we discussed, are these the most important?” “Yes.”

There were many other responses that demonstrate a strong emphasis on the visible, as well as particular aesthetics of what constitutes a clean environment. Consider: “we need to keep our houses clean, and the outside clean, we should not throw trash outside” (05FC7, 5). Another quote, from a female resident of Diyarbakır links themes of green, cleanliness, personal responsibility, and the local as key issues of environmental importance:

(When we say environment, it) makes one think of green. (It) makes one think of cleanliness. Then you need to take care of yourself, keep yourself clean. But unfortunately, in Diyarbakır people are not very clean. We litter, we throw sunflower seeds around. We never care about our environment. If I don’t care, if you don’t care about it, who will? It’s us that live here... Me and my family are very clean people, you would see if you came to see my home (05FC2, 16).

These sorts of responses highlight the immediate surroundings that one experiences and observes in day-to-day senses, individual responsibilities to maintain clean environments, as well as senses that there is something lacking in the culture of the people that makes environmental care more difficult. With emphasis on local spaces, and cleanliness, it is also possible to imagine that things that are not visible are unlikely to be considered as important.

As hinted at by the above statement, ideals of cleanliness also have clear links with gendered notions of the domestic including imperatives to keep oneself, one’s family, one’s house, and one’s neighborhood clean. “The environment is important. The neighborhood. If neighbors are clean, the environment is clean. If people are clean, then families are clean...” (05FC4, 11). Another commented, “If you have an orderly environment, you have a tidy family. It is necessary not to spit, or throw trash” (05FC7, 8). Still others said, “[The environment] should be proper, neat” (05, FC4, 10). Or “is important to be clean oneself, then you can be mindful of trees” (05FC6, 51). Making the gendered notions more explicit one female Diyarbakır resident noted:

I think it is women who want nature and the environment clean the most. Because men spit on the street ... Really! They walk down the street and spit. They are dirty. Cleanliness is (needed) all around. One needs to be careful about everything and keep clean from the home outward... (05FC2, 20)

In all such examples we see clear subtexts related to personal and familial hygiene, cleanliness, and gendered norms and expectations related to domesticity. I am not able to provide extensive detail on this theme, but such responses make clear connections between being responsible for one’s hygiene, house, and by extension, a clean environment—extending responsibility for the self and the home outward. In addition to

the above quote, also consider: “I mean if someone does not want to make a mess of their house, then he/she should not dirty the street either. [People should have priorities that include] my street, my neighborhood, my city, my country, I mean it is necessary to be able to continue like that” (05 FC 1).

The focus on visibility and aesthetics was also expressed in terms of the equation of environmental issues with beautification campaigns. “When we say nature, the first thing that comes to mind is the beauties of nature” (05FC6, 18). Others said, “(We need) to give more importance to cleanliness of the town. Cleaning should be important. Green and trees should be important” (05FC6, 43). Or similarly, “[If it were up to me] I would fix the road, plant trees, beautify. Trash wouldn’t be thrown, I would beautify the school, make parks” (05FC4, 15).

While these types of issues are likely to be important on many environmental registers, I find the interlinked emphases on cleanliness, the domestic, on visibility, and the aesthetics of clean environments to be significant, particularly given the ways that these themes articulate together with, and amplify, emphases on the local and on individual responsibility (e.g. self-care and care of the family or home). My argument is, in brief, that with concern focused on the immediate, the everyday, the aesthetic, and the visible, it is possible that other less visible, broader scale issues such as pollution of waterways, or climate change, may remain comparatively unexamined (again, see Table 1, cf. Maniates, 2001). As one said in response to a question of how her daily activities affect the environment “*Nasıl etkili? Nasıl etkili?* (how could it influence? Repeats twice) [My activities] do not influence the environment at all. If you can’t see it, how can it influence it?... If it is not related with dust, dirt, cleanliness, how can it have an influence?” (05FC4, 22). Given these types of articulations, environmental citizens appear to be understood by many as those who maintain cleanliness, respect for neighbors, and who exercise responsibility in terms of their communities and surrounds. Environmental citizenship does *not appear to be* expressed to the same degree in terms of corporate, institutional, or state responsibility, or transnational activism to address broad-scale challenges.

Transformation, self-care and individuated responsibility: “Cevrimizi temiz tutalım!”

The slogan found on bus stops or signs in Istanbul or Ankara “Let’s keep our environment clean!” is familiar to expressions of environmentalism from across contexts. Embedded in this is the idea that we all have responsibility to conserve the environment—everyone as individuals must do their part. Themes of self-care and individuated responsibility were also noted repeatedly in focus groups and interviews, and paired with the other narrative threads already mentioned offer revealing elements for the analysis elaborated further in the next section.

As one environmental activist explained,

The most important problem in Diyarbakır is that there is little in the way of

organized civil movements. People don't really participate in civil society (non-governmental) organizations...the second thing is (that) people don't feel a sense of ownership (or stewardship) for the environment... For instance, in Diyarbakir there is a big problem with people spitting on the ground ... this is a problem. When people do this they don't think about the implications, so without noticing they do this... (05 FC 1).

Another respondent discussed connections between poverty and degradation (responding to someone else who had made such a connection), "those who are poor don't control themselves, they are like bandits." Others similarly emphasized the role of citizens, and individuals, in dealing with environmental issues. "It is a citizen's duty to be connected to each other" (05FC6, 17). As another discussed, state changes would be insufficient, "individuals are the key: what matters is that, as individuals, we do not throw our cigarettes on the streets, we do not spit on the streets" (05FC7, 11). Similar themes were noted with the statement, "whether or not I fulfill my duties as a citizen is very important. The individual needs to fulfill one's responsibility" (05FC7, 13). Still another discussed the need to pass new laws, "however we cannot improve these issues through outside pressures. The important thing is the establishment of environmental awareness in the society and individuals...no matter how many laws [there are], we can't solve these issues if awareness is not formed. The state cannot put a man by every tree [to protect it]" (05, FC8, 4). Mirroring such ideas, another said "it is not good to expect to the state to protect the environment. What can the state do?" (05FC6, 42). While individual capacity and interest in environmental issues is of clear importance, narratives of this type express self-care and individuated responsibility as *paramount* considerations. Anyone familiar with the frequent popular and media discourses related to insufficient state responses in Turkey might expect these sorts of statements, given that the state is often cast as inefficient, inadequate, or even plagued by corruption. Even as these narratives might be expected, or merited given histories of state response, these sorts of articulations are nevertheless important to the degree that they emphasize abilities and responsibilities of individual citizen subjects to take on monitoring and other dimensions of environmental care. As the state cannot reasonably protect every tree, the imperative then is for the transformation of citizens, as individuals and as a collective to be 'more environmental.' In brief, embedded in these narratives were frequent calls to foster enhanced environmental citizenship in Turkey, very much in line with the expressions of environmental citizenship found in the environmentality and ecological citizenship literatures discussed above.

In highlighting this issue, I do not mean to suggest that there were not also explicit calls for increased regulations. Indeed, such calls were also made repeatedly during discussions.¹⁷ However, even with some calls for enhanced state regulation,

¹⁷ Some mention the need for more fines or the need to deal with unemployment as a first step to be able to appropriately tackle environmental challenges. For instance: "What is lacking in Turkey is a strong regulation (by the state). Fines, fees, police as they exist in Europe are needed" (05FC7, 5). I deal more directly with this issue in an article that considers constructions of Turkishness and Europeaness in relation to visions of environmentalism, as lack of regulation in Turkey was often juxtaposed against notions of strong regulations in Western Europe.

considerable focus was given throughout the discussions to the need to transform individuals and to overcome socio-cultural attributes. These emphases reinforce the focus on local scale issues as among the key concerns, and as such they have the potential to accentuate tendencies to de-emphasize state responsibility, regulations, institutions, or even transnational environmental activism or responsibility.

Before moving on to a fuller discussion of the potential significance of these narrative threads in the next section, it is important to mention several caveats. Specifically, there are some contextual and linguistic issues that make the appearance of these themes in the citizen narratives more likely, or understandable. As noted in footnote 16, the Islamic context might help to understand a focus on cleanliness (e.g. given ritual purification for prayer, for instance, cf. Ignatow, 2005). As respondents may not be formally educated, and may not read newspapers,¹⁸ and given weaknesses of the Turkish education system generally, it also perhaps makes sense that respondents would emphasize very local and everyday issues with which they are more familiar, rather than broader scale issues and challenges. Focus groups are also thought to elicit discussion of issues with which respondents are most familiar, further contributing to a possible focus on local examples (Goss, 1996), and perhaps augmenting a tendency noted by Towers (2000) whereby broader scale issues such as nuclearism or global warming are likely to be less evident, and less easy to articulate for many. Language further helps make sense of the narrative threads as discussed. *Çevre* is a common term for ‘environment’ (and was used often in interviews and focus groups). It translates literally as “surrounds,” including both social and natural surrounds, and is likely to bring to mind ideas of neighborhood or the home environment.

All of these issues may help to explain relative emphases highlighted across the focus groups, including a seeming conflation the local, the domestic, or the neighborhood with notions of environmentalism. As one participant noted in response to a picture, “When we say environment, it is society anyway. Environment means culture, cleanliness” (05FC6, 17). Even with these caveats in mind, I argue that the shared elements among narratives are nonetheless significant for understanding how environmental citizenship and subjectivity in contemporary Turkey are expressed, with important consequences. Indeed, the contextual and linguistic factors might suggest the degree to which these associations with environmentalism may be particularly entrenched—suggesting that these associations need to be taken seriously given their importance for environmental possibilities and futures in this context.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION: POLITICS/VISIBILITIES/PERFORMATIVITIES OF SCALE

In the previous section, I identified several interlinked narrative threads that stood out during the analysis of focus group transcripts from three different sites in contemporary Turkey. Many of these issues may be read as unsurprising, or even welcome, to those

¹⁸ The state statistical agency estimates literacy rates to be 87% overall, 80% for females, and 94% for males (based on the 2000 census).

familiar with Turkey or with recent discussions in environmental studies that call for the need to transform consumer behaviors, citizen attitudes, and so forth. It may come across as encouraging that residents in these varied locales recognize the need for self-transformation, the need to take on greater responsibility for environmental well-being, or the need to begin with one's own community to make progress towards more sustainable futures (as with the expression 'Think Global, Act Local'). Indeed, there are many possible ways to read and interpret these case study data given debates that have been ongoing with sustainability concepts and movements, or with respect to emergent environmentalisms in developing contexts. Returning to the themes identified in the introductory sections, however, I would like to provide one possible reading of these data that is informed by a focus on issues suggested as fruitful ways forward for engagements with environmental citizenship concepts and approaches: the need to attend to 1) political economic context (as with shifts ongoing with respect to neoliberalization and Europeanization processes), 2) potential power dynamics that operate through, and are revealed by, environmental politics and narratives, and 3) tensions and ambiguities revealed by these processes and intersections. Specifically, I ask: what are the potential consequences of these narratives threads, particularly given intersections, power dynamics, and ambiguities in relation to political economic context and discourses associated with neoliberalization and Europeanization? By paying attention to some of these contextual issues, power dynamics, and ambiguities, it is also possible to think more carefully about the production of normalized subjectivities, and also to move beyond simple valorization of 'environmental subjectivity' as it is often cast in the literature. This reading draws insights from geographic debates related to the politics and performativities of scale, as well as recent discussions of neoliberalism, neoliberal subjectivities, and neoliberal environments to consider these questions.

Politics and performativities of scale: sedimentation of the local/individual

Work by Kaiser and Nikiforova (2008) demonstrates the usefulness of engaging performativity—reiterative and citational practices that give the appearance of fixity or stability—to examine discourses and practices through which scales are sedimented, or made to appear as fixed or inviolable.¹⁹ With this analytic, it is possible to interpret the

¹⁹ This approach suggests that everyday practices, and narratives, may serve to sediment particular scalar notions, giving them the appearance of naturalness—even if they are never fixed or given. As Kaiser and Nikiforova explain (page 543), "The performativity of scale focuses attention not on the production of scales and scalar hierarchies as end products of social construction, but on 'the reiterative and citational practices by which discourse produces the effect' of scale. Instead of treating scales as things in the world that (inter)act ... performativity approaches (seek to understand) scale

repeated invocation of local and individuated environmental issues and responsibilities (accentuated by emphasis on the visible/domestic/aesthetic issues) as enabling key politics and performativities of scale with respect to environmental politics, and citizenship practices more generally. In this way, we can understand the possibility that narratives serve in part to enact, and sediment, particular scales with respect to appropriate environmental politics and practice (e.g. individuated, or domestic/neighborhood/local). For instance, throughout the narratives, it is commonly suggested that environmental problems (and solutions) occur most centrally at local scales, and also that dealing with environmental problems rests with the need to transform/alter, reinvent the individual, one's sense of political citizenship, or community interaction. This is reinforced by repeated invocations of the visible, the domestic, and aesthetic issues, all of which privilege and emphasize everyday, local, and neighborhood issues.

As scalar approaches frequently emphasize (e.g. McCarthy, 2005a, Delaney and Leitner, 1997), there are clear politics and consequences associated with scalar invocations and negotiations. For instance, with emphasis on the local and on the visible, broader scale issues (e.g. corruption at the national environmental ministry), or transnational or global scale issues (marine pollution, or climate change) may be relatively de-emphasized, if not entirely absent. To substantiate this possibility, it is notable that issues such as climate change or corruption concerns at the environment ministry (an issue that has been in the news over the past decade) were never mentioned in the focus group discussions (though these issues did come up in activist interviews). In brief, focusing on local trash concerns or lack of education among citizens has the potential to mask broader scale issues and challenges—whether issues related to pollution, corporate responsibility, regulatory imperatives of the state, or transnational environmental connections. Just as others have analysed the turn to the 'global' in environmental politics (Taylor and Buttel, 1992; Jasanoff and Martello, 2004), here I am highlighting the possible achievement, and potential effects, of scalar focus on the 'local' and the 'individual' in relation to environmental citizenship in this context. Among other possible consequences of these scalar sedimentations, given that many in Turkey face problems with unemployment, or poverty, it is easy to imagine that the focus on individual citizen capacity might have a disabling effect. If one is dealing with unemployment, illiteracy, or other challenges, how could one possibly take on environmental issues as well?²⁰ Even as I am invoking different languages and concepts (i.e. the politics and performativities of scale), the argument I am making here parallels other arguments that have been made, such as those related to the environmental breast cancer movement (EBCM) in the United States. Analysts have suggested that with the science of epidemiology, science and movements focused on breast cancer shifted attention to individual attributes (diet, genetic predisposition), and away from the

as a naturalized way of seeing the world, and explore the enacted discourses that over time work to produce 'scale effects'."

²⁰ Indeed, 'hierarchy of needs' sorts of connections were made often, although I do not detail them here (see analysis in Gökşen et al, 2002).

possibility that cancers could be linked to pollution and other broad environmental concerns (Zavestoski et al, 2004). In a discussion of environmental politics in the United States more generally, Maniates (2001) also similarly emphasizes the consequences of individualization of responsibility for the environment. He suggests that such individualization narrows, in dangerous ways, our environmental imagination and undermines our capacity to effectively respond to environmental threats. While there is a range of issues noted that merit attention, evidence related to the importance of the local scale in this case study is suggestive of the need to consider such possibilities more fully. This reading also lends support to suggestions made by McCarthy (2005a), or Szerszynski (2005)²¹ related to the importance of evaluating scalar politics and possibilities in relation to environmental politics and activism.

Neoliberalism, neoliberal environments, and citizen subjectivities

Growing attention to themes of neoliberalism, neoliberal citizenship, and neoliberal environmental governance among geographers, anthropologists, and others also provides a basis for a reading that reveals yet other possible power dynamics and ambiguities that may be at play with respect to articulations of environmental citizenship in the contemporary moment. Analysts have drawn attention to the ways that neoliberalization may condition new citizen subjectivities (e.g. Mitchell, 2004, Ong 2006) and the ways that individuals may respond to professionalization or linked discourses (Bondi and Laurie 2005, Katz, 2005). Researchers have also expressed interest in improving our understanding of how neoliberalism ‘travels’, and becomes naturalized and indigenized in various contexts (McNeill, 2005) as well of the ways that individual identities and subjectivities respond to and constitute neoliberalization processes (Larner, 2000). With respect to environment specifically, there has also been growing attention to the intersection of the broader political economic processes, logics, and discourses linked to neoliberalism and market environmentalism, and the social, political, and ecological consequences of such (see Heynen et al, 2007 for an overview).

Regarding themes identified through the case study from Turkey, interest in questions highlighted by these literatures offer other suggestive and intriguing possibilities for analysis. In particular, with invocation of local scales of action, together with individuated responsibility for environmental care as key themes, we see a possible convergence in terms of how everyday citizens in Turkey narrate key imperatives with respect to the environment and those broader processes and discourses associated with Europeanization or neoliberalization. With respect to EU accession, and linked infusion of funds to promote enhanced civil society capacity in Turkey, citizens too appear to express the need for transformation of citizen subjects to take on more responsibility for environmental care. Here there are clear echoes of ideals implicit in

²¹ Szerszynski (2005) considers the ways that different social groups might be able to understand environmental questions ‘across scales’ in ways that will enable the type of enlarged thinking demanded by environmental citizenship, while McCarthy (2005a) argues for more work on this theme generally.

EU support for environmental civil society development, as these discourses share an emphasis on the need to shift responsibility to citizens, and away from the strong state tradition that has dominated Turkish politics to date (see discussion in Bikmen and Meydanoglu, 2006).

With respect to neoliberalization, processes are ongoing in Turkey (and elsewhere) that endeavor to shift responsibilities from state institutions to citizens, to shift governance to localized scales concurrent with devolution, and also to highlight individual responsibility and enhanced sense of self-care among citizens.²² Neoliberal processes that are unfolding in Turkey that affect environmental governance include the privatisation of service provision, as well as the devolution of governance responsibility to local users. Just to provide one example of ways that neoliberalization of environmental governance in Turkey invokes ideals of enhanced local capacity, individual responsibility, and the need for a more engaged citizenry to manage resources, consider this quote from a planner involved with devolution of irrigation management from the state hydraulic works agency (DSI, Devlet Su İşleri) to users in southeastern Turkey (see also Author, 2005).

Our social programs are primarily created to realize a vision of a *participatory democratic individual, a modern individual*...Irrigation unions are one of the grassroots community organizations, so in that sense they *contribute to participatory society because they represent farmers...they are only a starting point*' (emphasis added, interview by author, 2005).

Here we see an emphasis on the idea that individuals need to participate more fully in environmental management, and in so doing; society will become more democratic (paralleling claims in the environmental citizenship literature with respect to theoretical connections between these concerns). There is also a clear resonance with neoliberalization agendas whereby the transfer of responsibility to farmers also serves the goals of reducing state functions and the associated financial burden. While I am not suggesting causality between narrative threads from the focus groups and neoliberalization and Europeanization processes, I am suggesting the possible importance of the *convergence* of these narratives in ways that appear to echo, amplify, and lend support to each other.

With this possibility in mind, repeated invocation of local scale issues, or of individual responsibility, can be read as offering justification and lending support for elements of broader discourses and trends that are underway with respect to neoliberalization and Europeanization (i.e. devolution, enhanced civil society capacity, individuated

²² See the discussion in Rankin (2001), Bacchi and Eveline (2003), and Phillips and Ilcan (2004), on ways that individuation is central to neoliberal agendas. Larner (2000), and Maniates (2001) offer some discussion that parallels my arguments here. Larner is interested in how New Zealander subjectivities become aligned with individual assumptions that underpin neoliberalism, while Maniates is interested in ways that individuation of environmentalist discourses limits political possibilities. With respect to these themes in Turkey, Bikmen and Meydanoglu (2006) offer a discussion of devolution in the Turkish context and other transformations underway that affect civil society and state-society relations.



responsibility, etc.). To the extent that citizen subjects narrate storylines that share elements of these broader discourses, we need to consider the potential consequences and possible power dynamics at play. To take this a bit further, we need to consider the possibility that by echoing EU interest in enhancing environmental civil society in Turkey or neoliberal discourses regarding the necessary devolution of environmental governance, citizen subjects may be reinforcing and entrenching these imperatives and associated power dynamics therein.²³ Further, to the extent that these divergent narratives together underwrite an idealized citizen subject that defines viable citizenship in particular ways—with emphasize individual responsibility—this is also a crucial convergence whose significance should not be overlooked. While answers to these questions may have to remain speculative, it is nonetheless necessary to pose these questions: What are the politics and possibilities that are implicitly authorized by these iterative citations and coalescence across these narratives and practices? What are the consequences when citizens themselves entrench and sediment power-laden shifts that are already ongoing with neoliberalization and Europeanization of citizenship practices generally, and environmental citizenship more specifically?

Just to sketch out several possible dimensions of response to questions of this type, it is possible that to the degree that respondents emphasize and echo the idea that individual capacities for environmental care need to be enhanced and extended, this may suggest that environmental problems are likely to be the fault of individuals, or as resulting from something lacking in ‘the culture’ of Turkey (indeed such expressions were common across narratives that emphasized socio-cultural obstacles, e.g. “people need to change, they need to think and behave differently” (05FC7). In framing and locating environmental issues as problems among the citizenry, to the extent that environmental challenges are not appropriately dealt with, it is implied that this is because the individual citizen-subject in Turkey has not yet taken charge of his or her own future, has been unable/unwilling to take ownership of the environment, or has been unwilling to engage in protest.

To be clear, I am not claiming that the focus on the individual or the local is necessarily new in the Turkish context, nor am I suggesting that these narratives necessarily arise *as a result* of broader neoliberalization and Europeanization trends. What I am suggesting is that the consistency and shared resonance across these narratives and discourses is potentially significant. The possibility that these narratives operate in concert, and potentially reinforce each other, may be particularly crucial in the contemporary moment when neoliberalization is already shifting governance of resources from state to individual responsibility and from centralized to local scale governance, or when Europeanization is similarly attempting to entrench heightened citizen responsibility for environmental care and management. Even without causal linkages, shared resonance across these narratives nonetheless helps to establish the possibilities for the ‘success’ of neoliberalism in certain contexts (cf. Larner, 2000), including the interest in how neoliberal ideals and practices become indigenized in

²³ Here I am referring to power dynamics with respect to Turkey-EU relations, or those at play with neoliberalization, including the role of International Financial Institutions and loan conditionalities, uneven trade relationships, and so forth (see Peck and Tickell, 2002 for an overview of neoliberalism to consider some of these issues).

various spaces and times (McNeill, 2005, recall the discussion with respect to Turkish linguistic and contextual issues that may further reinforce these logics).

V. CONCLUSION: POWER AND AMBIVALENCES OF NEO(LIBERAL) ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZENSHIP

While works on environmental citizenship and environmental subjectivity have raised interesting avenues for research, the tendency to valorize environmental citizenship and to downplay power dynamics has limited the value of this work to date. Learning from themes highlighted in Robbins (2007), and recent discussions related to the politics and performativities of scale, as well as neoliberal citizenship and natures, I have engaged a reading of environmental subjectivity and citizenship in contemporary Turkey that is open to the importance of political-economic and socio-cultural context, power dynamics, and key ambivalences. Rather than thinking about how to invest citizens with a greater sense of environmental responsibility, here I have asked how it is that citizen subjects are articulated vis-à-vis environmental problems and solutions, and with what potential consequences. In particular, given the confluence of citizen narratives and broader neoliberalization and Europeanization trends, what do these articulations authorize, or sediment, in terms of state-society relations, citizenship practices, or scalar politics? I have already highlighted several issues with respect to how these joint articulations might enable—and circumscribe—understandings, citizenship practices, and responses in the environmental realm.

Linking back to the theoretical issues in the introduction, the empirical discussion from Turkey substantiates the need to more fully consider political economic context and power relations in discussions of environmental citizenship and subjectivity. In this case, it is necessary to read citizen environmental narratives in relation to broader discussions underway with respect to neoliberalization and Europeanization to appreciate some of the tensions and power dimensions inherent in these expressions. With respect to environmental studies debates more broadly, the case study has illuminated that consideration of everyday understandings of environmental issues is key to evaluate conditions of possibility for environmental politics in certain contexts. Here, the results suggest that certain scales and visibilities associated with environmentalism make certain approaches and understandings more or less likely. It is likely that these expressions in the environmental realm may carry over to other civil society and citizenship dimensions as well.

With respect to the broader theoretical interest in power dimensions, the case study results reinforce the suggestion that there is a continuing need to better connect work on environmental citizenship with theories of power, including governmentality studies. Among Foucault's other contributions, his work exposes an interest in thinking through what conditions enable 'the conduct of conduct'—those power-laden moments when people take on the project of limiting their actions upon themselves. As Foucault writes,

It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings

of the word subject. Subject to someone else by control and dependence and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to (in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983, p. 212).

Even as Robbins (2007) considers certain power dimensions of environmental subjectivity, an interest in self-recognition, individuation, and subjection has remained little explored in works on environmental subjectivity to date (see Wainwright, 2008). In the Turkish example, power relations are key both in the sense of broader political economy (e.g. Turkey-EU relations), as well as in relation to questions of subjection in terms of self-recognition, representation, and ways that individuals insert themselves in the terms of ongoing debates. Here, citizens appear to reinforce calls for increased citizen responsibility for environmental care (rather than overtly challenging ongoing shifts from state to citizen responsibility, for instance). In terms of other issues related to the production of normalized subjectivities, respondents mention that people need to control themselves more to ward off the impulse to be “bandits,” or “outlaws.” As one respondent stated,

Self-control is something that develops within the social structure, it is a matter of consciousness...we should control ourselves, just like they do (in developed countries). The more developed a person's consciousness is, the person can control himself by thinking... (05FC8, 5).

With the invocation of words such as “otokontrol”, literally ‘self-control’ these sorts of narratives are very clearly reminiscent of Foucault's discussion of self-regulation.²⁴

Highlighting these connections, the analysis here also provides a point of entry in terms of how we might productively extend Robbins's use of Althusserian interpellation. Robbins's use of this concept enables consideration of the lawn as a socio-natural complex that interpellates (or calls into being) suburbanites as ‘lawn people’ (Wainwright, 2008). However, the flip side also deserves our attention. What conditions enable the *readiness* for the call? What makes individuals responsive to certain calls, and not others?²⁵ Otherwise stated, what enables individuals to respond to particular modes or moments of interpellation?

To consider these questions, I find the inclusion of citizen narratives to be of great interest methodologically. Through analysis of citizen narratives, we can see that citizens clearly invoke and sediment the idea that *they, themselves*, should be better environmental citizens. Whether or not these narratives find expression among the

²⁴ In the Turkish context, one can trace clear links between similar discourses of self-control, and the need to forge new types of citizen subjectivities in relation to Kemalist policies and discourses related to the ‘modern’ and ‘enlightened’ Turkish subject, if not before (Kadioğlu, 1998).

²⁵ This is consistent with Guthman's (2008) suggestion that in order to understand why people become ‘Lawn people’ who use chemical treatments, we might also consider how or why people also respond to alternative approaches to lawn care.



population as a result of discourses about the need for greater citizen capacity and involvement that circulate among EU planners, in the news, and through negotiations with the International Monetary Fund, the resonance between these narratives is nonetheless crucial. With invocation of these narratives among citizens, it is possible that we are observing a certain readiness for the call—to take on greater responsibility for environmental care, and perhaps even for broadened senses of individuated responsibility or self-care consistent with neoliberalization (see Phillips and Ilcan, 2004). If instead citizen narratives more readily invoked the need for state responsibility, or even the need for Europeans to consume less to reduce threats in the Turkish context, I would think that resistance to ongoing shifts associated with Europeanization or neoliberalization might be likely. However, the evidence offered appears to indicate otherwise.

In this vein, the analysis also contributes to neoliberal citizenship debates, enabling consideration of how certain neoliberal ideals are taken up, reproduced or refashioned in certain times and places (Peck and Tickell, 2002). Here we see examples of ways that elements of neoliberalization are reproduced and negotiated through diverse citizen narratives. As I have emphasized, in this case it is *critical* that citizen subjects, themselves, invoke discourses related to the need to mould new environmental subjectivities in ways that appear to naturalize neoliberalization processes (echoing expressions and ideals that circulate among international financial institutions, or in the halls of Brussels). Some have argued that it is at moments when there appears to be ‘no outside’ of neoliberal prescriptions that it might be most crucial to counter hegemonic practices and to articulate alternatives (Larner, 2003). Given this, when individuals are increasingly called on to perform a host of functions, and when notions of individuated subjectivity underwrite a series of linked shifts (from reduced state capacity, to private property regimes), there is perhaps a heightened imperative to resist tendencies to select out individual and local scales as privileged sites for appropriate politics and action. This also suggests that for the environmentality, and environmental/ecological citizenship literatures, there is a clear need to rethink assumptions related to the individual/local as appropriate sites of environmental politics and activism.²⁶

Finally, by way of conclusion, I offer a few further notes on ambivalences with respect to emergent environmental citizen subjectivities at the edges of Europe. First, with respect to the politics of scale, there is somewhat of an irony here. One might expect that recognition of transnational trends, or possibilities for transnational environmental activism might be easier with EU accession negotiations. However, the examples provided show that environmental subjectivities and civil society capacities are often articulated in ways that may make broader or transnational scale processes less visible. Additionally, there is a potential scalar mismatch or ambiguity in that several ENGOS are emphasizing transnational issues and networking connections (e.g. TURMEPA, and Greenpeace), while citizen environmental imaginaries appear to stress local issues.

²⁶ It is implicit, and explicit, in most discussions of this type that individuals can, and should, take on more responsibility for environmental issues (e.g. Bell, 2005). Given the focus on ‘good citizenship’ in neoliberal discourses as associated with voluntary governance of the self (cf. Katz, 2005), here I am calling for a need to be more self-reflexive about the underlying assumptions and imperatives of these literatures.

Understanding the discordances between these environmental imaginaries may help to illumine key challenges, for instance, to consider environmental attitudes to decipher discrepancies between concern and action (as called for by Adaman, 1997), or to identify scalar mismatches that might help to explain difficulties that the Turkish environmental movement has faced in terms of broadening participation or capturing the political imagination of the citizenry (see Adem, 2005)

In this case study example, there appear to be still other tensions in terms of the ways that viable citizenship is currently being expressed (paralleling tensions and contradictions that others have noted often accompany neoliberalization shifts, e.g. Katz, 2005). At once, with neoliberalization, citizens are increasingly asked to rely less on state services to meet their own needs, and to take on responsibility for resource governance to realize efficiencies. With EU investments in civil society capacity, viable political subjectivity is also expressed as one where citizens should actively engage in defining agendas and building networks. In some senses, these ideals related to environmental citizenship appear to be at odds. The case of citizen resistance in the Aegean town of Bergama helps to make these ambivalences apparent. Here citizens successfully protested proposed cyanide mining by the European company *Eurogold*. In certain respects, activism of the type witnessed at Bergama appears to be fully consistent with EU interests in forging an active citizenry capable of defining agendas and resisting state practices. However, this example also shows that other goals, particularly those related to European capital investment, or the opening of markets associated with neoliberalization, are potentially at odds with resistance movements of this type.

However, it is also possible that such ambivalences may not be as stark as they appear at first blush. As McCarthy (2005b), Power (2005) and others note, invocations of civil society at times are put forward as needing to provide that which markets lack. If civil society is able to focus attention to social-political inequalities, environmental degradation, and sustainability of resource use, then such mechanisms need not be internalized within the market, or within the realm of governmental regulations. Thus civil society and citizen subjects are being asked to take on increased functions of environmental, economic, and socio-political governance—for themselves, and for society more generally.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adaman F, 1997 "The Political Economy of Environment in Turkey" *New Perspectives on Turkey* 17: 129-150.
- Adaman F, Arsel M, 2005 *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between democracy and development?* (Aldershot, Ashgate)
- Adem C, 2005, "Non-state actors and environmentalism", in *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between democracy and development?* Eds. F Adaman, M Arsel (Aldershot, Ashgate) pp 67-84
- Agrawal A, 2005 *Environmentality: Technologies of government and the making of subjects* (Duke University Press, Durham)
- Author 2005
- Bac M M, 2005, "Turkey's Political Reforms and the Impact of the European Union" *South European Society and Politics* 10(1) 17 – 31
- Bacchi C, Eveline J, 2003, "Mainstreaming and Neoliberalism: A Contested Relationship" *Policy and Society: Journal of Public, Foreign and Global Policy* 22(2)
- Barbour, R. S. and J. Kitzinger 1999. *Developing Focus Group Research*. (SAGE Publications, London)
- Bell D, 2005, "Liberal Environmental Citizenship" *Environmental Politics* 14 (2) 179 – 194
- Bickerstaff K, P Simmons, et al. 2008 "Constructing Responsibilities for risk: negotiating citizen-state relationships" *Environment and Planning A* 40: 1312 - 1330.
- Bikmen and Meydanoglu 2006. Civil Society in Turkey: an era of transition (CIVICUS Civil Society Index Country Report for Turkey). Istanbul, TUSEV: 174. Accessible online at www.step.org.tr (last accessed December 3, 2009).
- Bondi L, Laurie N, (eds). 2005. *Working the Spaces of Neoliberalism: Activism, Professionalisation and Incorporation* (Blackwell)
- Delaney, D. and Leitner, H. 1997. The Political Construction of Scale. *Political Geography* 16(2), 93 - 97.
- Diez T, Agnantopoulos A, et al., 2005, "Turkey, Europeanization, and Civil society: introduction" *South European Society and Politics* 10(1): 1 - 15
- Dobson A, Bell D, 2006 *Environmental Citizenship* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA)
- Dobson A, 2003 *Citizenship and the Environment*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK)
- Dreyfus H, Rabinow P, 1983 *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL)
- Duru, Bülent, 2006 "Modern Muhafazakarlık ve Liberal Politikalar Arasında Doğal Varlıklar: AKP'nin Çevre Politikalarına Bir Bakış" ("Natural Assets in between Modern Conservatism and Liberal Policies: A view on AKP's Environmental Policies"), *Mülkiye*, 252: 297-313
- Gabrielson, T. 2008 "Green Citizenship: a review and critique." *Citizenship Studies* 12(4): 429 - 446.

- Gardner, S. S. 1995. "Major themes in the study of grassroots environmentalism in developing countries." *Journal of third world studies* XII(2): 200 – 245.
- Göksel D N, Guneş R B, 2005, "The role of NGOs in the European integration process: the Turkish experience" *South European Society and Politics* 10(1) 57 – 72
- Gökşen, F., F. Adaman, E. Zenginobuz 2002. On Environmental Concern, Willingness of Pay, and Postmaterialist Values: Evidence from Istanbul. *Environment and Behavior* 34: –460 - 477
- Goldman M, 2001, "Constructing an Environmental State: eco-governmentality and other transnational practices of a 'green' World Bank" *Social Problems* 48(4) 499 - 523
- Goss, J. D., 1996, "Introduction to focus groups." *Area* 28(2) 113-114
- Guthman J, 2008, "Review of Robbins, Lawn People: how grasses, weeds, and chemicals make us who we are" *Professional geographer* 60(3)
- Haggerty J H, 2007, "I'm not a greenie but..." Environmentality, eco-populism and governance in New Zealand: Experiences from the Southland Whitebait fishery" *Journal of Rural Studies* 23 222 - 237
- Haynes, J. 2009. "Power, politics, and environmental movements in the third world." *Environmental Politics* 8(1): 222 - 242.
- Heynen N, McCarthy J, Prudham S, Robbins P, eds 2007 *Neoliberal Environments: False Promises and Unnatural Consequences* (Routledge, New York)
- Ignatow, G. 2006. "Cultural Models of Nature and Society: reconsidering environmental attitudes and concern." *Environment and Behavior* 38: 441.
- Ignatow, G. 2005. "From Science to Multiculturalism: Postmodern Trends in Environmental Organizations" *Global Environmental Politics* 5 (2): 88 – 113.
- Izci R, 2005, "The impact of the European Union on environmental policy" in *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between democracy and development?* Eds F Adaman, M Arsel (Aldershot, Ashgate) pp 87-100
- Jasanoff S, Martello M L, Eds. 2004 *Earthly Politics: local and global environmental governance* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA)
- Kadioglu, A. 1998 "Citizenship and individuation in Turkey: the triumph of will over reason." *Cahiers d'etudes sur la Mediterranee* 26: 23 - 43.
- Kaiser R, and E. Nikiforova 2008, "The performativity of scale: the social construction of scale effects in Narva, Estonia" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26(3) 537 – 562
- Katz C, 2005, "Partners in crime? Neoliberalism and the production of new political subjectivities" *Antipode* 37(3) 623-631
- Keyman E F, Onis Z, 2007, "Globalization and Social Democracy in the European Periphery: Paradoxes of the Turkish experience" *Globalizations* 4(2) 211 - 228
- Kubicek P, 2005, "The European Union and Grassroots Democracy in Turkey" *Turkish Studies* 6(3) 361 - 377
- Larner W, 2000 "Neo-liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality." *Studies in Political Economy* 63

- Larner W, 2003 "Neoliberalism?" *Environment and Planning D Society and Space* (21) 509- 512
- Linnros H, 2001 "The discursive nature of environmental conflicts: the case of the Oresund link" *Area* 33(4): 391-403.
- Maniates, M. 2001. "Individualization: plant a tree, buy a bike, save the world?" *Global Environmental Politics?* 1(3): 31 - 52.
- McCarthy, J. 2005a. "Scale, Sovereignty, and Strategy in Environmental Governance" *Antipode* 731-753.
- McCarthy, J. 2005b. "Devolution in the woods: community forestry as hybrid neoliberalism." *Environment and Planning A* 37: 995 - 1014.
- McNeill D, 2005, "Narrating neoliberalism" *Geographical Research* 43(1) 113-115
- Mitchell K, 2004 *Crossing the Neoliberal Line: Pacific Rim Migration and the Metropolis*, (Temple University Press, Philadelphia)
- Neumann, R. 2009. Political Ecology: Theorizing Scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(3): 398 - 406.
- Ong, A. 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Paulson, S. and Gezon, L. 2005. *Political Ecology across spaces, scales and social groups*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Peck J, Tickell A, 2002, "Neoliberalizing Space" *Antipode* 34(3) 380 -404
- Phillips L, Ilcan S, 2004, "Capacity-building: The neoliberal governance of development" *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 25(3) 393-409
- Power, M. 2005, "Working the spaces of neoliberalism" *Antipode* 37(3) 606-612
- Rankin K N, 2001, "Governing development: neoliberalism, microcredit, and rational economic woman" *Economy and Society* 30(1) 18-37
- Robbins P, 2006, "Review: Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the making of subjects" *Geographical Review* 96(4) 715R
- Robbins P, 2007 *Lawn People: How Grasses, Weeds, and Chemicals Make Us Who We Are* (Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA)
- Rutherford S, 2007, "Green governmentality: insights and opportunities in the study of nature's rule" *Progress in Human Geography* 31 291
- Secor A, 2004, "There is an Istanbul that belongs to me": Citizenship, space, and identity in the city" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94(2) 352-368
- STGM website. Civil Society Development Center (Sivil Toplum Gelisterme Merkezi) Last accessed August 18, 2008 www.stgm.org.tr
- Szerszynski, B 2005 Local Landscapes and Global Belonging: toward a situated citizenship of the environment. In Dobson, A. and D. Bell (2006). *Environmental Citizenship*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press
- Taylor P, Buttel F, 1992 "How do we know we have global environmental problems? science

and the globalization of environmental discourse” *Geoforum* 23(3) 405 –416

Towers G, 2000, “Applying the political geography of scale: grassroots strategies and environmental justice” *The Professional Geographer* 52 (1) 23-36.

Tuncer, G., H. Ertepinar, et al. 2005 “Environmental attitudes of young people in Turkey: effects of school type and gender.” *Environmental Education Research* 11(2): 215- 233.

Wainwright J, 2008, “The nature of interpellation: Review of P. Robbins *Lawn People*” *Association of American Geographers annual meeting* (Boston, MA)

Yeh E T, 2005, “Green governmentality and pastoralism in Western China: 'Converting pastures to grasslands'” *Nomadic Peoples* 9(1 & 2) 9 – 30

Yeh E T, 2007, “Tropes of Indolence and the Cultural Politics of development in Lhasa, Tibet” *Annals of Association of American geographers* 97(3) 593 - 612

Zavetoski S, McCormick S, Brown P, 2004, “Gender, embodiment, and disease: environmental breast cancer activists’ challenges to science, the biomedical model, and policy” *Science as Culture* 13 4