



DIE ERDE

Journal of the
Geographical Society
of Berlin

Justice as relationality: socio-ecological justice in the context of anti-hydropower movements in Turkey

Özge Yaka

Centre for Citizenship, Social Pluralism, and Religious Diversity, Universität Potsdam, Campus Griebnitzsee, August-Bebel-Str. 89, House 7, Room 3.28,
14482 Potsdam, Germany, oezge.yaka@uni-potsdam.de, ozgeyaka@gmail.com

Manuscript submitted: 30 November 2019 / Accepted for publication: 25 June 2020 / Published online: 31 August 2020

Abstract

By introducing a notion of socio-ecological justice, this article aims to deepen the relationship between environment and justice, which has already been firmly established by environmental justice movements and scholarship. Based on extensive fieldwork on local community struggles against small-scale run-of-river hydropower plants in Turkey, it expands the justice frame of environmental justice scholarship by going beyond the established conceptions of environmental justice as distribution – of environmental hazards and benefits, recognition and representation. Drawing on ethnographical fieldwork conducted in the East Black Sea region of Turkey, the article introduces the notion of socio-ecological justice to translate the relationality of the social and the ecological, of human life and non-human world, to the vocabulary of justice. It aims to extend the strictly humanist borders of social justice by maintaining that our intrinsic and intimate relations with the non-human world are an essential part of our well-being, and central to our needs to pursue a fair, decent life. It also seeks to contribute to the broader debate to facilitate a ‘progressive composition’ of a common, more-than-human world.

Zusammenfassung

Durch die Einführung des Begriffs der sozio-ökologischen Gerechtigkeit will dieser Artikel die Beziehung zwischen Umwelt und Gerechtigkeit vertiefen, die von der Bewegung sowie seitens der Wissenschaft für die ‚Umweltgerechtigkeit‘ bereits fest etabliert wurde. Auf der Grundlage umfangreicher Feldforschungen zu den Kämpfen lokaler Gemeinschaften gegen kleine Laufwasserkraftwerke in der Türkei erweitert er den Gerechtigkeitsrahmen der Umweltgerechtigkeitsforschung, indem er über die etablierten Vorstellungen von Umweltgerechtigkeit als Verteilung – von Umweltgefahren und -nutzen, Anerkennung und Repräsentation – hinausgeht. Ausgehend von ethnographischen Feldforschungen, die in der Ost-Schwarzmeer-Region der Türkei durchgeführt wurden, führt der Artikel den Begriff der sozio-ökologischen Gerechtigkeit ein, um die Relationalität des Sozialen und des Ökologischen, des menschlichen Lebens und der nicht-menschlichen Welt in das Vokabular der Gerechtigkeit zu übersetzen. Er zielt darauf ab, die streng humanistischen Grenzen der sozialen Gerechtigkeit zu erweitern, indem er behauptet, dass unsere intrinsischen und intimen Beziehungen mit der nichtmenschlichen Welt ein wesentlicher Bestandteil unseres Wohlergehens und von zentraler Bedeutung für unsere Bedürfnisse nach einem fairen, menschenwürdigen Leben sind. Er versucht auch, einen Beitrag zur breiteren Debatte zu leisten, um eine ‚progressive Zusammensetzung‘ einer gemeinsamen, mehr als menschlichen Welt zu erleichtern.

Keywords socio-ecological justice, environmental justice, water struggles, hydropower, Turkey

Özge Yaka 2020: Justice as relationality: socio-ecological justice in the context of anti-hydropower movements in Turkey.
– DIE ERDE 151 (2-3): 167-180



DOI:10.12854/erde-2020-481

1. Introduction

Environmental justice, both as a movement and as a conceptual framework, has been transformative of the perception of the environment in the last few decades. Initially associated with the anti-toxic waste struggles of black communities in the US in the early 80s, the environmental justice frame has expanded to include a broad range of grassroots environmental struggles in many different parts of the world (Walker 2009; Schlosberg 2013; Martinez-Alier et al. 2016). The movements of local communities – rural, native, indigenous, black, minority and peasant communities all over the globe – against the immediate environmental threats that put their health and livelihoods at risk has altered the framing of the environment drastically. ‘Environment’ came to denote the immediate environment, “where we live, work and play” (Novotny 2000), instead of ‘somewhere out there’ to be conserved.

The environmental justice movement has fundamentally challenged the post-materialist framing of environmentalism as a luxury issue (Inglehart 1990; Martinez-Alier 1995). Instead, the environment has been re-framed as a vital cause for the working classes, the poor and the radicalized and marginalized communities that have been directly subjected to environmental hazards. In this sense, the main contribution of environmental justice has been to reveal the central role of race, class and gender in determining the quality of the environment we live in. Another important thing it accomplished, as a social movement and as a body of scholarship, was to connect the issues of environment and justice.

This article aims to deepen the conceptual relation between environment and justice, which has already been firmly established in the environmental justice movement and scholarship. It builds its conceptual contribution on the following research question: adopting an action-theoretical perspective of justice, how can we translate the justice claims of the struggles around environmental commons, anti-hydropower struggles in this case, into conceptual vocabulary of (environmental) justice? In doing so, the article expands the justice framework that environmental justice scholarship employs to study various environmental justice struggles around the world.

Based on extensive fieldwork on local community struggles against small-scale, run-of-river hydropow-

er plants in the Mediterranean, East-Southeast Anatolia and the East Black Sea regions of Turkey, the article initially identifies regional differences in terms of the main motivations and narratives of the anti-hydropower struggle and the justice claims that the anti-hydropower struggle produces. Building on this discussion, the article makes its conceptual contribution drawing on the empirical case of the East Black Sea region, where the struggle against hydropower plants is at its strongest. Drawing on ethnographical data collected in the East Black Sea region, it develops the notion of *socio-ecological justice*, as a conceptual attempt to translate the relationality between river waters, and the non-human environment in general, and human life into the vocabulary of (environmental) justice. Socio-ecological justice should be understood not as an alternative but as complementary to the notions of justice as (re)distribution, recognition and representation (procedural justice).

2. Expanding the borders of justice: what do environmental justice struggles tell us about the notion of justice?

As the environmental justice frame has expanded from narrowly focusing on the spatial distribution of waste and toxicity mainly in the US to include diverse environmental issues in many different parts of the world, the idea of justice implied in the environmental justice frame has also been diversified. Representation (procedural justice) and recognition are encompassed first in the practices of claim-making, and then in the definition of environmental justice (see Walker 2012; Agyeman et al. 2016). The ideas, meanings and relations the concept of justice implies, however, are still understudied within the vast volume of environmental justice scholarship. The main tendency within this scholarship is still to apply the Rawlsian idea of distributive justice¹ to environmental issues, and understanding environmental justice as the un/fair distribution of environmental hazards and benefits.

This tendency to frame environmental justice as a matter of (un)fair distribution could be seen as an attempt to translate the justice claims of the early environmental justice movements into the conceptual vocabulary of theories of justice. When the struggle revolves around the disproportionate exposure of disadvantaged communities to toxic waste and other pollutants, it makes perfect sense to refer to distributive justice. In this sense, environmental justice schol-

arship employs an action-theoretical perspective and takes the concrete, day-to-day experiences of injustice as a starting point to conceptualize what environmental justice is (Schlosberg 2013). Thinking justice through the justice claims of social movements provides an alternative to the dominant line of thought within theories of justice as a field, which discusses justice within an abstract moral frame. Justice here is a “permanent invention” (Balibar 2012: 38), perpetually being expanded by social struggles, by those whose experiences of injustice are not represented in existing regimes of justice (see also Fraser 2009). In this sense, social movements, such as environmental justice movements, perform what Kurasawa (2007: 6) calls a “social labour of justice.”

If justice is invented by the claims and demands formulated within and through struggles against what we experience as injustice, the nature of injustice in question, as well as the practices of claim making, become central in this very invention of justice. If so, what if we take slightly different environmental struggles than the ones that inspired the initial environmental justice frame as starting point to conceptualize justice? In other words, do the struggles against toxic waste, pollution and contamination and the struggles against enclosures of environmental commons and environmental dispossession,² by states and/or private industries, invoke identical frames of environmental justice? This piece aims to answer this question by exploring the implications of struggles around environmental commons for our understanding of justice. I use the case of anti-hydropower struggles in the East Black Sea region of Turkey as an empirical ground on which to translate the emergent notions of justice produced within struggles for environmental commons into the conceptual vocabulary of theories of justice. In search of such a translation, I develop a notion of *socio-ecological justice*, which responds conceptually to those emergent justice claims that are in excess of the environmental justice frame.

3. Empirical case study: local community struggles against hydropower plants in Turkey

After the opening of the energy market to private investment in 2001 in Turkey, which was one of the requirements of the IMF to release credit, the number of small-scale, run-of-river hydropower projects skyrocketed. Between 2002 and 2016, 919 hydropower projects received licenses and 70% of them are small-

scale, with a gross capacity of up to 20 MW.³ These small-scale, run-of-river hydropower plants are concentrated in the East Black Sea, Western Mediterranean and Eastern Anatolian regions where rivers have naturally sloped streambeds.

They are often presented as eco-friendly renewable energy projects (IPCC 2011), as they do not flood large areas like hydrodams. Instead, they divert the river waters to turbine generators at a higher point through pipelines, and then release the river back to its downstream. When they are built excessively in an unregulated manner, however, as is done in Turkey, they can have serious destructive effects on river ecosystems, natural habitat, fish and wildlife passages, biodiversity and forestry, as documented by the Chamber of Electrical Engineers of Turkey (EMO 2011), the Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (TMMOB 2011) and the Turkish Water Assembly (2010), and by independent scholars (see, e.g. Baskaya et al. 2011; Sekercioglu et al. 2011; Kurdoglu 2016).

Moreover, they also have destructive effects on the riverside communities, as they virtually lose their river when it is diverted from its streambed for a number of kilometers. The result is the dispossession of water, which has been an essential part of the everyday life patterns of those communities for some centuries now. Those riverside communities began to organize themselves as the effects of the first wave of plants became clear, especially around 2008 and 2009. A large and heterogeneous movement appeared in the villages and valleys of the country, which slowly led to regional and national networks (Hamsici 2010; Aksu et al. 2016).

The local community movements that emerged in different regions of the country shared certain strategies and forms of protests as they learned from each other both through the networks they formed and through social media posts and circulating videos. Organizing village meetings and inviting academics (environmental and electrical engineers, sociologists and economists) who support the cause has been a very effective tool to inform local communities and equip them with scientific knowledge in their struggle against state-backed private companies. Organizing demos and keeping guard at the construction sites – the so-called ‘resistance tents’ – to prevent the construction work have also been employed by many different communities. They have also successfully integrated the legal struggle into their social/envi-

mental struggles, as a network of lawyers working on a voluntary basis (CEHAV – Lawyers of Environment and Ecology Movements) was established precisely to support these local struggles. Lawyers working voluntarily have effectively cooperated with resisting communities in suspending many construction projects.

4. Fieldwork and methodology

I began to work on the anti-hydropower movement in Turkey in 2013. I conducted ethnographic fieldwork in the regions where hydropower development is concentrated – in the East Black Sea and Mediterranean regions and in East-Southeast Anatolia (Kurdish region), between 2013 and 2016. The main dataset of the research consists of semi-structured interviews (see *Blee and Taylor 2002*) and recorded conversations with more than 100 people, including villagers who protest against hydropower plants and elected heads (*muhtar*) of those villages where possible, in addition to local, regional and national activists for the cause, i.e. members and representatives of local associations, regional and national platforms such as DEKAP (*Derelerin Kardeşliği Platformu* – Sisterhood of Rivers Platform), KIP (*Karadeniz İsyandadır* – Black Sea in Resurrection Platform) and MEH (*Mezopotamya Ekolojik Hareketi* – Mesopotamian Ecological Movement), volunteer lawyers and academics who work on the issue and/or are engaged in the struggle.

In designing my fieldwork, I made a selection of villages in which there was resistance against hydropower plants defined according to a number of criteria, such as media coverage and public visibility and availability of local contacts. As I went to these villages mostly through local connections, my selection of interviewees was shaped by the local networks of those contact persons, and thus was not totally random. To balance the inescapable bias of being introduced to a field by a well-known figure, I talked to as many villagers as I could, when and wherever it was possible (coffee houses, terraces, doorways, etc.). I recorded most conversations and took notes when I could not. I made the effort to reach women, as men are easier to reach at coffee houses and on the streets and are always more willing to talk. Even though the exact content of the interviews shifted depending on to whom I was talking and where, the main focus of the interviews was on the reasons and motivations behind opposing hydropower plants. Besides visiting many villages and valleys in

those regions to spend time with protesting peasant communities, I also conducted research in town centers where most local activists were located.⁴ In addition to villages and local towns, I visited central cities of those three regions, namely Trabzon, Antalya and Diyarbakır, as well as the biggest cities in the country, Istanbul and Ankara, to reach regional and national activists, lawyers and academics. I combined my interview data with participatory observation, archival research⁵ and content analysis of visual material (videos and photographs) and written texts produced by protesting communities and/or anti-HPP associations and platforms, usually made available through social media, news stories published in national media outlets, documentaries by independent film makers, etc. Combining different methods of research, i.e. triangulating multiple methods, is a research strategy widely employed by qualitative researchers to complement and supplement weaknesses and/or biases of any one single research method (*Snow and Anderson 1991; Snow and Trom 2002*), such as the relatively biased selection of interviewees in my case.

5. Identifying regional differences: the uses of water and geographies of justice

My ethnographic research has demonstrated that the actual relationships between those communities and their river waters differ from region to region, and sometimes from village to village. Geographical differences are central in shaping regional characteristics of the anti-hydropower struggles and the notions of justice the struggle implies. Besides geographical differences, ethnic, cultural and political identities, the specific organization of social and spatial relations, material properties of river waters and the specific characteristics of the connection between river waters, human communities and the wider non-human environment also play a role in identifying which aspects of justice becomes dominant in different cases.

In the Mediterranean region, for example, where summers are long, hot and dry, river waters are essential in sustaining subsistence agriculture and animal husbandry. River waters are traditionally used for irrigation, to water the fruit trees, vegetable fields and greenhouses – fruits and vegetables are the main agricultural products of the region – and the grazing lands that sustain food for the animals. Consequently, the narratives of socio-economic and distributional justice are more visible in the region, as people op-

pose hydropower projects to protect their immediate livelihoods. There is a reason why villages are located along rivers across the Anatolian geography. It is clear for the villagers in the Mediterranean region, as I observed in the Alakir (Finike/Antalya) and Yuvarlakçay (Köyceğiz/Mugla) valleys, that losing river waters would force them to migrate to big cities, only to join the workforce as unskilled laborers. It is also clear to them that this would mean, in a country like Turkey where unemployment is very high and wages are very low, impoverishment at best.

While the aspect of distributive justice is at stake in the Mediterranean region, the whole issue is embedded in the Kurdish struggle for cultural and political autonomy in the East-Southeast (Kurdish) region of the country. Erdal Balsak from the Mesopotamian Ecology Movement, with whom I conducted an in-depth interview in November 2014 in Diyarbakir, explained his interest in the issues of ecology, including HPP projects, by pointing out the etymological relation between ecology and autonomy with respect to the Greek term *oikos*. He argued that domination over water equals cultural and political domination. Ecological struggles are an important dimension of the Kurdish struggle for autonomy not only in the sense of self-determination, self-sufficiency and sovereignty over natural resources, but also in terms of the Kurdish people's right and capacity to arrange their own relations with their non-human environments.

While issues of autonomy, history and heritage are more visible in the case of Ilisu Dam (*Hombres et al.* 2016; *Eberlein et al.* 2010), which has recently been completed and has been filling its reservoir since the last months of 2019, culture and belief are clearly the central motivations behind the anti-hydropower struggle in Dersim area. Dersim (Tunceli) is where the unique belief system of Zaza Alevi shows naturalistic-pagan characteristics; especially the hydrodam projects that threaten the Munzur valley and the sacred sites located along the Munzur River have been strongly opposed by the local community (*Deniz* 2016, and fieldwork conducted by the author in fall 2014). The arguments against hydropower both in Ilisu and Dersim are very much in line with the use of recognition as an aspect of justice in environmental justice struggles and literature, with reference to the claims of native/indigenous and/or minority populations to cultural respect and self-determination (see e.g. *Castree* 2004; *Vermeylen and Walker* 2011; *Martin et al.* 2014). Representation and/or procedural justice is

also an apparent dimension of the struggle, not only in the Kurdish case but also in all other regions, as the villagers are not seen as proper political subjects with a right and ability to participate in the decision-making processes concerning their own environments.⁶ Typically, they are not even informed, and experience a shock when faced with construction machines digging out the riverbeds.

6. East Black Sea Region as an atypical example: beyond distribution and recognition

As discussed above, in the Mediterranean and East-Southeast (Kurdish) regions, anti-hydropower struggles exhibit typical characteristics of distributive justice and justice as recognition, intertwined with certain aspects of procedural justice, as hydropower projects misrepresent and/or discount the needs of the local communities. In the East Black Sea, however, which is the region most associated with anti-hydropower struggles in the public sphere due to the high number of HPP projects and local resistance, these three established notions of justice fall short of translating the claims, framings and motivations of the local communities into the conceptual vocabulary of environmental justice. The atypical character of the anti-hydropower struggles in the East Black Sea comes from the fact that local communities, in most cases,⁷ do not use river waters for any immediate economic purposes as the rainfall alone sufficiently sustains mono-cultural tea and hazelnut agriculture in the region. This goes against the established assumptions in the literature that the local struggles of rural communities for environmental commons are driven by their immediate economic dependence on the resources they fight for (see e.g. *Martinez-Alier* 2002).

The issues of cultural/group identity do not play a central role in the struggle in the East Black Sea region. Even though Laz and Hemschin minorities live in the region claims toward self-determination and/or autonomy do not exist as they are very much assimilated into the Turkish identity politically. In addition, water is not associated with secrecy and/or belief, as with the Dersim in the Southeast region, except for some isolated examples.⁸ Rivers bear cultural value in the broader sense of the term, as a part of the cultural heritage, as an entity in relation to which "meaning and identities are produced" (*Ahlers* 2010: 224). One apparent example is the folk music of the region, in which rivers are always mentioned as the symbols of

vitality, fertility and joy, as the witnesses of life, love and sorrow. However, their cultural value is grounded in the everyday patterns of interaction between river waters and human communities, more than their role in cultural identities and belief systems.

Consequently, distributional justice and/or justice as recognition are not as dominant as they are in the Mediterranean and East-Southeast regions. Economic, political and cultural notions of justice are occasionally employed by local movements in the region, but they are certainly not as central as in other regions of the country. Instead, the intimate relationship between river waters and human communities is the central aspect, which is also reflected in the narratives of anti-hydropower struggles, especially in the narratives of women who are at the forefront of the struggle. Hence, the notions of justice utilized within the environmental justice frame – distributional and procedural justice as well as justice as recognition – were necessary but not sufficient to translate the justice claims manifested in this particular struggle. In other words, the case of the East Black Sea region registers the need for a new vocabulary. The notion of socio-ecological justice is a conceptual attempt to translate this relationality between river waters, and the non-human environment in general, and human life into the vocabulary of (environmental) justice.

The East Black Sea region is located in the northeastern corner of Turkey, from the city of Trabzon to the Georgian border. It is a region where hydropower development is concentrated and where resistance to those projects is at its strongest. The local anti-hydropower movements in the Black Sea region also employ the main slogan of the movement across different regions: Water is Life. The word “life” in the slogan, though, holds different meanings in different regions. It refers to both the instrumentality of water to sustain subsistence agriculture and domestic life, as in the Mediterranean region, and the right to a dignified life in terms of cultural recognition and political self-determination, as in the Kurdish region. The multi-layered interrelationship between water and life goes beyond these two established meanings as well, as discussed below.

In the East Black Sea region, rivers typically flow from the mountains – the East Black Sea Mountain range, which runs parallel to the Black Sea – to the sea along deep and densely forested valleys. Villages are located along these valleys, and houses are dispersed along

the rivers (see *Photo 1* which shows a small settlement on a hilltop in Yaylacılar village – Arılı stream, which flows at the base of the valley). Those rivers are not very large or deep, so it is more suitable to call them streams (*dere*) than rivers, in most cases. However, they are typically fast moving – as a result of the naturally steep riverbeds – cascading and clear, and form small natural ponds in different places along with the current, which serves as small swimming/playing pools for children and adults. Rivers are the central elements of the physical landscape in the region, and are understood as the life-blood of the whole valley by the local communities. Even though the water is not used for agriculture, villagers believe that the rivers sustain the ecosystem, the unique flora and fauna of the region, as they express that “all this greenery will disappear if the river waters are taken away from their bed.”⁹



Photo 1 Yaylacılar Village – Arılı Valley, Fındıklı/Rize. Source: photograph taken by the author, 2013

This natural landscape of the region, defined as “heaven on earth” by many villagers, is seriously disturbed by hundreds of HPP projects, which means multiple HPPs on each and every stream of the region. The struggle against HPPs reached its peak between 2008 and 2010, as dozens of private companies got licenses to build HPPs and started construction. Many local communities, however, managed to halt these projects through popular resistance, i.e. organizing local events, meetings and demos, and practically blocking construction. This included not letting anyone they did not know and trust enter the valley, camping and keeping guard at the construction site day and night, and sometimes physical clashes with company supervisors or workers. Anti-hydropower movement was not entirely new to the region, as a local movement

that opposed a planned HPP project in Fırtına Valley (Çamlıhemşin/Rize) had successfully prevented the project already in 1990s, before the private run-of-river HPP wave of 2000s. Fırtına Valley struggle has provided other local communities with a much-needed example and motivation to resist HPPs.

In spite of popular resistance and many legal decisions to suspend construction of hundreds of HPP projects, though, some of those projects were constructed at a high ecological price. Besides directing river waters away from their streambeds and thus seriously disturbing river ecosystems, biodiversity and fish and wildlife passages, the excessive and unregulated construction of HPPs has seriously damaged natural habitats and forests, turning valleys such as Senoz and İkizdere (Rize) into construction sites. Bulldozers, excavators and dump trucks have dug up much of the earth there to build roads, pipelines, tribunals, etc. They have either left the excavated soil and rocks in the riverbeds or thrown them over high hills down into the valleys, causing soil erosion (see *Kurdoglu* 2016 for a detailed discussion and pictures).

Local communities have learned much from lost cases such as İkizdere and Senoz, both illegally taken over by HPP projects despite being natural protection sites. Seeing the destructive effects of the first wave of HPPs motivated other local struggles, and the networking of local organizations in various villages, valleys and towns in the region resulted in the establishment of the Sisterhood of Rivers, first as a regional, than as a national platform for anti-hydropower struggles. The struggles became radicalized, as villagers clashed with the military and police in many different cases, becoming injured by tear gas and plastic bullets and/or facing legal charges. The main motivation of the local communities in opposing the HPPs is to protect the rivers as the central feature of not only the natural landscape, but also their homeland and their way of life there.

Living in an East Black Sea village involves daily interaction with rivers, as people build their houses along the riverbanks. It is an organizing element of the social space, as people use riverbanks as public spaces, much like the squares of the city: people meet there to work and socialize, kids play, young people meet and fall in love... Life, in that sense, is a practice of living together with and/or alongside the river. As Saniye, a young woman from Aslandere village (Caglayan Valley, Fındıklı/Rize) told me: “the river flows just by

our house; I worked today in the field while my child swam in the river.” Ülker, a middle-aged woman from the same village, explained:

Rivers are our joy, our festival. Today I went by the river before I prayed. I sat down there, watched the river, listened to its sounds, and looked at the fish swimming in it. I felt such peace. I then went to my house and prayed in peace.

Hakan, a young man from Gürsu village (Arılı valley, Fındıklı/Rize), explained to me his motivations to oppose the HPP projects in front of his house: “We grow up by this river. We are in contact with it every day; every day we see it, we hear it. It is like a neighbor or like a relative to us.” His wife Zeynep added: “We are like hand in glove with the river.” Another young man spoke to the camera in *A Few Brave People (Bir Avuç Cesur İnsan)*, a documentary about his aesthetic and affective experience of river waters:

It is like watching a beautiful woman or a beautiful movie... millions of words cannot describe the river. Here it flows, here it makes a wonderful pool. Here a stone emanates its wonderful blue... I met my wife, Arzu, for the first time by the river; I fell in love with her there. Many loves budded and blossomed there.¹⁰

Rivers, as expressed by local people, are central not only to the physical but also to the social and affective landscape, and are an indispensable part of everyday life and sociality in the East Black Sea.

People grow up seeing, hearing, touching and tasting the river. Their everyday experiences, their memories and their sense of place are shaped by the flow of the river. As Sirin, a middle-aged woman from Arılı village, told me: “I am 60 years old. We grew up with this river to this age, with this view, with this greenery. We saw this river every day. My grandmother died at the age of 115. Her father, and her father’s ancestors, they all grew up by this river. Why would I give up on this river now? Why would I lose all the memories they left behind?” The river here becomes the material locus of memories of parents and ancestors, and the defining feature of the place the people live in. Yet, the rivers not only materialize memories of the past, they also attest to promises of the future, for the next generations. As Aysen, a young woman from Konaklı village (Arhavi/Artvin) put it: “We learned how to swim, how to fish in this river. It is now our children’s

turn. I have a 10-year-old daughter. Why would I darken her future?” The theme of children comes up often, especially in the conversations with women. They see rivers as central to the area and to the heritage they want to leave to their children.

Hence, the river flows not only in place but also in time, connecting the memories of the ancestors with the children’s future. It manifests the continuity of life itself, as old women watch their grandchildren bathe in the same waters they once bathed in (see *Photo 2*).



Photo 2 Children play in a small pond in Arılı River – Gürsu Village, Fındıklı/Rize. Source: photograph taken by the author, 2013

As the river is always involved in everyday social and material practices, particularly women¹¹ seem to develop an intimate, corporeal and sensory connection with the river waters (*Yaka* 2017). They often talk about falling asleep to the sound of the river, waking up to the familiar sight of it, going into the river waters after working in the fields to rest and rejuvenate. Bedriye, a woman in her late 50s, described this intimate, sensory connection in one of our conversations:

I feel like a piece of earth parched by thirst when I am in Istanbul. As soon as I set foot in Fındıklı, by this river, my body comes to life, like when you water the land after a long dry season and it absorbs immediately.

Bedriye also used the term “life-blood” (*can damarı* in Turkish) to define the rivers. Defining them as “life-blood” or equating them with life itself seems to be a common way of expressing the urgency of the anti-hydropower struggle.

Can refers to something different than life (*hayat*) in Turkish: it is the life and soul of the person. A group of women I interviewed in Bulanık Village (Ardanuç/ Artvin) repeatedly said that the river is their *can* – their life and soul, something I heard from many others in other parts of the region as well. The injustice experienced by the riverside communities who lose their rivers and their practices of claim-making expresses the very centrality of the non-human environment to our social existence. It is not a coincidence that the majority of my interviewees told me that they could not live without the rivers. What they meant by life, however, was not mere physical survival, but a certain socio-ecological existence, a certain way of relating with non-human entities, organisms and environments.

7. In search of a new vocabulary: the notion of socio-ecological justice

Remaining loyal to the action-theoretical perspective that environmental justice scholarship adopts requires bridging empirical work and conceptual reflection. In the specific case of the anti-hydropower movement in the East Black Sea region, the question is whether and how we can analyze the empirical conclusions of the case study – that the injustice produced by run-of-river hydropower plants consists in the destruction of a certain socio-ecological existence, a way of relating with the rivers as non-human entities – within the conceptual frame of environmental justice.

It is clear that the East Black Sea case cannot be discussed within the frame of distributional justice. My claim is that the conceptual implications of the case also go beyond the ‘justice as recognition’ frame. All the major theories of recognition, despite the differences among them, frame mis/recognition in relation to cultural and institutional processes of disrespect, status injury, discrimination, denigration, neglect, insult and the like (see *Young* 1990; *Fraser* and *Honneth* 2003; *Honneth* 2004). What is at stake in our example, however, is not identity, difference, status hierarchy or cultural value, as I discussed in detail above. It is

the very ecological embeddedness of our social existence. Hence, I claim that the empirical conclusions of the case study extend beyond the established framework of environmental justice that frames justice as distribution, recognition and representation (procedure). In order to translate those conclusions into the conceptual vocabulary of theories of justice, we need a term to express the *relationality* of the social and the ecological – what I suggest is *socio-ecological justice*.

The notion of socio-ecological justice has been employed before by various scholars over the last decade, to denote different things. One main tendency is to use the term without much explanation, as another way of saying ‘social and ecological justice’ or to point out that in many environmental conflicts the issues of social and ecological justice are indeed intertwined. As these accounts mainly refer to the unjust distribution of ecological services and/or adequate access by certain classes and groups to those services, their use of socio-ecological justice does not essentially differ from the conventional use of environmental justice (see e.g. *Barton 2013; Barton and Román 2012*). *Pichler* (2016: 34), on the other hand, uses the term from a political ecology perspective to emphasize global and political dimensions of “socio-ecological” conflicts in addition to “mere distributional aspects.” As she claims that socio-ecological justice is about politically challenging existing “societal nature relations” and democratically negotiating responsibilities in relation to nature and natural resources, one might say that her approach reproduces the main concerns of political ecology, issues of control and access, in the field of (environmental) justice.

Zwarteveen and Boelens (2014), mention social-ecological justice (and/or integrity) as a potential fourth dimension, complementary to distributional justice, procedural justice and justice as recognition, the questions of water justice call for. They, however, do not elaborate on the term at all. Referring on their conception of socio-ecological justice as complimentary to environmental justice, I develop the term further based on a relational ontology of human life and the non-human world. *Merleau-Ponty* (1968, 2003) discusses how we become part of the flesh of the world through our own flesh. The idea of flesh as a common web shared by human and non-human bodies is a useful conceptual tool to think about relationality. Our bodies are in corporeal continuity with other bodies and things. We are intrinsically connected with our environments not only through various physical

and chemical processes. What is often overlooked is that we are also socially connected to the non-human world. We sense our bodies only in other, human and non-human, bodies and things. So, it is not only that we become part of the flesh of the world through our own flesh, but we also sense the flesh of our own body only within the flesh of the world. We sense, we feel, we act, we come to know ourselves only through our environments, through our connectedness with other bodies, organisms and things. The self, in this sense, is formed in relation to the other, within a world of encounters, not only with human but also with non-human bodies and entities. In other words, everyday relations, interactions and encounters that form selfhood and subjectivity involve not only human but also non-human others.

There is a rapidly growing field of scholarship from posthumanist and new materialist theories to science and technology studies, from environmental humanities to critical geography, that reveals the ways in which what we define as ‘social’ is entangled with and dependent on the non-human world (see e.g. *Haraway 1991; Latour 1993; Swyngedouw 1999; Ingold 2000; Whatmore 2002; Milton 2002; Bennett 2010; Alaimo 2010; Descola 2013; Braidotti 2013*). Ecology denotes the interrelationships between organisms, while society is about the interrelationships between human beings. What we come to realize on the verge of an ecological crisis, though, is that relationships between humans cannot be imagined without the mediation of non-human organisms, things and entities. As human societies are in a transversal interconnection with their non-human environments (see *Franklin et al. 2000; Braidotti 2013*), what we call social is, ultimately, socio-ecological. In other words, as human societies are never wholly human, the social is never purely social (*Law and Mol 1995*). If social can only be thought of in an intrinsic relation to the ecological, then our ideas of social justice should be rethought accordingly.

Ethics and justice are often understood as a set of notions and principles concerned with intra-human relations. There are of course attempts to extend their boundaries to include soils, waters, plants and animals. American ecologist *Leopold* suggested that as early as 1949 with his conception of land ethics (1949). Ecological justice also aims to maintain justice to nature (see *Law and Gleeson 1998; Baxter 2005*). What I aim to do by introducing the notion of social-ecological justice, though, drawing on empir-

ical material, is not just to extend the community of justice to include non-human environments, but to incorporate human-non-human relationality into our understanding of justice (see also *Yaka* 2019b).

This idea of relationality is articulated in various different ways by the communities who struggle against profit and/or growth-oriented enclosures of environmental commons. Translating this idea and practice into the conceptual vocabulary of justice is needed for two main reasons. Firstly, from an action-theoretical perspective, such a translation is required to explore what justice, as it is employed by the struggling communities themselves, denotes: what are the very notions of justice that could be derived from the struggles on the ground? Secondly, from a more conceptual point of view, there are ethical and political implications of maintaining the relational and transgressive character of human and non-human lifeworlds (see e.g. *Alaimo* 2010; *Bennett* 2010; *Whatmore* 2002). In other words, we need a new vocabulary to re-articulate concepts such as sociality, justice, subjectivity, even democracy, in order to configure our common life on earth, not only with human but also with non-human others.

Socio-ecological justice is an attempt at contributing to this new vocabulary to facilitate such a “progressive composition of a common world” (*Latour* 2004: 53) by extending the strictly humanist borders of social justice. Holding such an objective does not contradict the methodological anthropocentrism of the study in terms of the justice claims by human communities. As one of the most important names in ecological thought, *Andrew Dobson* (2000) discusses in detail that being human-centred does not necessarily mean being human-instrumentalist. An expanded notion of self-interest could very well be instrumental in engendering an ecological consciousness (*Bennett* 2000), as destroying the ecological environment is a form of auto-destruction (*Guattari* 2000).

In line with this argument of expanded self-interest, by framing the relationality of social and ecological realms as a matter of justice, socio-ecological justice maintains our intrinsic and intimate relations with the non-human world as an essential part of our well-being. These relations are central to our need to pursue a fair, decent life. What we experience and identify as injustice and what we demand as justice necessarily involves our transversal connection to our environments. Socio-ecological justice aims to incorporate this connection into our conception of social justice,

which goes beyond the limits of the environmental justice frame. It corresponds to a posthumanist ethic and locates justice within a relational ontology that maintains an intrinsic relationship between social and ecological phenomena.

8. Conclusion

Scholars from different disciplines have criticized dualistic understandings of nature and culture or nature and society in the last decades. The current conjuncture that is marked by ecological crisis and climate change also uncovers the arbitrariness of such binaries. We are becoming increasingly aware, as *Latour* puts it, that “nature and society do not designate domains of reality; instead they refer to a quite specific form of public organization” (*Latour* 2004: 53). Justice claims come out of communities, as in the case of Turkey’s East Black Sea region, echoes *Latour’s* point. It does not necessarily follow, though, that human societies are entwined with non-human ecologies only in the remote areas where native, indigenous and rural communities live. The ecological embeddedness of social existence is not a matter of culture or cosmology. It is the very condition of human life, temporarily shadowed by the modern organization of nature-society duality.

Environmental justice has already discussed the ways in which the environment affects the well-being of humans and it has framed this issue as a matter of justice. But, the idea of justice produced by struggles for environmental commons is not limited to the right to be protected from environmental hazards and/or to equitable distribution of environmental benefits. It is about the right to cohabit with non-human bodies and entities within a particular environment. Those bodies and entities are not merely resources; they are “a part of the social world” (*Gudynas* 2011: 445). The notion of socio-ecological justice is an attempt to translate the relationality of the social and the ecological, of human life and the non-human world, into the vocabulary of justice.

This involves understanding the rights and interests of ‘humans-in-nature’, not controversial but compatible with the rights and interests of non-human nature. In this sense, socio-ecological justice denotes the right of human societies and non-human ecologies to coexist and flourish free from institutionally sustained injustices that are experienced as ecological destruction, degradation, pollution and dispossession.

Notes

- ¹ Distributive justice, often used interchangeably with social justice (see, e.g. *Dobson 1998*), is concerned with the distribution of goods, benefits and burdens within the society. *John Rawls' seminal A Theory of Justice* remains the main reference of the discussion on distributive justice since its publication in 1971. In *A Theory of Justice*, *Rawls (1971: 8)* defines social justice as “a standard whereby the distributive aspects of the basic structure of the society are to be assessed.” His book is concerned with the formulation of generalizable, universal principles of organizing those distributive aspects, such as fairness and impartiality. For a detailed discussion of the use of distributional justice in the environmental justice movement and literature, see *Schlosberg (2007)*.
- ² Think of many struggles against land and water grabbing, struggles of local, native/indigenous and peasant communities to protect their lands, waters and forests against various profit and/or development-driven energy and infrastructural projects, as well as extractive (not only mining but also sand mining, fracking, oil sand drilling, etc.) and other (palm oil, bottled water, etc.) projects.
- ³ Turkey is not a part of the regulatory carbon credit market, but carbon-offsetting projects in Turkey are benefiting from voluntary emission trading. Turkey actually ranked as the world's 6th largest carbon offset supplier in 2016, with 218 registered projects, most of which are hydropower plants (see *Turan and Gündoğan 2019* for a detailed discussion).
- ⁴ A list of town centers, villages and valleys in which I conducted research (underlined: town centers):
Mediterranean region: Köyceğiz – Pinar and Beyobası villages (Yuvarlakçay valley – Köyceğiz/Muğla), Fethiye – Saklıkent valley (Fethiye/Muğla), Finike – Karacaören village (Alakır valley – Finike/Antalya), and Boğazpınar village (Tarsus/Mersin)
East-Southeast (Kurdish) region: Tunceli (Dersim) – Munzur valley, Hasankeyf and Dargeçit – Ilisu Dam Site and Ilisu village (Dargeçit Mardin).
East Black Sea region: Hopa and Kemalpaşa, Arhavi – Balıklı, Konaklı, Kemerköprü villages and Kamilet valley (Arhavi Artvin), Fındıklı – Arılı, Gürsu and Yaylacılar villages (Arılı valley, Fındıklı), Aslandere village (Çağlayan valley Fındıklı), Ardanuç – Bulanık and Tosunlu villages.
- ⁵ Independent archives of anti-hydropower struggles in Turkey are in the making; one important example is the *Ekoloji Almanağı (Ecology Almanac)* prepared by *Cemil Aksu* and *Ramazan Korkut (Aksu and Korkut 2017)*, with an aim to create an extensive archive of local environmental conflicts and struggles between 2005 and 2016. The Almanac spares 100 pages for anti-hydropower struggles. Another example is the Turkey section of the *Environmental Justice Atlas*: <https://ejatlas.org/country/turkey>.
- ⁶ On representation as an aspect of justice, see *Fraser 2009*. For a discussion of representation and/or procedural justice in the context of environmental justice struggles, see *Schlosberg 2007*.
- ⁷ As might be expected, the use of river waters depends on geographical location. In Ardanuç, for example, as I observed during my field trip, river waters are often used for agriculture and husbandry, different from many other places in the East Black Sea region. Ardanuç is located toward the Eastern Anatolian region, at the south edge of the East Black Sea mountain range, which runs parallel to the Black Sea. Like other Black Sea towns located in the terrestrial-internal parts, the rainfall is much lower in comparison to the towns located in the coastal part, or to the villages located on the northern side of the East Black Sea mountain range, toward the Black Sea, such as Fındıklı – the flagship of the anti-hydropower struggle.
- ⁸ One exception is the Romeyka (Pontic Greek)-speaking people of Ogene (Karaçam-Köknar) – Solaklı Valley/Tra-bzon, for whom, *Oğuz (2016)* argues, Derebaşı (the name given to the place where the headwaters of Solaklı river are located) is a sacred place, a place of wailing for the dead.
- ⁹ All quotations are from interviews conducted by the author, in 2013 and 2014, unless stated otherwise. General information on, and analysis of the East Black Sea case is based on participatory observation and interviews conducted by the author, and supported by documentary analysis and archival research as well as ethnographical accounts of the region such as *Bellér-Hann and Hann (2000)* and *Biryol (2012)*.
- ¹⁰ *A Few Brave People*, by *Rüya Arzu Köksal*, is available at <https://vimeo.com/132728416>, with English subtitles.
- ¹¹ Women are the farmers of the household in the East Black Sea region, as in many other parts of the world. While women are responsible for both domestic and agricultural work, men work either in the town center, in a bigger city or even abroad, or sit in a coffee house and play cards. As they work out in the fields within the dramatic natural landscape of the East Black Sea, of which rivers are the defining feature, women's relationship with their environment in general and with the rivers in particular has an intimate quality to it. As the rivers are central to their everyday lives and material practices, women seem to employ different narratives and take more radical positions than men in the movement against hydropower. For a detailed discussion, see *Yaka (2017; 2019a)*.

References

- Agyeman, J., D. Schlosberg, L. Craven and C. Matthews 2016: Trends and directions in environmental justice: from inequity to everyday life, community, and just sustainabilities. – *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **41** (1): 321-340, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-090052
- Ahlers, R. 2010: Fixing and nixing: The politics of water privatization. – *Review of Radical Political Economics* **42** (2): 213-230, doi:10.1177/0486613410368497
- Aksu, C., S. Erensu and E. Erdem 2016: Sudan Sebepler: Türkiye’de Neoliberal Su-Enerji Politikaları ve Direnişler (Neoliberal politics of water-energy in Turkey and resistance). – İstanbul
- Aksu, C. and R. Korkut 2017: Ekoloji Almanağı 2005 – 2016 (Ecology Almanac 2005 – 2016). – İstanbul
- Alaimo, S. 2010: Bodily Natures: Science, Environment, and the Material Self. – Bloomington
- Balibar, E. 2012: Justice and Equality: A Political Dilemma? Pascal, Plato, Marx. – In: Balibar, E., S. Mezzadra and R. Samaddar (eds.): The borders of justice. – Philadelphia: 9-30
- Barton, J.R. 2013: Climate change adaptation and socio-ecological justice in Chile’s metropolitan areas: the role of spatial planning instruments. – In: Boone, C.G. and M. Fragkias (eds.): Urbanization and Sustainability. Linking Urban Ecology, Environmental Justice and Global Environmental Change. Human-Environment Interactions 3. – Dordrecht: 137-157
- Barton, J.R. and Á. Román 2012: Social movement strategies for articulating claims for socio-ecological justice: glocal asymmetries in the Chilean forestry sector. – *Globalizations* **9** (6): 869-885, doi:10.1080/14747731.2012.739346
- Başkaya, Ş., E. Başkaya and A. Sari 2011: The principal negative environmental impacts of small hydropower plants in Turkey. – *African Journal of Agricultural Research* **6** (14): 3284-3290, doi:10.5897/AJAR10.786
- Baxter, B. 2005: A Theory of Ecological Justice. – New York
- Bellér-Hann, I. and C. Hann 2000: Turkish Region: State, Market & Social Identities on the East Black Sea Coast. – Oxford
- Bennett, J. 2010: Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things. – Durham and London
- Biryol, U. 2012: *Karardı karadeniz* (The Black Sea has Darkened). – İstanbul
- Blee, K.M. and V. Taylor 2002: Semi-structured interviewing in social movement research. – In: Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (eds.): Methods of social movement research. Social Movements, Protest and Contention 16. – Minneapolis: 92-117
- Braidotti, R. 2013: The Posthuman. – Cambridge, UK
- Castree, N. 2004: Differential geographies: place, indigenous rights and ‘local’ resources. – *Political geography* **23** (2): 133-167, doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2003.09.010
- Deniz, D. (2016): Dersim’de su kutsiyeti, mizur/Munzur nehri ilişkisi, anlamı ve kapsamı ile baraj/HES Projeleri [Sacred Water in Dersim, the Relationship of Mizur and Munzur River, Its Meaning and Scope and the Hydropower Projects]. – In: Aksu, C., S. Erensu and E. Evren (eds.): Sudan sebepler: Türkiye’de neoliberal su-enerji politikaları ve direnişler [Neoliberal Politics of Water-Energy in Turkey and Resistance]. İstanbul: 177-198
- Descola, P. 2013: Beyond Nature and Culture. – Chicago
- Dobson, A. 1998: Justice and the environment: Conceptions of environmental sustainability and theories of distributive justice. – Oxford
- Dobson, A. 2000: Green political thought. 3rd edition. – London and New York
- Eberlein, C., H. Drillisch, E. Ayboga and T. Wenidoppler 2010: The Ilisu dam in Turkey and the role of the export credit agencies and NGO networks. – *Water Alternatives* **3** (2): 291
- EMO (*The Chamber of Electrical Engineers*) 2011: Doğu Karadeniz Bölgesi HES Teknik Gezisi Raporu (Report on the Hydropower Plants Technical Trip to the East Black Sea Region. – Online available at: http://www.emo.org.tr/ekler/45a43a1706a8faf_ek.pdf?tipi=2&turu=X&sube=0, accessed 20/11/2019
- Franklin, S., C. Lury and J. Stacey 2000: Global nature, global culture. – London
- Fraser, N. 2009: Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World. – New York
- Fraser, N. and A. Honneth 2003: Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange. – London
- Guattari, F. 2000: The Three Ecologies. – Athlone
- Gudynas, E. 2011: Buen Vivir: Today’s tomorrow. – *Development* **54** (4): 441-447, doi:10.1057/dev.2011.86
- Hamsici, M. 2010: Dereler ve İsyancılar. – Ankara
- Haraway, D.J. 1991: Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature. – New York
- Hommes, L., R. Boelens and H. Maat 2016: Contested hydrosocial territories and disputed water governance: Struggles and competing claims over the Ilisu Dam development in southeastern Turkey. – *Geoforum* **71**: 9-20, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.02.015
- Honneth, A. 2004: Recognition and Justice: Outline of a Plural Theory of Justice. – *Acta Sociologica* **47** (4): 351-364, doi:10.1177/0001699304048668
- Inglehart, R. 1990: Culture shift in advanced industrial society. – Princeton
- Ingold, T. 2000: The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling, and Skill. – New York
- IPCC (*Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*) 2011:

- "Hydropower". – In *Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, K. Seyboth, P. Matschoss, S. Kadner, T. Zwickel, P. Eickemeier, G. Hansen, S. Schloemer and C. von Stechow* (eds.): *Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation*. – Cambridge: 437-495
- Kurasawa, F.* 2007: *The Work of Global Justice: Human Rights as Practices*. – Cambridge
- Kurdoglu, O.* 2016: Expert-based evaluation of the impacts of hydropower plant construction on natural systems in Turkey. – *Energy & Environment* **27** (6-7): 690-703, doi:10.1177/0958305x16667186
- Latour, B.* 1993: *We Have Never Been Modern*. – Cambridge
- Latour, B.* 2004: *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences Into Democracy*. – Cambridge
- Law, N. and B. Gleeson* 1998: *Justice, Society, and Nature: An Exploration of Political Ecology*. – London
- Law, J. and A. Mol* 1995: Notes on Materiality and Sociality. – *The Sociological Review* **43** (2): 274-294, doi:10.1111/j.1467-954x.1995.tb00604.x
- Leopold, A.* 1949: *A Sand Country Almanac*. – Oxford
- Martin, A., N. Gross-Camp, B. Kebede, S. McGuire and J. Munyarukaza* 2014: Whose environmental justice? Exploring local and global perspectives in a payments for ecosystem services scheme in Rwanda. – *Geoforum* **54**: 167-177, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.02.006
- Martinez-Alier, J.* 1995: The environment as a luxury good or "too poor to be green"? – *Ecological Economics* **13** (1): 1-10, doi:10.1016/0921-8009(94)00062-z
- Martinez-Alier, J.* 2002: *The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation*. – Northampton
- Martinez-Alier, J., L. Temper, D. Del Bene and A. Scheidel* 2016: Is there a global environmental justice movement? – *The Journal of Peasant Studies* **43** (3): 731-755, doi:10.1080/03066150.2016.1141198
- Merleau-Ponty, M.* 1968: *Visible and the Invisible*. – Evanston, IL
- Merleau-Ponty, M.* 2003: *Nature: Course Notes from the Collège De France*. – Evanston, IL
- Milton, K.* 2002: *Loving Nature: Towards an Ecology of Emotion*. – New York
- Novotny, P.* 2000: *Where We Live, Work and Play: The Environmental Justice Movement and the Struggle for a New Environmentalism*. – Westport
- Oğuz, S.P.* 2016: Trabzon Solaklı Vadisi: Oğene halklarının HES'lere karşı mücadelesi [Solakli Valley of Trabzon: The Struggle of Oğene People against the Hydropower Plants]. – In: *Aksu, C., S. Erensu and E. Evren*: *Sudan sebepleri: Türkiye'de neoliberal su-enerji politikaları ve direnişler [Neoliberal Politics of Water-Energy in Turkey and Resistance]*. – İstanbul: 199-222
- Pichler, M.* 2016: What's democracy got to do with it? A political ecology perspective on socio-ecological justice. – In: *Pichler, M., C. Staritz, K. Küblböck, C. Plank, W. Raza and F.R. Peyré* (eds.): *Fairness and justice in natural resource politics*. – Oxon: 45-63
- Rawls, J.* 1971: *A theory of justice*. – Cambridge
- Schlosberg, D.* 2007: *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature*. – Oxford
- Schlosberg, D.* 2013: Theorising environmental justice: the expanding sphere of a discourse. – *Environmental Politics* **22** (1): 37-55, doi:10.1080/09644016.2013.755387
- Snow, D.A. and L. Anderson* 1991: *Researching the homeless: The Characteristics and Virtues of the Case Study*. – In: *Feagin, J.R., A.M. Orum and G. Sjoberg* (eds.): *A case for the case study*. – Berkeley: 148-173
- Snow, D.A. and D. Trom* 2002: The case study and the study of social movements. – In: *B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg* (eds.): *Methods of social movement research, Social Movement, Protest and Contention* 16. – Minneapolis: 146-172
- Swyngedouw, E.* 1999: Modernity and Hybridity: Nature, Regeneracionismo, and the Production of the Spanish Waterscape, 1890-1930. – *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* **89** (3): 443-465, doi:10.1111/0004-5608.00157
- Şekercioğlu, Ç.H., S. Anderson, E. Akçay, R. Bilgin, Ö.E. Can, G. Semiz, Ç. Tavşanoğlu, M.B. Yokeş, A. Soyumert, K. Ipekdal and İ.K. Sağlam* 2011: Turkey's globally important biodiversity in crisis. – *Biological Conservation* **144** (12): 2752-2769, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2011.06.025
- TMMOB (The Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects)* 2011: *Hidroelektrik Santaller Raporu [Report on the Hydropower Plants]*. – Online available at: http://www.tmmob.org.tr/sites/default/files/682384b57999789_ek.pdf, accessed 20/11/2019
- Turhan, E. and A.C. Gündoğan* 2019: Price and prejudice: the politics of carbon market establishment in Turkey. – *Turkish Studies* **20** (4), 512-540, doi:10.1080/14683849.2018.1533821
- Turkish Water Assembly* 2010: *Water Manifest of the Turkish Water Assembly*. – Online available at: http://turkish-waterassembly.weebly.com/uploads/6/7/0/8/6708484/watermanifestoftheturkish_waterassembly.pdf, accessed 20/11/2019
- Vermeylen, S. and G. Walker* 2011: Environmental justice, values and biological diversity: the San and the Hoodia benefit sharing agreement. – In: *Carmin, J. and J. Agyeman* (eds.): *Environmental Inequalities Beyond Borders: Local Perspectives on Global Injustices*. – Cambridge: 105-128
- Walker, G.* 2009: Beyond distribution and proximity: exploring the multiple spatialities of environmental justice. – *Antipode* **41** (4): 614-636, doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00691.x

Justice as relationality: socio-ecological justice in the context of anti-hydropower movements in Turkey

- Walker, G.* 2012: Environmental Justice: Concepts, Evidence, and Politics. – New York
- Whatmore, S.* 2002: Hybrid Geographies: Natures Cultures Spaces. – London
- Yaka, Ö.* 2017: A feminist-phenomenology of women's activism against hydropower plants in Turkey's Eastern Black Sea region. – *Gender, Place and Culture* **24** (6): 869-889, doi:10.1080/0966369x.2017.1340873
- Yaka, Ö.* 2019a: Gender and framing: Gender as a main determinant of frame variation in Turkey's hydropower movement. – *Women's Studies International Forum* **74**: 154-161, doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2019.03.002
- Yaka, Ö.* 2019b: Rethinking Justice: Struggles For Environmental Commons and the Notion of Socio-Ecological Justice. – *Antipode* **51** (1): 353-372, doi:10.1111/anti.12422
- Young, I.M.* 1990: Justice and the Politics of Difference. – Princeton
- Zwarteveen, M.Z. and R. Boelens* 2014: Defining, researching and struggling for water justice: some conceptual building blocks for research and action. – *Water International* **39** (2): 143-158, doi:10.1080/02508060.2014.891168