

AN ANALYSIS OF URBAN STRUGGLES IN THE PROCESS OF PRACTICES OF
URBAN COMMONING: RESISTANCE ON “UNCOMMON GROUND” “IN, FOR AND
BEYOND” ISTANBUL

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

OF

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

NEZİHE BAŞAK ERGİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

FEBRUARY 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Besime Şen (MSGSU, URPL) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç (METU, SOC) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Uzun (METU, URPL) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu (METU, SOC) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Umut Beşpınar (METU, SOC) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Nezihe Başak Ergin

Signature:

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF URBAN STRUGGLES IN THE PROCESS OF PRACTICES OF URBAN COMMONING: RESISTANCE ON “UNCOMMON GROUND”“IN, FOR AND BEYOND” ISTANBUL

Ergin, Nezihe Başak

Ph.D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç

February 2014, 627 pages

The thesis aims to examine urban social oppositions, ways of resistance, their patterns and dynamics in Istanbul against urban transformation projects with the production of space having the central role and potentiality to generate these struggles. Through critical and radical urban and social opposition theories and related ideas of analysis, the study considers this as a process of “urban commoning –social- practices” for the “rights to the city”. The research covers the period which starts with the European Social Forum preparation process in 2010. Instead of focusing on an urban transformation project and related oppositions in a neighbourhood of the city, the study has focused on the patterns and dynamics of the urban oppositions in Istanbul which are highly fragmented. The research explores various appropriations of the city with an evaluation of distinct, common and even conflictual aspects as well as alliances, associations and tensions. In this respect, the thesis analyses tensions and attempts of togetherness between different groups, organisations and associations; particularly of active inhabitants, intellectuals and academic-activists both with

their pioneering and obstructive roles in different contexts shaped by structural, political, and especially emotional factors.

Keywords: urban social movements, the right to the city, social practices of urban commoning, (un)common ground, Istanbul

ÖZ

KENTSEL MÜŞTEREKLEŞME SÜRECİNDE KENTSEL MÜCADELELERİN ANALİZİ: İSTANBUL’DA, İSTANBUL İÇİN, İSTANBUL’UN ÖTESİNDE ORTAK OLMAYAN ZEMİNDE DİRENİŞ

Ergin, Nezihe Başak

Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç

Şubat 2014, 627 sayfa

Tez, mekanın üretiminin mücadelelere yol açmadaki merkezi rol ve potansiyeliyle, İstanbul’daki kentsel dönüşüm projelerine karşı gelişen kentsel toplumsal hareketleri, direniş biçimlerini ve dinamiklerini incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Eleştirel ve radikal kentsel ve toplumsal teoriler ve buna bağlı düşüncelerin analiziyle, çalışma “kent hakları” mücadelesi için “kentsel müşterekleşme –toplumsal- pratikleri” bir süreç olarak ele almaktadır. Araştırma 2010 Avrupa Sosyal Forum’u hazırlanma süreciyle başlamıştır. Bir mahalledeki kentsel dönüşüm projesi ve buna bağlı muhalefete yoğunlaşmak yerine, araştırma, İstanbul’daki son derece parçalanmış olan kentsel muhalefetlerin desen ve dinamiklerine yoğunlaştı. Çalışma ortak, farklı ve hatta çatışan öğelerin yanı sıra birliktelik, işbirlikleri ve gerilimlerin değerlendirilmesiyle, kentin farklı sahiplenmelerinin açıklanması amaçlanmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, tez değişik grup, oluşum ve derneklerin, özellikle de yapısal, politik ve özellikle duygusal etkenlerle belirlenen farklı bağlamlarda, öncü ve bazen de engelleyici rolleriyle

aktif sakinlerin, entellektüellerin ve akademik-aktivistlerin birliktelik çaba ve gerginliklerini incelemiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: kentsel toplumsal hareketler, kent hakkı, kentsel müşterekleşmenin toplumsal pratikleri, ortak (olmayan) zemin, İstanbul

To my dear professors

Dr. Paul Chatterton, Dr. Ayşe Saktanber, Dr. Umut Beşpınar, Dr.
Besime Şen, Dr. Nil Uzun

To my precious friends,

Erdoğan Yıldız, Ömer Kiriş, Çiğdem Şahin,

Gülriz Şen, Esra Can,

Sandra Azeri, Zeki Günay, Elif Öner, Zeynep Baykal, Sinem
Aydınlı, Esin İleri, Federico Venturini, Güzin Şen ...

And to my mother Saliha Nurhan Ergin and my father Raşit
Ergin,

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It was the longest and painful journey of my life. Without any application to any university abroad, I had preferred to stay in Turkey; METU especially after that I decided to analyse and write on Istanbul. I learnt a lot; I suffered a lot and now, I am at the end of this road made of sweat and tears. When I look back, I do possess too many words to say that I have to choose some of them to write down in this part reserved only for acknowledgments. I could not be able to write and survive in this life without the presence and contributions of these people.

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç to accept me as her doctorate student and confide in me in my every step. I learnt from her especially in terms of analysing and reading every text in a critical way and to try to do almost the best after reading every single source written on a subject. I am grateful to her giving me many opportunities and support as a young scholar.

I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu who is a genuine sociologist who praised my works and supported me especially to become a research assistant. I would like to express my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Uzun, as a role model for a young PhD student like me. Her precious presence and analytical approach contributed a lot to my thesis. Without the presence and help in every critical moment of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Besime Şen, my unique professor, inspiring human being, amazing woman, always thinking, smiling and struggling, I would not be able to put the final point.

One day, another inspiring woman and my role model, Assist. Prof. Dr. Umut Beşpınar came to me and stated: “Başak, you have to finish and you will finish your dissertation.” She made a plan and wrote down some points that I would keep these words with me at the end of my life. At that point that she saved my life by grabbing my hand from the dark abyss that I was drowned into. She made (more-than-) comments and categorized my manuscript with her encouraging

words and flowers. I would not be able to finish without her help without her valuable presence.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Paul Chatterton, who was the main inspiration of my thesis. It was one of my biggest dreams to meet and work with him. When I received his email informing me that he accepted me as a visiting researcher in the School of Geography, The University of Leeds, the best period of my academic life had started. Without his words, the thesis and the academic life that I have chosen would not be the same. I appreciate his revolutionary and brilliant mind and courage to create change every day. Moreover, I would like to underline that the title of the thesis is a reflection of his ideas. One day, Dr. Paul Chatterton asked me whether or not I have ever met Prof. Dr. Marcelo Lopes de Souza after reading my working plan in Leeds and later on kindly invited me to a talk in Liverpool. There, I had the big chance to meet Prof. Dr. Souza, who supported me via his encouraging emails. One day, he invited me to Rio where I had the unique chance to listen from him Rio de Janeiro, “os morros”, “o *Complexo do Alemão*”. Professor Souza was one of my inspirations who shaped this thesis as well as my way in the academy.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation for the invaluable insights and supports of my esteemed directors Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber and Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık. Prof. Dr. Ayata was the professor for whom I decided to come to METU thanks to his works on urban sociology. I learnt a lot from him, from his lectures and the period. Prof. Dr. Altunışık asked me whether or not I have any difficulty to finish my thesis at any time. Prof. Dr. Saktanber, my precious professor, dearest örtmen, -more than- a mentor was always with me with her unique academic insight and emotional support. I am deeply indebted to her... I hope that I could find and pave my right path, my Dear Professor.

In this period, many professors asked me how I am, whether or not they could help me. I would like to express my gratitude to these professors and good people, Dr. Stuart Hodkinson, Dr. Sara Gonzales, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluoğlu, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz-Hoşgör, Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağatay Topal, Dr.

Barış Mücen, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kayhan Delibaş, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Murat Ergin. I would like to people in Giresun University and especially Arzu Kurt who supported me during my studies and research since the very beginning. I am grateful to these good people, Selma Şahindokuyucu, Sibel Er, Zekai Bey, Neslihan Kaya, Bilgehan Yıldırım, Eyüp Şahin, Sevbhan Başer, Güler Barış, Öznur Çatak Soylu, Hatice Kalaycıoğlu, Sündüs Aydın, Mehmet Abi ve Nihat Abi, Nagehan Güçlü, and not last but least, Murat Bey from Tekno Art.

I appreciate presence of these good people in my life... I would like to express my gratitude to my parents' friends, our chosen family members, Murat Ay, Nevzat Sezgin, Gamze Sezgin, Hüseyin Sarsan, M. Serdar Karahasan, İsmet and Çiğdem Kurtuluş, Fatma Yıldız Ünlü... I would like to express my gratitude to Nermin and Bekir Sadık Şen...

I learnt a lot in this period in terms of encouragement, guidance, amity and sincerity. Without her presence, I would not be able to breathe in this world. There is no word to express my gratitude for her sisterhood, insight, help and encouragement. Until infinity, we are together...I owe a lot to you, Dr. Gülriz Şen. Esra Can, I don't know how to express my feelings... Without your sincerity, guidance, help, and for sure, sisterhood, I could not be able to survive in this world and finish my studies...You will live the best; I will be there with you. I am grateful to friends, sisters and brothers, comrades...My soulmate Sandra Azeri...We will meet soon my dear; and Sinem Aydınli, Zeynep Baykal, Sinem Aydınli, Elif Öner, Esin İleri, Güzin Şen, Zeki Günay, Federico Venturini, Aslı Ertan, Figen Uzar, Hatice Çelik, Esra Demirkol, Kübra Oğuz, Zeynep Tekten, Simge Sönmez, Ayşegül Balkanlı, Ali Ulupınar, Yanpeng Jiang, Hui-Fang Liu, Gloria Dawson, Megan Waugh, Ersilia Verlinghieri, Haktan Ural, Gözde Çerçioğlu, Gülşen Aydın, Volkan Yılmaz, Mariana Fernandes, Deniz Koç, Kate Ferguson, Ekin Soysal, Victoria Habermehl, Ana Cabrera Pacheco, Andre Pusey, Tom Gillespie, Nihal Yerli, Ezgi Çakıroğlu...

I have gained real friends for a lifetime who struggle for the rights to the city with I whom I met thanks to my field study. Not only my study and my words but also my life would be unfulfilled without their precious contribution. I am

lucky to meet with Erdoğan Yıldız, Ömer Kiriş, Çiğdem Şahin, Arif Belgin, Cihan Uzunçarşılı-Baysal, İmre Azem, Hatice Kurşuncu, Deniz Özgür, Kumru Çılgın, Yaşar Adanalı, Besime Şen, Erbatur Çavuşoğlu, Murat Cemal Yalçın, Fırat Genç, Ebru Soytemel, Şadi Çatı, Süleyman Songur, Kent Hareketleri, İMECE, Dayanışmacı Atölye and other friends who are claiming their rights to the city in Istanbul and all over the world.

This period was a lonely period. It must have been as isolation from the world even though this is quite impossible and unhuman. However, I am so sad that I could not spare time and care to my grandmothers Şaziye Işık and Nezihe Ergin. They are my angels and my role models as strongest women in the world. I will be stronger when you live with us one second more in this life. My aunts Aysan Yılmaz and İnci Narin, my uncles Altan Işık and Ahmet Narin... You are my mothers and fathers, friends always with us.

My parents...my best friends...You became older while dedicating your life to me. I became older dedicating my life to my PhD at Middle East Technical University. I deeply appreciate Nurhan Anneciğim and Raşit Babacığım –as I named you when I was two years old- for your endless sacrifice, patience, support, amity, and encouragement.

I am grateful to everyone who has enriched my life. At the end, I can clearly see that without you, I could not be able to move on. Thank you! I am ready for new challenges in the life and academia to pave my unknown paths. I wish not to lose passion, anger and curiosity which keep me alive in this cruel system but still amazing world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xiii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Main Aims of the Study.....	1
1.2. Introductory Literature.....	21
1.3. Research Questions of the Study.....	38
1.4. Structure of the Study.....	39
2. METHODOLOGY.....	42
2.1. Nature of the Field and Limitations.....	42
2.2. General Framework of the Methodology.....	44
2.3. Literature on Participatory and Solidarity Action Research.....	51
3. GORUNDED THEORY ON THE PATHS OF REAL SUBJECTS.....	67
3.1. The Right to the City: From Lefebvre to Today's Im-possibilities.....	68
3.1.1. The Right to the City of Lefebvre.....	80
3.1.2. "Active Inhabitants" and "Autogestion".....	89
3.1.3. "–Social Practices- of Urban Common-(s)-ing" and Struggling From and Beyond the Right to the City.....	105
3.1.4. Conceptualizing the Right to the City for Radical Social Transformation.....	126
3.2.Theories of Urban Struggles.....	140
3.2.1. An Introduction for Social Movement Theories to Reflect Upon Urban Struggles.....	140
3.2.2.Urban Social Movement Theories.....	160
3.2.3.Social Forums and Urban Struggles.....	205
3.3.Engaging Geographies.....	211

3.3.1.Radical Geographies.....	213
3.3.2.Autonomous Geographies.....	234
4.CLAIMING DIFFERENCE BUT BEING COMMON IN ISTANBUL.....	244
4.1.A Critical History and Theory of Urban Struggles.....	244
4.1.1. From Urban Regeneration Projects as the Motive behind Urban Struggles and Beyond: The Meanings of Urban Regeneration in Istanbul.....	252
4.2. The Right to the City for Urban Commoning in Istanbul: A Slogan of Some Groups and Beyond.....	271
4.2.1. Origins, Uses and Usefulness of the Right to the City In Istanbul: From the Literature in Turkey to the Struggles.....	274
4.2.2. Interrogation of the Right to the City from the Practices.....	290
4.3.Dynamics of Urban Commoning.....	308
4.3.1.Formation and Structure Analysis of Urban Opposition Groups and the Inhabitants in the Practices of Urban Commoning: Differences and Commonalities of Components, Fields, Tactics, Strategies, and Objectives.....	315
4.3.2. Potentialities and Difficulties of Urban Oppositions in Istanbul.....	394
4.3.3.“In Between the Moments of Encounters and Fragile Alliances”: Is Forming Alliances an Artificial Problem in the Practices of Urban Commoning?.....	433
5. ONE URBAN COMMONING ATTEMPT: “URBAN MOVEMENTS (FORUM)”(KENT HAREKETLERİ) IN ISTANBUL.....	474
5.1. The European Social Forum: From the Days of Togetherness Toward the Intended Formation of “Urban Movements” (Kent Hareketleri).....	473
5.2. Turning Moments of the Forum: Protests and Protests and	

International Campaigns.....	505
5.3. Activists Speak on “Urban Movements”(Kent Hareketleri): Success, Failure or a Real Necessity.....	526
6. CONCLUDING REMARKS ABOUT POSSIBLE IMPOSSIBILITIES: TOWARDS NEW URBAN COMMONS BEYOND ISTANBUL.....	535
6.1. Concluding Notes and Arguments.....	536
6.2. Prefigurations on Istanbul.....	555
6.3.Claiming Urban Commons?.....	563
REFERENCES	575
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY.....	605
B.CURICULUM VITAE.....	622
C. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ ONAY FORMU.....	627

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is quite hard but also hopeful to think about urban struggles these days. Cities all over the world are becoming more and more socio-political spaces of conflicts where different groups and their interests, claims and aims confront spatially, so socially and politically, which paves the way for the “urban” in Lefebvrian terms. It is appropriate so start with Lefebvre (1991) who had argued:

Space has power in itself, nor does space as such determine spatial contradictions.

There are contradictions of society, between the forces and relations of production, emerge in space, engender the contradictions of space. (Lefebvre 1991, 358-359)

1.1. Main Aims of the Study

Through a critical and radical urban social movement theories and related, this study aims to analyse urban oppositions composed of different actors, neighbourhood associations, groups of intellectuals and activists emerged from being against urban regeneration, more exactly transformation projects in Istanbul. The research covers the period which starts with the European Social Forum preparation process in 2010. Instead of focusing on an urban transformation project and related oppositions in a neighbourhood of the city, I focused on the changing patterns and dynamics of urban oppositions

in Istanbul being highly fragmented in terms of localities and space, actors, their politics and “scales”¹ of opposition. In this respect, the thesis analyses different patterns and inner-dynamics of conflicts, tensions and attempts of togetherness of different groups and organisations, more exactly of “active inhabitants”², intellectuals and academic-activists with their pioneering versus obstructive roles in different contexts and with different dynamics, structural factors and political, especially emotional factors.

The study considers a *process of (social practices of) urban commoning* with the help of the concepts such as *the right(s) to the city* and *autogestion* (*autogestation in English*) which will be explained throughout the thesis with theoretical inspirations. At the beginning of the study, the basic question of the research was focusing on the main question of the actors, which was whether or not there is an existed alliance of actors; and in time, it has changed into an analysis of urban resistances in terms of commoning practices. In this respect, the study was focused on the action frames, statements, discourses and positions, objectives, ways, changing organizational and tactical repertoires, and strategies of different activists from urban oppositional groups, organizations, and platforms of intellectuals, alternative planners, and academicians. This had another significance in terms of conflicting and common aspects, reasons yet the potentialities and obstacles (please examine the mainly online open access reports of the group namely İMECE, which will be elaborated in the thesis). Thus, from a Lefebvrian perspective, the production of space has central and

¹There is a necessity to be critical for the use of the “scale” in our analyses. The related discussions will be elaborated in the thesis.

²To understand this concept, please examine the studies of Mark Purcell, which will be elaborated throughout the thesis. It is important to refer and read the article of Türkmen (2011) as one of the first examples which used the concept for what was experienced in Istanbul especially in terms of intellectuals active in urban opposition.

yet potential roles to generate urban oppositions and social transformations in the thesis.

What has been changed so far in Istanbul? Why are some people against these urban transformations? Urban transformations in Istanbul as an outcome of local and global processes of capital accumulation as running parallel with the displacement and further exclusion of disadvantaged groups and transformation and *enclosures*³ of green areas and parks since the 1990s like the construction of hotels namely Swissotel Istanbul and Conrad, city squares, and cultural centres. From the 2000s, new urban oppositions have been formed against urban regeneration projects with new organisations as significant eventually still being shaped into new forms. These oppositions with different claims evolving into claiming urban commons have challenged both the ways and aims of doing politics while making common people active inhabitants in and for the city. Political party or old class movements' organizations are trespassed –due to mainly the party politics towards urban issues- and substituted by new attempts from the production of urban space.

This study, by evaluating characteristics and dynamics of urban oppositions discusses potentialities and difficulties of resisting from the “urban space”, limitations and obstacles to go beyond, the necessity and characteristic of urban alliances (see the discussion in the conclusion of Purcell’s article (2009)), the local and international characteristics of urban oppositions, the duality of being form neighbourhoods or not vis-à-vis the importance, differences and limitations of supports of external actors with the influence

³Even though I will elaborate in the related parts of the thesis, I would like to give the basic definition of Trapese Collective (2007), as the process of seizing and dividing communally held land for individual ownership, in twelfth to nineteenth-century of England. Contemporary social movements against the privatisation of land and the sale of public goods are considered as struggles against the “new enclosures”.

of questions raised by scholars, groups and academic-activists who will be cited in the study -read the related studies of Çavuşoğlu, Yalçın, Çilgin, Strutz, Türkmen, Yücel, and Solmaz-. The potential for change in the urban system however can only be obtained if claims for the right of the city are formulated in the name of a new commons and “autogestion”. At that point, the thesis does underline the role of multiple agents such as individuals, groups or networks and alliances with the priority of intellectuals from neighbourhoods and from other critical groups which form; I find these agents as emotionally loaded and fluid. The opposition from neighbourhoods which find their manifestation in the local as strongly based on way of how people use space and live in it. Even though there is a potential to go beyond the “local levels”, self- organisation based on experiences and local knowledge at neighbourhood level is one of the crucial characteristics. These urban oppositions created another identity, new solidarities as well across different classes and political views by struggling for urban issues. As a social entity, urban space means appropriation of a collective life, with the sense of solidarity before and after the resistance.

Since the early 2000s and onwards, in Istanbul, the production of space is used to ensure the growth and survival of capitalism via the exchange value of space in real estate as secondary circuit of capital (Lefebvre 1976, 1991, 2003). This production is determined by instrumental rationality and commodification as the abstract space (Lefebvre 1991, 2000) of homogeneity (Lefebvre 1991, Lefebvre 2000, 48), fragmentation (Lefebvre 2000, 48, 188) and hierarchization (Lefebvre 2000, 48) via urban regeneration projects. Consequently, we witness that some inhabitants have (re)claimed their rights to the city commencing mainly from the right to shelter. In the meantime, social space (Lefebvre 1991, 2000) based on values, meanings, perceptions, practices and every day experiences is being

erased by these socio-spatial interventions not only in neighbourhoods but also urban commons (*please see the related part and mainly the articles of Chatterton 2010b and Hodgkinson 2012*) such as destruction or transformation of a park and squares, movie theatres or cultural centres. Urban regeneration projects involve not only housing areas but also historical public but more exactly these *common spaces* such as Emek Movie Theatre, Galata Port, Haydarpaşa Port and Taksim Square. In this respect, *the main difficulty and challenge of urban struggles will be commoning urban struggles in the neighbourhoods and common urban spaces*.

Urban land policies, changes and decisions mainly related to urban transformation projects have been marked by populist to neo-liberal practices (Kuyucu and Ünsal 2010a, 2010b). Urban regeneration and more exactly urbanism as an ideology of the state controls using this myth of technocracy (Elden 2004, 145) was proposed in 2001 as the solution for so-called “socio-spatial problems” and recently the “risk of earthquake” by offering “new, modern and appropriate lives” not only in *gecekondu*⁴ neighbourhoods in Istanbul but in time including historical neighbourhoods like Fener-Balat⁵, Sulukule⁶ as well as other neighbourhoods like

⁴*Gecekondu* is the type of spontaneous, self-constructed housing as a popular urgent solution for state inability to construct social housing for migrated people in the 1940s, which is the early industrialization period. The *gecekondu* neighbourhoods have been changed in time by spatial and popular interventions as well as changing legalizations and discourses. Urban regeneration projects in this respect represent another break for its “illegalization”. The studies of Aslan (2004) and Aslan and Şen (2011), of Erman (2001, 2004) and of Pérouse (2004) are strongly recommended in order to understand *gecekondu* neighbourhoods, their struggles as well as their stigmatizations and criminalization in urban and state policies and discourses.

⁵The website <http://www.febayder.com/> contains information about the neighbourhood as well as the association. The statement on the last decision for the cancellation of the project from Çiğdem is available at <http://bianet.org/bianet/toplum/139203-fener-balat-ayvansaray-yikimi-da-iptal>.

⁶In 2009, an “alternative” plan for Sulukule was proposed by Dayanışmacı Atölye (Solidarity Studio) with the presence of different platforms and urban opposition groups.

Tozkoparan⁷. Simultaneously, Istanbul was labelled with various brands⁸ such as the “European Capital of Culture” and projected as the centre of finance through “mad mega-projects” as “urban spectres”. From the early periods of urban regeneration which were practised in housing areas as demolition, employed the criminalization⁹ and stigmatization of neighbourhoods in different contexts by political or petty offences went hand in hand with the pretext of to legitimize these urban renewal projects which were founded on arguments about “environmental” (earthquake and natural disasters) risks. A statement by Erdoğan Bayraktar¹⁰ the former chairman of TOKİ-*the abbreviation for the Mass Housing Development Administration*- and the recent former Minister of Environment and Urbanization is significant to show the correlation of physical, spatial

This experience is inspirational as well as conflictual for urban opposition groups with local, national as well as international support. Sulukule was a turning point for urban activists and groups in terms of their experiences of struggle determinant in later attempts of alliances.

⁷See the website of the association for Tozkoparan neighbourhood: <http://toz-der.blogspot.co.uk/> to read the journals of their neighbourhoods, covering urban regeneration but also other issues. Statements of Ömer from the neighbourhood Tozkoparan, the Platform of Life and Urban Movements about the recent legislation Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk are available at <http://www.emekdunyasi.net/ed/guncel/18208-bu-yasanin-tek-amaci-yikmak>.

⁸The “branding” of cities becomes big business for Harvey (2012, 104), which necessitates the expulsion and eradication of everyone or everything else which does not fit the brand (Harvey 2012, 108).

⁹The “criminalization” is based on us/them discourse, correlated with poverty, non-integration into the city, violence, anger, and their spatial invasion and deterioration of the city (Erman 2001, Erman 2004, Erman and Eken 2004), which is supported by the approach of media (Ergin 2006). Please read Caldeira (1996) to see the relationship between socio-spatial segregation, urban intervention and control via privatization, enclosure and criminalization of urban space by stigmatization of workers.

¹⁰In the statement, Bayraktar stated that the necessity of urban regeneration, urban renewal, *gecekondu* and earthquake transformations comes from the necessity of getting rid of the unfavourable and shed-like buildings. This idea is supported in order to reduce social such as unemployment and “criminal” problems. The statement is available on the website: http://www.emlakkulisi.com/musiad_kentsel_donusum_konulu_paneli_duzenled_i_-55050.html. In this respect, the article of Şen (2010) as a pioneering critical evaluation of the statements is strongly recommended.

conditions and “moral” and social aspects. The municipalities of these districts, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality¹¹ and legislative arrangements at the national level have launched a cycle of regeneration¹² where neighbourhoods under threat of demolition are regenerated via the construction of luxurious houses by private firms and TOKİ, the main responsible public body within the housing sector. Even though on the homepage of the English version of their website, there is a welcoming message on the “right to housing¹³” as stated in the article number 57 in The Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, the Administration envisages collaborating with local municipalities on urban renewal projects and creating financial opportunities with the private sector to finance social housing projects. To exemplify: There are plans for inhabitants and mainly tenants of neighbourhoods such as Ayazma eventually to be relocated to newly built social housing blocks such as Bezirganbahçe¹⁴, located far from

¹¹Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality is the decision organ in the Istanbul Metropolitan Area; its council members are mainly composed of people from the Justice and Development Party (AK Party) and the Republican People’s Party (CHP) according to the number of votes. Its duty is not only at the metropolitan level; it has power at the local district municipalities in terms of spatial infrastructure and social services. At the beginning of the urban regeneration projects, Istanbul Metropolitan Planning and Design Centre (IMP), which was a (semi-)private company, was one of the main actors in the planning process with Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. The Municipality has also a housing corporation, KİPTAŞ, besides the Mass Housing Development Administration, TOKİ. More information is available on the website: www.ibb.gov.tr.

¹²Urban regeneration projects, as a form of gentrification, are implemented in neighbourhoods located in different districts in historical and city centres which have different political sensibilities (Pérouse 2006). Secondly, urban regeneration projects became a clearance, demolition project in *gecekondu* settlements and thirdly, these two branches are supported by international, transnational projects, concerning the new constructions (Pérouse 2006).

¹³The mentioned article is: “The State shall take measures to meet the needs of housing within the framework of a plan which takes into account the characteristics of cities and environmental conditions and shall support mass housing projects.”

¹⁴For a critical evaluation of the projects as forced eviction, please see the text of Cihan Uzuncarşılı-Baysal on Ayazma with various relocation and eviction maps of Istanbul available on the website:
http://reclaimistanbul.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/diwan_istanbul_living_in_exclusion.pdf

the city centres. The former owners become obliged to engage in a long-term payment process which can involve life-long debts, while tenants in general will have to find new accommodation.

In some cases, for example in Ayazma, although the municipality made some promises to the tenants, they found themselves without any shelter, which initiated their resistance in terms of *survival* as Mitchell and Heynen (2009) conceptualized with the right to the city. As an illustration, some tenants have gained this privilege of being relocated to the newly built social houses in the beginning or after struggles of residents sometimes with former owners. The statements of Erdoğan Bayraktar, November 2012 are important in two respects: Firstly, Bayraktar stated that the urban regeneration projects will be presented in new ways such as via call centres, and will not be realised without all people's consent. Secondly, the economic crisis in Turkey is not as severe as it is in other countries in the world thanks to the contribution of TOKİ and the construction sector¹⁵. However, critical aspects of the right to the city should be remembered: urban regeneration became a general project valid for every neighbourhood, mainly for buildings under threat of risk after the inclusion of former social housing neighbourhoods such as Tozkoparan and historical neighbourhoods such as Fener-Balat, in addition to *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. The other aspect is that TOKİ initiated a system of - low quality - housing ownership; in other words private property based on debt (Şen 2010, 319-320), which I use for both housing and sheltering. Especially in the first periods, the relocation also became principally a displacement and dispossession of the poor, which means the geographical relocation of poverty as conceptualized by Kuyucu and Ünsal (2010a). These policies transform the cities from

¹⁵The statement is available on the website:
http://www.emlaktasondakika.com/haber/Kentsel_donusum/Bakan_Bayraktar_10_yilda_kentsel_donusumle_yaklasik_60_bin_konut_yapildi/40469.aspx.

“Spaces of Hope” to “Spaces of Hopelessness” for those who live and try to survive in the city (Türkün 2011, 64). The legislative bases of these interventions vary from changes of acts in old legislation to the introduction of new laws (Türkün 2011¹⁶). The Parliament accepted law n° 6306: “the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk” on 31.05.2012. Popular figures supported this change which was promoted as a “national mobilization” with public spots on television. In fact, it includes some clauses which prevent people from asking, appealing and reacting against decisions of demolition and resettlement, even though inhabitants have the legal title of their houses. This transformation depicted by some scholars as the “authoritarian neoliberalism” (Lovering and Türkmen 2011) created a boom in the construction industry. On the other hand, bargaining processes related to the difference of property tenure are used strategically by construction companies to obstruct oppositions in some cases. Kuyucu and Ünsal claimed, based on what has been experienced in the neighbourhoods, that the “collective right-to-housing” had evolved into the agreement of the project based on personal gains intensified by the lack of resistance experience and state violence (Kuyucu and Ünsal 2010a, 2010b). However, I must add that to negotiate for the house must not be roughly elaborate as “property” or we must not label these people as “negotiators” due to the created dilemma of being displaced by being indebted and the impossibility to stay put. Trying to go beyond or question the impasse “between rights awareness and the limits of property rights activism” conceptualised by Shin (2013) mainly valid for residential areas planned to be demolished, the activists from neighbourhoods or from different professions, political groups

¹⁶For Türkün (2011), neo-liberal urban policy reduced into an illusionary politically as so-called participation while neo-liberal urban policy targets the transformation of areas with high rent potential, resulting in the eviction of the inhabitants. Spatial regulations are legitimized in a hegemonic discourse, which represents a tautological character due to the gap between legality and legitimacy (Türkün 2011).

or groups only mobilized for the urban co-produce an urban struggle in Istanbul.

These projects became a turning point mainly for the (re)emergence of *gecekondu* grassroots resistance(s), oppositions as well as formation of new types of non-hierarchical and flexible types of “organizations” of different actors as well as new types of neighbourhood associations in different neighbourhoods in Istanbul; this had the effect of intellectuals from and outside the neighbourhoods claiming the “right to the city” by challenging the private meaning and exchange value of urban space. We must ask for whom different projects of urban regeneration are proposed, given that it creates new deprivations and dispossessions due to the dislocations and enclosures of urban commons (especially see elaborations of Chatterton 2010, Hodkinson 2012 in the thesis) leads to an economic and social aggravation of the existing inequalities once social housing is enforced with indebted conditions.

In the framework of urban social movements against spatial interventions and demolitions realized in the name of urban regeneration and gentrification projects, this thesis aims to expose ways of resistances and experiences of different activists, active inhabitants from different neighbourhoods and different platforms.

Protests were few and limited notably organised by almost same people against new regulations passed overnight without participation, discussion and even consultation, which displaced inhabitants from their neighbourhoods of *gecekondus*, social housing areas and old historical neighbourhoods, and sometimes city centres.

As mentioned before, the study has as an aim to display the importance, potential as well as impasses of urban oppositions taking part in and for urban space. In this respect, I chose to focus on the main objective when the

research has started, different aspects of possible coalitions, attempts of togetherness as I use later “*urban commoning process*” in, for, and beyond Istanbul and to intervene in and take action on their right(s) to the city, which is formulated by Paul Chatterton. Urban social movements are considered as a process of urban commoning struggle in/for and beyond Istanbul, with different moments of togetherness. *Urban commoning do refer to common practices, process to go beyond space¹⁷ by forming new solidarities across spaces and issues and by challenging the dichotomy of the private and the public to redefine the “urban”.* In this respect, I must refer to the words of Chatterton mainly for the -practices of- urban commoning. As Chatterton (2010b, 627) proposed:

We can see these practices of urban commoning through a range of examples, from more spectacular interventions such as urban gardening or subvertising and adbusting (see Carlsson, 2008), to more mundane everyday acts of kindness, social care and togetherness. The ... potential of the urban commons relates to new political imaginaries. Tackling injustice requires not just successful attempts to mobilise against oppression, hierarchy and exploitation, although these are of course crucial. It also requires the generalisation of rebellion, cooperation and the commons which can develop and advocate for new imaginaries and political vocabularies. This is not an imaginary which relies on old or established political tools and formulas. In trying to build the urban common we find a

¹⁷From the Occupation Movement, Peter Marcuse on his blog (<http://pmarcuse.wordpress.com>), dealt with what he calls “the danger of fetishizing space” vis-a-vis the symbolic, educational, glue, umbrella and activation function of the space. However, it is important to underline some roles that Marcuse proposed: glue function as the pursuit of common goals for those affected and concerned and umbrella function as an organising base.

political project that ‘cuts diagonally across these false solutions—neither private nor public, neither capitalist nor socialist—and opens a new space for politics’ (Hardt and Negri, 2009, p. ix). It is this kind of space for new forms of political imagination that is also part of spatial justice. Actively building an urban commons also involves much more than capturing land and assets, although this is essential. It also requires the ability to control and imagine governance in new ways (Chatterton 2010b, 627).

We could only take action in, for and beyond cities by commoning, which refers to Chatterton’s following statement:

We can see the potential for many rebellions here, both large and small; but not just rebellions in the city, but also against the city. And this is what Soja, as well as Hardt and Negri, are seeking to illuminate in their work—struggles which are subversive and oppositional, but also transformative and prefigurative of possible, as yet unknown, urban worlds (Chatterton 2010b, 628).

For the formulation of the thesis’ title, “in, for, and beyond” Istanbul, I must refer once again to Chatterton’s words (2010a, 2010b). Chatterton (2010a, 236) argued that the urban impossible is being simultaneously within, against and beyond the current urban condition and stated that rebellions in the city are not only in the city but also against the city (Chatterton 2010b, 628); which means that they are subversive and oppositional, but also transformative and prefigurative of possible unknown urban worlds since they are sites of contemporary social change through its potential to organise the politics of the common.

We must ask the exact questions like “Whose cities”? while our main sheltering right turning into a commodity and cities becoming more and more segregated and exclusionary shaped by priority of urban rent for the production of space. To return back to the general aim of the thesis: As mentioned above, the question of the research initially was whether or not there will be an alliance between neighbourhood associations, urban oppositional groups, platforms but more exactly urban activists mainly mobilised against over-imposed spatial projects in Istanbul. In time, the research focused on the characteristics of these changing conditions and dynamics vis-à-vis heterogeneous and conflictual aspects of these group(s) within existing and power relations, tensions, overlapping and intersecting conflicts and turning moments: I consider this a *process as social practices of urban commoning, which creates “urban cracks”, inspired by crack of John Holloway (2002).*

From urban oppositions of different neighbourhoods and groups of intellectuals, the motive behind this study is to pave the way theoretically and practically for the possibilities of radical change for another city in another society through urban commoning practices. To contribute to this idea, the thesis has an objective to expose and question hidden aspects of the concepts and proposes new definitions by revealing origins, uses, and usefulness with the advices of Dr. Paul Chatterton. I firstly focused on reactions against demolitions, evictions, and housing rights violations because of top-down urban projects, and legislations; later I tried to make an analysis of “urban commoning practices” in claiming the rights to the city. I asked about aims, demands, strategies, messages, targets, and actions of groups and activists by revealing successes as well as obstacles and consequently, I aimed to expose and question “thinking and acting from and beyond space”, which is the main problematic of the scholars referred in the study. Instead of focusing on, fragmenting, homogenizing and comparing neighbourhoods, my research aimed to comprise differences and similarities

of groups and more exactly “few” actors in the *process* exemplified from Urban Movements Forum case in Istanbul set up in 2010 (for the pioneering study on these questions, please see Türkmen 2011). The thesis aims also to expose urban opposition in Istanbul against emerging from being against rental urban transformations in Istanbul, by focusing not on neighbourhoods, but instead on collective action by questioning obstacles of these oppositions, aiming to form a solidarity action research.

This study emphasizes the role of academic-activists including critical urban planners in the urban opposition and the relationship between theory and practice (please examine the article of Purcell 2009), as well as frame construction. However, it is necessary to add here that according to some residents and local activists, they themselves appropriate and struggle for their problems and underline that there is a “theoretical lack” which they feel while struggling. I questioned the necessity and characteristics of a possible coalition and togetherness between groups active in the struggles and as well as alliance formation attempts -raised mainly by activists and Çavuşoğlu and Yalçınhan in their journal articles- but came to a point that this is a process of urban commoning –practices-. This is evaluated in terms of tactics, strategies beside their type of organization, which in time tends to be decentralized, open and non-hierarchical grassroots organizations. What was critical was that some platforms were composed of merely one person or were led by only a few people even though these are neighbourhood associations. Moreover, they could leave the groups that they are working with and the groups could leave their active roles or even could stop working. It is essential to underline the importance of flexible organization of groups and the role of emotions with ideas and experiences of the leading activists, intellectuals, activist-academicians active in the urban opposition and coalition building in the urban commoning process by recognizing their roles in grassroots oppositions as well as alliances and common and conflicting positions that keep changing in time.

Accordingly, not individualizing and overemphasizing, the study will try to show the significant role of activists from neighbourhoods and intellectuals who are the leading figures in their groups, neighbourhoods as well as in various alliances and coalitions. In fact I can mention the presence of a core group in “emotional relations” of the urban oppositions in Istanbul, on their transition from reactive to proactive. The study does attach importance to affinity group¹⁸, in terms of activists who are engaged in commoning practices from urban struggles and trying to find different ways of resistances for effective struggles namely to form alliances, coalitions, protests and campaigns.

The thesis is focused on the lived experiences with changing characteristics in time. It is focused on how different groups and actors choose their ways, how they define, in which respects they find ways and concepts useful, what their main aims and demands are. From living in fear of becoming active inhabitants, neighbourhood inhabitants in Istanbul firstly claimed their right to house as a shelter, fragmented because of the propositions based on property and exchange value of space. In time, meeting with new people and seeing that they are not the only ones, mainly active inhabitants from

¹⁸The affinity group, which will be elaborated in the thesis is defined by the Trapeze Collective (2007) a small group of activists who work together on direct action using non-hierarchy and consensus. They often made up of friends or like-minded people and provide a method of organisation that is responsive, flexible and decentralised. In the Ecology of Freedom, Bookchin (1982) explains groups of affinity not as a means to gather people for action, but must be an ecological entity which is a permanent, humanist, communitarian, un-hierarchical, un-patriarchal, group of relations and which develop emancipatory relations. The argument of Bookchin could be an appropriate one with the libertarian and communitarian movement which finds its roots in affinity groups as a permanent, intimate, decentralized community. For Bookchin (in Clark 1986, 207), the ecological society – libertarian communitarian society is formed from these affinity groups as cellular tissues. Since it is based on unity-in-diversity, mutual interdependence, non-domination. For Clough (2012, 1673), affinity as a complex concept and opposed to the hegemony, domination, and inequality refers to a political organization but also a particular kind of emotive connection /relationship between comrades to the way of an egalitarian, non-hierarchical, grassroots democracy. In terms of anarchist affinity, it is a feeling of trust, closeness, and respect for a society of free and equal individuals. Clough (2012, 1673) reminds what Brown and Pickerill underlined; this requires a critical reflexivity and openness toward comrades.

different neighbourhoods claimed their right to survival and shelter, staying put in the neighbourhoods to *dwell in “home” and neighbourhoods* as a lived space, and homes of others as well. The study questioned the meaning of the right(s) to the city in practice and theory. To illustrate, three different neighbourhood associations from different socio-political characteristics namely Gülsuyu-Gülensu, Tozkoparan and Fener-Balat and two external organizations namely İMECE and Dayanışmacı Atölye and different in terms of their leading activists were used as cases to enter into the field of commoning practices in Istanbul. The research aims to emphasize the reasons why various activists mobilised for urban issues and to explore reasons and ways, kinds of protests. By doing this, it underlines their similarities and differences and examines alliances, tensions and contradictions, with an emphasis on all kind of associations, local politics related to urban issues.

The right to the city, with different meanings and connotations is valuable not only theoretically but also in relation with active urban struggles, mainly since 2010. During meetings and preparation forum before the European Social Forum held between the 1st and 4th of July 2010 in Istanbul, mainly discussing the right of housing and zero eviction, and the right to the city and urban social movements, the right to the city was proposed as a unifying slogan used by various urban oppositional groups and multiple agents against over-imposed urban projects, homogenization and commodification of urban and rural spaces of Istanbul. It is necessary to mention here that the right to the city was a controversial concept and the forum before the ESF became a turning point by reproducing existing splits apart from launching a new period of acquaintances, formation of new solidarities and information network.

The right to the city, conceptualized in the literature as a collective right in the struggles was mainly discussed as a slogan with a potential for creating alliances (see for a pioneering text on Istanbul case, Türkmen 2011) and a ground for a future anti-capitalist struggle. Consequently, the right to the city is used but also discussed, contested within the struggle, especially the alliance formed as “Kent Hareketleri” (Urban Movements), I intentionally chose not to work on one neighbourhood which is not a “homogeneous resisting unit” but instead to follow the actors and their interconnected oppositions and experiences.

Apart from differences, tensions, difficulties and obstacles, one of the objectives is to focus on commonalities to display and analyse the potentiality to extend dialogue on “uncommon ground” into “common places” as proposed by Chatterton (2006) beyond the categorization of “activists” and “ordinary people” or neighbourhood inhabitants. In this respect, emotional factors, friendship, personal, professional and political networks do matter for involvement as well as splits. As Chatterton (2006) underlined the importance of “taking encounters on uncommon ground” as a reply to the need to engage in politics as equals, which refer “emotionally laden, relationally negotiated, hybrid dialogue on uncommon ground into common places.” The research is an attempt to write experiences and words of the actors who are mainly active in paving the paths for urban resistances; demolitions, events, issues, visits created alliances for a specific time. The study is the story of urban resistances of revolting geographies as Dikeç (2007) conceptualized, struggling together in commoning on the way of appropriating others’ neighbourhoods and their city and common spaces against their enclosures. Intellectual actors are important and their self-transformation by struggling together. The meaning of the local benefiting from outside supports will be questioned in terms of self-organisation and representation at the local. On the other hand, questioning the “spatial” trap

and limits for claims of the right to the city and another production of urban space and urban oppositions whether or not urban opposition is reactionary and sporadic in Istanbul, the scaling-up and articulation of rights and demands which depart from property rights will be discussed with a focus on the obstacles behind the radical claim, “*possible-impossibles*” for the city and society (Lefebvre 1972, Elden 2009, Elden 2004, Purcell 2009, Purcell 2013b, Chatterton 2010, Souza 2010a, Routledge 2010).

This was a period for the attempts to build a strategic alliance namely “*Kent Hareketleri-Urban Movements*” of all the platforms, groups, neighbourhood associations, mainly shaped by academicians, intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods, alternative professional or academic groups. The thesis will question different local and also international meanings and dynamics of groups and struggles mainly in terms of campaigning activities, which became “moments” in this “process” of “togetherness?” rather than difficulties of a “permanent alliance”, which is discussed and thought to be a solution.

I have been working on this subject for more than ten years-period since my master studies and in 2010 for my doctorate project; I had decided to examine the attempts and problems of forming a real and permanent solidarity between urban opposition groups in Istanbul. After I had finished my master thesis in 2006 which was one of the very first examples of urban oppositions in which I worked on the first neighbourhood which has resisted against urban transformations Güzeltepe, new civil initiatives as well as new types of neighbourhood organizations were forming. Due to changing discussions and global as well as local dynamics, new conceptualizations came out from new efforts in the practice. Therefore, it was quite difficult and painful for me to seize, examine, and interpret the field. It is necessary to recognize that there are always some limitations to portray the Istanbul

case, but I hope that this study promises conceptual and practical contributions. Another important aspect is that there are some tensions in the field research: For instance, the perceptions of the actors and my interpretations of the facts may not correspond to some facts, which was the main challenge. From my position as an activist-researcher, I can define this action-oriented ethnographic research as a participatory and solidarity study, which mainly elaborates the effectiveness of urban oppositions *in / for (against) / beyond* (see Chatterton's articles) Istanbul to intervene in and take action on the right to the city. The research is undertaken with a special concern on individuals, and groups, who are the real subjects of urban oppositions. By making an analysis of the narratives and statements, experiences of activists and my personal reflexion from the protests and meetings supported by in-depth interviews, the thesis aimed to reveal the interconnected motives and ways and sheds the light on the continuous process of struggling, learning and self-organizing by focusing on types of organizations, associations, and ways of oppositions with due regard to the importance and changing composition of the activists.

The research period was a transformative and self-reflexive process for me as a "researcher" by learning and producing information from inside in accordance with questions and needs in urban activism in Istanbul throughout on-going process of commoning. Mainly based on my field notes taken in the meetings organised almost every week, in campaigning processes and many protests, visits to neighbourhoods as well, I try to refer to the words and thoughts of activists who play role in the initiation of the Forum, before and after the European Social Forum. In this respect, I mainly include the statements of different people¹⁹ mobilised, mobilizing and

¹⁹After raising the main point of the research, practical concerns, and analyses for whom and criticising the fact that all the social movements' analyses could remain within academic audience, Sutherland defined as "activist turn", in Social Movement research leads to a new approach namely "activist ethnography" influenced by feminist approaches

taking active positions in urban opposition. The interviews that I made were with the people that I abstained from academic violence. I also tried to propose definitions for urban oppositions from a radical analysis of the right to the city and urban commons or more exactly urban commoning in and beyond Istanbul. In this respect, I would like to refer to Blomley (1994) who asked the subsequent questions: “How can we contribute to and learn from progressive struggles without reinforcing the hierarchies of privilege, silencing those with whom we work?”, “Is our role that of catalyst, facilitator, or student?” Beyond the “academia”, the thesis is also an attempt trying to explain new and various platforms against demolitions supported by local beautification neighbourhood associations and other types of organizations, considered as a “vehicle for liberation, radical social transformation and the promotion of solidarity” as Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge proposed (2007).

What is critical is to work together and to use research for promoting solidarity beyond participation not being based on hierarchy, while challenging power relations to avoid the rigidity of social roles and categories-even doing away labels such as “activist” as Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge pointed out (2007). Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge referred to another aspect, which is *building “emotional connection” with direct experiences, intuition and a sense of justice, and dispelling “emotional objectivity” or “emotional imbalance” statements even though it is essential to not lose our coolness, temper by conveying our emotions and respecting and responding to those of others*. The action is not just an action in the research process, but it is a search for an answer of “how the research

to the “participatory action research”. This is not only an inclusive and democratic research process which acknowledges lived experience, but it is a “liberating and transformative” attempt able to contribute to social justice agendas for Sutherland (2013, 627). From a activist standpoint which challenges and connects the divisions such as activism-practice and research, it analyses specific movements (developments, local understandings, constructions, processes, structures) within movements in a politically engaged and collaborative participant observation and including the perspective of the activist themselves (Sutherland 2013).

process can contribute to wider activism”, while learning from the action, encouraging people to connect and linking micro-resistances (Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge 2007).

1.2. Introductory Literature

Throughout the study, I mainly examined critical and radical geographers and scholars from whom I get the inspiration to find my own path. I would like to emphasize again that all of the concepts of the grounded theory and methods, and related discussions in the field are explained in the theoretical part of the thesis.

To find my own path but being stuck in the mainstream explanations based on urban appropriation vis-a-vis “identity”, in time, the discussions and articles fed from insiders’ views and critiques mainly published in the journals namely “*City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*” and *Antipode* guided me to other paths in my research and my academic-activist journey. Apart from ideas of scholars from Turkey which I will elaborate in detail, I could cite Lefebvre’s social production of space and his “radical” understanding of right to the city, and autogestion, Chatterton’s radical, autonomous geographies, and new horizons for the right to the city, Souza’s understanding of right to the city from the radical-libertarian critique of urban resistance theories supported by further elaborations of the right to the city autogestion, and urban citizenship of Harvey, M. Purcell, P. Marcuse, Dikeç and Elden, supported by the idea of Holloway’s change the world without taking power through cracks and doings, and conceptualisation of multitude and commons of Hardt and Negri and Caffentzis’ and de Angelis’ commons, and McFarlane’s assemblage.

The main aim of the thesis is to interrogate and challenge the concepts such as the right to the city and urban opposition from the practice and experiences, to expose the relationship between words and struggles, and to

reveal abiding and non-abiding aspects with the theories. Consequently, the concepts that I have chosen is to demonstrate different usages and to reveal the core of the concepts for urban oppositions by proposing new conceptualisations, that is, beyond general understandings and categorizations based on direct observations, via a participatory manner and in-depth open-ended interviews in a longitudinal process.

In the *critical urban theory*, the “production of space” in Lefebvre’s term should be a first step; “capitalism” involves the fragmentation and homogenization of space, in other words, the “reproduction” of social relations of production, constituting the central and hidden and inherently spatial process of capitalist society. What is crucial is the control of the state and other groupings over spatial organization and authority for the use of space, thus the reproduction of social power relations. Lefebvre (1976), in the “Survival of Capitalism” argued that urban planning has a strategic instrumental role in the hands of state in the framework of production of abstract space, the manipulation of fragmented urban reality and the production of controlled space. Basically, the urban space is produced by the abstraction of the space by means of planning and urban design activities. The conflict between social and abstract spaces - the abstract space which the state and investors consider for their profit and its exchange value, rather than the use value of social space- leads to the resistance of the residents against displacement, demolition, privatization of the social space (Lefebvre 1991). The conflict between social and abstract spaces is significant to understand the resistance of the residents for the displacement, demolition, privatization of the social space. In this respect, Lefebvre points out the conflict between these spaces, planning activity is contradictory to existing social space (Lefebvre 1991). In Lefebvre, there is another treatment of space namely *trialectics*, i.e. *triplicité* (Lefebvre 1991, Gottdiener 1994, Shields 1998, Elden 2004) which means differentiation between social practices of the perceived -the physical space of the

everyday life, production and re-production of the city-, the conceived -the mental space that of plans, abstract space of technocratic, spatial and planning professions of the capitalist state-, and the lived -spaces of representation, space of the art, the space of “inhabitants” and underprivileged users and inhabitants who could decide on and produce so not of the buyer-. Lefebvre’s conceptualization of the political character of space, its production like other commodities in the market defined with technocratic domination over instrumental space, and the fragmentation of space according to the exigencies of the mode of production. In other words, the reproduction of relations of production gives the basis of the relationship between space, urban renewal and urban resistance, which constitutes the main structure of the study. If we return to urban social movements, its salience comes from its potential to challenge the following theses: Firstly, the main thesis is that class does not matter in contemporary movement. Secondly, there is no effect of identities and other factors of groups and societies and still class and relations of production is the mere determinant in social movements. My thesis supports the idea that urban social movements neither a mere class movement nor an “ideal type” of new social movements, characterized by orientations of issue, lifestyle, cultural elements, environment, identity, and gender with changing social relations of production and characteristics of class. It is necessary to underline that all contemporary movements are labelled prominently as “new social movements”, which is quite problematic: Urban social movements in the thesis are held to be social oppositions and struggles starting from urban space with a potential of urban commoning from the right to the city in a process. Another aspect is the effect and change aimed by urban social movements and subsequently the used way of mobilisation so institutionalization and type of organization. One of the related problematiques are their positions vis-à-vis the state. In this respect, we must mention the position with the power too since with the changing forms

of actions and organizations, the movements could aim “change the world without taking power” (Holloway 2002). Apart from *gecekond* struggles, urban social movements were considered as “identity movements”, in the framework of life quality or civil society. It is also taken in terms of “*kentlilik*” in Turkish and “high level of consciousness” not correlated with poor people in the literature in Turkey (please examine Mengi (ed.) 2007) until the mid-2000s marked by activist-academicians, their groups and intellectuals from neighbourhoods. In the study, “collective consumption” of Castells (1983) is proposed to be politicized as “urban commons”, which is a quite novel and critical use in Turkey. In fact, from Castells to Harvey, the scholars who study urban social movements and struggles underline the necessity of alliances between different struggles. The importance of urban social movements comes from its local and international, transnational - about discussion on transnationality of movements see Rucht 1999- characteristics, whose dimensions are open to discussion. Between and beyond its old and new social movement characteristics, urban resistances will be elaborated with the unique importance of the urban activists. As Gusfield, Laraña and Johnston (1994) defined, urban movements could be held as new social movements with their following features: *transcending class structure*, emergence of new and weak dimensions of identity as well as blurred relations between the individual and the collective, also *involving personal and intimate respects of human life and new mobilization tactics* but on the other hand, being *segmented, diffuse and decentralized*, so different in terms of organizations, tactics and ideological points. The study will consider both structural and actor level of urban oppositions, with the actual conditions of different alliances. This represents different faces for Castells in the 1970s and the 1980s as stated by Pickvance (2003). Castells opens the debate from the following proposition: urban movements do not carry structural change potential even though there are conjunctions with

other groups and because of macro forces, urban movements remain to be “reactive utopias” (Pickvance 2003, 103).

The study aims to question and challenge urban social movements literature with the dilemmas of being a single-issue movement mainly concentrating on urban issues or focusing on particular neighbourhoods, and considering an old or new social movement. The thesis proposes new ideas for the literature pointing out multiple compositions of resistances, intellectual and international support with changing meanings of “urban claims” elaborated by Erbatur Çavuşoğlu and Murat Cemal Yalçın, Hade Türkmen and Hakan Yücel.

The study aims to examine local dimension and new forms of mobilization and organization which emerged during the resistance process. It stresses the heterogeneity of multiple agents, which could gather under a new understanding of commonality of urban issues. Chatterton and Heynen (2011) underlined the importance of progressive change as the goal of resistance and collective social action. They referred to multiple spatial relations and an emotional core for the impossible. In this study the idea that resistance is geographical activity, emerging from the local and linking to the global is considered as basis. As underlined by Mayer (2009), with the neoliberalization of policies, there is a return of the so-called urban issues to the agenda of urban social movements. Even though a single and non-controversial definition is not possible, urban social movements are defined as “a conscious collective practice originating in urban issues, able to produce qualitative changes in the urban system, local culture and political institutions in contradiction to the dominant social interests institutionalized as such at the societal level” by Manuel Castells (1983, 278). Much of the debate must revolve around tactics and co-optation of urban social movements. Souza (2010a, 330) stated:

social movements must continually reinvent themselves, their strategies, and tactics, and finally their language, in order to avoid the colonization of radical slogans and concepts (such as the “right to the city”) and to cope with new and old challenges...Several important movements have already done and doing precisely this, in different countries under more or less different (and more or less similar) circumstances...

For Souza (2010a), these emancipatory movements are keys to the right to the city, to more exactly, a just and free society. To develop critical premises, I could refer to the European Social Forum. Souza (2010b in Atkinson, Lipietz, Souza, Suri, 2010) underlined that students (mostly middle class), NGOs and academics are the majority of the people attending to the Social Urban Forum in Rio. Activists from favelas, sem-teto settlements-squatted buildings-had had merely a low percentage, while poor population were not aware of changes; he added that there is a need for an alternative to the alternative produced by a few academics and activists connected to political parties and NGOs who guide and control social movements’ organizations (Souza 2010b in Atkinson, Lipietz, Souza, Suri, 2010). Mayer (2009), in her article explores the relation between the right to the city and urban resistance movements by comparing the different versions and changes of the motto of the right to the city, which has become a defining feature of urban struggles all around the world. Different meanings are associated with the concept ranging from a radical definition in a Lefebvrian sense to a more liberal democratic participatory versions used for instance by global NGOs and governments (see Mayer 2009). The right to the city is chosen and also rejected as a concept from urban activism in Istanbul, appropriated especially by some neighbourhood activist dwellers, intellectuals and academicians from platforms, and groups of

urban opposition. Lefebvre, who put forward the “concept”, had elaborated the survival of capitalism and its growth from its means of occupying space and producing a space. In this framework, he puts forward the right to the city, like a cry and a demand (Lefebvre 2000, 158); however as a transformed and renewed right to urban life (Lefebvre 2000, 158). It was based on self-management, autogestion and urban change (Kofman and Lebas in Lefebvre 2000, 35). The right to the city was proposed Henri Lefebvre and found its way in the social movements of 1968 marked by the slogan “change the city, change the life” (Elden 2004, 160-162), which is criticised by Lefebvre (2003). In the literature as well as in the opposition, the right to the city still has to be elaborated in a meticulous way. Even though we have witnessed the popular return of Lefebvre’s magical concept, which was subsequently discussed in academic milieus, in both its legislative (Souza 2001, 2012b, Fernandes, 2007) and sometimes ideological usages by state institutions (Mayer in Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer 2012, 6), it is co-opted by governments (Souza 2010a, Mayer 2009) for legitimizing the so-called participatory forms of urban governance and newly introduced forms of participation in municipal affairs as the realization of the right (Mayer in Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer 2012, 6). As referred above, it is used, debated and contested by different actors and groups and as a key for alliances all over the world: it is the focus of workshops and forums and has created a discussion and solidarity milieu for opposition groups, actors and academics –even though it is mostly those actors who could afford to travel could attend these meetings (Souza 2010b in Atkinson et al. 2010) - such as the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, the European Social Forum in Istanbul and Urban Forums in Naples, to resist collectively or effectively against displacement and evictions.

As Souza (2010a) demonstrated, the fashionable expression “the right to the city” arising from the common need for an umbrella word for action and theory runs the risk of robbing the idea of its radical meaning and potential

(Souza 2010a, 316). The more the concept is marked by trivialization and the action of social movements reduced to a “politics of turf” (Souza 2010a, 317). It is necessary to be specific about the right to the city’s essential components for the power of the idea not to be lost as Purcell (2008) argues.

Souza (2012c) made a remark about the right to the city which becomes a vague slogan with the increasing number of politically weak and limited usages for the convenience of various interests of different groups and organizations including movements and added that it is necessary to provide a political and strategic clarity for the heterodox Marxist Henri Lefebvre and the right to the city (Souza 2012c, 563). How to be specific about the right (Purcell 2008)? It is a claim to a totality, to a totally different city, and especially different society, by rejecting the unequal and exploitative nature of the prevailing capitalist system as Souza (2010a, 2012c) and Chatterton (2010) maintained. The right to the city as a claim from the *urban* -in relation with and prerequisite of socialist revolution- has the capacity to go beyond in and beyond state with its characteristic of being grasped only by struggle as Lefebvre underlined and Harvey (2008) re-emphasized. What is inspirational in the right to the city is mainly related to its emphasis on the use-value of urban space, questioning relations of possession. If the elaboration is made through the space at the centre of politics and revolutionary action, the use-value must be free from its domination of exchange-value for Lefebvre. The right to the city is formed by the right to the *uses of spaces*, the right to *inhabit, dwell poetically* from Heidegger (Lefebvre 2003, 181) free from the right to property of spaces to be bought and sold. The right to the city in Lefebvre will be elaborated in the thesis in terms of the production of space and of the transformation of the city with its further elaborations at the same time recent discussions, what is written, discussed and lived. The right to the city beyond being a mere slogan should be considered in the framework of challenging the right to dwelling based on property, as a horizon for the right to oeuvre and appropriation, the right

to “*autogestion*” –that I will elaborate- and even basically to the priority of the use value over the exchange value as a superior form of right (Lefebvre 2000), challenging citizenship, legislations and human rights and especially for another future –city.

The study will underline that the right to the city is a key for urban struggles and it is up to us, to understand, use and build it. To present how activists define the right to the city and the way they reason as well as their proposed is another aim of the thesis. *The “right to the city”, a concept of critical and radical geography and urban geography, a reality of contemporary cities is one of the most important concepts used in the study. At this point, I would like to add that with an emphasis on radical geography, I will discuss common as well as conflicting aspects in Marxist explanations.*

In the framework of the “geography of survival” as conceptualised by Mitchell and Heynen (2009), the right to the city was present from the very first formation period of *gecekondu* neighbourhoods. It was the right to appropriation in terms of using and producing space according to need. In the neighbourhoods of Istanbul, some may occupy a bus stop, as happened in Güzeltepe in Eyüp, and others spent their nights in a park in Küçükçekmece to campaign for their rights of dwelling after the demolition of their homes in Ayazma. However, as a reaction to urban regeneration, inhabitants active in the urban opposition reclaim the right for the occupation, the use and production of urban space once again. Some of the actors from neighbourhoods have broadened their claims starting from their own houses in terms of the right of property and their neighbourhoods. Referring to Isin, Dikeç put the city as the battleground to claim group rights, whose struggles are for claiming rights to the city as a space of politics. Dikeç (2002a) explains the right to the city following Lefebvre, as a call to advance an *urban spatial approach to political struggles with the*

participation of all those who inhabit the city without discriminating any individual.

The right to the city is not a gift, but has to be seized by political movement, to open spaces of the city (Harvey 2008). The right to the city must be understood by the transformation of the city by changing ourselves in collective struggles as “a collective right to be seized”. In other words, it is a common right that is not given; but grasped. This transformation inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization²⁰ (Harvey 2008). It is a right to change us by changing the city, *being a common rather than an individual right as well as a unifying tool, working slogan and political ideal of struggles, unifying these struggles and also for a broad social movement* and Harvey adds: “Lefebvre was right to insist that the revolution has to be urban, in the broadest sense of that term, or nothing at all.” (Harvey 2008). What is the most crucial is that the right to the city is not merely a right to access to what already exists (Harvey 2003). In these conditions, “a different right to the city must be asserted.” This – inalienable- right to the city, worth for fighting, must be “an active right to make the city different, to shape the city more in accord with our heart’s desire to re-imagine and re-make, and to re-make ourselves in a different image, with the creation of new urban commons, a public sphere of active

²⁰In the text titled as “On Architects, Bees, and Possible Urban Worlds”, Harvey (1996) states that urban planners are bees in the capitalist hive to create cities functioned as spaces of capital accumulation. The “real spaces” populated by different groups are now dominated by free market ideology, marginalization of population, and cheap labour forces. What distinguishes the worst of architects from the best of bees is that architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. For Harvey (1996), there is not a mere causal relationship, but a dialectical relationship, if it is explained in Lefebvrian terms, between spaces of representation and representations of space, but the material productive force of special practices. From the same line, Harvey (1987) asserted that the flexible geographical mobility of flexible accumulation within the inter-urban competition is materialized as consumer centres, cheap imitations of attractive places for people burdened by commoditized life styles.

democratic participation against privatization of neoliberalism (Harvey 2003).

As Marcuse argued (2009, in Chatterton 2010 a), the right to the city “is not the right to the existing city that is demanded, but the right to a future city.” In other words, the key role for urban imaginer is to make today’s impossibility into tomorrow’s possibility, while creating new vocabularies, imaginations and strategies for action about a radically different city for Chatterton (2010a). Questioning “Which right to which city?”, Souza (2010a) claims that the more the expression “the right to the city” of Lefebvre becomes fashionable these days, the more the concept is marked by the trivialization and corruption. Here, the question of Souza (2010a) is critical: “Which right to which city?” in the pretext that the concept of Henri Lefebvre, as a claim for the right to a more human life but in the context of the capitalist city and the basis of a representative democracy. For Souza, even though David Harvey has a non-reformist understanding of the right, making political-strategic evaluations, he evaluates new and radical-democratically based social movements as “old”, and “static”. This leads to the ignorance of agency, and capability of social actors. What is critical is the libertarian interpretation which is proposed by Souza. What he proposed has crucial significance since he exposed that especially in the dominant “civil society” liberal democratic political discourse, the term is used as an “umbrella-phrase” for what? And instead, it should be used as a kind of contested territory of emancipatory social movements and radical intellectuals. This is important since this concept is narrowed with the conceptualization as human and affordable housing and participation. It is true that decent and affordable housing are “concrete” aims to be attained. However, what Souza underlined is inspiring: Not only neoliberalism but also capitalism could lead to taming of urban resistances. All these claims are trapped into “capitalism” through state protectionism and combination

of so-called “ecological goals” with capitalism. Peter Marcuse²¹ (2009) addresses to the right to the city with the questions “Whose right?” by referring to David Harvey and “what right?” and “what city?”. As a critical urban theory by exposing –analysing and making clear the roots of the problem-, proposing -working with those who are affected with proposals, programs, targets, strategies for desired results-which could conflict with his right to the city conceptualization- and politicizing -clarifying the political action implications of what is exposed, proposed and by organizing strategically, with day-to-day politics including media and academic discussions- as solutions to link this theory and the practice, the demand for a right to the city is a demand and a goal, which needs a definition.

The thesis aims to elaborate changing and expanding dimensions of urban resistances and to pave the way for a new horizon for discussions on the urban social movements trapped in the dilemma between old and new social movements as well as in terms of its potential for change. The study claims that urban oppositions makes possible to think about social movements beyond old and new categorizations. In this respect, the socio-political component as the claim for the participation in decision making, i.e. “*autogestion*” carries great importance in this process. *Autogestion* is proposed and defined by Lefebvre (in Dikeç and Gilbert 2008, 72) as self-management which is the condition in which each time a social group refuses to passively accept its conditions of existence, of life or of survival, each time such a group attempts not only to learn but also to master its own conditions of existence” on a way to a new citizenship. The working class or as Purcell (2002) termed “citadinship” as a specific set of rights of people,

²¹For Marcuse (2009), the future should not be predicted, designed, defined, but be left to the democratic experience. Referring to Harvey’s Spaces of Hope in terms of a broader change, Marcuse underlines that it is necessary to be aware of the dangers of the spatial focus, which ignores the economic, social, political origins of the problems and the common roots, nature of the deprivation and discontent as well.

to appropriation and participation based on everyday life in urban space. What is critical is that Purcell underlines citizens' participation within and outside of the state apparatus by challenging capitalist social relations. The right is opposed to the private property and ownership, and it destabilizes capitalist social relations and the process of capitalist accumulation for a new citizenship and new politics. *Autonomy* is defined by Pickerill and Chatterton (2006) as contextual and situated tendency with many trajectories, a socio-spatial strategy in which many autonomous projects across time and space converge. The idea of autonomy -in Greek *autos-nomos*- for Chatterton (2005) is explained as "the desire for freedom, self-organisation, making its own laws, mutual aid, collective experience and solidarity" and a "demand to be heard and recognised". It is a reply to another freedom with *individual and collective pillars* against individualised freedom based on consumer society. Autonomy is defined as resistance and creation of praxis, as well as a commitment to the revolution of the everyday, daily struggles in everyday realities in "prefigurative politics" and "movement of movements" without centre and hierarchy in order to renew democracy via direct action for radical change by accepting pluralistic nature of the world and difference for Pickerill and Chatterton (2006). If I continue from Pickerill and Chatterton (2006), autonomy also means a change of the world, without taking power-considering autonomy as a commitment to freedom, non-hierarchy, a desire for elimination of power relations- as Holloway says and a rejection of government that demands obedience as Castoriadis states. Providing alternative ways, at least choosing to take the path as the Zapatistas say, will encourage people to articulate, expand and connect them. In this respect, autonomous geographies are everywhere in anytime in a web of stories and lessons, which inspire people acting in their locality (Pickerill and Chatterton 2006). It is essential to understand this "locality" since this is not limited to a

change of the locality but the potential for multi-scalar change (Chatterton 2006).

To return to the basic question about urban social movements, Souza (2010a) made a very crucial remark from the right to the city: There is a danger of the reduction of the right to the city, even for “grassroots activists” to a “politics of turf”. This could be understood that ignoring all other parts of the world, the right to the city is reduced to a “general framework” like an umbrella term for action. Souza²² (2010a) explains his point and consequently he argues: *gentrification and the housing question are results of “capitalism” and “participation as a tool for crisis management”* (Souza 2010a, 317). The demands must consider these points. The concept of Lefebvre must be held as *a radical one*, together with his political concept “*autogestion*”, *self-management, which is not a mere participation*. In other words, for Souza (2010a), the right to the city for Lefebvre cannot be reduced to the right to better housing, especially in the framework of capitalist city. Autogestion is becoming a tamed and hollowed participation both in literature and practice. In Turkey, in terms of political claims, autogestion is in general used as “devolution of power, self-government” which is generally correlated with Kurdish region of Turkey. However, in the thesis, it will be explained as the critique of so-called urban participation, which in fact necessitates the active presence of citizens from/until the level of fulfilment of human beings; it is a re-claim for “good city”²³.

²²Souza (2010a) underlines the importance of operationalization of “autonomy” –in the philosophical framework created by Castoriadis- for positive social change and social justice.

²³Chatterton elaborated step by step in his talk made for the launch of Urban Cultures and Consumption Research Cluster, at the University of Leeds, on the politics of hope via autonomous social movements such as networks of autonomous neighbourhoods and the solidarity economy to recreate a sense of collectivity. It is also a reclaim of self-management in solidarity as well as a responsibility to challenge decision making in cities,

For Iveson (2011), the right to the city is not merely an issue of re-ordering urban space, but directly related to relations which generate forms of injustices in the city as a “common cause” or a “glue that binds” to build alternatives to injustices. He reminds what Marcuse (2009) underlined, the right to the city as a common mobilizing cause around which groups of the deprived and the alienated. The most crucial problems have spatial aspect, but with the real origin is in historically embedded economic, social, political issues with partial spatial cause, derivative of broader processes of injustice. What Soja²⁴ emphasized is that the spatial causality of injustice and justice which are embedded in spatiality, in the framework of the socio-spatial dialectic. For a right to a future just city, spatial justice has to be sought via urban struggles. These struggles for spatial justice must be radically open to multiple constituencies, avoiding monolithic social movements. This search for spatial justice of Soja could be related to the search for “the commons” of Negri according to Chatterton (2010b), which opens new horizons for “urban social movements” and also the “right to the city”. Chatterton asserts that spatial justice could be fully realized by rebuilding the “urban common”, the common which is complex and produced and reproduced through relations in different times, spaces and struggles, in other words, it is not a static entity. This is a tool to understand theoretically the alliances in the process of building and rebuilding and also to be used practically in the struggles while trying to build alliances. This is underlined by Chatterton who states that ‘the common is full of productive moments of resistance that create new vocabularies of solidarities, social

being aware of potentialities of everyday politics with the slogan: “be the change you want to see.”

²⁴ For Soja (1980), the space is not a separate structure and an expression of class structure from social relations of production, but a dialectically defined part of general relations of production, which are social and spatial.

and spatial practices and relations and repertoires of resistance’ (Chatterton 2010b, 626): The urban common is a useful and I think innovative, appropriate and revolutionary concept for our understanding of spatial justice and the city, the city as the cradle of powerful forces of capital accumulation but also practices and potentials of the common, the productive capacities of the multitude. The city itself has the force to create commons, by creating social relations of commoning via decommodifying urban life. Another critical aspect is that with its neither private nor public characteristics; it opens a new space for politics, new forms of political imagination, part of spatial justice.

From the framework of *the social practice of commoning* (Harvey 2012), the city has brought another type of consciousness, I propose, in *ongoing “practices of urban commoning”* with an emphasis on the process still shaped by multiple actors against the enclosures of public spheres as well as neighbourhoods as common spaces with new types of horizontal solidarity organizations and experiences. In the study, there is an emphasis on the presence of different actors some defining themselves as “non-political”, which means that they were not involved in protests and have not questioned the city and the governmental politics before. In this respect claiming the right to the city as social production of space became a common motive for different groups which *learn and practice urban commoning and question* what common and commoning is, what the enclosures are and what the ways of struggles could be.

In terms of forming and proposing a new conceptual framework, the study aims also to expose existing explanations of different groups and actors in Istanbul mainly from words, experiences and emotions of resistant subjects (Chatterton and Heynen 2009). As Chatterton and Heynen (2009) underlined the importance of progressive change as the goal of resistance and collective social action with multiple spatial relations and emotional

core for the impossible, the study tries to be based upon the idea that the resistance is a geographical activity, from local to global revealing resistant subjects in affinity group, who is taking action and resisting. Urban opposition, emerging from urban space and localities questions possession relationships, inequalities, power-capital relations and interest groups, so it is one of the most economic and political ones. In this respect, locality deserves to be elaborated much more carefully. Şen (2010, 343-344), in her pioneering article on urban social movements in Istanbul, underlines that even though it is open to discussion, some neighbourhood movements went on to make global connections beyond their localities. Brenner (2000), from Lefebvre and its overlooked theories on the state, argues that the scale question offers new methodological and political challenges for critical urban theory. Questioning “the contours of the scale question”, Brenner underlined from local to global, scales are considered to be static entities frozen within a geographical scale. This disregards complex and perpetually changing historical interconnections and interdependencies, links, communications, networks and circuits (Brenner 2000). About Lefebvre’s theories on the state, Brenner (2000) proposed the “state mode of production”, while the state being institutional mediator of uneven geographical development –for uneven development and second circuit of capital from the built environment, please examine Harvey (1989), Smith (1996, 2002)- under capitalism so “scales” must be thought in terms of power geometries and in a changed political process.

Purcell (2006, 2009) critically questions the right to the city in the framework of urban citizenship and struggles. The scale held in terms of subject and geography or both in terms of international connections, for Purcell, the right to the city is a reframing of decision-making in the cities for urban space to be occupied, accessed and “fully and completely” used for and by its users, urban inhabitants as well as a radical restructuring of social, political and economic relations in the city but also beyond -the state

structure- everyday life (Purcell 2006, 1930-1931). What is essential is the reinvention of radical democratic practices and resistances in cities and more wider-scales as well as rural places (Purcell 2006, 1036-1937). It is crucial to be aware of the characteristic of the urban, which is comprehensive and non-local (Purcell 2009). This thesis discusses the multi-scalar action or i.e. scaling-up from property rights, meaning of home and neighbourhood to other neighbourhoods and city, from and beyond collective consumption issues which could go to a discussion on the system. It would create commonalities through differences, complexities of articulation of rights.

The study asks whether or not there is a risk to stay fixed to the locality/space and that this will hinder the development of a broader claim or political project. However, it is considered that the importance of urban social movements emerges in local experiences but may incorporate as well international/transnational characteristics. On the other hand, it is required to remind that locality does not necessarily mean to a “real” or more democratization as Purcell pointed out (2006).

1.3. Research Questions of the Study

With the following hypotheses: “Urban oppositions in Istanbul are highly fragmented. In spite of fragmentation, they are different patterns and dynamics of opposition and alliances”, the thesis concentrates on the following questions: “How and why do urban opposition emerge?, Who are the actors?, What are they addressing to?, What are the importance of space and local?, What are the potentialities, difficulties and limitations of urban oppositions? How do these notions and issues apply to Istanbul?, Are there any possibilities of extending oppositions (for example scaling-up from the exchange-value of the space to the meaning of home, staying put in the neighbourhood, as well as connecting the issue with other neighbourhoods, the city and the system)? Do urban oppositions aim radical social

transformations, “beyond reactions to spatial interventions”?, Why is to form alliances one of the main aims of opposition groups? Do some attempts of alliances such as the Forum of Urban Movements meet with its aims? , What kind of different actors can be identified in this process?, What kind of patterns and dynamics of urban oppositions can be identified?, What kind of examples of cooperation and failure can be observed?, Are there any differences between the perceptions, definitions, positions and expectations of activists and groups in the urban oppositions?, What are different meanings of the right to the city in terms of its origins, uses, and usefulness through literature and struggles in Istanbul? In which respect does it offer potentialities?, What are the roles and effects of intellectuals? What are the reasons of controversies and tensions?, What are the commonalities and differences of the groups?, Are international campaigns important in urban oppositions in Istanbul?

1.4. Structure of the Study

After this introductory chapter which dealt with the main aims of the study with a bibliographical essay, the second chapter covers the methodology of the dissertation which is composed of sections that elaborate on the nature and the limitations of the field, draws general framework of the preferred methodology, supported by the literature on participatory and in some respect solidarity action research since the methodological perspective has not had much contact with the existing literature on social movements.

The third chapter “Walking on the Paths of the Real Subjects: Grounded Theory” start with in-depth analysis of the right to the city through the discussions of concepts such as “citadin”, “autogestion”, and “urban commons” to show a horizon for radical social transformations “beyond reactions to spatial interventions”. The chapter also sheds light on the

theories of urban social movements illustrating social forums within the framework of urban oppositions by revealing some patterns in the elaborations. To pose a critique to existing perspectives, I propose revisiting urban oppositions through radical and autonomous geographies perspectives, which, I argue, constitute the ignored core of the concepts that are in use.

The fourth chapter is built on my field research based on my participatory action research since 2010 in urban struggles in Istanbul. This is the period of alliance formation attempts initiated by different activists namely “Urban Movements (Forum)”. In this context, I had the chance to participate, observe and involve in meetings, protests, and campaigning processes to analyse this “uncommon ground”. Firstly, I provided a critical history and theory of urban struggles in Istanbul from the points that I find problematic. I question urban regeneration as the motive behind urban struggles in Istanbul supported by ideas of activists, since urban oppositions started as reaction against urban regeneration projects. I find this point vital for rethinking urban oppositions beyond being spatial reactions. Secondly, the right to the city is questioned from its different meanings in terms of its origins, uses, and usefulness through right to the city literature and struggles in Istanbul with the interrogation from the practice. Lastly, I examined dynamics of “urban commoning process” from urban opposition groups by emphasizing the role of activists, the potentialities and difficulties and I discuss the “problem” of forming alliances in terms of whether or not it is an aim or a strategy.

In the fifth chapter, I illustrate the discussions of the fourth chapter through the case of Urban Movements (*Kent Hareketleri*) which is an open alliance –attempt- in Istanbul. I started to describe and analyse the days of togetherness before and during the European Social Forum days, which initiated the formation of an alliance under the name of “Urban

Movements”. The chapter will be elaborating its significance for the discussion on the necessity of forming alliances or coalitions. As mentioned above, this will expose the importance of urban commoning process rather than forming a permanent coalition. Secondly, I reveal the turning moments of the forum which are mainly the protests and campaigns with the initiation of activists in an international network. Here, I made a discussion from activists’ ideas on international campaigning and its meaning for the locality. At the end of the chapter, I put some supporting and critical views of the initiator activists vis-à-vis this alliance attempt.

To conclude, in the sixth chapter, I expose concluding remarks and arguments of the thesis. I try to show a horizon from prefiguration on Istanbul and mention important characteristics of urban resistances to claim urban commons.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

2.1. Nature of the Field and Its Limitations

In this chapter on methodology, firstly, I will try to expose the nature and limitations of the field. Secondly, I will expose the general framework of the methodology as an attempt for a participatory action research, supported by the interviews made with key actors in the alliance process. Lastly, I will try to present the literature on participatory and solidarity action research. As an attempt to a certain extent for a participatory approach, the aim of the study was to convey experiences, related advices and critiques of actors for assessing and exposing weaknesses and strengths of the oppositions and campaigns²⁵. In the study, it is tried to determine some turning points for the opposition *in/for/against*²⁶ Istanbul including actors' experiences to reveal overlapping and diverging issues and common standpoints. The thesis is an attempt to write the experiences and ideas of the actors²⁷ who are searching the ways to pave the paths to claim the rights to the city will speak by and

²⁵ The critical ideas are from "Campaigning for Social Change" course of Dr. Paul Chatterton, 2012, the University of Leeds.

²⁶ I appreciate the conceptualisation of Dr.Chatterton to explain urban opposition groups in Istanbul mobilising from urban space against neoliberal transformations. Another formulation could be beyond Istanbul to refer to going beyond being "spatial mobilisations".

²⁷One of the earliest books in Turkey about social movements is titled "Social movements talk" edited by Leyla Şanlı (2003). Like this study aimed, my research aimed to analyse their requests and struggles with its successes and weaknesses via the voices and thoughts of activists and their lessons and experiences.

for themselves in the study. This study aims to tell the stories of people who struggle for the right to housing in their neighbourhoods evolved in time claim for others' rights as a collective right in different neighbourhoods, their city from the spatial evictions and displacements because of the so-called urban regeneration projects. *As a "researcher", I tried to challenge and break the questions and categories a priori (labour movements, "ideal activist") and focus on what is living, experiencing and needed.* I think the main distance is in us, our categories before and after our research, which results in searching the replies to our former questions while ignoring interpersonal relations and common people involved in movements.

There were some limitations and sensitivities in the field. Firstly, I did not intend to go on the field, do my interviews and return back. Furthermore, my field study was covering many aspects including meetings, protests in both city centres and different neighbourhoods, visits in neighbourhoods at many levels from organizations to inner relations, emotions in a longitudinal way which takes approximately two years. It was a real transformation period, which is difficult to find common, conflicting and turning points. Due to the constraints of my field, though I forced the limits of personal and professional conditions, I could not state that it is a fully realized solidarity study; however, as an attempt in the social movements' literature in Turkey, I did establish my points to certain extent which I had in my mind on the questions: "What is needed?, What can you give back to these people?" I would like to articulate on the critical points of the theoretical framework during my research. When I had written my first research proposal, my study was focused on different associations in Istanbul from the claims on the production of space along class lines. My aim was to challenge the existing and confusing aspects of urban oppositions through my fieldwork. I reformulated my research questions from the needs of the field.

If we return to the definition, in the Dictionary of Human Geography (2009), action research is defined as a synthesis between study of social change and active involvement in processes of change, with a critical research, reflexive activism and open-ended pedagogy in an attempt of pursuing a collaborative methodology. The main motive behind this study is the interrogation of the position of the researcher as the authority to produce knowledge about the marginalized other as the object and the challenge of the dichotomy between researcher and researched trying to include researched as intellectual collaborators. The aims of the study are mainly during the study, making them a part of theory-making with a critical self-reflexivity and intellectual self-empowerment so to include them into “dominant system of knowledge”. However, this represents also a self-reflexivity of researcher in the sense that this type of research is a means in the academic market or a goal/an end. Since the 1980s, the critiques addressed to this type of research are challenged by geographers who are doing applied geography with a poststructuralist approach.

2.2. General Framework of the Methodology

In this section, I would like to illustrate that the study process was not a *mere methodology for data collection, yet this is the most important period of my life, mainly a self-reflexive one*²⁸, while learning from the process of struggle, from the actors. Since the mid-2010, when I decided to work on urban activism, I realised that activists were trying to find effective struggle ways to raise their voices. Their main discussion point was to form a platform including all the activists against urban regeneration projects all over the city and other cities as well, which became my main framework.

²⁸Maxey (1999), in his paper, elaborates “academic-activist “in a reflexive way from feminist approach challenging the actively constructed and changing boundaries of this binary and beyond with Maxey’s own words.

Therefore the study mainly aims not to speak for the subjects but *my participatory research provided me to grasp real discussions in the opposition and demands and claims of these inhabitants.*

My notes from the meetings of Urban Movements (almost every week with the active participation of different actors from neighbourhoods and groups and platforms from outside the neighbourhoods), from visits, meetings in different neighbourhoods and districts such as Gülsuyu-Gölensu, Tozkoparan, Fener-Balat, Sarıyer, and Ayazma and participation in the protests supported by in-depth interviews composed of open-ended *questions which I developed after more than one year of involvement.* The focus is mainly on critical aspects to reveal common and conflictual aspects of neighbourhood associations and solidarities, of groups namely İMECE and Dayanışmacı Atölye and Kent Hareketleri. The interviews are conducted with *“intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods who are actively struggling both for neighbourhoods and the city and who form the core group of the activists in finding new ways on resisting on uncommon ground via the practices of urban commoning”.* These activists are not unknown soldiers but activists who are also writing, speaking and struggling with their names. This is not a priority on leading activists but these activists are the ones who struggle. Even though I had the possibility to do interviews with other inhabitants, I did decide not to do due to possible academic violence in their living and personal conditions at that time. However, their thoughts and demands of the active inhabitants are integrated into the research aimed to create a connection more than being a mere research. Moreover, fed by activists’ thoughts on the research during the process, some questions directly on the research were posed. To illustrate: Çiğdem commented on the study: “We are writing a history and the study will be transferred right as a lesson for the next generations. It would be a document and a part of the history. This would serve people to serve to people understand this process and a consciousness raising so their

engagement. It would concentrate on obstacles, strategies and weaknesses.” Kumru stated: “While talking, I am also re-revising myself and considering our lacking aspects”. For an accurate analysis on urban oppositions in Istanbul, this study aims to convey the voices, experiences of actors involved in this opposition in an action-oriented and participatory way in a self-reflexive learning process, while learning from inside in the process of struggle. I have participated in meetings and protests especially organized to form alliances for an effective opposition against urban regeneration projects, which were held almost every week since 2010. I tried to understand the main issues for the actors and turning points for urban oppositions in Istanbul. The main difficulty as well as inspirational aspect of the research was to witness different histories of different people. It was so difficult, important for me to write due to appropriately academic, practical and personal reasons since apart from producing an academic product, this document has an aim to be a document which will be used and discussed by the actors.

As a self-reflexive and participatory research in a longitudinal way based on the grounded theory, in-depth interviews are conducted with different actors including different groups composed of academicians, professionals, different active inhabitants from and for different neighbourhoods. I questioned my position vis-a-vis intellectuals’ positions in urban opposition especially with claims for other neighbourhoods and public spaces. The main aim of the thesis is to write from lived experiences and to include “knowledge” produced by actors and their agencies, ways of and abilities of (self-) organizing into the literature. The study tried to cover more-than-two-years-period of time and interviews were made in one year and half in different periods, aiming to seize changes within the process. The research aims to raise new *understandings for and also beyond academia* as well as for the effectiveness of urban oppositions, while trying to explain new and various platforms against demolitions supported by local neighbourhood

associations and other types of organizations with their alliances, conflicts and tensions. Groups and activists were informed about the fact that I was conducting a research. However, my main position for them was being a member of the group.

The questions in the interviews that I primarily conducted with key actors in urban resistance and alliance process are formulated after this two-year of active involvement with an aim to reveal and focus on critical aspects and turning points of the resistances. It is necessary to remark that the study is not merely based on these interviews which are conducted with activists from different organizations, active in alliance formation process in a year period so that different turning points in terms of actors as well as associations and changes in questions as well as permanent concerns are revealed. Even though there is a general structure of the questions, the main intention behind the questions is to reveal actors' ideas within and apart from that of groups and associations that they are involved in or affiliated with. The questions could vary according to the actor with whom the interview had been made. Moreover, some questions lost their validity and but not the meaning because of the change of some regulations e.g. after the new legislation about urban regeneration. However, these types of changes could lead to politicization and radicalization of some actors and neighbourhoods. In the process, some new neighbourhoods and actors are involved in the oppositions. It is aimed to understand personal political histories and experiences and so similarities as well as diversities of histories and overlapping or diverting experiences of getting together in terms of associations and alliances. Different actors replied these questions from different respects, which led to self-reflections for activists. Another important aspect is that to picture intersecting experiences to understand similar, common and different/conflicting points which are shared as well as obstructing for the efficiency. In this respect, actors are the main points of

the study since associations and attempts of alliances are made by these key actors.

The thesis is based on lived experiences and discussions of urban activists, platforms, associations both of neighbourhoods which could be named as an action research. I could not claim that this study is an ideal activist research but I try to learn from actors, people in the opposition and I do not know whether or not I became productive for them, toward a political goal as elaborated by Speed (2006). Apart from telling about the ways that the research is conducted, the aim of this chapter is to tell about more “action research” which is mainly discussed and used in the Western literature but absent in our literature because of the type of research and the research subject. So, this chapter could be also considered as a collection of literature on “action research”.

The theoretical framework and outline of the study are formulated according to “concepts”, discussions and dynamics of urban activism in Istanbul. Therefore, the study is based on a grounded theory with a purposeful aim to reduce the distance between the researcher and the researched. Moreover, the literature and used concepts are reformulated and extended from the field. Based on lived experiences as well as emotions, the study aims to explore different appropriations of the city, Istanbul with an evaluation of distinct and conflictual aspects of urban oppositions and various alliances and associations. The main aim is to write “silent” actors’, groups’ own experiences and words to let them these subjects write their own stories trying to minimize most the “academic concerns”. I tried to take a path which appropriately suits to my concerns, feelings and sensibilities, being aware of its weaknesses and strengths. However, it must be asserted that this double identity which is mentioned in Interface journal is also a “scientifically objective” yet an intentional choice. The thesis, in

methodological term, could be evaluated as participatory observation of the politics of space.

To illustrate the general framework of the interview questions, here are some points that are focused on: Why have you chosen to oppose mainly for urban issues? Could you tell about in your political history, other struggles that you are involved in? Are there some difficulties and problems of the opposition for urban issues for you? How are you *defining urban opposition*? Is the urban opposition different or important? How do your ideas change in time or shaped during your struggle? What is the *meaning of your neighbourhood for you*? What is the meaning of urban regeneration in the opposition for you? Why have you chosen the *association/group* that you are involved in? What is the reason behind the formation of the group? What are the main principles, aims, slogans, and their propositions? (For significant studies concentrated on these questions, please see Yücel 2013 and Solmaz 2013). In what extent is the group inclusionary? In what campaign or opposition are you thinking that you succeeded in? What are the *obstacles that you are faced with*? Are there any *organizations and groups* that supported and are giving support your opposition? What are the *advantages and disadvantages of the opposition for urban issues*? What could be *types, tactics and ways of struggle*? Do you think that one way exclude the other type of resistance? Could these differ according to some time periods/political moments? Do you think that ways that are thought to exclude each other –for Istanbul case such as alternative planning, resistance during the demolition, legal struggle - really different? What are you thinking about *togetherness of (alliances between) neighbourhoods*? What could be their strategies? How could these be determined? What are you thinking about the different actors' roles in this issue? Are you giving support to *other neighbourhoods*? There were some togetherness between neighbourhoods and groups in different periods of time in terms of protests and campaigns/supports like *Urban Movements* recently. What are you

thinking about these *platforms and togetherness*? What do you think about *perpetual and permanent togetherness of diverse groups*? Is this necessary for an effective opposition? Do you think that they were some *temporal and periodical differences*? What were the breaking and turning points? What are thinking about the support to the neighbourhoods from outside? Do you think that there is a difference to be from or outside the neighbourhood? What are you thinking about the *roles of the academicians and intellectuals*? (for sources concentrated on the questions, please see Çavuşoğlu, Çılgin & Strutz 2011, Yücel 2013, Solmaz 2013). What are thinking about *international support and networks* in the neighbourhood and urban opposition? Where are the political parties and groups in the urban opposition for the right to the city? How could their support be? What is being successful according to you? Is the result or the process of struggle important? What is the *meaning of the right to the city* for you and for your neighbourhood? What is the right city for you? Do you think that there is a unifying role? Instead of right to the city to reflect your struggle or do you prefer to use any other right (the right to use and housing) or claim from and for other issues? There were *moments in that urban oppositions are gathered for other issues including rural or environmental ones*. Do you also relate your opposition to the opposition against the construction of the Third Bridge and hydroelectric power plants on the rivers mainly in the Black Sea Region? Whose city is and must be Istanbul? What could be *possible-impossibilities -from Chatterton's elaboration on Lefebvre's the right to the city explanation- that you could think like Alice in Wonderland who thought about six possible-impossibilities before breakfast*? What are the subjects and points that you have learnt and you want to underline from your *experiences*? What do you think about the points that *this study must be concentrated on*? In what extent and how could it be useful for struggles?

2.3. Literature on Participatory and Solidarity Action Research

The objective of this chapter is to expose the literature on the “action research”. In the thesis, the main inspiring articles are “Demand the Possible: Journeys in Changing our World as a Public Activist-Scholar” (2008) and “Give up Activism” and Change the World in Unknown Ways: Or, Learning to Walk with Others on Uncommon Ground: Facing emotions and hybridity, giving up activism and breaking the silence” (2006) of Paul Chatterton with a claim for demanding the possible between theory and practice. The participatory action research²⁹ will be used in the urban social movement research in Turkey, if used mostly in the education field. The thesis will be based on lived experiences of urban activists from platforms, associations, i.e. which could be named as an action research. I could not claim that this study is an ultimate solidarity research but I try to learn from actors, people

²⁹As underlined by Speed (2006), the study must contribute to transformation of the discipline by questioning the politics of knowledge production and decolonization of the research project. However, I could say that I tried to “produce knowledge” empirically grounded by reflecting what is living and by trying to decolonize my position, so the relationship between researcher and research subject; which means deconstructing the unequal power balance between the researcher and the researched “object” (Speed 2006). In terms of organizational research in an different context, action research is defined as one of the used methods as a close collaboration between researcher and practitioner by generating critical knowledge with the theory grounded in action of this self-reflexive research (Susman and Evered 1978). The division between theory and practice is rejected as an applied research for new theories and solutions to problems (Ozanne and Saatcioglu, 2008). Research process must be based on community-based identification of problems, collaboratively design and conduct research, and taking action toward building grassroots organization and social transformations. Ozanne and Saatcioglu (2008) defined organic intellectual as a person questioning and organizing organically from within a social class and arguing a critical understanding of people’s realities with the potential to challenge unjust social arrangements against the domesticating education proposed by Freire. This is the culture of silence which dominated political process surrounding the poor having little voice who internalize dominant group’s negative images for them (Ozanne and Saatcioglu, 2008). The research project is for making people to be aware of their capacity of creating a change in terms of active and reflective learners for social change. The community action research became a dialectical process, as a contact point for theoretical and indigenous knowledge for radical transformation of lives, while researchers and participants are both learners and partners benefiting from each other’s, creating new understandings and revelations from action (Ozanne and Saatcioglu, 2008).

in the opposition and I do not know whether or not I became productive for them, toward a political goal as elaborated by Speed (2006).

Influenced by “Participatory Action Research in the City”-“Not just researchers, but academic-activists”- and “Solidarity Action Research”, the methodological readings covered many publications of Paul Chatterton who has dedicated himself on this type of “research”. Chatterton (2008b) defines “activist-scholar” from his own experiences, “own story” of challenging, inspiring and innovating in his own work and life. These are related with radical education which is radicalising by learning with more horizontal social organization, giving people the ability to manage their own affairs through mutual aid and solidarity. Living ideas to catch the imagination and to act for more sustainable, just and equal lives- and the public debate of ideas challenge the norm and empower people to get involved in social change. Kimpson stated:

I do not pretend to have the answers or the truth. Adrienne Rich’s (1979) words ring in my ears: “There is no ‘the truth,’ ‘a truth’—truth is not one thing, or even a system. It is an increasing complexity”. Indeed, the truth of any situation is to be found through the interweaving of many voices and perspectives, and is socially constructed. ... By focusing in a self-reflective way on what and how I have learned, I can identify what is transformative for me in this process, and some possible implications for other researchers (Kimpson 2005, 77).

My research is conducted being based on some principles: The most important one is to make a research “without hierarchy”, which is *not considering the real subject in the study as the others to be investigated with a distance mainly in terms of the construction of research as well as my*

position. The distance in terms of doing an analytical study was always there but the distance that I am trying to tell about is to “just look at from a point higher than the ivory tower”. During the research process, not a mere data collection, my voice became mine when I heard and wrote people’s ones. I decided intentionally to write my thesis in Turkey since I believe that you could even be a “tourist academician” in your country. I have chosen to write what I see, what I live, which is for me, the real objectivity-but-subjectivity while producing knowledge. What is the most important is that I learnt from people, I see the life, the real one, so I found myself. In “The research as resistance”, as Brown and Strega (2005) stated, I intended a “research from, by, and with the margins”, while everybody who are struggling for *their basic rights are marginalized*. Brown and Strega (2005) defined “marginalization” as people “who routinely experience inequality, injustice, and exploitation live their lives”, “objects” but rarely the authors of research. They underlined that research from the margins is “not research on them”, marginalised people, but “research by, for, and with them and us” (Brown and Strega 2005).

In the part namely “Special Section Rationale, Practising Participatory Geographies: potentials, problems and politics”, Wynne-Jones, North and Routledge argued that participatory approaches are popular from 2004 onwards. It is important to remember that participatory research is eclectic and diverse with theoretical and empirical applications, radical pedagogies, participatory learning approaches, activist and solidarity research, dating back 1994, being in fact the product of different theoretical standpoints, from Marxist to anarchist and feminist thought. Participatory Geographies Working Group was formed in 2005 with Research Group status in 2009 aiming to the main traditional boundaries between “expert” researchers and “researched” communities enabling spaces for collaborations, and co-construction of knowledge. The group contributes to the idea with their statement about openness and fluidity about the boundaries of the way of

doing participatory geographies and engaging methods and approaches. It is important to think about tensions, difficulties with the potential and politics.

Fernandez (2009) proposed that while collecting data, he did not only reject data, but also deliberately blurred the lines of participants, activists, scholars, to embed himself into the movement that he lost himself in it, with his own words. He defines his approach as *fluid for entering, understanding, experiencing the complicated environment to develop the study from the ground up reflecting the emotional realities*. Consequently, the theory develops from the data, derived from his personal experience within the movement for a deep experience of the situation, valuable new insights. Fernandez referring to Burawoy (1998), rather than falling back on the notion namely “objective distance” for producing “truth”, *a reflexive approach includes interaction and focuses on uncovering situated knowledge, encouraging participation and involvement and commitment, in space and time of “studied” people, their lives, intentions and passions*.

The research documents a broader problem on activism and involvement as a reflexive research practice while the boundaries are becoming more and more blurred (Pain 2003). Participatory research is defined as the research undertaken collaboratively with and for individuals, groups, communities who are the real subjects with an aim to create an emancipatory potential for a research space especially for excluded groups (Pain 2003, 653). From where must we start? In this term, questioning the definition of activism includes many visions of social change differing across time and space by making radical alternatives like real possibilities for our times in workplaces and outside as a part of anti-capitalist, anti-globalisation and global justice movement, while being realistic to demand the impossible. Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge (2007) stated: “...we all consciously strive to bring ourselves into contact with social movement groups struggling for radical social change, and to participate with them in participatory actions and

“research”.” They maintained that activism and PAR are not the same things: Even though activists and participatory researchers could learn from each other; participatory researchers are more interested in R (research) rather than A (activism). PAR is crucial as a “vehicle for liberation, radical social transformation and solidarity”, rather than aiming mainly the production of knowledge: Co-producing contextually relevant knowledge is useful to groups in their struggles and beneficial for the group with their common identification of problems as well as desires for social change (Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge, 2007) asserted. Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge (2007) underlined that it is a necessity to ask ourselves how we can create spaces and open up universities and academic research, added: “... a commitment to social transformation, *challenging power relations*, showing solidarity, *recognising and using emotions*, *being the change you want to see*, and *building spaces for critical dialogue*, is crucial to our activist, rather than just action-based, methodology. ... increasing global social, economic and environmental injustice, this seems to us to be an urgent methodological as well as political imperative.”

From this perspective, it is necessary to mention the reflexive and public sociology. In the preface of the book of Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), *the reflexive sociology* is defined as the effect on the dissemination of weapons of defence against symbolic domination (Wacquant 1992). It is essential to consider Bourdieu’s main position which is the *rejection of the theory and research split*. Reflexivity is the systematic exploration of the “unthought categories of thought which limit the unthinkable and predetermine the thought” (Wacquant 1992, 40). About social movements, at the footnote 104, Bourdieu declared that intellectuals never create political movements but they can and should help, invest their cultural capital but generally, at that time, they do not in between the choices namely an expert or an intellectual at the service of the dominant and an independent petty producer in the old mode, lecturing in the ivory tower. By making a proposition for a

new form of intervention about the collective intellectual who claims their independence as a group (Wacquant 1992, 58), Bourdieu talks about the difficulties and limitation of his “methodology” and “participant observation”: it is impossible to objectivise the interests with the posture of the sociologist (Wacquant 1992, 68). With changing socio-political conditions, the sociology is questioned in terms of its meaning and role in the public. As Burawoy underlined (2005), the turn dates back to the 1968s and voting about the position of American Sociological Association in the Vietnam War. This was the shift for the sociology and its focus subjects namely: political sociology started to study the state, its relations to classes, social movements as political process, sociology of work the study of domination and labour movements, with the critique of stratification studies with structures of social and economic inequalities: class, race, and gender. However, the university itself was under attack of private corporations and its competitive and commodifying ideology. So Burawoy asked: “Do we have to abandon the very idea of the university as a “public good”?” (Burawoy 2005, 7) Another proposition is that there are multiple public sociologies (Burawoy 2005, 7) and in this respect, it is essential to acknowledge that *public sociology is part of broader division of sociological labour including policy sociology, professional sociology and critical sociology* (Burawoy 2005, 9). *In this respect, critical sociology could question the audience and the ends of sociology and the place of knowledge. The reflexive type of knowledge has its critical academic audience and an extra-academic audience. These questions about “knowledge for whom?” and “knowledge for what?” could define the main character of sociology as a discipline* (Burawoy 2005, 11). This refers to the presentation of findings in an accessible manner and teaching basics of sociology. The last related thesis of Burawoy could be critical in terms of “sociology as partisan”: *the standpoint of sociology, different from economics and political science, is civil society and the defence of social*

and interests of humanity (Burawoy 2005, 24). There are also some discussions of the “public intellectual³⁰”. This is very crucial for the study since it deals also intellectuals sometimes from the academy that support and struggle for the neighbourhoods. The intellectual has dual and duelling agendas for Bourdieu as referred in Cushman (1999). He/she must belong to the autonomous intellectual world, while he must use his/her competence and authority gained from the intellectual field in the political action. The activist research mainly deals with notions of reciprocity and dialogue between scholars and those whom with knowledge is made, as a praxis research rather than an oppressive relationship between the researcher and those studied. As Gordon (2012, 86) asserted, instead of *participant observation*, there must be “participatory observation” as a form of collaborative inquiry which aims to “break down the traditional boundaries between researcher and researched” by involving community “in the generation of research question, outputs and analyses” so in every stages of the “research”. So observing participant, as an insider is based on the idea that good research cannot be done on people but “*with people*” in a *reflexive process of emancipation, collaboration, learning and dialogue to empower, motivate, increase self-esteem and develop solidarity between groups and to help them to clarify and articulate the meaning of the activities and ideas as co-researchers* (Gordon 2012, 87). In other words, the voice is conveyed not that of intellectual “from above” but “from within” (Gordon 2012, 88) with the researcher’s “own” reflections, emotions and behaviours, personal experiences (Gordon 2012, 92). The points which are proposed by Gordon (2012) are mainly aimed and

³⁰Paul Chatterton wrote about “Another “Reclaim the City” with “Participatory Action Researchers”, “academic-activists”, which is defined as following: “we all consciously strive to bring ourselves into contact with social movement groups struggling for radical social change, and to participate with them in participatory actions and ‘research’.” One of the most important works of Chatterton is “5 principles for Urban Survival”, especially with the principle 2: Working Collectively and Managing Ourselves”, “not waiting for politicians, planners, or local business elites and the media to tell us what will happen”. Even though he proposes a guideline, he did not propose the receipt and he finished with the following question: “What are you waiting for?”

intentionally pursued in the study: appealing directly to the co-participants for relevant questions prefer semi-structured interviews for an open-ended dialogue for co-participants' own questions, dilemmas and priorities. After the research, the study aims to initiate group discussions for reflecting on meanings and challenges and for getting feedback from the outputs of the research (Gordon 2012, 89-92) to be useful and valuable for actors and groups by revealing points that participants could not be aware of or keen to confront with.

Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge (2007) argued that transformative encounters are based on solidarity of deep emotional responses to the world in a prefigurative action, i.e. "be the change you want to see". What is vital is to work together by using research as a tool to promote *solidarity and direct forms of democracy not based on hierarchy, by challenging power relations avoiding the rigidity of social roles and categories and labels such as 'activist'* (Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge 2007, 219). Even though it is important not to lose our temper by conveying our emotions, by respecting and responding to those of others, Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge (2007) referred to another aspect, building emotional connection with direct experiences, intuition and a sense of justice: This is only possible by dispelling "emotionally objectivity" or "emotional imbalance" statements. What is significant is developing solidarity beyond so-called participation. They underlined: "Confronted as we are increasing global social, economic and environmental injustice, this seems to us to be an urgent methodological as well as political imperative." Activist research implies *a common identification of problems and desires, using research encounters for encouragement, solidarity and direct forms of democracy through direct action and militancy*. The action is not just an action in the research process: but putting solidarity based on mutual respect, learning and understanding into practice means co-producing contextually relevant knowledge which

are useful to groups in their struggles in different forms, which refers to Solidarity Action Research (SAR). If we examine the roots of “Solidarity Action research” (SAR) for Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill (2010) is an approach influenced by traditions of research militancy of the Italian and Argentinean autonomist struggles, working “horizontally and in solidarity” with groups of struggle producing relevant outcomes for resistances and not to academia, funders or our careers. It carries strong anti-academic sentiments in terms of a more autonomous/anarchist wings of the anti-capitalist movement.

“So what does it mean to be anti-capitalist? Conversations with activists form urban social centres”, Chatterton (2010b) exposes via social centres³¹ which are studied Participatory Action Research (but developing and showing solidarity, not as researchers but as movement participants) where ordinary everyday practices and grounded, collective politics constitute anti-capitalist practice both in locality with politics of place (which challenge land speculation, gentrification), social relationships and organizational practices and political strategies, as a transnational contention. For Chatterton, it is also a duty to act in public interest with a re-imagination of a good life, with the aim for an impact by challenging the distance between the researched and the researcher while the scholar activism is to be-against-beyond. On the website of Autonomous Geographies³², their approach and methods are explained as a contribution to the improvement of “welfare of marginalized communities and those working for progressive social change, and not the interests of powerful elites”. PAR in this term is the bottom-up grassroots level type of research breaking down the barriers between the researcher as the expert and the community as the researched object, so to the necessity of value-free and neutral research. This is basically related to

³¹ To read more on social centres from Chatterton, please read the last part of the sixth chapter of the thesis.

³² Please visit the following website: <http://www.autonomousgeographies.org/faqs#six>

their critique of capitalist society and their political reply as “autonomy” and “self-management”, so social movement struggles for their self-empowerment and social transformation in terms of skills, tools and critical understanding both for practical and intellectual interventions rather than the accumulation of academic knowledge. They refer in this sense to the Italian Marxist, Antonio Conti who stated: “the goal of research is not the interpretation of the world, but the organization of transformation”. The aims of action-oriented and engaged form of research are to show the possibility of autonomous ways of living, (co-)producing, and learning against capitalism by adding new values by empowering knowledge.

Along similar lines, Fernandez (2009) defines his approach fluid to enter, understand, and experience the complicated environment and to develop the study from the ground up reflecting the emotional realities. The theory develops from the data, derived from his personal experience within the movement for a deep experience of the situation, valuable new insights. Fernandez referring to Burawoy (1998), rather than falling back on the notion namely “objective distance” for producing “truth”, a reflexive approach includes interaction and focuses on uncovering situated knowledge, encouraging participation and involvement and commitment, in space and time of “studied” people, their lives, intentions and passions.

Hale (2001) in his article namely “What is Activist Research?” has fostered the debate by referring to Miles Holton and Paolo Freire, as two pioneers for their basic methodological steps: For the step of “arriving at research questions and objectives”, it is necessary to have a dialogue and collective work with the subjects of study (not the objects), to identify common set of problems that the people are interesting in addressing while the scholar will develop particular affinities with these subjects. “Data collection” is merely possible with participation among interested subjects, groups, communities in the research process. This specified group must actively participate and

learn from research skills and contribute to the data collection, taking active role in the process of knowledge creation. The interpretation also must be a collective work, involving people who are active participants in the research process for enriching the analysis being useful for their own purposes. The step namely “dissemination of the research products” is much more related to receiving knowledge and making use of it. The “data” people will be much more than object but subjects having an active stake in the research project. Learning from the research is the aim with the collective participation of the subjects both in the data collection and its interpretation. Even though the geographers distinguish that research must consider the power imbalances between researchers and researched as Kitchin and Hubbard settled (1999), few of them try to effect change for an emancipatory by fulfilling her own political goals through the combination of research practice and political and social actions. Mainly critical geography challenges and deconstruct the traditional distance between the researcher and the researched by trying to find strategies for the empowerment of marginalized groups for their struggle for justice either themselves or via this kind of research. However, they complained about that this reproduces the dominant and existing rules in the research and related academic knowledge production and the division between study (*academia*) and action (*struggle*). So, the empowerment remains at the activity of writing and teaching but not joining in the struggle to keep the division between the “gaze” and action for “academic” concerns and audience which are different from that of action. However it is necessary to form a “reciprocal relationship” between theory and practice, a reflexive learning process through researcher’s “multiple positional ties” trying to find in more inclusive forms of research in which researched becomes co-researcher and of seeking change by engaging in practical politics on the ground. The main characteristic of the participatory research is not mainly for the sake of the methods and techniques as a methodology for research, but in

fact for the “degree of engagement of participants within and beyond the research” as “a process aiming to change” in a non-hierarchical, bottom-up way to create impacts beyond academic articles and conference papers and traditional knowledge production and data collection even though there is always hierarchy between what is aimed and what is lived (Pain and Francis 2003). According to Pain and Francis (2003), the participation carries the danger of being a part of policy making institutions, which does not have a specific model, but on the contrary should integrate participants into problem definition and research design. Moreover, they must be informed about the aims of the research and its impacts while researchers must be self-critical about the plan and the consequences of the study. As Colectivo Situaciones explained (2005), another dimension which is the research militancy must be produced and developed, while experimentation, power to think, possibility of experience for different becoming being praised. This must rise from the “double problematizations” and double existence and fidelities as the sad militant and the university researcher: politically the militant commitment and on the other hand, the relation to the university and knowledge generation processes. Here is the moment of, for Colectivo Situaciones, *the articulation of involvement and thought for a need and desire for a common ground with the construction of new perception.*

Another important aspect is to convey the words of people from what is lived and felt, but with their own narratives for not leading to a symbolic violence. *In the Voice and the Eye*, Alain Touraine (1981) explains what he calls “sociological intervention” from the question how we can attain an adequate understanding of motives and meaning which are so deeply hidden from the mere spectator. Sociological intervention goes far beyond the participant observation, but merely be revealed in the experiences, conflicts, struggles at the smaller groups, in an active role. Pierre Bourdieu, in *La Misère du Monde* (1993), refers to an ethnological nature and a new

qualitative method, a “provoked -to pursue the object of the study- and accompanied -the interviewer must accompany the interviewer- self-analysis”. In this respect, sociological intervention is a self-analysis that the active participation of social actors engaged in a collective struggle concerning political and social issues. It also concerns a militant action and aims to carry out a sociological analysis, an action in co-operation with principal actors, while tracing their history of the struggle, in an open discussion with its own actors. The very first objective is the active participation of the social actors, having a practical consciousness for their action, a real knowledge about their social action. The reflexivity (strong reading of reflexivity as in Wasserfall (1993) transcending the power differences between researcher and informants) is not for monitoring subjectivity but for deconstructing the power and authority of the researcher to produce a valid account of the field, as Wacquant says from flesh to text. Luis A. Fernandez, in the article namely “Anarchism and participatory observation”, as a participant, an activist curious rejecting traditional notions of science and objectivity, he said that he adopted a multi-ethnographic approach including participatory observation, reinforced with analysis of web pages, newspaper articles. The methodology of the thesis is my inner-trip and this research is a self-reflexive learning process to understand urban resistances.

Participatory action research as a social justice approach questions knowledge production processes as well as the agents who are engaged considers the objects or respondents in the research as equal collaborators or co-researchers by reclaiming a personal and political context of knowledge construction (Brown and Strega 2005). These processes, not just about, but also with and for, are parts of an emancipatory involvement and even commitment with a stance of resistance, by challenging existing relations of dominance and subordination. Potts and Brown (2005) ask the same question about the destination of the research: *What and whose purpose*

*does the research serve? The techniques that we are using make and contribute to the meaning. The data collection is a process of seeking, perceive, describe, listening, learning and reflecting. They believe that emancipatory research can be a powerful tool for social change, if the researcher aims to become an anti-oppressive researcher which is not a comfortable place to be –anti-oppressive practice during the research process, while starting from the nature of the relationship between the researcher and the researched - who considers political purpose and action, social justice and resistance -a means of resistance- in the research (Potts and Brown 2005). The main idea behind this proposition is that *all knowledge, as a commodity embedded in people and the power relations between us who cannot be isolated from people -so many truths- is socially located, constructed and political. Potts and Brown (2005) deduced that anti-oppressive research, targeting change, gives back the ownership of knowledge back into the hands of those who experience and who need it. Deb Rutman, Carol Hubberstey, April Barlow, and Erinn Brown (2005) elaborated the commonalities between Participatory Action Research and Anti-Oppressive practice in terms of research as a political act, while researcher located within a set of social relations and social research is focused on powerless and marginalized people. They underlined that in a typical research, which is not value-neutral; people have no control over their representation as well as the type of analysis. Both two types of approaches include the ideas of research participants about the research agenda. Blomley (1994) asked: “How can we contribute to and learn from progressive struggles without reinforcing the hierarchies of privilege, silencing those with whom we work?”, “What grass roots activists stand to lose from such an exchange?”, “Is our role that of catalyst, facilitator, or student?” As Blomley (2008) elaborated in his text with the same title, in which he underlined the linkages between the academic world and his community activism that he deals with in a search for an alternative model**

between the “opposed perils of academic elitism” and “political disengagement”. The sentences more exactly the questions that he posed that he ended up are crucially important: “How can we contribute to and learn from progressive struggles without reinforcing the hierarchies of privilege, silencing those with whom we work?”, “What grass roots activists stand to lose from such an exchange?”, “Is our role that of catalyst, facilitator, or student?”. Blomley (2008), referring to Chatterton and Routledge, questions “spaces of activism” where academic-activism occur for possibilities of a radical politics based on dialogical connections and encounters with others. The effects of this scholarly thinking could be to blur the boundaries between ‘activist’ and ‘public’, from which emerges a commonality and connections. Referring to Paul Routledge, he said that he advocates for a ‘third space’ between academia and activism, a space of continual flux and movement, as an activist within the university, and as an academic while in activist settings in spite of many barriers. Blomley proposed another concept, which is “applied activism”, “the tendency has been to eschew activism that is “applied” or “policy-oriented” in favour of apparently purer forms of engagement with grassroots organizations”. One of the radical methodological research questions is about for whom is the research, as stated by asked by Ross (2013), as a participant researcher. The militant research is focused on the researchers’ active and committed participation in the political movement of their subjects, which involves participation by conviction, where researchers play a role in actions and share the goals, strategies, and experience of their comrades because of their own committed beliefs. This is not related to the reason of conducting the research and obtaining data. The results of the research could become a useful tool for the activist group, either to “reflect on structure and process, or to assess the success of particular tactics”.

It would be appropriate to finish to open new ways with a quotation from Ricketts (2012) in the Introduction of the book namely the Activists’

Handbook are inspirational: “Most of these people had never been activists before, ...I sincerely believe that when people wake one day to find an issue on their doorstep that they cannot just ignore, there is enormous potential for transformation....when individuals first break the habit of political passivity they begin a journey from being a passive subject to an active citizen and beyond to being a lifelong activist...on a local issue, or taking ..on a big global issue, ...the life cycle of social movements but underlying this is the life cycle of activists themselves.” (Ricketts 2012, 1-2)

CHAPTER 3

GROUNDED THEORY ON THE PATHS OF THE REAL SUBJECTS

The starting point of theoretical reflection is opposition, negativity, struggle. It is from rage that thought is born, not from the pose of reason, not from the reasoned-sitting-back-and-reflecting-on-the-mysteries-of existence that is conventional image of ‘the thinker’. (Holloway 2005, 1)

The research has the main intention to be based on a grounded theory, which means the theory did come from the field not from the theory a priori. Radical, engaging and public geographies and “autonomous geographies” which represent not only the theoretical, ideological and more than a methodological standpoints of the study, it was what the theoretical and political base of the standpoints of actors in the struggle and their everyday life. The main attempt of the study was to feed both theory and practice following the bind between; I proposed a grounded theory to write the theoretical framework from the way paved by my field research. Correspondingly, I tried to question practice vis-à-vis related theories such as in what extent the concept of the right to the city which does possess a mere definition or is open to other elaborations mainly from the practices which is changing and used to what is being experiencing in Istanbul. This will be exposed in the dialectical relation between theory, the intellectual discussion and practice as well as in the urban oppositions in Istanbul underlining the importance and the effect of presence of intellectuals

especially from the usage of the “right to the city” and as a slogan of some groups or not.

3.1. The Right to the City: From Lefebvre to Today’s Impossibilities

... I do not intend to be yet another writer who trivialises and abuses the Lefebvrian formula on the “right to the city”. In fact, considering the increasing number of politically weak usages of this expression—which has been gradually converted into a vague slogan that is used for the convenience of interests as diverse as those of emancipatory social movements, leftist intellectuals, nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), and even government institutions and international organisations—it is necessary to call for a minimum degree of political and strategic clarity. It must be recalled that for the heterodox Marxist Henri Lefebvre, the ‘right to the city’ could not be reduced to mere specific material gains (more and better infrastructure, social housing and so on) within the capitalist society. The “right to the city” is the right to full and equal enjoyment of the resources concentrated in cities, something which he believed would only be possible in another, non-capitalist society (Souza 2012b, 563).

As pointed out by Elden (2004), Elden and Lebas (2006), it is crucial to seize the possible and impossible, (revolutionary theory of) possible-impossible –“how revolutionary thought is rendered possible” and “utopia

today is the possible of tomorrow” (Elden 2004, 243 referring to Lefebvre)-in Lefebvre’s ideas, which gave inspiration to other radical geographers like Chatterton.

This chapter elaborates Lefebvre’s ideas for the right to the city by referring to his original words in order to understand current elaborations of the concept mainly with the critical contributions in the framework of citizens’ autogestion and urban commons. As it is stated by Chatterton in his courses in the School of Geography, the University of Leeds, it could consign to different trends like material (goods, services etc), symbolic (identity), right to participate, right to survival, but more crucially right to determine the future. The key questions must be “Whose right, what right? What city?” from Henri Lefebvre to its later elaborations of Harvey and later Mark Purcell (2008) about alternative urban futures, of Don Mitchell (2003) as the right to public space and Peter Marcuse (2009), the just city.

It will be proper to start from the dilemma “between rights awareness and the limits of property rights activism” of Shin (2013). Referring to Merrifield, Shin accentuated that there is a need to bind people together but togetherness in difference and building an alliance may be challenging but not impossible. However, here, the task is to produce a language of commonality. Referring to Dikeç, the construction of a cross-class alliance and socio-economic groups will also challenge land-based groups and their interests (Shin 2013). The right to the city is a right to the urban life, to appropriation in terms of occupying and using spaces by producing according to their needs. The right to the city must arise from the streets, neighbourhoods, as a cry for help and sustenance by oppressed peoples in desperate times, not primarily out of various intellectuals’ fascinations and fads (Harvey 2012). With this statement and other propositions, Harvey points out real subjects of the struggle and the concrete need. At abstract and discursive levels, the right to the city as both working slogan and

political ideal, as a right to no longer exists, an empty signifier. So how this emptiness must be operationalized? The pillars of the responses are the struggle and the active characteristic to create so in Lefebvrian terms produce space: Harvey considers that it is not a gift, but has to be seized, grasped by political movement, to be a force to open spaces of the city to protest, to create public spaces, as “an active right to make the city different, to shape the city more in accord with our heart’s desire” inspired from Park (Harvey 2012). This is a process, as Lefebvre underlines, of self-realization as assumed by Harvey, the transformation of the city aims changing ourselves in collective struggles, as “a collective right to be seized”, a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization (Harvey 2008). It is necessary to state that it is common rather than an individual right therefore, it gains meanings and functions in the struggles, as a working slogan, a unifying tool creating new urban commons and continuously being produced for a broad social movement (Harvey 2008). The right to the city means a struggle of existence and collective self-formation and a process of change by struggling.

What must be underlined is that the right to the city is not mere a right to access to what already exists for, which is related to the revolution idea and its urban characteristic in Lefebvre (Harvey 2008). However, the urban must be in the broadest sense of that term for Harvey (2008) in a global urbanizing process –while urban development along class lines as a global issue (Harvey 2012) - in which quality of urban life has become a commodity in a city of fortified fragments of gated communities with the loss of urban commonalities via enclosures, spatial controls, policing and surveillance (Harvey 2012) of those who have money could enjoy, where consumerism of the economy of spectacle reigns. Harvey proposed that the crisis is an urban one more than ever, marked by accumulation by dispossession, dispossession of the assets of the low-income urban population, leading to forced displacement in the cities while being branded,

which calls for a city-wide organization and political response (Harvey 2012).

In this respect, the right to the city will be questioned whether or not it is used as a real collective and common idea in an anti-capitalist struggle for another life, from/beyond to be a slogan and even a cry and a demand. The study aims to show important potentialities of this right which is shaped by different struggles and actors. The production of space under capitalism which involves the fragmentation and homogenisation of space -by planning's role in this production as a strategic instrumental role in the hands of state in the production of abstract space- will be the main starting point in Lefebvrian terms. The right to the city in this study follows the idea that refers to an active process of appropriation in terms of access, occupy and use spaces -in terms of commons against privatization and enclosure-. This claim includes the production of spaces according to the not owners but users' needs. It implies to centrality and difference in terms of the "the city as an oeuvre". It is a force to open spaces of the city to protest, to create public spaces (Harvey 2008). As Harvey³³ stated, the right to the city is a

³³ In the speeches made in Turkey, Harvey underlined that Lefebvre's right to the city is in fact as an empty signifier as he always says in his writings. He questioned what kind of social movement could be for grasping the right to the city and he made a historical line from the Paris Commune to contemporary era. The city for Harvey is the site and the stake of lot of struggles which are class struggles. He proposes togetherness both from workplace and neighbourhoods –organized in such as community centres by questioning temporary employment, unconventional union structures including domestic workers and taxi drivers to organize the whole city -. Harvey asks: "What kind of urbanization, urban life do we want?, Who manage?, How organize the whole city?" to propose alternative politics of public spaces, to all which is to public, to commons. Harvey asks two important questions about how to organize the city politically and what kind of alliance could be on this anti-capitalist agenda/struggle/movement for an egalitarian, social inequality, public services and alternative city. For the organizations, firstly for the type or organization, Harvey underlined a new form of organization: horizontal, anti-hierarchical way of political common organization. The right to the city (like RTTC alliance gathering resistances all together) could be a broader project for fragmented urban social movements for political common politicization. For the composition, against soft democratic programs and NGOs, he proposes another type of (more than) class struggle/urban social movements, political commons, an alliance of student movement with not only factory workers but for instance from transportation such as truck drivers, against over defined proletariat. Both for alliance and organization, so the very core of the struggle, Harvey proposes togetherness of

right to no longer exists, an empty signifier and not static entity but it is a collective right emerged from and grasped/seized in the streets, out from neighbourhoods as a struggle but not primarily out of various intellectuals' fascinations and fads (Harvey 2012). In this respect, the characteristic of this linkage of trade unions, political groups and urban-based groups is quiet important. Another aspect is that firstly, urban-based groups strategically must find a common point for getting together. The other point is the way how different political groups could get together. In this respect, political groups could find a common point from "urban" issues. In this respect, the right to the city must be understood by the transformation of the city by changing ourselves in collective struggles as "a collective right to be seized"(Harvey 2008) with new possibilities for social and political action, new types of collectivities from below.

Peter Marcuse (2009) addresses to the right to the city with the following critical questions: "Whose right?", "what right?", and "what city?" in the framework of critical urban theory by exposing [analysing and making clear the roots of the problem], proposing [working with those who are affected with proposals, programs, targets, strategies for desired results, which could conflict with his right to the city conceptualization]and politicizing [clarifying the political action implications of what is exposed, proposed and by organizing strategically, with day-to-day politics including media and academic discussions]. Marcuse (2009) asserted: ""Let us not be afraid of

workplace and living space and units, rising from use values and neighbourhood support. However, what Harvey proposes for the city mainly remained at the "space" level by saying that "let's have another quality of urban life", possible and clear demands for the city – which make possible to organize-and the proactive program and role of schools of urban thought, design is important even though he underlined that he does not propose something on the space. The question how to organize an alternative city is related to the possibility of the organization of an anti-capitalist movement. Harvey gave examples revolutionary stakes in urban struggles, Paris Commune, El Alto, Brazil as well as living wage campaign in Baltimore.

naming the common goal, and the common enemy.” So it could be possible to link the theory and the practice with the combination of the deprived and the discontented with the collective and common push to “Expose, Propose, Politicise!”. In this respect, the right to the city could be a manner for the mobilization in the struggle over who should have the benefit of the city and what kind of city it should be (Marcuse 2009). Defending “cities for people, not for profit”, the right must be claimed as multiple rights but to a totality as a collectivity. This is considerable to find the way starting from exposing the situation and then utilizing it as a tool sometimes a unifying slogan in urban resistances for going beyond by struggling. As a response to the following critical question “What right?” Marcuse (2009) stated: “The right to the city is a claim and a banner under which to mobilize one side in the conflict over who should have the benefit of the city and what kind of city it should be. It is a moral claim, founded on fundamental principles of justice, ... “Right” is not meant as a legal claim enforceable through a judicial process today...Rather, it is multiple rights that are incorporated here: not just one, not just a right to public space, or right to information and transparency...but *a right to totality, a complexity*, in which each of the parts is part of a single whole to which the right is demanded...Much more is involved, and the concept is as to a *collectivity of rights*, not individualistic rights.” with a slogan “cities for people, not for profit.” If we mention one of the first examples which elaborated the right to the city through the public space, Don Mitchell (2003) in his book namely “the Right to the City Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space”, elaborated the concept from the control and struggles over the concept, by questioning “who has the right to the city and (the right to speech) its public spaces, who is excluded and who define the right to the city”. The struggle for social justice in the city and the right to the city seek to establish a different kind of order according to the needs of the poorest and marginalized residents. The right as a cry and a collective work for Mitchell (2003) must be heard to

be put into practice as a result of citizens' participation and creative activity. These are other than products and consumable material goals.

For Purcell (2008), other possible identities and other groups which could be active in the mobilization are reduced to class politics, *which makes the realization of the right to the city problematic*. Souza (2012a) emphasizes that *urban revolution whose carrier is not only the proletariat, but many social movements could guarantee the right to the city for all people* (Souza 2012a, 24). *It is necessary to consider the right to the city as the key to alliances*. This is valid for the *anti-capitalist* struggle changing from being reactionary in the protests and campaigns to the creation of *another urbanity and public through autogestion and broad-based grassroots movements* (Doğan 2011). This would be possible only through the struggle for radical social change and through communal, solidaristic socio-economic relations, which make popular anti-capitalistic political alternatives and the right to the city, democratic (Doğan 2011). The right to the city should be considered not merely as a slogan but also as a framework which challenges the right to sheltering for survival and dwelling based on property or and exchange value, as a horizon for the right to oeuvre and appropriation, the right to "autogestion" as conceptualized by Lefebvre (1972, 2000, and 2009). Lefebvre's idea must be considered as a target for a real change both for the analysis and the practice. Being more than a right, the right to the city must imply a collectivity of rights and a collective right (Marcuse 2009) for "cities for people, not for profit" (Marcuse 2009, 195-196). Not built on the fears of the bourgeoisie but on the needs of the poorest and most marginalized residents, the right to the city must aim for radical change for a different city and different society, by rejecting the prevailing unequal and exploitative capitalist system (Mitchell 2003). The discussions around the right to the city must be pursued in a collective and collaborative way for mobilization in different political context and for radical democratization

(Purcell 2008). The struggle for the right to the city must be against the disguised improvements such as left Keynesianism, taming global capitalist market, environmentally friendly capitalism and participation instead of neoliberalism, globalization and representative democracy (Souza 2010a, Adanalı 2011).

Nowadays as a slogan, it has become “a live wire material practice today” according to Mayer (2009, 367), by gathering different movements in terms of tangible and real connections between struggles and losses of rights with the importance of the actors for its usage in the resistance within information and solidarity networks. *It is essential to state that the right to the city is far beyond being just a demand; is in fact a claim, a redefinition for another city in the future, from the possible to the impossible; a horizon a “possible-impossible” determined with the idea that what is impossible today will become possible tomorrow* (Lefebvre 1972, 147, Lefebvre 2000, 164, Lefebvre 2000, 181, Purcell 2009).

Souza (2010a) claims that the more the expression “the right to the city” of Lefebvre becomes fashionable these days, the more the concept is marked by the trivialization and co-optation of the right to the city, even for “grassroots activists”, reduction to a “politics of turf”, a “general framework” like an umbrella term for action. Mayer³⁴ (2012 in Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer 2012, 6) states that it is used ideologically by state institution, co-opted for legitimizing existing weakly participatory forms of urban governance proposing systemic implications of newly introduced

³⁴While exploring the relationship between the right to the city and urban resistance movements, Mayer (2009) compares different versions and changes in the motto of the right to the city, which has become a defining feature of urban struggles all around the world and gains different meanings in Lefebvrian sense from more depoliticized versions in the global NGO context, considering the participatory demand to inclusion within the existing system, and having the potential to bring together the demands and aspirations. In terms of community and neighbourhood associations’ actions, the right to the city could be considered as the right to socially innovative city (Swyngedouw and Moulaert 2010, 220) which could create cracks, fissures and spaces in state governance (231-233) by building networks with others from similar agenda in a distance with the state.

forms of citizen participating in municipal affairs as the realization of this right. So, there is a trap for its radical potential, tamed by the institutions and the state.

Is it necessary as Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer³⁵ (2012, 8) say, the rule of the world economy as a whole for the realization of a genuine right to the city? As we referred above, the right to the city as Marcuse said (2009, in Chatterton 2010a) “is not the right to the existing city but the right to a future city.” In other words, as Chatterton asserted (2010a, 235), the key role for urban imaginer is to make today’s impossibility into tomorrow’s possibility, while creating new vocabularies, imaginations and strategies of action, for a radically different city, a “just city of the future”, presupposing a post-capitalist another society as Souza (2008, 2010a) proposed and asked: “Which right to which city ?”

Another critical study is that of Caprio, Irzabal and Pulido (2011), *the right to the “suburb”*. It is an interesting research, by *revisiting the right to the city in terms of centrality of Henri Lefebvre and the maximization of political access and participation with the claim of public-space- and citizenship/self-governance*. This is both a large call for regional networks of activists struggling for same issues and an analytical and mobilizing framework (Caprio, Irzabal and Pulido 2011, 202) so an intervention to the suburban American life and the Latino immigrants and their (networks of) activisms. What was critical is that they have focused on the right to the city

³⁵ It is necessary to read the very critical article of Souza (2012a) on the fact that the “critical urban theory from North America and Europe” in the book is ignoring libertarian authors’ earlier studies (their existence), and for instance Bookchin who wrote on these issues (its relevance) mainly for autogestion as a critical point between “critical urban theory” and “radical”, Marxism and libertarian thinking. Another aspect is that even if ‘Global South’ is elaborated, it remains as a simplification of the diversity of the movements and the commonly shared aspect with the North, and even misinformation. So what need to be emphasized as commonly lived is elaborated separately and what is to be analysed in detail is generalized and homogenised. Radical planning also is remained as “top-down”/academic-intellectual rationality rather than being “radical”, grassroots, insurgent planning as a direct action. All these aspects necessitate a true dialogue in the academy.

and its transformations, while the public offering new possibilities and potentials vis-a-vis the collective and public rights as well as the metropolitan geography-the suburbs- is both related and distinct from the city.

From Shanghai, China and Mumbai, India, Weinstein and Ren (2009) proposed examples for housing right activism of displaced residents (Weinstein and Ren 2009, 409): Both for themselves and academic studies, the displaced people are thought to be “passive victims”, rather than active citizens. We know that residents remain passive due to many reasons mainly due to fear or sometimes negotiation possibility. As we know from some anecdotes, people who claim their right to housing could even lose their lives. The “disjunction and fragmentation” of urban citizenship as they argue occurred due to housing rights, precarity and development induced residential displacement and even forced evictions in the name of urban renewal. There are different forms and strategies of housing activisms, of residents and civil society groups, in the process of the right to housing, i.e. a major component of the larger rubric of -new forms of- urban citizenship rights (Weinstein and Ren 2009, 408, 410) as formulated “new claims to the city”. These could be defined as Holston and Chatterjee studied, *an active citizenship process* by claiming insurgent spaces for the right to the city (Weinstein and Ren 2009, 410). This engenders the *property-based activism* and later the broad engagement in the rightful resistance, from their “legal rights “to the rights to housing and the city, claiming *the substantial presence* (Weinstein and Ren 2009, 427).

The right to the city as we see from the practice is an international movement while the concept incorporating two concepts, the social function of property and social function of the city to achieve social and economic justice for poor people, the right to participation and the right to appropriation, as a transformed and renewed right to urban life according to

Pindell (2006). The right to participation means that urban residents must have the opportunity and power to make meaningful determinations of the contours of the urban space while the right of appropriation gives priority the rights of city residents as occupiers and users of city space (Pindell 2006). The inhabitants-identified with the working class and a struggle against the forces of private capital, whose antithesis is speculative capital.- must accede to city space as stated by Pindell (2006). In Brazil, the right to the city questions existent approaches to land use planning dominated by centralized government planning and by private interests with economic and political influence, “changing “the rhetoric used in the competitions of property”. The application makes apparent the tension between social and individual “idea of property”, in other words, social function of property and also social and economic benefits of poorer inhabitants in these market-based societies (Pindell 2006). According to Pindell (2006), the World Charter could be a guide while implementing participatory, comprehensive municipal planning regimes on the ground, at the local. Away from utopian understanding, the right to the city could be achieved in the United States with concrete efforts of struggle to have a voice for the construction of the city.

The right to the city as an inspiring claim *for the conquest of human, urban and social transformation, as well as the possibility of a radical change cannot be reduced to the right to better housing or other related material gains within the capitalist society* (Souza 2010a, 2012c). So a radical critique of capitalism and with the effort and need to overcome it if the right to the city is the right to a radically new socio-spatial reality (Souza 2012c, 563-564) is necessary. Another concept that I will elaborate in the related part, *autogestion* (Lefebvre 1972, 2000, and 2009) is a key term for the theoretical understanding and practical usage of the right to the city as the right to the *oeuvre*, to *participation and appropriation* (Lefebvre 1972, 2000, 2009, Mitchell 2003, Purcell 2008). It is in fact a form of radical-

democratic transformation (Lefebvre 2009, 139-152) via socio-political mobilisation in neighbourhoods, cities, regions, rural peripheries, national states and on a world scale (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 3, 14, 15, 134-135). As Lefebvre posits, *autogestion* is not a magic formula or recipe (Lefebvre 2009, 134), nor a panacea for the “workers’ problems” (Lefebvre 2009, 134), yet is open to being assimilated in a number of different ways (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 16; Lefebvre 2009, 134). However, in a process of continuous struggle (Lefebvre 2009, 135, Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 16), it opens up a practical path to the possible and to the politics of the possible (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 38, Elden 2004). Souza (2010a, 2012a, 2012c) underlined, it is significant to discuss the ideas of Castoriadis and Bookchin³⁶ in terms of *autogestion*, new citizenship and politics³⁷. The right to the city “is not the right to the existing city but the right to a future city” (Marcuse 2009, Chatterton 2010, 235), which presupposes a different, post-capitalist society as Souza (2008, 2010a) proposes with his question: “Which right to which city?” The idea will pave the way for examining dialectical relationships between experiences of *everyday life, conflict, and resistance in a multiplicity of places* (Barraclough 2013, 1049). In the framework of the multiplicity of places and multiple characteristic of resistant groups and activists, the right to the city could be a part or one of the main ideas of commoning practices. *The right to the city, as an individual (self-determination) and collective*

³⁶I would like to thank Federico Venturini for his support, inspiration and remarks about Murray Bookchin’s ideas.

³⁷For Bookchin (1991), libertarian municipality, as the social and political alternative (Bookchin 1986, 25) makes citizens active and free -rather than passive constituents in so-called “social justice” programs supported by spatial improvements to give capitalism a human face- with a claim for another policy made by a community or neighbourhood assembly. It could pave the way for the fully transformed cities (Souza 2012a, 17) emerged from the difference between urbanization without cities and citification (Bookchin 1986, 169, Souza 2012c). Citizenship is a process of self-formation of active participants in the management of the communities and the citizen as free subject could only be possible by autogestion (Bookchin 1982).

claim like autogestion must be pursued by aiming another life. We have to depart from the city to social production of space³⁸ but to go beyond.

3.1.1. The Right to the City of Lefebvre

The right to the city was proposed by Henri Lefebvre from the conceptualisation of the production of space with its relation with capitalist system in 1968 and influenced new type of global social movements at that time with the slogan “change the city, change the life” (and criticized by Lefebvre in Elden 2004, 160-162), and later internationally discussed and used academically in the conferences, articles, as well as institutionally and legislatively³⁹, sometimes critically like in UN. Before all, it is claimed practically as a slogan and/or aimed inherently in the urban struggles and

³⁸Because of neglecting space in favor of temporality, for Gottdiener (1994), there is a “necessity” to go beyond. According to Gottdiener, the role of class conflict in space and the manner in which the process of capital accumulation is said to produce the urban form require reexamination. The trinity formula-capital, labor and land-, three components of the capitalist mode of production, comprise all secrets of the social production process, according to Marx. However, Lefebvre, beginning from a distinction between the use value and exchange value, translated all these into ‘*spatial*’ term (multifaceted feature of space and another dimension of space, *social space*, defined by culture, politics, rather than economics-besides *abstract space*, resembling to that of more Marxian political economists’ understanding), different from being reduced to mere land, associated with land-ownership, development, economic contradictions internal to capital accumulation. Abstract space is correlated with capitalist class and social with working class; the forces form absolute and social space *cuts across class lines*. *Split character* of classes, of relations of *distribution*, rather than production, and of *consumption* patterns leading to new socio-spatial cleavages, being complement to Marxian analysis, according to Gottdiener, are crucial in explaining interest of different kind of dwellers located in one area. Only class and economic relations and struggles cannot be explained elements in subject of community as social space. For instance, community coalitions are cutting across class lines. Moreover, the use and exchange values of space are interconnected and land value is structured and manipulated by capitalist class. The analysis of space as a force of production and social determination of location value in space and its return, of land of real estate (social nature of real estate value, value of land socially produced) are significant change in analyses.

³⁹ It is necessary to underline the co-optation of the concept and so urban movements (Souza 2010, Mayer 2009) by the governments but being aware institutional way of conquering the right to the city like participatory budgeting in Brazil as Souza (2001) and Fernandes (2007) analysed and discussed in their studies.

alliances all over the world, workshops, forums creating a discussion milieu for opposition groups like Social in Istanbul and Urban Forums recently in Naples and World Social Forum like that of Porto Alegre. *In what extent would these movements be emancipatory to grasp the radical claim of the right to the city, as Lefebvre defined, a transformed and renewed right to the urban life and what Harvey pointed out the right to change ourselves by changing the city?*

Could we use both for exposing the situation and for using as a tool and a unifying slogan in urban resistances if we refer to the study of Cunningham (2010), who underlines the right to the city's current popularity as a slogan which may be down to a domestication and taming of more radical demands -between reformist, conservative and progressive modalities-? Or is it also an "integrative umbrella" for coalition building, a kind of connective tissue or "glue" as Soja asserted? The concept will be questioned in what extent it could be a bind between practice and theory, an integrative expression of lived experiences, discourses and statements of different urban grassroots groups of different neighbourhoods having different political identities, histories, and characteristics.

The right to the city is also a right to a renovated centrality –*in a dialectic, if there is periphery, there is centrality for Lefebvre*- which is not only a simple visiting right but to difference -implying also differential space- as the right to oeuvre, decision, self-management, and self-decision in the sense of autogestion. So we must consider centrality more than spatiality and its related possible traps in the struggle. It is a right to the place of encounters and exchanges, rhythms of life and time programmes which permit the full and whole usage of these moments and places from and beyond the right to work, instruction, education, health, as well as leisure (Lefebvre 1972, 146). As its most referred definition, the right to the city is

like a cry and a demand (Lefebvre 2000, 158); however as a transformed and renewed right to urban life (Lefebvre 2000, 158).

Reclaiming the right to the city is also the *realization of the human being, self-realization and self-determination* (for a significant analysis, please see Butler 2012). Another space in the future, namely differential space of lived experience is proposed and claimed by Lefebvre, which is a new space emerging from the resistance against the homogenisation as the abstract space determined by exchange value abolishing and absorbing the use value as well as the oeuvre transformed into exchangeable product. This differential space- a new space and new mode of spatial practice that develop out of the oppositions and contradiction of “abstract space”, of squatters and slum dwellers (Shields 1998)- must be claimed via struggle and politics of difference. While the contradictions are inscribed in space, so the struggle for claiming the right to difference and centrality emerges from the space and the claim for its production which is in fact mainly shaped by the mode of production, which is a class struggle. From these contradictions of the market, abstraction of the space and the peripheries of the city must rise another sociality so appropriation for the use value and contradictory space, counter-space from below (Lefebvre, 1991).

This right to the priority of the use value over the exchange value—by challenging the exchange value of housing as well as correlated redefinition via “inhabitation” and “dwelling”—paves another way for defining another type of “citizen” —citadin- via an urban change on the path for a continual and active process of appropriation to another city, to another society (Souza 2010a). The right to the city is crucial a horizon (Lefebvre 1972) for the struggles’ commoning rather than remaining at a limited definition of “urban” or the right to the city as a mere slogan, as Souza (2010a) demonstrated in a very appropriate and critical way. With the idea that there

must be a dialectic relationship between theory and practice for grasping and realizing the right to the city, the article aims to discuss the radical core of the right as an inspiring, unifying claim for the conquest of human, urban and social transformation as well as the possibility of a radical change for a just society which could not be reduced to the right to better housing as Souza (2010a) asserted.

As Elden, Purcell, Chatterton and Souza revealed and emphasized in their articles, the right to the city is much more than a demand: *It is a radical struggle for another, a future city; for a horizon of a "possible-impossible". What is impossible today will become possible tomorrow* (Lefebvre 1972, 147; Lefebvre 2000, 164, 181) via an urban change on the path of a continual and active process and the struggle to appropriate another city, to move towards another society (Souza 2010a). For Lefebvre, an urban society is not possible without the working class (Lefebvre 2000 154, 158). The struggle of claiming the right to the city is a class struggle and thus an urban revolution for a radical change of society (Lefebvre 2003), which is in fact a process. For Purcell (2008), Lefebvre struggles to propose an agent other than the working class to mobilize for the right to the city. Other possible identities and other groups which could be active in the mobilization are reduced to class politics, making the realization of the right to the city problematic (Purcell 2008, Elden 2004).

However, the agent class of the right to the city is another working class, composed of people who are spatially and socially excluded: What identifies the existence of working class is "the segregation and misery 'to inhabit'" (Lefebvre 2000, 178). Lefebvre stated: "The pressure of working class has been and remained necessary (but not sufficient) for the recognition of these rights..." (Lefebvre 2000, 157) and underlined is that "it cannot but depend on the presence and action of the working class", as this is the only class which is able to abolish segregation, to reconstruct the centrality destroyed

by this segregation and to be present in the centres of decision making (Lefebvre 2000, 154). For Lefebvre, “only groups, social classes and class fractions capable of revolutionary initiative can take over and fruition solutions to urban problems” (Lefebvre 2000, 154). Here lies one of the significant aspects. He added: “This does not mean that the working class will make urban society all on its own, but that without it nothing is possible.” (Lefebvre 2000, 154). The agency of working class or more exactly of different dispossessed groups and people in their endless everyday struggles the working class, the youth, the students, the intellectuals, the armies of workers with or without collars, the people from provinces, the colonized or semi-colonized, who endure a well-organized daily life, have to “exhibit the derisory and untragic misery of the inhabitant, the suburban dweller, who stay in residential ghettos, the mouldering centres of old cities” (Lefebvre 1972, 121; Lefebvre 2000, 159), which is different from the routines of the bourgeois everyday life mentioned in the paragraph. This represents a very critical assessment and contributes not only to the definition of the urban-with the practice and the way that we engage in (Lefebvre 2003), but also to that of class. So those spatially and socially excluded and segregated from the centres and possible urban life towards the peripheries (Lefebvre 2000, 146, 154, 158, 178) deserves to be discussed in a meticulous way.

To achieve this realization of the “urban”, the working class which is the “victim of segregation and expelled from the traditional city, deprived of a present or possible urban life” (Lefebvre 2000, 146) and rejected from the centres towards the] peripheries, dispossessed of the city is merely the agent and the social carrier (Lefebvre 2000, 158). As Lefebvre argues: “only groups, social classes and class fractions capable of revolutionary initiative can take over and fruition solutions to urban problems” (Lefebvre 2000, 154). It is only via these social and political forces that the renewed city

could become the “oeuvre” determined by art, as a work of art and “appropriated time and space”, of the body and desire (Lefebvre 1972, 147-148; 2000, 154). To realize the right to the city of Lefebvre, it is required to understand his elaboration related to the survival of capitalism (Lefebvre 1976) and its growth from its means of occupying space and producing it as homogeneous and fragmentary by its exchange value in real estate explained as secondary circuit of capital (Lefebvre 2003). This described characteristic could be maintained also in terms of the mondial crisis as stated by Lefebvre and underlined by Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer (2012) where different types of cities across the world system are repositioned within unpredictable and financialized circuits of capital accumulation. The spatial analysis is meaningful and functional as well with its interpretation as “abstract” one created by state actors and capitalist including strategic instrumental role of urban planning and urbanism against the “urban”, proposed beyond capitalism (Lefebvre 2003). As Purcell (2013a, 9) supported the idea of distinction between the urban and the city, the contemporary capitalist city is not the “urban” but a reduced urban world into economic elements. The produced space of instrumental rationality, homogenization, control, fragmentation and commodification aims the justification of spatial interventions. In this respect, I must add that the space must be considered beyond specialization, as a mental, physical, and social entity (Lefebvre 2003).

Another aspect which Elden underlines in Lefebvre is meaningful for understanding urban spatial interventions and regeneration in terms of technocracy as a myth, used for the persuasion of the people about technological decisions (Elden 2004, 145). Urbanism as an ideology of the state controls behind this myth of technocracy (Elden 2004, 145). While its social characteristic being ignored, social space as a social product based on values, meanings, perceptions and practices is erased by these interventions.

“The right to the city” is more than being a “natural and contractual right”. *It is principally a right to centrality which is mainly underlined by Lefebvre as that of citizen, citadin -citizen of the city- and “l’homme”, human being against exclusion of the groups from the urban, the civilisation, and the society* (Lefebvre 1972, 163). From the social need, the right to the city is the refusal of the exclusion by discrimination and segregation of decision, richness, power, information and privileged politics, as a re-constitution of spatio-temporal unity instead of the fragmentation (Lefebvre, 1972). The right to the city is a superior form of rights as a right to freedom, to individualism in socialization, to habitat and dwelling with the right to the oeuvre, to participation and appropriation challenging the right to property (Elden 2004, 152).

Lefebvre mentions the need for *creative activity, the oeuvre with his own words, not only for product and consumable material goods, but for information, symbolism, the imaginary and the play* (Lefebvre 1972, 147). The relationship between the *rural and the urban, city and the countryside*⁴⁰ *must be elaborated in terms of mode of production*. Apart from the festivities of the rural, the new cities’ urban life must rise from new humanism, a new praxis, new life of another man that of real urban society. The nature is destroyed by commercialized, industrialized and institutionally organized leisure pursuits (158), while the nature became separately the place of pleasure and the retreat from creativity (158). Colonized by urban dwellers, Lefebvre supports the countryside underlining that it has lost the qualities, features, charms of its peasant life, thus became an urbanized countryside against a disposed rurality, as the extreme case of deep misery

⁴⁰Souza (2012) elaborates very critically this relationship and underlines that urban revolution whose carrier is “not only the proletariat, but many social movements” which could guarantee the right to the city for all people (24). In this respect, the article of Barraclough (2013) proposes to reveal the rural emphasis in Lefebvre’s idea and propose as a key to create a new life in the countryside beside a new life in the city.

of the inhabitant. After that elaboration, Lefebvre puts forward his famous proposition about the right to the city like a cry and a demand with the right to nature as a tendency to flee the deteriorated and unrenovated city and “alienated urban life” (Lefebvre 1972, 158), which emphasizes the use value. The right to the city is a transformed and renewed right to urban life for Lefebvre (1972, 158), which couldn’t be conceived as a simple visiting right or as a return to traditional cities but would be possible with the urban as a place of encounter and the priority of use value. The centrality is elaborated in terms of the city and the countryside being the place of production and of oeuvre, the rurality, the urban tissue and the “rurban”. In this respect, it is necessary to refer to Souza’s elaboration on emancipatory struggles for the right to the city in terms of decentralization of power at different scales and overcoming of the capitalist division of labour which necessitates new emancipatory spatialities which must hold two not dichotomous but interrelated challenges in terms of “urban” and “rural” socio-spatial, reminding that city and countryside are elaborated together in an urban society in Lefebvre (Souza 2012a, 23-24). The rural movements could be the most emancipatory ones like in the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century according de Souza strategically in relation with activism in cities, which is also a challenge for the radical change of the existing socio-spatial order⁴¹ (Souza 2012a, 23).

The realization of the “urban” is related to the working class, who is the mere agent and the social carrier or the support. Landed property and segregation likewise every project of urban reform challenge the structures, the individual and daily relations of existing society, the coercive and

⁴¹ Social movements from different geographies and diversities must be considered in the framework of both libertarian thinking and especially praxis, for instance in Latin America with the cooperation between activists and some progressive scholars on the meaning of the social production of space, new forms of heteronymous socio-spatial control, proposing emancipative urban strategies and insurgent spatial practices in the 21st century with various examples from the world, from different scales and localities both from urban and rural areas (Souza 2012a).

institutional means of urban reality. What is critical for the agent of the change is that “only groups, social classes and class fractions capable of revolutionary initiative can take over and realize to fruition solution to urban problems”; from these social and political forces, the renewed city could become the “oeuvre” determined by art and as a work of art and “appropriated time and space”, of the body and desire (Lefebvre 1972, 147-148). The change and the urban strategy need social and political dimensions to be realized and Lefebvre adds that “it cannot but depend on the presence and action of the working class”, who is the only one able to abolish the segregation, to reconstruct the centrality destroyed by the segregation and to be present in the decision making. Without working class, for Lefebvre, the urban society is not possible. As I pointed out above, the struggle of claiming the right to the city is a class struggle thus an urban revolution for radical change of society (Lefebvre 2003). In this respect, it is necessary to underline his later statements which is a very critical assessment and contribution not only to the definition of the urban, but also of class.) The working class, the youth, the students, intellectuals, armies of workers with or without collars, people from provinces, the colonized or semi-colonized, who endure a well-organized daily life, have to “exhibit the derisory and untragic misery of the inhabitant, the suburban dweller, who stay in residential ghettos, the mouldering centres of old cities” (Lefebvre 1972, 104), in their endless everyday life struggle. In this respect, it is a distinction of people who have a daily life routine and difficult living conditions different from the bourgeoisie.

Rural and urban relation, as an ignored aspect deserves to be developed. For Harvey (2012), the right to the city is a cry and a response to the existential pain of everyday life in the city as well as a demand to look the crisis in the eye and to create an alternative urban life (Harvey 2012, Preface x). One part of Lefebvre’s famous proposition has frequently been overlooked: After the elaboration related to the relationship and opposition

between the rural and the urban, the city and the countryside, he puts forward the right to the city like a cry and a demand which can “only be formulated as a transformed and renewed right to urban life” (Lefebvre 2000, 158). To realize centrality (mentioned also in Lefebvre 2003, 160) and the right to oeuvre, it is also necessary to consider the rural. Centrality is elaborated in terms of the city and the countryside being places of production and of oeuvres, the rurality, the urban tissue and the “rurban”. This must hold two not dichotomous but interrelated challenges in terms of “urban” and “rural” socio-spatiality, reminding us that city and countryside are elaborated together in an urban society in Lefebvre (Souza 2012a, 23-24). Lefebvre supports the view that, when colonized by urban dwellers, the countryside underlines the fact that it has lost the qualities, features and charms of its peasant life, thus becoming an urbanized countryside against a disposed rurality, as the extreme case of deep misery of the inhabitant. Nature is destroyed by commercialized, industrialized and institutionally organized leisure pursuits (Lefebvre 2000, 158; Lefebvre 1972, 120), while nature became separately the place of pleasure and the retreat from creativity (Lefebvre 2000, 158; Lefebvre 1972 120).

3.1.2. “Active Inhabitants” and “Autogestion”

The history is always marked by urban struggles in different geographies; however, these times, the systemic as well as similar types of interventions and projects all over the world lead to displacements, evictions from the centrality in Lefebvrian terms and so give rise to urban oppositions and resistances in different ways. This chapter is revised when Occupy Movement’s anniversary was “celebrated” in New York, Spain’s indignados were returning and reoccupying the city squares as well as in Athens. It is also a period of squatting is “illegalized” in United Kingdom, the time when many inhabitants of the cities from all over the world are evicted from the

homes where they live. All the facts that I observe and find in the field necessitated the radical geography terminology, which was ignored for a long period like autogestion of Proudhon mentioned in the work “Théorie de la Propriété”, influential in 1960s in terms of workers’ self-management. In the online document namely “L’autogestion d’hier a demain?”, we can find practical (at different levels from individual to workplace as Purcell (2013a, 8) illustrated, city) and theoretical linkages of autogestion from Proudhon⁴² who considers it as the fruit of the social evolution for emancipation based on auto-education, which is development of physical and intellectual faculties to the way on the auto-administration. The struggle against injustices of capitalism and efficient practices of autogestion must be made together. *Historically, it refers to self-management and worker control and even a total rejection of the state.* In this respect, there is a reference to the emancipation and alienation; in this respect, autogestion is conceived as a remedy for individuals against economic exploitation, hierarchy, and authority by questioning the state. From the similar line, Lefebvre (Purcell 2013a, 8) suggested that autogestion in all areas of life from the grassroots decision making with decentralisation via autonomous local units.

Lefebvre’s “*l’homme total*” (Lefebvre 1972, 1991, Shields 1998) is another concept which refers to struggle permanently, human being could be liberated from his/her chains for the integration due to the individual revolution in everyday life. We will later mention and elaborate from and after Lefebvre, what is autogestion and whether or not it is a panacea or the path could only lead to gestations of autonomy with a revolutionary strategy. The rights to the oeuvre of the citoyen, *to (active) participation and appropriation with the use-value are clearly distinct from the right to property* (Lefebvre 1972, 2000, Mitchell 2003). In the construction of

⁴² What was crucial is that for Proudhon, political autogestion must be thought with the economical one. In the pamphlet, the so-called “participation” is criticized while the “citoyennisme” is related to the state, which is not a solution.

transformed and renewed urban life, the right to the city paves another way for defining another type of “citizen” –involving the relationship between the ruled and the ruler for Elden (2004)- in a continual and active process of appropriation claiming to take the use, control of the city from capital, privileged ones as an active, insurgent citizenship’s right to “claim the presence in the city” since the presence of some citizens is erased from the city and relocated into other lands by force (McCann 2003, Lefebvre 1972). The democracy must not be limited for some citizens as idealized in the antique city (Lefebvre 2000) so it is not the right to the ancient city but to urban life, to renewed centrality, to places of encounter and exchange, of the routines of everyday life in the space of the city as underlined by Lefebvre. The right to the city covers the right to “the use of the centre”, “a privileged space”, instead of being dispersed and stuck into ghettos, which could be grasped by a struggle for collective citizens’ rights for Harvey (2012).

There are now “cities without citizens” and the right to the city is the struggle (with social movements) for a space that it is robbed from them to develop and live with dignity (Borja in Sugranyes and Mathivet 2010, 29). Related to the citizenship (of Purcell, Fenster in Sugranyes and Mathivet 2010, 65), there is another aspect of the radical reconstruction of formal citizenship with rescaling of citizenship, reterritorialization and then reorientation of citizenship which could lead to another citizenship far from being homogenous entities trapped into nation-state. This necessitates the right to appropriate as full and complete use of urban space and to participation for decision-making processes for the production of urban space. As I mentioned, the citizenship should not be thought and elaborated within the limits of “the” citizenship whose rights are given and determined by the state, but “citadinship” as a specific set of rights, to appropriation and participation in terms of the production of urban space, control away from capital and appropriation as the right to inhabitants to physically access, occupy and use urban space, but also to produce space for the needs of

inhabitants (Purcell 2003) based on everyday life in urban space refined through struggle, hence the right to resist. So the right to the city must arise from streets and neighbourhoods as a cry for help and sustenance by oppressed peoples in desperate times, not primarily out of various intellectuals' fascinations and fads (Harvey 2012, Preface xiii). It is a demand for a city of *inhabitation*, which must be at the centre of the alternative to the right to own and profit from space to make the right to the city an "effective linchpin" and an "agenda for the mobilization against neoliberalization" (Purcell 2008, 92, 99-100). There must be a conception of the active inhabitant who makes a claim for appropriation and participation in terms of the production of urban space and who seeks to take control from capital appropriating it as the right for inhabitants to physically access, occupy and use urban space and to produce space for the needs of inhabitants⁴³ (Purcell 2002). Purcell (2002) underlined the citizenship in Lefebvre and uses "citadins" instead of citizens. Lefebvre fuses the notion of citizen with inhabitant-denizen. Referring to Lefebvre, Purcell argues: "the right to the city should modify, concretize and make more practical the rights of the citizen as an urban dweller –citadin- and user of multiple services" (Purcell 2002, 102); while the central role of the inhabitants especially in terms of decision making, is as a challenge to the nature of citizenship. Inhabitants have two main rights which are the right to appropriate urban space, full and complete usage of the urban space in the course of everyday life and the right to participate centrally in the production of urban space.

⁴³ It is critical to take into consideration the point of Purcell (2008) who asserts that there is a difference between inhabitant and *inhabitation* in that every inhabitant would not be a part of the struggle of a progressive alternative *inhabitation* (Purcell 2008, 102-103). Mitchell and Heynen underline another difference, that between the right to habitat and the right to inhabit: While the former refers to a place and to the ability to make life, the latter implies making that place one's own – collectively - to dwell, to have a right to be. When these rights are not available, people use their instincts of survival to try to make them possible (Mitchell and Heynen 2009, 615-616).

“The city as an oeuvre” that all citizens participate in the public space and social justice, and the priority of the use over the exchange value (Mitchell 2003) must be introduced in terms of autonomy (Lefebvre 1972, 85) against the corrosion of the characteristics of the oeuvre by appropriation, which could be only possible by the “l’homme” and “citoyen”/”citadin”; so *from individual to the active, collective appropriations, definitions and struggles for these rights*. However, as underlined, the city is in fact a site of expropriation by a dominant class. The economist and productive rationality eliminates the “oeuvre”. The right is opposed to the private property and ownership and it destabilizes capitalist social relations and the process of capitalist accumulation for a new citizenship and new politics.

I must refer here to the citizenship in the framework of libertarian municipalism of Murray Bookchin (1991), while with the struggles and movements, libertarian municipality make “active citizens who reclaim the public sphere for the exercise of authentic citizenship rather than passive constituents” in the so-called “new politics” with “social justice” programs. It is a claim for another policy, “policy is made by a community or neighbourhood assembly of free citizens”, not reduced to a centralized worker-control forms. It represents a very critical aspect: Bookchin (1991) said: “...by creating cultural centres, parks, and good housing, they may well be improving the system by giving capitalism a human face without diminishing its under lying unfreedom as a hierarchical and class society.” This must be the point from where the genuine right to the city must be claimed in the context of an increasing antithesis between urbanisation and “citification” (Souza, 2012b), which for Bookchin means the formation of authentic cities. This could only be possible with a radical critique of capitalism and with the effort and need to overcome it if the right to the city is the right to a radically new socio-spatial reality (Souza 2012b, 563-564).

Autogestion⁴⁴ is a key term for theoretical understanding and practical usage the right to the city as a revival of -born from- the contradiction between use value and exchange value (Lefebvre 2009, 148), mainly related to its radical meaning and its relation with the state. Lefebvre argued that autogestion is opening the practical way toward the possible –as a way for a politics of the possible (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 38) - for changing the life and through autogestion, the members of the free association control over their own life so the work, oeuvre, which means appropriation (Lefebvre 2009, 150). It could be assumed as a model of grassroots democracy or workers’ control in terms of oppositional socio-political mobilisation in neighbourhoods, cities, regions, rural peripheries, national states and on a world scale for Brenner and Elden (in Lefebvre 2009, 3). It is also an adversary proposition for a politics of difference and radical grassroots democracy so autogestion (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 4) Brenner and Elden explained very accurately that even though autogestion could be translated as self-management, it could be understood as “workers’ control” or more exactly “grassroots control” (Brenner and Elden 2009, 14). Like Souza (2010a), they recognized that the “project of autogestion” has its roots in the anti-statist social movements, Castoriadis’ journal “Socialism ou Barbarie”, The French Left position against Yugoslav system of industrial democracy as well as the Algerian independence movement (Brenner and Elden 2009, 14), with its gain of popularity in May 68 events as a “popular rallying cry for the non-communist and anarchist Left” (Brenner and Elden

⁴⁴Merrifield (2011, 101-102) argued that autogestion “calls the state into question as a constraining force erected above society as a whole, capturing and demanding the rationality that is inherent to social relations”, and proposes that autogestion has to emerge from somewhere expanding spontaneously, magnifying and amplifying the problems of the society with the possibility of radicalization and generalization for a new right, on a right to the commons (Merrifield 2011, 168-169) for taking back the land asserting the right to the city as a right to control the land, a right to de-dispossession but to re-possession of the commons (Merrifield 2011, 174-177). Another contribution from Pattaroni (2007) is that relating it to autonomy discussed from squatting movements in Geneva, it is a critique of the “heteronomy” logics of the State and the standards of the market and the capitalist system struggling with social justice and solidarity (301).

2009, 14), as a form of radical democracy against the hierarchy and state authority of the communist party . Yet it became confusion in between of statist and anti-statist political projects as well as grassroots and liberal-parliamentary political participation, making it as a hollow slogan (Brenner and Elden 2009 in Lefebvre, 15) like in some extent the right to the city. So autogestion could be understood as the essential basis for radical-democratic transformation, the withering away of the state in terms of “Theoretical -as well as practical- Problems of Autogestion” (Lefebvre 2009, 139-152) in historical and ideological elaboration, or a direct democracy, as a grassroots political practice from the social life produced by the state which transform subjects into objects as passive and manipulated (Lefebvre 2009, 133). There is a possibility for the transformation of the state into a “radically decentralized and participatory” one, making struggles also possible. The state is reconceptualised as an arena for making possible “spatial autogestion, with direct democracy, democratic control and recognition of differences produced in and through struggle” in a continuous action (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 16) revealing contradictions of the state –as a constraining rational force above society (Lefebvre 2009, 147) - as a perpetual class struggle (Lefebvre 2009, 135). Brenner and Elden demonstrated that Lefebvre is aware of the fact that (social and territorial-with a concrete struggle with concrete objectives against the state power (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 250)) autogestion is not a magic formula or recipe⁴⁵ (Lefebvre, 134) in this sense, nor a panacea for the “workers’ problems” (Lefebvre in Brenner and Elden 2009, 134), which is open to be assimilated in different ways like co-gestion (Brenner and Elden in Lefebvre 2009, 16, Lefebvre 2009, 134) but must be put into action

⁴⁵ Elden, while discussing autogestion which is “neither a magic formula that will solve all problems nor a recipe that can be applied immediately with the state” (Elden 2004, 165), stated that this requires an active participation in the political process, alter the domination relations between the rulers and the ruled, challenging the active and passive, subjects and objects (Elden 2004). According to Elden, Lefebvre evaluated autogestion not as an achievement but as a process of continual struggle.

immediately as a practical struggle reborn with failures and setbacks pointing out a way and strategy at different scales (Lefebvre 2009, 134-135). For Lefebvre, autogestion could be followed from the organization of space, which could be exemplified by a Mexican shantytown or other neighbourhoods (Lefebvre 2009, 160) but while underlining a shift from peasant to urban revolutions (Lefebvre 2009, 161).

For Souza (2010), participation is used as a tool for crisis management and so urban diversity is tamed and domesticated. However, the concept of Lefebvre must be held as a radical one with its political core: not a mere participation, but self-management as underlined by Souza in the philosophical framework created of *Castoriadis*, in the studies namely *Philosophy, Politics, Autonomy Essays in Political Philosophy* (1991), which exposes the autonomy of human beings with the autonomy of society and of individuals inseparably, related to praxis and *the Imaginary Institution of Society* (1998), for its social dimension. For de Souza, even though human and affordable housing and participation are concrete aims, the right to the city for Lefebvre could not be reducible to the right to better housing in a reformist way, especially entrapped within the framework of capitalist city and capitalism. As proposed and elaborated by Souza (2012a), while proposing autogestion, Lefebvre did not mention radical discussions on autogestion in terms of workers' self-management by Castoriadis as well as anarchist ideological roots of the conceptualizations (Souza 2012a, 22).

Souza underlines the importance of *operationalization of "autonomy"* –in the philosophical framework created by Castoriadis in terms of tension between individual and collective autonomy and being not a panacea for all urban problems - for positive social change and social justice. For instance,

Brazilian⁴⁶ “urban reform” developed by Brazilian left-wing scholars, planners, militants from social movements with “participatory budgeting” is a good example for citizen participation in urban planning, and providing accountability and popular control over the state as underlined (Souza 2000, 2001). What was critical is that “reforma urbana” was not simply an intervention for spatial restructuring, but more a social reform for a transformation of the institutions regulating power and production of space, for the “social justice” (Souza 2000). Souza (2000) argued that there is a difference between alternative planners from conventional urban planners: It is a popular participation for a just and democratic city in the political process of the planning. This was an example of rare usage of its instruments progressively (Souza 2000). In other words, it was demystifying of the planning process in a bottom-up and participative way (Souza 2001), through social movements. However, with the underestimation of socio-political factors and overestimation of the role of the institutional and legal framework of the alternative planners more crucially marked by the lack of the more ambitious project of social change for the original radicalism for the “idea of “reforma urbana””. By struggling for the rights, it is critical to avoid problems such as overestimation of the power of plans and laws, underestimation of socio-political factors and social justice and citizen control (Souza 2000, 2001). In this respect, another question is autonomy and vulnerability about co-optation, control and repression in terms of

⁴⁶Fernandes (2007), from the right to the city of Lefebvre which has been influential in Latin-America both in legal and political terms, questioning legislative changes and citizenship dimensions, elaborates its legal construction and exclusionary characteristic and its future materialization (legal-political reform) in Brazil with socio-political mobilization. Brazilian urban areas are similar to Turkey, with informal, precarious and insecure “favelas” and later speculative land markets, clientalist political systems, exclusionary legal and elitist urban planning practices (Fernandes, 2007). Legal reform has been based on the right to the city, the core of that of Lefebvre, the right to habitation and to participation according to Fernandes (2007). The politicization of the urban law leads to broader popular participation in terms of social interest and collective rights. Lefebvre conceptualization must be understood both with the right to habitation and right to participation, and be realized with new political contract of social citizenship through strengthened legal-political arena (Fernandes, 2007).

planning, occasional demolition of illegal houses (Leontidou 2006). This could be accomplished in terms of co-optation is via participation in urban planning (Souza 2006 and in Leontidou 2006). However, urban social movements in Brazilian case, favelas, as agents of participatory budgeting and “grassroots urban planning”, “urban governance” could be considered within the limits of partnership between the state and civil society (Souza, 2006). Latin American favela activism, sem-teto movement of Brazil and piqueteros, *assembleas barriales* of Argentina -as a civil movement of neighbourhood associations with discussion groups- could propose radically alternative socio-spatial strategies against urban neo-liberalism, and entrepreneurialism as attempts of “grassroots urban planning” (Souza, 2006). According to Souza, social movements can offer social change, while not assisting to the state apparatus, but at the same time, criticizing the state and putting pressure on it against urban entrepreneurialism which serves in favour of private companies, developers. Social movements then must offer proposals to conceive alternatives and to realize them despite the state apparatus against the state in a process of conquering of “autonomy”. It is necessary also to think about the position vis-à-vis the state but with possibilities of alternative or new spatialities. New spatial forms must be produced for a possibility for “(grassroots) urban planning” with which civil society directly and proactively conceive and implement solutions independently of the state apparatus. It challenges the state as the sole urban planning agent⁴⁷, starting from access and right to some services for

⁴⁷It's critical to avoid problems which are suggested by de Souza like overestimation of the power of plans and laws, underestimation of socio-political factors and the overestimation of the degree of compatibility between capitalism and representative democracy on the one hand and social justice and citizen control on the other hand (Souza 2000), with successes and obstacles towards urban reform for conquering the “right to the city” (Souza 2001). According to Souza, institutional struggle must be pursued in relation to direct action since institutional struggle is not a taboo, but trying to influence public policies, plans a legislation. Social movements can offer social change, not being assistant to the state apparatus, but criticizing the state and putting pressure on it offering proposals and conceive alternatives and to realize them despite the state apparatus against the state in a process of conquering “autonomy”.

realizing another radically participatory one, “*together with the state*” for tactical reasons but in fact “*despite the state*” and “*against the state*” (Souza 2010, 2008, 2006). *This new spatiality requires a just society*, in term of “equal chances of participation in political processes for all of its members” (Souza 2008), but proposing radically alternative socio-spatial strategies against urban neo-liberalism, entrepreneurialism (Souza 2006) with horizontal, non-hierarchical self-management structures. Referring to *Bookchin* (Souza 2012), even though these are contested in terms of some anarchist principles, to think about block organizations, neighbourhood assemblies, town meetings, civic confederations with its risks and limitations, and the public arenas beyond single-issue demonstrations and campaigns, could address social injustices for change. This must be considered in terms of the difference between urbanisation despite the citizens and citification, while the libertarian municipality for a right to the city proposes a changing and formative perspective. It must be a concept of politics and citizenship to transform cities and urban megalopolises ethically, spatially, politically and economically (Souza 2012, 17).

All the regimes of citizenship are formulations of equality and inequality (Holston 2011, 337), so as Young proposed (Holston 2011), *a differentiated citizenship could be a way for the full inclusion and participation of everyone*. James Holston (2011) referred to right to the city in the framework of differentiated citizenship and the politics of difference and argued that this becomes the legitimization of inequalities via so-called the legalization of privileges. This also means the emergence of the insurgence of another, new citizenship(s), urban citizenship, rather than rights-based claims from the citizenship of the state. The main argument of Holston is that especially the urban poor, by claiming the right to the city, are creating another citizenship, which is conceptualized as insurgent urban citizenship, distinct from the national –correlated with the state-. However, the problem

in this respect lies in the idea that urban citizenship is mainly correlated with urban spatial issues, and later insurgent urban citizenship, with the reference to the political transformations (for the right to the city) claimed by active citizens. This claim could and will start from the residential based organization but against “national regimes of citizen inequality” (336). For Holston (2011), the claim of the right to the city and urban citizenship could pave the way of the conception of “right to rights”. Holston refers to the “rights turn” with the influence of Lefebvre (Holston 2011, 337, 346). It has continued with Castells and Harvey too, apart from liberal statements with property rights. This could be for Holston (2011) a broad coalition for a project of democratization. However, as Holston described, there could always be many problems and misconceptualisation in the practice of possession and claims of rights based on existing socio-economic problems and inequalities (such as merely “honest people, good workers and tax payers have to have rights”) (Holston 2011, 351). In this respect, I could refer to Sandercock (2003) who underlines the importance of socio-economic forces with resurgence of indigenous peoples, rise of organized civil society and the new politics of social movements for the analysis of the 21th century’s cities and regions. To characterise the new urban condition in which difference, otherness, fragmentation, splintering, multiplicity, heterogeneity, diversity, plurality prevail, of living alongside others who are different, learning from them, creating new worlds with them, instead of fearing them; an utopia, a “cosmopolis” with politics of difference shaped by insurgent planning “histories” (addressing the formations of insurgent citizenship of Holston and James (1998) as a counter-agent). She added that contemporary cities are sites of struggles over space of two kinds: one is of life space against economic space and the other over belonging. In the mongrel cities of the 21th century, the claims of “who belongs where”, “with what citizenship rights” become loader with new vices for new demands for right like rights to the city, rights to a voice, to participation, to

co-existence in the actual physical spaces of the city. She proposes a radical postmodern planning practice characterised by practical wisdom, people-centred (deliberative and analytical), learning from local communities' knowledge-s- based on practices of talking, listening, seeing, contemplating and sharing in experiential, grounded, contextual, intuitive way, multiple histories and learn to access other ways of knowing, deconstructing both the public interest and community understanding that there are multiple publics requiring multicultural literacy and a new kind of democratic politics, more participatory, deliberative, and agonistic. Studying the grassroots' mobilizations and everyday practices subverting state agendas, they must know through dialogue and experience, citizens, residents, mobilized communities, city governments, politicians and city building professions together. She explains the right to the city with the right of presence, bridging the difference and getting along so the right to difference. What is critical is that the achievement depends on a politics of active local citizenship, an agnostic politics of broad social participation in the never complicated process of making meanings, an always emerging and negotiated common culture. Even though there is a cultural emphasis from immigrants, it is necessary to pursue the ideas especially on urban political economies and discourses of fear. She talks about different examples to be hopeful from different parts of the world and different types of possible needs which must be included into planning (rational decision making for land-use and resource management) like the need of a language and a process of emotional involvement, a story of participatory action research in an empowerment planning. She said that the building of cosmopolis (a paradigm shift from metropolis to cosmopolis), the effort of social transformation is a combined effort not only mobilizing resources and power and changing institutions but also about organizing hope, negotiating fears, mediating collective memories of identity and belonging, and daring to take risks (Sandercock 2003, 179) with the importance of story and the

emotions inside for another city, another society (Sandercock 2003, 208) for multiple and heterogeneous public-s- including mainly other ways of knowing from stories of local communities daring to break the rules for a city of memory, of desire, of spirit, of non-rational in a search for the city's song lines for all that is life sustaining and also of struggle. Even though there are some problematic concepts, especially for multiculturalism and creativity, his proposition for a planning as a process involving to organize hope, negotiating fears, mediating memories and daring to the break the rules (Sandercock 2003, 220) is revolutionary.

Considering the impossibility of the "justice" in "capitalism", the right to the city is another type of human right far more than the individual liberty to access urban resources. It is a cry and a response to the existential pain of everyday life in the city, a demand for looking the crisis' eye for creating an alternative urban life for Harvey (2012). The city could be proposed as Dikeç stated (2002a) as the battleground to claim group rights, whose struggles are for claiming rights to the city as a space of politics. The right to the city for Lefebvre is a call to about urban spatial approach to political struggles with the participation of all those who inhabit the city without discrimination. This must modify, concretize and make the rights of the citizen as an urban dweller –citadin- and as user of multiple services more practical (Dikeç 2002). In other words, the right to the city, as an enabling right which will be defined and refined through political struggle is related to the active participation of the urban citizen in the political life and administration of the city. Dikeç (2002) underlined the "right to difference", as a complementary to the right to the city, which is a "right to resistance, right to politics questioning the order of things" so as the right to resist and struggle (Dikeç 2002). These rights are not granted by institutions which do not prevent social, economic and cultural exclusion, but are defined and redefined by political action and social relations through continuous re-

negotiation of those rights in the active participation (Gilbert and Dikeç 2008).

I would like to emphasize here another dimension what Purcell (2013b) reveals as a concept which is generally dismissed: It is “*transduction*” proposed by Lefebvre (2003, 152). Purcell explained that Lefebvre proposed the method transduction as a way to cut a path leading beyond the actual world already realized and “toward a possible world yet to come” (Purcell 2013b, 21).

As we read from the Urban Revolution (Lefebvre 2003), the possible world is already here even if it is “*inchoate*” (Purcell 2013b, 22, 83). In this respect, we can propose the urban society of Lefebvre that is explicitly presented by Purcell. In contrast to industrial one, the urban is correlated with the urban space which is appropriated by inhabitants for their use and needs, which is managed together according to differences so for themselves (Purcell 2013b, 22-23). What is necessary to remark that the urban society is mostly not been realized as a “virtual or possible object”, not an end but a horizon toward we can move (Purcell 2013b, 23-24, 148), as a path always with a distance if we come near. This is interwoven in practice and thought so transduction is affirming for Purcell (2013b, 148) with emerging practices and enable to be aware of new alternative ones thanks to the riots of different people in different degrees with multiple wills, desires and voices (Purcell 2013b, 148-149). These are desires for democracy which exploded in the city for Purcell (2013b, 147), by occupying and using the space (148). Purcell (2013b, 23) put forward that for Lefebvre in the Urban Revolution, this virtual object is not a utopia, an ideal that can never exist but amplification in thought of practices and ideas already taking place in the city with ideas and practices that are inchoate and yet not mature. *Transduction could also be a concrete plan to move forward for an active democratic autonomy (Purcell 2013b, 25). “Autogestion”, more than a “self-management”, is a key term for the struggle in which people engage*

actively managing their own affairs for themselves (Purcell 2013b, 37). Like democracy, it is itself a process and perpetual struggle against its bureaucratization and transformation into an ideology of the state (Purcell 2013b, 84, 146). As I exposed in the right to the city part from *State, Space, World: Selected Essays* (Lefebvre 2009), by referring to early Marx, it is obvious that Lefebvre distances himself from the State: People must appropriate their power from the state mainly for the accomplishment of the human emancipation (Purcell 2013b, 38). In this term, what is critical is the determination of Purcell (2013b, 152) about the occupation and use of the space where people inhabit and make it more democratic, but not the confrontation with the state. On the other hand, there are always explorations how to be and act together outside the existing political and economic system (Purcell 2013b, 153).

In Turkey, associations are correlated with an attempt to move within the state, so they are not autonomous, differing from “asambleas” in Spain which are described by Purcell (2013, 156). Here, Purcell made a great contribution by questioning the transition from being “beyond protest” to a “real movement”. This does not exclude continuing to become more democratic, never settled down into institutions and the centre, to forge positive alternatives, and to invent democratic collectives outside the state and the market (Purcell 2013b, 156). From the horizon that is shown by Lefebvre, Purcell argues that desire for democracy is already here (Purcell 2013b, 156), to reach the “irrepressible lightness and joy of the multitude able to govern themselves” (Hardt and Negri in Purcell 2013b, 157). Souza (2009), in one of his earlier works, criticized the social scientists from their over-simplifications and generalizations, by reminding reactions of “hyper-precariats” in other places such as Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and cities in Brazil other than European and Western cities. These cities were considered as “laboratories for every new product” by the capitalists and imperialists. Another aspect is the use of Marxism as a mere base for radical thinking,

which will limit the questions and propositions for alternative urban visions, radically democratic alternatives of thought and practices. What is crucial is his remarks on autogestion, which is not a Euro-communist concept but a traditional anarchist and autonomist idea. For Souza, autogestion was proposed by Lefebvre against threats of co-optations. However, for Souza (2009), Lefebvre did not elaborate workers' autogestion sufficiently, which he held as "autogestion generalisée".

3.1.3. “-Social Practices of- Urban Common-(s)-ing” and Struggling From and Beyond the Right to the City

“Urban commons” is becoming a key expression in both theoretical and practical senses which gains new meanings mainly in this period of projects of urban regeneration, “enclosures” of all over the city including rural areas. In the arduous path of claiming property to urban commons against many forms of enclosures, different groups and associations from different classes political platforms, neighbourhood associations and ordinary people tried to come together to resist against violation of their rights to use collectively the urban space, collective meaning and use of their neighbourhoods and the enclosures of public and cultural spaces in the city in time.

“Commons” is appropriated by intellectuals, activist-academicians who are mainly active in the urban opposition in Turkey –which I will mention in terms of analysis on the right to the city literature in Turkey- namely “Müştereklerimiz” (*Our Commons*) (as the collectivity of Ecology Movement, Boğaziçi Consumption Cooperative, Immigrant Solidarity Network, İMECE, TarlaTaban Initiative and Public Art Laboratory since June 2012). The right to the city in this respect represents a common value, burdened by a totality of rights for different groups and actors.

The crisis, as an urban one, marked by accumulation and by dispossession of the assets of the low-income urban population, urban commonalities have been lost via these capitalist enclosures and control mechanisms, which leads to forced displacement in the cities (Harvey 2012), these projects in Turkey have triggered questions starting from the decisions on the production of space by those who are excluded from the centrality in spatial and political terms. New urban enclosures of privatization, dispossession, and capitalist subjectification all over the world (Hodkinson 2012, 506) also create possibilities for new urban commons via ways of decommodifying urban life (referring to Hardt and Negri⁴⁸ and de Angelis, Chatterton 2010b, Russell, Pusey and Chatterton 2011). For Chatterton (2010b, 627), the common “as both a political imaginary and vocabulary, and also as a material aspiration and organising tool” is useful to operationalize and understand deeply the right to the city and spatial justice. For Chatterton, the city is the cradle of powerful forces of capital accumulation but also practices and potentials of the common, the productive capacities of the multitude. What is the common? What could offer us? I would like to continue with Chatterton’s words: “The common is full of productive moments of resistance that create new vocabularies, solidarities, social and spatial practices and relations and repertoires of resistance.” (Chatterton 2010b, 626). From the way paved by Negri and autonomous thinkers, Chatterton (2010b, 627) argued that the city itself has the force to create commons, social relations of commoning via decommodifying urban life.

Even though there are differences among urban oppositions, the right to the city has been a common mobilizing cause for groups of the deprived and the alienated by building alternatives to injustices over who should have the

⁴⁸The related ideas of Hardt and Negri on the common could be found in their works namely *Commonwealth* (Hardt and Negri, 2009) and *Declaration* (available on <http://antonionegriinenglish.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/93152857-hardt-negri-declaration-2012.pdf>).

benefit of the city and what kind of city it should be (Marcuse 2009, Marcuse in Iveson 2011). The right to the city must consider the need for “urban commons” collectivized by alliances of struggles from the local. In its relation to progressive and participatory forms of democratic politics; to new forms of mobilization; coalitions and confederations of grassroots social activists (Soja 2010a, Chatterton 2010b), this could be a common ground for struggles for spatial justice to come together from losses to create alternative politics against enclosures (Chatterton 2010b, 626): as a mobilizing force and strategic objective for various demands and for democratic rights to urbanized space (Soja 2010a, 7).

For Harvey (2012, 72-73), the common is not to be defined but is as a particular kind of thing, asset or even social process, as an unstable and malleable social relation between a particular self-defined social group and those aspects of its actually existing or yet-to-be-created social and/or physical environment vital for its life and livelihood.”Against the practices of capitalist domination and accumulation by dispossession, Harvey underlined: “There is, in effect, a *social practice of commoning*. This practice produces or establishes a social relation with a common whose uses are either exclusive to a social group or partially or fully open to all and sundry. At the heart of the practice of commoning lies the principle that the relation between the social group and that aspect of the environment being treated as a commons shall be both collective and non -commoditized-off-limits to the logic of market exchange and market valuations.” (Harvey 2012, 73) since different social groups “can engage in the *practice of commoning* for many different reasons” and he illustrated, the ultra-rich could protect their residential commons as anyone (Harvey 2012, 74). Contemporary social and occupy movement in the squares in Athens, in Cairo, in Barcelona were public spaces which became an urban commons since “people assembled there to express their political views and make demands (Harvey 2012, 73). David Harvey, referring to potentiality to build

new forms of social relations, a new commons against privatization and spatial controls, enclosures, defined the common: “The common, even-and particularly-when it cannot be enclosed, can always be traded upon even though it is not in itself a commodity. Through their daily activities and struggles, individuals and social groups create the social world of the city, and thereby create something common as a framework within which all can dwell.” (2012, 74) and asked: “How, then, are urban commons produced, organized, used, and appropriated across a whole metropolitan area? How commoning might work at the local neighbourhood level is relatively clear.” (2012, 79)

Iveson (2013) by using the concept “urban justice”, argued that the right to the city proposes a renewed concern about “what, why and how of urban justice” (Iveson 2013, 2). Iveson locates the right to the city on two points: the role of bridging the gap and a basis to formulate policies and to build movements for a more just city and a political focus to help inhabitants to forge alliances beyond the limitations of class and identity politics (Iveson 2013, 2). These statements are quite significant mainly for the practice. Iveson, referring to Purcell and Ahmed, underlined that this is not a simply a practical matter but also a theoretical claim. The concept of “equivalence” of Purcell is “not the result of a political archaeology to reveal what is already there” but it starts to exist through “political struggle to forge strategic linchpin that resonates equivalently with the challenges facing each group” while the right to the city is one potential linchpin and equivalence but must be worked out by political movements in specific contexts” (Purcell 2008, Iveson 2013, 2). Ahmed (in Iveson 2013, 2) assumed that “strange encounters” might make possible the formation of alliances across difference. From Ahmed, Iveson quotes the following sentences: “The collective is not simply about what we have in common or what we have in

common. Collectives are formed through the very work that we need to do in order to get closer to others.” (Iveson 2013, 2).

Chatterton (2010b) asserts that spatial justice for a right to a future just city can only be fully realized by rebuilding this “urban common”, not being a static entity, as a complex one produced and reproduced through relations in different times, spaces and struggles (Chatterton 2010b, 625-626), full of productive moments of resistance that create new vocabularies of solidarities, social and spatial practices, and relations and repertoires of resistance (Chatterton 2010b, 626). It could form a potential base for communities to come together for losses, having a potential for alternative politics for enclosure of spatial issues. This is a tool to understand theoretically the processes of building and rebuilding alliances as well as be used practically in the struggles while trying to build alliances. With its neither totally private nor public characteristics; urban commons opens a new space for politics, new forms of political imagination, part of spatial justice. The metropolis is a factory for the production of the common according to Hardt and Negri (2009 and in Russell, Pusey and Chatterton, 2011), the city itself has the force to create commons with social relations of commoning via decommodifying urban life⁴⁹. It is a social practice of unifying, commoning as well as commoning struggles with an anti-capitalist ideal and to new urban commons (Harvey 2008, 2012). Main criticisms about Harvey’s elaboration on urban commons are on his doubts about “horizontality” conceptualized as “fetishization of horizontality” so he insists on the need for “some type of centralized hierarchy”⁵⁰. As a tool for

⁴⁹It is demonstrated, conceptualized and operationalized in the framework of anti-capitalism by Hodkinson, Pusey and Gillespie in academic presentations and project available on the website: <http://www.designingeconomiccultures.net/thinking-creatively-about-anticapitalism/>

⁵⁰ Legard (2013) in his article on Harvey and libertarian municipalism published in *New Compass* raises the newly popularized but misconceived aspect, “horizontality” vis-à-vis social movements as well as cities. Harvey, in his recent book namely *Rebel Cities*, made a claim about the fetishization of horizontality as Legard pointed out. For Harvey, there is

unifying and for creating new urban commons, it is continually being produced for this broader social movement (Harvey 2012, Preface xviii, 112). In the chapter entitled “The Creation of the Urban Commons” in “Rebel Cities”⁵¹ (2012), Harvey asserts that there is an on-going struggle “to appropriate the public spaces and public goods in the city for a common purpose” (Harvey 2012, 73) in the framework of the right to the city⁵² with class emphasis. Harvey concludes that the creation of a new urban commons based on an inclusive urban democratic participation could only be possible via fight for inalienable right to the city with different political-economic practices, and it necessitates rolling back of the growing privatization of

always a need for organization based on centralized hierarchy. This totally contradicts with Bookchin’s idea, libertarian municipalism, which is also elaborated in Harvey’s book. In this formulation, there is a real will for democracy, as the direct democracy on the local level with a flow from bottom to top. For Harvey too, as Legard demonstrated, libertarian municipalism is the most sophisticated and radical proposal for the creation and collective use of the commons-across scales-. However, there is a necessity of a higher authority across municipalities to maintain the equality of opportunities. On the other hand, as Legard stated, in contradiction with his own ideas, Harvey put forward that libertarian municipalism could mask something, i.e. the state. For a human and anti-capitalist cities, Harvey proposes a mixture of organizational forms such as horizontal but /and hierarchical. Especially, the idea of the right to the city gains importance, in terms of being not a right to what already exists, but the right to rebuild, recreate the city as a socialist body politic, which eradicates poverty and social inequality (Harvey in Legard 2013).

The right to the city is also a claim for a radically different urbanization like urban movements’ coming together became an appropriate example. In Harvey, apart from the discussion on the commons, there is a strong emphasis on the class struggles are urban struggles and vice versa. The main questions of Harvey are “how to organize diverse urban movements into a unified struggle for a radically different project of urbanization” to jump scales (which is criticized by Springer 2013) and “how to manage commons issues after the success of these movements” as Legard underlined. Legrand’s main criticism about Harvey is that his rough conclusion about the fact that hierarchy is necessary. Our main concerns must be the organizational forms which oppress people and the negative outcomes of the hierarchies. However, the emphasis of Harvey about the class content in urban movements is very crucial (Legard 2013).

⁵¹I would like to thank the reading group, my dear comrades from the University of Leeds, School of Geography: *Federico Venturini, Andre Pusey, Vicky Habermehl, Tom Gillespie and Marie-Avril Berthet.*

⁵² For Harvey (2012), the creation of a new urban commons, as a public sphere of active democratic participation requires the rolling back of huge wave of privatization of neoliberalism.

destructive neoliberalism (Harvey 2003, 941) by integrating the commons into anti-capitalist struggle (Harvey, 2012, 66).

Underlining a significant aspect, Pusey⁵³ underlines that Harvey, being less critical of Ostrom than he was expecting, which is a critical point which is ignored in the current discussions on the commons for constructing a “neoliberalism Plan B” from the ideas of George Caffentzis⁵⁴ and “libertarian municipalism” of Murray Bookchin, which is also underlined recently in the article of Souza (2012), that we discussed in this article. Pusey added another outstanding aspect, horizontalism⁵⁵ understanding of

⁵³The review could be read on the following link: <http://www.redpepper.org.uk/cities-of-struggle/>. For another article of Pusey on the commons, please go to the following website: <http://journals.sfu.ca/affinities/index.php/affinities/article/view/31>

⁵⁴You could read the referred text on the following website: http://sduk.us/silvia_george_david/caffentzis_future_commons.pdf. Another important link is <http://anarchism.pageabode.com/afaq/sec16.html>, for a critique of Hardin and the Tragedy of Commons as well as for an explanation for the “true commons” referring Engler who stated: “They cared for common property and when necessary acted together to protect it against those who would damage it. Under capitalism, there is no common property. (Public property is a form of private property, property owned by the government as a corporate person.) Capitalism recognises only private property; on the other hand, and a social anarchist society is a communal, decentralised one based on communally owned and used resources. Another text directly related to urban land struggles (Lower East Side of Manhattan, Zurich, the city with the countryside and the commons) available in Midnight Notes, an important autonomist Marxist source especially for the “commons”, <http://www.midnightnotes.org/newenclos.html>, <http://www.midnightnotes.org/pdfnewenc10.pdf> and <http://www.midnightnotes.org/pdfnewenc11.pdf>. In “Reclaiming the Commons” which is available on the following website <http://newleftreview.org/II/9/naomi-klein-reclaiming-the-commons>, Naomi Klein states that this is a radical reclaiming of the commons while relating this claim with commonly shared urban spaces’ enclosures all over the world: “As our communal spaces—town squares, streets, schools, farms, plants—are displaced by the ballooning marketplace, a spirit of resistance is taking hold around the world”. Without forgetting “cultural” products and technology in the creation of the commons, she referred to Movimento Sem Terra and their intervention on the genetically modified soya beans fields by stating: “activists aren’t waiting for the revolution, they are acting right now, where they live, where they study, where they work, where they farm.”

⁵⁵ The book of Sitrin (2006) gives an accurate picture of “horizontalism” from Argentina and South America examples. Strin refers to “horizontalidad” which reflects an “ever-changing” experience as a tool and goal implies democratic communication and non-hierarchical and anti-authoritarian by underlining autonomous organisation, direct action, mutual aid (Sitrin 2006, 3).

Harvey in terms of applicability for larger scales and hierarchy as well as anti-organisationalism.

The basis of the theoretical standpoints could be found in Lefebvre's "the right to the city" as a mobilizing force and strategic objective in contemporary politics at every geographical scale for various demands and for democratic rights to urbanized space as Soja (2010a) asserted. In relation with space, spatial justice as Dikeç (2002) conceptualized could be explored in terms of dialectical relationship between in-justice and spatiality to produce politics against domination and repression, and the spatial dialectics of injustice revealing how injustice is created and maintained through space as Soja proposed (2010a). Seeking spatial justice has influenced mobilization, identity, cohesion and strategic actions of urban social movements into social and political practice. For Soja, spatial justice is related also to progressive and participatory forms of democratic politics to new ways of mobilization, coalitions and confederations of grassroots social activists (Chatterton 2010b, Soja 2010a). For a right to a future just city, spatial justice has to be sought via urban struggles. These struggles for spatial justice must be radically open to multiple constituencies, avoiding monolithic social movements. This search for spatial justice of Soja could be related to the search for "the commons" of Negri according to Chatterton (2010b), which opens new horizons for "urban social movements" and also the "right to the city". Seeking spatial justice in terms of socio-spatial dialectic⁵⁶, will serve to form new lasting and innovative coalitions across

⁵⁶ In *Seeking Spatial Justice*, Soja (2010a) makes a discussion on the spatiality of (in)justice and the (in)justice of spatiality and the dialectic between them. He defines the spatiality of (in)justice neither as a justice determined only by its spatiality, nor spatial justice as one of many different components or aspects of social justice. Soja underlines that this does not mean a simplistic spatial determinism but means that spatiality and spatial processes shape social relations, and toward a new spatial consciousness, "a critical spatial perspective has the power to advance our knowledge in new and innovative ways whatever subject one chooses to explore.", the innovative ways of transforming theory into practice, knowledge into action (Soja 2010b). For a spatial theory of justice, the basis of the theoretical standpoints is the right to the city of Lefebvre, proposed to stimulate a mutually reinforcing convergence between two versions of the struggle over geography, for spatial justice –as a

class, race, gender with new strategies for Soja (2011a), creating new possibilities for social and political action as well as for social theorization and empirical analysis (Iveson 2011). Lefebvre underlines the right to the city as the right to difference, the right to be different as means of challenging the controlling forces of homogenization, fragmentation, and uneven development imposed by the state, the market and the bureaucracy (Soja 2010, 99) to re-establish justice, democracy, citizen's rights -urban dweller, *citadin*- in the urban space.

Struggles over the right to the city are vital political responses to capitalism's efforts to create geographies for its fundamental and survival interests, the reproduction of social relations of production, keeping capitalism going and growing even through times of economic crisis. For Iveson (2011), the right to the city is not merely an issue of re-ordering urban space. This idea mainly deals with relations generating forms of injustices in the city as a "common cause" or a "glue that binds" for radical theorists and activists even though there are differences, while trying to build alternatives to injustices. Referring to what Marcuse (2009) underlined, that the right to the city is a common mobilizing cause for the groups of the deprived and the alienated, while problems having spatial aspect but the origin is in historically embedded economic, social, political issues. Seeking spatial justice has influenced mobilization, so identity, cohesion and strategic actions of urban social movements into social and political practice. For Soja, spatial justice is related to progressive and

mobilizing force and strategic objective in contemporary politics at every geographical scale for various demands- and for democratic rights to urbanized space according to Soja (2010a), while "seeking the right to the city" as "a continuous and more radical effort at spatial reappropriation in urban life under capitalism" (Soja 2010a).

The struggles over the right to the city are vital political response to capitalism's efforts to create geographies for its fundamental and survival interests, the reproduction of social relations of production, keeping capitalism going and growing even through times of economic crisis, reminding important quote Lefebvre's capitalism and space relationship, the survival of capitalism and the production of urban space (Soja 2010a).

participatory forms of democratic politics, to new ways of mobilization, coalitions and confederations of grassroots social activists (Soja 2010, Chatterton 2010b).

Movements can be the basis for a broader common politics; however, alliances are needed by using alternative forms of democracy which move beyond a limited local scale and are capable of addressing the metropolitan region as a whole. Merrifield argues the possibility of radicalization and generalization for the right to the commons (Merrifield 2011, 168-169) to take back land via the right to the city, which is a right to de-dispossession and to re-possession of the commons (Merrifield 2011, 174-177). Juhana Venäläinen, in his presentation namely “Urban commons against enclosures” (New Commons, University of Eastern Finland), explains enclosures as a systematic and on-going process of taking something “out”. Another important and mostly used aspect is that enclosures could be not only by force but by offering images of “progress” and promises of wealth. What does the common mean? De Angelis (2003) defines: “Commons suggest alternative, non-commodified means to fulfil social needs, e.g. to obtain social wealth and to organise social production. Commons are necessarily created and sustained by communities, i.e. by social networks of mutual aid, solidarity, and practices of human exchange that are not reduced to the market form.” De Angelis proposed that the place in the commons and networks does not mainly connected to what is local but refer to communities in local and trans-local places. To really talk about commons created and sustained by communities of mutual aid, solidarity outside the market forms means to be directed towards main strategic horizon for a new political discourse from movements and practices, “practices of the current transnational movement for global justice and solidarity” for the possibility of another world. This new language of this new political discourse and its practice are important to create new types of commons “defending, building and transforming” the communities everywhere, from the fields to the

streets of our cities. This discourse must include alternatives against commoditized patterns of life and (neoliberal) capitalist enclosures in “every sphere of social life and human relations” with variety and multiple characteristics and networks of struggles which will make real these “alternatives”, which must not be thought and fetishized merely at the level of local place for de Angelis. Since while locality may serve for cohesion, it could lead to fragmentation as well. Furthermore, de Angelis states that it is the “world we want to gain” and “communities are everywhere and overlapping.” While the means of our sociality such as land, water, food for de Angelis (2003) are being enclosed as well as the communication is directed in certain ways and silenced. Moreover, this process (of alternatives) contains always the risk of (alternative form of) co-optation. De Angelis (2003) proposes the concept as: the movement of the wisdom as the space of the commons. Where the competition sways including academic life, we could not form sustaining mutual aid, solidaristic practices of human exchange and engagement/direct action in any sphere of life so communities and commons but with an effort not to idealize or romanticize. For de Angelis (2003), it is necessary to deconstruct illusory communities such as state, but put instead community of all citizens. However, the state, which is no longer the state as we know, can be “community of communities” or an illusory community ruling our lives, i.e. the state for the sake of capital accumulation. The community of communities could only be possible by “horizontal articulation of communities”. From this point, the movement of movements must be alike, where participation and dignity must prevail instead of exploitation, oppression and competition. De Angelis stated: “In a word, a different world springs from a movement that practices what it preaches.”

Caffentzis (2004) puts forward *the political problem is the capitalist use, commodification and the quick enclosure of the common lands or more*

exactly “the commons”⁵⁷ strategically and ideologically. Not only in the “third worldist”, but in all over the world, in different cities, *there are struggles not “simply for housing” but for common land and communal space of different urban agents as it is mentioned in Midnight Notes in 1990*. The –new- enclosures as a technical term–returned in the 1990s as referring to the privatization and closure by fences of lands and by the new owners do mean also employment of armed guards to prevent their common and continuous use. This return of the discourse makes possible the connection of struggles of different components of anti-globalization movement for Caffentzis (2004). Moreover, this provided the elements for the recomposition in the movements. The important aspect for the “anti-capitalist supporters of the commons” is to create another world being against the threat of the “*enclosure by capitalism*”. The “commons” have witnessed a real transformation and variety such as free software programmers, ecological activists in the last fifteen years Caffentzis (2010). Caffentzis (2010, 24) *underlines another possibility of anti-capitalist commons against imaginary impression of sharing and co-management of social wealth by the citizens*. So it is important to be aware of the distinction between commons vis-à-vis their positions against capitalist accumulation as Caffentzis (2010) categorized as *pro-capitalist commons* as a firm and anti-capitalist commons. The capitalist common as a firm could be

⁵⁷ I would like to quote Caffentzis’ explanations for the history of the “commons”: “One of the attractions of Marx’s account was that “commons” and “enclosure” were well defined legal terms in England. “Commons” has two uses in English political vocabulary. One, of course, is the designation of the legislative body (the House of Commons) that, by the way, had very few commoners (in the other sense) as members. But the second meaning of “commons” arose out of the fact that certain lands in or near villages open for productive use by villagers who collectively regulated this usage. “Enclosures” became a technical term in English law and it aroused metonymically from the fact that the privatization of common lands (which the term designates). It often was accomplished physically by the new owner surrounding the land with hedges or fences and often employing armed guards to prevent the commoners from continuing to use the land that had previously been theirs collectively. Given the precision of these terms, Marx traced the process of primitive accumulation by simply examining the historical record available to him in the British Museum’s parliamentary records and judicial decisions justifying the attack on the commons.”

evaluated as the New Enclosures as explained in Midnight Notes being masked by theoretical, political and emotional-aesthetic aspects. Caffentzis finishes by asking: “Can there be a future without the commons?” The commons were appropriated from the capitalist perspective such as “social capital”, “civil society”, and “civilisation” and so on, with the aim to save capitalism. The aim must be to propose other ways against individualism and neoliberal critiques of the commons such as the Tragedy of the Commons, Hardin (Caffentzis 2010). However, there is always a risk of co-optation of the “common” togetherness of the (pre- and post-) capitalist forms of social coordination. There are the “New Enclosures” conceptualized and repoliticized by the Midnight Notes for the capitalist commons with theoretical, political, emotional and aesthetic aspects (Caffentzis 2010). Hardin, as cited by Caffentzis (2010), elaborated the Tragedy of the Commons, which portrays conditions where if there is an attempt for commons, there is also a tragedy which follows it. So it is impossible to have commons in a limited world still reigned by people’s ambitions and interests. However, this idea is used and attacked by the own words of Caffentzis (2010) as a legislative point and its regulatory monetary institutions and cooperations by the neoliberal approach for the capitalist accumulation. Here competition does play a highly crucial role. As examples of commons against the capitalist enclosure and criminalization, all over the history, Caffentzis showed pirates from Atlantic ones to the software movement. However, there is always an intentional confusion/conflicting uses of the commons and its articulation (Sachs, Ostrom and Binswanger) of the use of capital accumulation. Instead/besides the question ‘does the commons have a future?’, we have to ask: “can there be a future without the commons?” with a struggle for social life beyond the capital.

Blomley (2008), one of the scholars who worked on urban commons, stated that they have been *overlooked and ignored*. Blomley (2008) mainly deals with *commons taken from the poor, especially at urban level such as gentrification as a form of enclosure*, or what David Harvey terms “dispossession by accumulation” for Blomley (2008). On the other hand, there is *a creation of another commons (of community) produced through use, occupation, need and for instance collective habitation so exclusion of interests, as a threat to enclosures*. All these processes inner city transforms collective interest into an individualized property for Blomley. This could be a clue for us, to understand urban regeneration processes in Istanbul. Blomley underlines the importance of property -private and state- in discourses of ignorance and trivialization of the commons. He proposes that there are commons outside the law, such as the squatter settlements in the cities, with his conceptualizations of developing countries. On the other hand, there are also (few) examples of law mainly in the past, which ensure commons ownership and collective regulation. Blomley, referring to some communal economic or other activities, mentions criticisms (for instance, of McCann) about property and instrumental commons research, ‘methodological individualism, self-interested rationality, rule guiding behaviour and maximizing strategies’. Blomley mentions Britain and the urban activists’ commoning under the slogan “The Land Is Ours”: This refers indeed to a language of a historic rural common right against contemporary urban redevelopment, appealing not only to social need but also to collective entitlement for all the dispossessed of Britain who in fact reclaim their inheritance.

While the moral and political logic of the commons needs to be acknowledged -as Gibson-Graham⁵⁸ proposed as non-capitalist possibilities,

⁵⁸We will refer to Gibson-Graham in following pages. However, here, I would like to refer to “commons” of Graham-Gibson (2006, 95-97, 187-188): They underlined that the commons “everywhere” have direct contributions in individual and community terms.

Blomley (2008) refers to his earlier study in 1998 and stated that the story of enclosure and dispossession, but they also reveal and produce the commons. Referring to commons means also important social movements for the environment and conservation as Bollier stated. Referring to Geisler who proposed that the commons are everywhere, Blomley (2008) stated that a space of hope and potentiality is prised open. The communal spaces all around the world such as town squares, streets, schools, farms, plants are living displacement, so does the spirit of resistance by calling back privatization as McCarthy stated for reclaiming commons of many kinds, at every scale including cultural knowledge. Blomley declared that scholars differ in their politics of commons interpretations. For Hardt and Negri, Blomley stated that the commons is the base also medium for their concept, the “multitude” so the defence of the commons against the appropriation is the basis for its political project (Blomley 2008, 323). Harvey defends that the enclosures of commons, displacement and privatization of collective rights, the accumulation by dispossession is present in contemporary capitalism too (Blomley 2008, 323). However, new waves of enclosing the commons require new areas for the capitalist investment. If earlier ones led to radical movements, the contemporary ones to global resistances against dam construction in India, privatization of social housing and health care. A “global commoners’ movement” is also ethically useful, as Klein defends the linkage of campaigns of the local to global activism, as gentrification being generalized across the world (Blomley 2008, 324). Commons are crucial for many political movements. In this respect, Blomley quotes from Klein that oppositional networks all around the world are inspired by the radical reclaiming of the commons. However, referring to Harvey, Blomley stated that the defence of the commons could be “reactionary and particularized”. The politics of nostalgia could lead to localized and regressive politics, so not all commons are worth defending. Blomley opens the discussion mainly from potential problems related to “property” so its

language; this could offer a “powerful and political register for naming conflicts and for issues of fighting (Blomley 2008, 324). The language of rights provides for Blomley, “relations of subordination to be reframed as relations of oppression” referring to Laclau and Mouffe. So property rights, exclusive domain of the right, is configured in “restrictive and antisocial ways” so in this respect too, reclaiming the commons, requires a reclamation of language for Blomley. Private property, proposed as an individual liberty and autonomy is sustained by the state through “continuous forms of intervention and rule”. However, Blomley refers to DeFilippis and pre-existing forms of organized commons, land trusts and coops and stated that we can find many other examples of the remaking of property to serve both social and private ends, whether enclosure, zoning or the civil rights movement. Referring to Steinberg, Blomley stated that the commons is an ‘underrated, much-ignored reservoir of valuable resources, system of social governance, and crucible for democratic aspirations’.

In that respect, Narotzky (2013, 122) argued that in the post-2007 period, urban social movements emphasized the right to the city in three-fold dimension: everyday life (in terms of production and consumption), sharing/public space (around mobility and encounter), and creative activity which could be accomplished via the creation and/or reclaiming of three forms of urban commons, *i.e. the practice of commoning* as Harvey conceptualized, which they find accurate and useful to explain contemporary social movements and to understand their socio-political transformative meaning mainly through the collective production, management, and appropriation of space. This common and collective common could also be understood empirically in the observable processes of commoning by asking “what social relations the commons help to produce and reproduce”, “do the commons stand for a better form of public good?”, and what boundaries, exclusions, and regulations produce urban

space as an equitably accesses resource (Narotzky 2013, 123). Susser and Tonnelat (2013) stated that “transformative” urban social movements with the claim of the right to the city are the reflections of the three following urban commons which must come together in terms of themes and cities all over the world from the symbolic city squares to the streets of the neighbourhoods (it is necessary to include homes and social life in these neighbourhoods): labour, consumption, and public services –referred as decent urban everyday life-, public space including mass and virtual communications-simultaneity and encounters collectively used, reclaimed, built, and reframed by citizens-, and art which covers all forms of creative expression-city as the oeuvre-. For Susser and Tonnelat (2013), the urban dimensions of new social movements, all public goods, spaces, and services have potential toward the commons, the commons of tomorrow (109). Public space, more than the “expression of a right to the city and its inhabitants to a self-management of common space and common issues”, brings transformative cities with exposure, unforeseen encounters, and discoveries influencing individual life trajectories. In fact, I must remark that the right to the city covers these encounters too and self-management is a factor which makes possible the “exposure”. Not only a more just but a transformative city is what we are looking for (Susser and Tonnelat 2013, 106-108). *All these activities which are collective and non-commodified could be defined as Harvey did, “commoning”, more exactly the practice of commoning possible only by struggling.* For Benni Barmann (on keimform.de), mainly because of the communication within movements-mainly between theoreticians and practioners-, the commons could be considered as a strategic perspective for any kind of social movements, whose power comes from their heterogeneity. On the other hand, even though difference is desirable, different slogans are obstacles behind a common answer and denominator of various claims, from different world views. So strategically, it could be problem. However, this could be changed

into a strategic platform for many social movements and new ones, so a common theory-practice-process, commons theory for all kinds of movements and worldviews. It is gathering different worldviews together since the commons are “threatened than ever”. But the commons “are more powerful than ever”, while the public sphere is more organized around commons principles. As it is argued, the barriers are also the possibilities, by not removing the differences of social movements but still existing while making comprehensive cooperation possible.

In the Commonwealth, Hardt and Negri (2009) proposed the common for the communism as in the “Spectres of the Common”: From the productive social cooperation, the bio political metropolis which is a living dynamic of cultural practices, intellectual and affective networks and social institutions, is the reservoir (*referring to both source and receptacle*) of the common (Hardt and Negri 2009, 153). In this respect, Hardt and Negri underline the importance of the land value and ground rent as well as for the labour in the urban environment. Apart from the privatization, for instance real estate agents rationalize the markets. They refer to artist-led gentrification and urban rent for the production of a new cityscape. They stated: “Real estate agents do not need to privatize externalities and “rationalize” the markets. With an eye to the common; they are very capable of making money from the metropolis (see Simmel 2002 for the rationality and money economy in the city) and its “irrationality””. However, they added: “Despite the fact that the *commonwealth of the city is constantly being expropriated and privatized in real estate markets and speculation, the common still lives on there as a spectre.*” (Hardt and Negri 2009, 156). It is necessary that political organization generate political events so for Hardt and Negri, the kairos -the opportune moment which ruptures monotony and repetitiveness of the chronological time- will be grasped by the political subject. So they propose making *the multitude (in a conflictual and collective process of*

interaction of singularities and self-transformation grounded in the common) (173-175) with the autonomy of singularities-for this project of exodus and liberation, different than unified traditional political organization based on hierarchy and central leadership (165-166). However, it is critical that the multitude must select the most beneficial common while letting the detrimental forms go which block the formation of the multitude. *Love is another component as a political and philosophical concept which takes form such as affective networks, schemes of cooperation* and this power for the common led to the production of a new world and new social life (180). Within the movement of the multitude-which is not masses or crowd-, there are mechanisms of the common which produce new subjectivity by forming institutions (198). By giving the example of banlieue from the French context, they propose “geographies of rebellion” which aims to relate the production of capital with the social territory. So struggles must aim the reappropriation of life time and life space of the multitude. Hence every attempt of resistance in the metropolis which is the core of the multitude is considered as “terrorism” as the enemy of capitalist biopower. They stated: “*the metropolis – defined by the common and encounters with antagonism and violence - is to the multitude what the factory was to the industrial working class*” (250-256) *in the terms of the metropolitanization of the world, the multitude of the poor and the deprived*. It is the site of hierarchy and exploitation, violence and suffering, fear and pain (258). However, the metropolis is also pathological with its hierarchies, divisions between and within, and corrupts the common with control and stereotypes. These divisions are produce, maintain and reproduce via rent and real estate values as well as gentrification (257). *Rent could operate with desocialization of the common while the common being privatized by the rich* (258). Even though it is a dangerous place for the poor, it is the place of antagonism and rebellion of the multitude-productive multitude rebel- (258) which must target the violence of hierarchy and

control with the defence of the productivity of the common and the freedom of encounters (259). They argued that the rebellions such as piqueteros in Argentina, or La Paz in Bolivia and rebellion in Paris, France are not only in the metropolis or generated *here but also against it, against the pathologies and corruptions, divisions and hierarchies* (259). The movements must be that of liberation in terms of self-determination and self-transformation (331). *The multitude different from traditionally conceived coalition or alliance which imply and seek for fixed identities so emancipation, refers to encounters of singularities within the (autonomous production of the) common* (350). During this process of articulation, there is process of liberation, transformation and common of singularities and social being (350) in order to create a new humanity, new form of life and social being (361). The common must aim to restore and reinvent political conceptions of joy, love for our world, which is possible by demanding the support of life with equality against hierarchy –in terms of participation in the constitution of society, collective self-rule, and open access to the common against the barriers of the private property (380-381).

Hardt and Negri (2013) in the Declaration gave a historical explanation of the commoners from the group who work in the medieval England to the Modern era, designating a person without a rank and social standing, so *everyman and everywoman. The commoner is an ordinary person who challenges the private property for all including the control of the state for the public for the common*. This is only possible with free exchange of ideas, images and information based on the creation of social bonds. Moreover, the commoner must try to find and create new ways of political organization with a broad alliance of variety of groups. The coalition in this respect means that every group keeps their own distinct positions but try to form a tactical and strategic alliance and exchange with each other. Another concept that the study will use of it is “multiple”. Urban spaces could be appropriated across different classes. In this respect, another concept, the

“multiple” of Hardt and Negri will be used to explain this diversity active in urban social movements. The study has an aim to question also alliance is necessary, or from which reasons and conditions, there are some moments of togetherness. In the thesis, there is a will to find turning points and alliance attempts for these oppositions in/for/against Istanbul supported histories and experiences of struggle. While doing, the study reveals overlapping and diverging issues, so the way for another new concept, “urban commons” against capitalist enclosures. From a solidarity standpoint, the main aim of the study is to convey experiences and related advices and critiques of actors for assessing and exposing weaknesses and strengths of the oppositions and campaigns on activism and social change as it is underlined in the “Campaigning for Social Change” course of Paul Chatterton (2012), the University of Leeds. Multitude is important in terms of not using working class as the subject and actor of social movements but there is new struggle ways. The city in fact pathological metropolis with its hierarchy, segregation, and inequalities as an obstacle against common existence ways and useful encounters (256) is very important for riots and resistances for Hardt and Negri (2011, 247). The world is becoming more and more “metropolitized” in terms of street occupation of piqueteros in Argentina, in water and gas wars blocking the roads in Bolivia and occupation of city centres beyond ghettos, rebellions in banlieue of Paris. However, this does not only mean the domination of hegemony and exploitation, but also expansion in networks of rebellion, solidarity and communication as well as condensation of common existence (259). For Hardt and Negri, *the metropolis is the space where multiple feel like home* (259). The study proposes that another categorization beyond old and new social movements must be maintained which include urban commons, multitude and affinity groups with the “return of the actor” –but not in terms of identity- with new ways of struggles.

McFarlane refers to Hardt and Negri (2009 in McFarlane 2011b, 158) and assemblages as forms of “commoning”: “Commoning” means “bringing into imagination, debate and so realization forms of urban learning produced through a participatory inclusion so the commons”. The commons are also the practice of interaction, care and cohabitation as well as a process of becoming, so as Negri stated, an activity not an end or result so an assemblage on a process in this sense (McFarlane 2011b, 158). This is a significant conceptual contribution as well as clarification for the relation between the commons and the multitude on the line of Deleuzian concept, assemblage from Tampio (McFarlane 2011b, 158). For Hardt and Negri, the common is a way of collecting multiple knowledge and ways of being, while affirming singularities (McFarlane 2011b, 158). The commons refers also a space, for Hardt and Negri (2009 in McFarlane 2011b, 158), a space of people living together, sharing ideas and communicating so for McFarlane (2011b) a project of learning to dwell differently through this type of inclusive and participatory sharing of this knowledge to make just ways of perceiving/living urbanism. On the other hand, assemblage necessitates processual thinking, mainly in terms of bringing actors together, their contestations, dissolutions and reformulations (McFarlane 2011b, 163). These are inclusive urban commons based on urban learning assemblage but in fact a project of mutual recognition, solidarity and resistance as stated by McFarlane and exemplified from Lefebvre’s right to the city as a renewed right to urban life (2011b, 166).

3.1.4. Conceptualizing the Right to the City for Radical Social Transformation

We witness a period when the right to the city is meaningful for many activists as well as different scholars. Neighbourhoods, especially actors from and outside the neighbourhoods propose, learn and (re-)define the right

to the city while struggling in different ways by claiming it in terms of appropriation, another type of participation for centrality, their everyday life as well as their communal spaces. It is necessary to question fetishizing as well as taming the right to the city but be aware of the potentialities using it both conceptually mainly for practical reasons and for new possibilities of social and political action: new types of organizations, new collectivities from below as a “common cause” and strategically binding and coalition-building between localities and forming new relations between global forms of struggles and resistances as all these authors substantiated. The right to the city beyond being a mere slogan should be considered in the framework of challenging the right to dwelling based on possession/property, as a horizon for the right to oeuvre and appropriation, the right to participation, “autogestion” and even basically to the priority of the use value over the exchange value (Lefebvre 2000).

They are steps like challenging citizenship, legislations and human rights, if we use Holloway’s concept, to create cracks in capitalism. The right to the city must aim a radical change by restructuring not only the city but all relations in this unequal and exploitive system. We must reveal the importance of struggling for right(s) to another society inherent in the right to the city. This radical project is underway within associations and between different actors, in a long process of struggle. It is a claim to a totality, to a totally different city, and different society, by rejecting the unequal and exploitative prevailing capitalist system as a radical claim, which differs for Marcuse (2009), from utopias, in the sense that the future should not be predicted, designed, defined, but be left to the democratic experience. *Utopian thinking is a precondition for the radical transformation of politics and society for another city and for another society* (Souza 2010a, 2012a).

Attoh (2011) referring to Brenner and Elden reminds their point on *the critique of the capitalist state and the political rights counter neoliberal state retrenchments*. The right to the city offers *a radical alternative directly challenging and rethinking the current structure of capitalism, competition and current liberal-democratic citizenship*. However, *it is crucial to think about what kind of a city these new urban politics will lead to*. Another aspect is that its realization does not mean a new urban revolution but it is a beginning and it is earned out of the routines of everyday life in the space of the city.

In this respect, the right to the city could be proposed as a key. Even though, goals and framing of different groups, local level activists, organizations in Istanbul could be different in various sites within dynamics of urban oppositions, it is necessary to *find effective ways for generating common actions and practices, solidarities starting for the urban, new possibilities for new types of non-hierarchical, horizontal organization for social and political action, new relations between local and global forms of struggles and organizations and finally social change*. The right to the city, as Marcuse asserted (2009, in Chatterton 2010a), “is not the right to the existing city but the right to a future city” (Chatterton 2010a, 235). Chatterton (2010a) believed that *the key role for an urban imaginer is to make today’s impossibility into tomorrow’s possibility, while creating new vocabularies, imaginations and strategies of action, for a radically different city, a just city of the future* (Chatterton 2010a, 235). *This presupposes a different, post-capitalist society as Souza (2008) argued with his question: “Which right to which city?”* (Souza 2010a). The right to the city is far beyond being just a demand, is a claim, a redefinition for another city in the future, from the possible to the impossible, what is impossible today will become possible tomorrow, a horizon, a “possible-impossible” (Lefebvre 2000, 164, 181) for a “just city of the future”, in which social justice would reign, presupposing another society, a post-capitalist society but with a

strategy in order to achieve this justice (Souza 2008, 2010) is critical. Purcell (2013a) along similar lines with Chatterton and Souza argues that the right to the city is a cry for a radical struggle beyond the state and capitalism; it was a project for “radical politics” (Purcell 2013a, 6). Purcell (2013a, 12) revealed that the “urban” is a society beyond capitalism, a possible world and a society yet to come. Here there is a need for an urgent utopia which could not be confined in present conditions (Purcell 2013a, 12). As it is argued in the Urban Revolution, the urban represents “a not-yet-realized potential for urban life” (Purcell 2013a, 12). For Purcell (2013a, 13), from the right to the city, “new citizenship” and autogestion, the urban constitutes a revolution, here and now, entails everyday acts of resistance and creation. The right to the city is a beginning and opening toward a possible urban world, is both on a long way and right in front of us (Purcell 2013a, 13).

The struggle for the rights to the city necessitates rethinking the politics of an anti-capitalist tradition by focusing and organizing on the broad terrain of the city and the urban (Harvey 2012, 115) in the framework of a political and social alternative to the operation of the capitalist law of value across the world market for reclaiming the city for anti-capitalist struggle (Harvey, 2012) while urban social movements always having a class content for Harvey (2012, 123). From Marx’s saying, underlining that the crisis is the result of underlying contradictions of capitalism, in one of the last interviews made with Harvey in the Red Pepper⁵⁹, Harvey stated that a postcapitalist imagination (since there is an alternative and we must think of it) is necessary by returning to the use value especially of housing.

⁵⁹ For the article, please go to the website: <http://www.redpepper.org.uk/david-harvey-interview-the-importance-of-postcapitalist-imagination/>

It is necessary to be aware of the difference between what we are dreaming and wishing for (for instance an anti-capitalist commons) and what is being lived. However, without overemphasizing its functions in the struggles and being aware of its traps (Souza 2010, Mayer 2009, Harvey 2008) but the political ideals, alternatives and possibilities must be maintained and discussed. This struggle with other imaginations must aim to make the impossible, the possible for and by those who are excluded from the centrality in spatial and political terms. It is to re-imagine and re-make against the narrowly confined in the hands of a small and political elite's particular needs and hearts' desires (Harvey 2012, 24), to re-make ourselves in a different image (Harvey 2008) by proposing alternative forms of urbanization must become central for any pursuit of an anti-capitalist alternative (Harvey 2012). We must recognize that it is difficult as well as controversial to define the justice as well as social justice so it is necessary to be aware of the traps within its spatial elaboration underlined by Souza (2010). Autonomy from Castoriadis which is self-management, i.e. according to one's own laws, becomes a key aspect in this point as Souza (2011, 73) proposed in the review of the book, *Seeking Spatial Justice* (Soja 2010a). This critique of Souza (2011, 73) on seeing spatial justice as another kind of justice rather than as an aspect of social justice is the key point of this part in terms of "reintroducing spatial fetishism into geographical discourse"⁶⁰, as a dialectic characterized by reductionism" (Souza 2011, 76).

Marcuse (in Sugranyes and Mathivet, 2010) reveals the "radical" right to the city (as a unitary-singular) as a cry, a demand and a claim like "Another World is Possible". As a political slogan, it broadens demands for social change with a vision of a different society for the "urban" (from the Urban Revolution) place as a place of encounter, with priority of use value.

⁶⁰ Souza (2011) shows us another crucial aspect: In the book, articulation and cooperation between social movements are "oversimplified", considered as "broad front" strategy by Soja (Souza 2011, 74).

Marcuse (in Sugranyes and Mathivet, 2010) said that many struggles are between today and the achievement of the better world, “cities for people, not for profit”. Marcuse’s elaboration of the (National) Right to the City Alliance in the United States including different people and groups could be a key for understanding urban opposition in Istanbul in terms of a meeting of some organizations, presence of resource people (allied members supporting base-building organizations with technical assistance, support on legal, research and media matters), general members (individuals and organizations committed to the right to the city principles as unity) and the core members. Caruso (in Sugranyes and Mathivet, 2010) has written for a *potentially* global alliance for a globalizing right to the city for practice and theory (with his own words: practice as theory and vice versa) elaborating WSF events as crucially relevant to the right to the city in a globalized platform with strategies and problematizations of differences and conflicts by making the way while walking. It creates also a space of common engagement. Other points addressed by Caruso are burning questions as he defined: The actual existence of such a thing as a global movement for the right to the city, without a central leadership or coordination with a shared agenda. He mentioned “network” for describing the dispersed actors like the right to city in the WSF has taken place since 2003. According to Purcell (in Sugranyes and Mathivet, 2010, p. 14), Lefebvre’s right to the city necessitates the radical reinvention of social relations of capitalism and the spatial structure of the city as Lefebvre underlined as a transformed and renewed life. The emphasis here is much more on the idea of equity and justice, which must be thought with the critique of de Souza (2010a). Purcell said that the right to the city involves the radical reinvention of social relations of social relations of capitalism and the spatial structure of the city (Sugranyes and Mathivet, 2010). As it is stated by Sugranyes and Mathivet (2010), Habitat International Coalition is crucial as a part of this story or in fact struggle. The mentioned study is one of the most important

ones in articulating struggles, describing in their locality with a global perspective to build links, networks and alliances. It is a part of a process of action and reflection from the practice and a forum for debate and exchange of ideas, experiences for the right to the city as tool for a city and better world telling about the paths for the realization of the right to the city. As stated in the study, in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia and Mexico, several countries included the right to the city in their legal frameworks. We have to be aware of the fact that the agent for change (or the carrier of this transformation) is the working class by reminding the original text (in Sugranyes and Mathivet 2010, 15-18, 108).

Routledge (2010) refers to Dikeç (2001) and states that people act from space, by politically mobilising from the material conditions of their space for alternative spatialisations. He reminds Chatterton's autonomous social centres to rebuild social relationships with emotional responses, solidarity, and trust and shared practices of working and learning together and Heynen's "Food Not Bomb" study as another right of resistance, "eat and survive". Routledge mentions US' the Right to the City Alliance⁶¹, as an alliance between urban community groups, neighborhood organizations, non-governmental organisations and voluntary organisations with a unifying agenda for different communities and interests and an acceptance that all issues like environmental justice, homelessness, displacement, housing, gentrification are interrelated and cross-cut by issues of class, race and gender. The city provides discursive, material and practical resources for activism, with sometimes pragmatic connections between different groups as targets and key contexts for political action across ethnic and class

⁶¹The Right to the City Alliance (Harvey 2012, Routledge 2010) is an important grassroots initiation in terms of being an attempt of alliance between different groups and from neighbourhoods to other organizations concentrated on different issues from urban like housing and urban services to employment issues. For this alliance, the right to the city is proposed to be a common ground for getting together of different groups across different socio-economic groups having different priority concerns.

divides beyond the local. Another aspect is that the right to the city demands also change over time (over space and process could be added) from to inhabit to gather, perform and use public space. Moreover, urban places' relational characteristics connect to distant others as with Massey's term, geographies of responsibility, being expanded with a linking together similar projects across scalar divisions (multiscalar understanding) of local-scale actors, expanding beyond the urban. The justice, for Routledge (2010) could act as "master frame" connecting and convincing different struggles and political actors together in common struggle. Routledge argued that it is essential to conceive spatial justice struggles including social, political, economic and environmental rights require reciprocal solidarities and mutual responsibilities between urban and non-urban groups and communities with the articulation of rights within, between and beyond particular cities with common but dynamic, contingent, contested identities between activists. The construction of such alliances means the construction of "convergence spaces" where groups and activists can meet, exchange experiences for planning collective strategies. According to Routledge (2010), struggles for the right to the city produce space with the active claim of urban space since the right to the city as a "radical restructuring of social, political and economic relations, within the city and beyond" with inhabitants' (users') decisions in the production of urban space (Routledge 2010). Following Lefebvre's ideas, political struggle must start from the contemporary space and its contradictions which are produced under capitalism while every mode of production having its space and hegemony of one class is provided by the space. What Lefebvre proposes is still influential and critical in terms of "mondialisation" ⁶²creating commons being not entrapped in local spatiality in terms of space and issue.

⁶²Brenner and Elden (in Lefebvre 2009) underlines that different from "globalisation", mondialisation implies the possibilities for and constraints on political, social and cultural transformation at that time vis-a-vis contemporary historical and spatial formations.

His proposition for a new spatiality both for the analysis and the practice, from Marxian point but going beyond could lead to radical claims aiming a real change. Being more than a “right”, starting from to habit and inhabit, it is inherently tied to collective struggle, a collectivity of rights and a collective right for “cities for people, not for profit” as underlined by Marcuse (2009). It is necessary to underline that struggle must therefore seek to establish a different kind of order, not built on the fears of the bourgeoisie but on the needs of the poorest and most marginalized residents for Mitchell (2003) but as a radical claim to a totality to a different city and different society, by rejecting the prevailing unequal and exploitative capitalist system. Utopian thinking is precondition for a socio-spatial change, so that a radical social change may come (Souza 2010, 2012).

Neither private nor public characteristics; it opens up a new space for politics and new forms of political imagination. We must have “*a much more wider political imaginary for the intervention in the unfolding story of the city and engage in the building of an equalising participatory democracy for the realization of radically different urban futures and values*”, by “*dreaming six impossible cities before breakfast*” (Chatterton 2010a, 235) to claim the “right to the city” for paving the way for possible-impossible (Chatterton 2010 a, Lefebvre 1972, 2000, 164, 181) as the right to another city in another world (Souza 2010a), in the dialectic between theory and practice of different urban grassroots groups and dwellers as real subjects in the cities and societies. Not last but least, we must ask who determines where we will live in which conditions from the critical questions proposed by Souza (2010a) from Lefebvre, which right to which city?

Souza (2010a) stated: “social movements must continually reinvent themselves, their strategies, and tactics, and finally their language, in order to avoid the colonization of radical slogans and concepts (such as the “right

to the city”) and to cope with new and old challenges...” and added: “Several important movements have already done and doing precisely this, in different countries under more or less different (and more or less similar) circumstances...” For him, these emancipator movements are keys to the right to the city, to a just and free society. Souza (2010b) in (Atkinson, Lipietz, de Souza, Suri, 2010) underlines that students (mostly middle class), NGOs and academics are the majority of attended people in the Social Urban Forum in Rio. Activists from favelas, sem-teto settlements-squatted buildings-had had merely a low percentage, while poor population were not aware of what’s going on. He said that “we need an alternative to the ‘alternative’”, which is colonized by a few academics and activists having connection with political parties and NGOs and trying to guide and control social movements’ organizations. Mayer (2009), in her article explores the relation between the right to the city and urban resistance movements and underlines, compares the different versions and changing of the motto of the Right to the City, which has become a defining feature of urban struggles all around the world with different meanings (a radical concept in Lefebvrian sense compared to the more depoliticized versions in the global NGO context, considering the participatory demand to inclusion within the existing system) but having the potential to bring together the demands, aspirations as said by Mayer. Routledge (2010) underlines that struggles require collective action and solidarity following: “people must act from, act on and act in space, in order to remake it.”, for appropriating, dominating and reshaping the space to create the conditions to expand public political involvement (referring to Dikeç, 2001 in Routledge, 2010). He also refers to the opportunities for social justice activism at local to be expanded by mobilizing a consciousness of justice and multiscale understanding of place (Routledge, 2010). By referring to Schlosberg and Katz (in Routledge, 2010), a unified but not uniform-broader- ‘justice movement’ has the potential to be developed which could extend beyond the

urban, enabling different themes to be interconnected and convincing different political actors from different struggles and cultural contexts joining together in common struggle from the personal, the community, the city, the state, to international arenas and institutions (Della Porta, Routledge and Cumbers in Routledge, 2010). Routledge (2010) referring to Angotti states that there are progressive and radical movements in the world, using the term “assaulting their lifeworlds”, which he explains as “challenging evictions, working for better living conditions” and attempts for “citizen participation”. He ends up with the right to the city which is explained as “means of organising and contesting power relations and the social content of justice.” Referring to Purcell, Routledge (2010) tries to reveal the meaning which Henri Lefebvre gives, as a radical restructuring of social, political and economic relations within the city and beyond, for that the city must be produced for its users, rather than the owners as an active participation in urban social life. He underlines the right to inhabit space rather than owning. Routledge (2010) from Dikeç and Purcell, defines urban citizenship as a form of identification with the city through political struggle for its construction as the right to difference and collective resistance.

Urban resistances of revolting geographies as Dikeç (2007) conceptualized, form urban to anti-capitalist commons -as it was valid for some groups in Gezi Park-, and urban opposition process in Istanbul while appropriating others’ neighbourhoods and their city, so commoning spaces against their enclosures by struggling. In “Some Introductory Remarks about a New City for a New Society”, Souza (2008) told about a vision about a “just city of the future” in which social justice would reign, presupposing another society in fact a post-capitalist society but with a strategy in order to achieve this justice. However, in this respect, there is a critical point: this does not mean a development of a normative model, *but there is a need for a vision*. And this “genuinely alternative city of the future” should be managed by the

concrete man. New spatiality must be built and conquered on the basis of struggle and in the framework of changing social relations. According to Souza (2008), this new spatiality with radically participatory urban planning and management-tactically valuing positively some instruments and mechanisms-, requires a just society, “which provides equal chances of participation in political processes for all of its members”. This proposition of de Souza is crucial since he supports theoretically and politically a radical change; however, he proposes that the use of these strategies help to prepare a new social order. This proposition of Souza is crucial since he supports theoretically and politically a radical change; however, he proposes that the use of these strategies help to prepare a new social order. Questioning “Which right to which city?”, Souza (2010a) claims that the more Lefebvre’s expression of “the right to the city” becomes fashionable these days, the more the concept is marked by the trivialization and corruption. The question of Souza (2010a) is critical: “Which right to which city?” in the pretext that the concept of Henri Lefebvre, as a claim for the right to a more human life but in the context of the capitalist city and the basis of a representative democracy. For Souza, even though David Harvey has a non-reformist understanding of the right, making political-strategic evaluations, he evaluates new and radical-democratically based social movements as “old”, “static”. This leads to the ignorance of agency, and capability of social actors. What is critical that Souza proposed is the libertarian point of view, inspired by the lived experiences. What he proposed has crucial significance since he exposed that especially in “civil society”, the term is used as an “umbrella-phrase”, but it must be elaborated as a kind of contested territory by emancipator social movements and radical intellectuals. This is important since this concept is narrowed with the conceptualization as human and affordable housing and participation even in urban movements and “radical” in Istanbul. It’s true that human and affordable housing and participation are “concrete” aims to be attained.

However, what Souza underlined is inspiring: All these claims are trapped into “capitalism”. In other words, neoliberalism is refused; however, capitalism leading to protectionism, combination of so-called “ecological goals” with capitalism. This must be overcome, with “participative democracy”.

Purcell⁶³ (2013) made an emphasis on democracy claims of different people with multiple desires and agendas in Turkey. Therefore, there is a need to reveal “political desires for nurturing and spreading a political vision and practice of democracy with his own words”, to return the real meaning of democracy. This refers to the people’s will for acting together to make decisions for themselves, not through a party or the state. As he stated in his previous texts, “the democracy is neither end state to be reached one day nor a stable polity at the end of history”. It is a horizon, a process of becoming. Quoting from Lefebvre, Purcell underlined that democracy is nothing other than the struggle for democracy. This is up to becoming active in practicing democracy for the competence and confidence of managing ourselves. This could also be explained by the *rhizomic network of Deleuze and Guattari*, a “*multitude of individuals connecting horizontally with multiple peers*”. In this respect, referring to the Urban Revolution, Purcell⁶⁴ recalls the struggle

⁶³The blog of Purcell namely “Path to the Possible” is critical in terms of clues about current and crucial discussions mainly on democracy and power issues from his notes as well as his presentations made in the conferences. For instance, in his speech namely “the Will to Govern Ourselves”, Purcell emphasized the constituent (popular) power, a real will to govern ourselves, from the People’s Assembly of Syntagma Square in Athens and Spain. In this respect, saying no and to refuse are positive acts. From Lefebvre, Purcell underlines that democracy-as it is emphasized in Lefebvre and Springer-, is not an end stable state that we have to reach. But, instead, it is a lifelong project of becoming and a perpetual struggle.

⁶⁴This is an “urban democracy claim” for the production of urban space as well as its management as self-management. In Turkey, Istanbul, from the production of urban space, this will is to make decisions and show that what is impossible is perfectly possible as Purcell stated, like self-management acts of cleaning the streets, distributing food, arranging for medical care etc. Another important determination is that even though agendas are different (secularism, liberal democracy, nationalism, LGBT community), the dissatisfaction about the figure of Erdoğan became a common point, with the desire to

for autogestion in Lefebvre, of urban inhabitants for the production of urban space. By approaching and narrating critically yet supportively, it is necessary to be aware of the desire for democracy is everywhere and is growing according to its own inner drives. In this respect, we can mention Purcell (2013c) latest contribution to both planning and urban theory from Deleuze and Guattari, who recalls the concepts such as the rhizome. The rhizome refers to being “without trunk and no general committee at all, self-organizing, possible everywhere”. By using the terminology of Deleuze and Guattari, this type of network, as noticed by Purcell⁶⁵ (2013c, 29) could not be planned or directed by a leadership: fuite as the escape from the state by “inhabiting” the smooth space of the nomad with the possibility to form a “war machine” in order to destroy the state, without taking power Purcell (2013c, 30) through *assemblage and minor politics in the process of becoming*. The claim for the right to the city starting from the production of space is exposed to be the way of change in our lives. If we follow these views, by questioning capitalist cities, inhabitants could imagine from today an imagination and construction of a new life and society.

manage urban space themselves across rhizomatic networks as Deleuze and Guattari conceptualized and Purcell reconceptualised and used.

⁶⁵“Inhabiting” must be considered as an action, claim, and a social experience: Purcell opens the discussion on the state and the quality of a revolution; in other words, he underlined once again autogestion, as ***the will of people for direct self-management beyond parties and the state***. Mentioning proliferation of informal settlements on the outskirts in megacities of the Global South, including Turkey, Purcell (2013c) refers to the concepts of flow and opening of a space beyond to explain. Apart from the deprivations and injustices, the creation of restlessly new strategies and the space beyond the state is necessary, which is beyond the market so on their own. Purcell asks whether or not a self-organization is possible and there is or not a possibility to live beyond the state with a management of our affairs by ourselves vis-a-vis urban planning. A ***“becoming-planning”*** could be an appropriate term as Jean Hillier proposed to catch dynamic, emergent properties as well as uncertainty, multiplicity and complexity (Purcell 2013, 34).

3.2. Theories of Urban Struggles

3.2.1. An Introduction for Social Movement Theories to Reflect Upon Urban Struggles

There are many discussions about definitions of social movements as well as of urban struggles and movements -and what make “social movement”- with the question whether or not these oppositions are “movements”. In this respect, Della Porta and Diani⁶⁶ (in Crossley 2002, 6) proposed: social movements could be defined as informal networks for conflictual issues which are based on shared beliefs and solidarity in various forms of protest. With some degree of collective and joint action and organizations and temporal continuity, these could be demarcated as extra-institutional collective action in a mixture of institutional activity of change-oriented goals. The locus of change, its extent from partial to total transformations and the reasons why social movements emerge are mostly ignored or under elaborated, which distinguish from collective action, reactions –such as panics and mass reactions as a collective discontent neither dealing with the reason of the problem nor seeking for a new social life- (Crossley referring to Blomley 2002). Crossley referred to Eyerman and Jamison (Crossley 2002, 4) to make a remark about social movements are “temporary public

⁶⁶This article is useful mainly in terms of collecting together, summarizing different approaches with its linkages between new social movements (for “new” “conflict” with “new social classes”) and “old” ones and American and European approaches, and movements’ creative, producer characteristic, “rational”, purposeful side of the action, its cyclical feature (their specialized study area in Italy) it touches upon critical issues in this literature. In addition to differentiation between social movements and protest events, what is the most important point is that organizations and movement relationship, towards the end of the article. In the article, the distinction between movements and organizations is very clear with the statement that social movements are not organizations, “not even of a peculiar kind”, considering individual participation “without having automatically to belong to a specific organization”. Social movements do not have members, but participants. It is also a critical point for Turkey with some -or exactly with a great number of- organizations which are not organizations and does not leading movements.

spaces” and “moments of collective creation” “providing societies with ideas, identities and ideals”.

We could see the categorization according to continents and breaking points such as the 1970s or the 1980s. In the United States, before the 1970s, collective behaviour and the 1970s onwards, resource mobilization and political process approach while in Europe, before the 1970s Marxism and the 1970s onwards, new social movements were predominant approaches. It could be stated that in the United States as well as in Europe, there are different combinations and new openings as Crossley stated for “collective behaviour approach” and “purposive social action”, which is defined by contemporary approaches as a “irrational” reactions (Barker, Cox, Krinsky and Nilsen 2013), a “psychological” reflex replies to grievances, deprivations, anomie (Crossley 2002), so “deviance” being irrational in motivations. Social movements still are intentionally considered in the framework of disintegration, disorder, deviance etc. mainly for political reasons and discourses. In the 1960s mainly till the 1980s, the processes of micromobilizations were blamed by correlated with psychological weaknesses and personality factors of individuals; i.e. some people were more inclined to activism; consequently, collective behaviour was considered as “irrational” and “abnormal” in the literature (Crossley 2002). In time, the theories were departing from psychological approaches to different rationalities of mobilizations. The interactionist type of collective behaviour theory puts emphasis on the symbolic production processes and the construction of identity (Della Porta and Diani 1999). As mentioned above, social movements are not analysed in terms of why people are recruited or what conditions lead to the social movements. There are conceptualizations which could be categorized as American perspective, in other words the “how” of the collective action (Della Porta and Diani 1999, referring to Melucci). The new social movements from Europe are

concerned with the “why” of action (Della Porta and Diani 1999, referring to Melucci).

What Goodwin, Jasper⁶⁷ and Polletta (2001) argued, until the 1960s, emotions, apart from being expelled from social movements studies, were keys to understand “anger and violence of the crowd”. “Mobilizing structures, frames (motivational framing, injustice –puts fire in the belly and iron in the soul-frames), collective identity and political opportunity-much of the causal force attributed to these concepts come from the emotions involved in them” (Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta 2001). However, what I do defend, feelings like anger, frustration and other emotions are important factors in today’s mobilizations such as: studying with grievances, resources, opportunities in terms of collective identity and culture. Goodwin and Jasper (2009) defined social movements as conscious and sustained collective efforts by ordinary people to change some aspects of the society

⁶⁷Jasper (2011), in his study about the analysis of the relationship between emotions and social movements over twenty-year-period, stated that emotions of protest and social movements are crucial, but in between, which is: emotional processes matter but not all the emotions at the same way as well as encouraging researches into the interaction of different emotions. In this respect, the main contribution of Jasper in social movement theories is that the emotions are not irrational. On the other hand, the overreaction and the overemphasis on emotions must be avoided. Emotions, anger and fear, are present in every phase and moment, while thinking and feeling are parallel, as Jasper stated (Jasper 2011, 286). It is necessary to remind as Jasper did, until 1960s, the emotions are used for the analysis and explanation of “irrational and immature protestors”. Then till 1990s, the scholars did not include emotions while trying to demonstrate the protests are rational. The 1990s –with the feminist approach- was marked by the return of the repressed by analysing the emotions of protest, emotional man, starting firstly by the critique of the rational-choice models (287). Another aspect is that emotions are entwined with the so-called rational goals. For instance, human dignity, the feeling of belonging/attachment to group, sensual motives has great power in the motivation of political right claims. To exemplify, the desire to create an impact, another vision with the sense of fear, anger, threat and mainly hope shows how emotions play importance role in social movements. This is also valid from the recruitment of bystanders by focusing attention to the radicalization, i.e. the reinforcement of commitments and the creation, the construction of collective solidarities, the organization, and internal group dynamics. Another analytical fact is that scholars did referred to pains and pleasures, and mainly anger, without mentioning “emotions”. Emotions, with risks, costs and benefits, different and positive ones, the sequence, combination, constraints and complexity of emotions have future prospects for social movement research. The other thing, emotional vision is working as hidden mechanisms behind the structures such as voting systems, well-armed police.

by using non, extra-institutional means. The sustainability with “extra-institutional” character must be underlined for further analyses. Emotions which have controversial positions in social movements literature do matter in social movements as Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta (2001) asserted, distinguishing themselves from “crowd theories” and “rational protestors” and ration versus emotion “duality”. Oliver made an analysis (1984 in Crossley 2002, 96, Della Porta and Diani 1998, 21) on the participation in neighbourhood association based on friendship and relativity and the availability of solidarity. Gusfield⁶⁸ (1994) puts emphasis on the analysis of the content, “meaning” (from the roots of Blumer) given or perceived, rather than form. Gusfield recognizes also multiple affiliations, in other words, fluidity of social movements. The studies of Mc Carthy, Zald and Obershall cover both material, human resources and moral, cultural resources in terms of social movement organizations sometimes acting as firms accumulating resources and hiring staff (Della Porta and Diani 1999, Crossley 2002).

Even in the earliest studies, social movements are defined as a set of opinions and beliefs which represents preferences for changing some elements of social structure or reward distribution of a society. We could see here two important points: to change some elements of the social structure, so in a sense a reformist approach and to be aware of some disorders in the society. Network analysis is proposed in the study of social movements through the examination of new direct and indirect linkages and actors’ embeddedness⁶⁹ of Mario Diani (2002), social-psychological explanations and frames as values, beliefs, goals, rhetoric, ideological elements of

⁶⁸In this article, the reference of Melucci is critical: Melucci considered collective behaviour as actors without action and resource mobilization theories as actions without actors.

⁶⁹Network nodes are consisted of individual and collective actors, key activists with active/dual memberships and the analysis from “realist strategy” based on interorganisational and interpersonal linkages with extensions to global network properties and the meaning of social cohesion.

Goffman⁷⁰ (Crossley 2002) and framing processes⁷¹ of Benford and Snow (1988 in Crossley 2002) as alignment bridging between people, amplification, extension, transformation, resonance, master frames-by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experience and guiding action and exposing individuals from bystanders to participants in collective action-(Benford and Snow 2000, Snow, Soule and Kriesi 2004).

Keck and Sikkink (1998) proposed another concept, transnational advocacy network critical to understand collaboration, exchange -of information, resources, and services- and assistance transnationally, bound together across borders with common beliefs and concerns. These networks include both international and domestic NGOs and local social movements being careful *not to exaggerate* the power of individuals and groups that play these roles. Stahre (2004), in terms of new social movements and cities, argued that new movements are segmented, with varying size and aims, decentralized, sometimes form a network-structure of different groups. In historical connections with older movements, the core may be formed from one group's possibility to bring together broad categories of people of different age and different political opinions, demands for a more human urban environment and participation in city planning, creating cooperation

⁷⁰For Goffman, the frame analysis is referring to propose definitions of a situation built up in accordance with principles of organizations and our subjective involvement in, while slogan refers to the examination in these terms of the organization of experience (Della Porta and Diani 1999).

⁷¹Snow and Benford (Della Porta and Diani 1999) made an analysis of frame as the assignment of meaning and interpretation. In this respect, frame alignment is the major mechanism through which grievances are interpreted as social movements or attempts. Bridging of movement interpretation and clarification frames to ideologically similar perspectives of immobilized sentiment pools or public opinion clusters. In this term, we can refer to the amplification of beliefs and values of project adherents. The extension of a movement's interpretative framework to encompass interests and perspectives and lastly the transfer of old meanings and understanding the generation of new ones could be analysed. The master frame serves to colour and constrain the orientations and activities of the movements while the frame serves to locate, perceive, identify and label occurrences within their life space and the world at large.

and fellowship among people in districts. Social movements can be considered to be the product of networks linking a multiplicity of individuals, groups and formal organizations (Cinalli 2003).

The political opportunity structure developed by Tarrow⁷² and Tilly is one of the earliest approaches to analyse social struggles. The studies deal with state forms vis-à-vis resources, their interactions are proposed to be main axes of the analyses such as the full exclusion of the state with polarising and repressive methods⁷³. The repertoires- *political opportunities and constraints, forms of organisation, framing as a collective process of interpretation, attribution and social construction by which people engage in contentious collective action, the lineaments as dynamic, complex and relational processes of the struggle of a “model in motion”*- of contention

⁷² Sydney Tarrow (1993) opens spaces for cyclicity and “new social actors and identities”, while studying the 60’s and the 70’s. Moments of madness creating “new” repertoires, he states certain elements of cyclicity namely heightened conflict, geographic and sector diffusion, previous and new forms of social movement organizations, new frames of meaning for mobilization and expanding repertoires of contention. With these ideas about cyclicity – not regular- creating new frames of meaning, new forms, he opens a way for new social movement literature.

⁷³For Kriesi, Koopmans, Duyvendak, and Giugni (1995), new social movements and political opportunities, and specific characteristics of the political context are considered to be separate in the social movement literature. There are also “informal” procedures and dominant strategies, apart from formal ones. In Figure II, formal institutional structure and dominant strategy matrix is crucial in order to realize different levels. For instance, a “weak” state can be exclusive and a “strong” one, inclusive. Although they take into consideration and accept importance of cultural and social issues in new social movements study is more concrete by taking into consideration culture, their emphasis is upon politics. However; new social movements could not be explicated and correlated considerably with politics. The strong state -France, as an “exclusive” strong state- is mentioned in terms of increasing repression leading to radicalization of movement, and with a low number of petitions in terms of mobilization level. Depending on “various” new social movements (ecology movement, peace movement, solidarity movement, autonomous movement, women’s, gay movement, and “citizens’ rights movement) and current conditions, the political opportunity and state’s repression level could differentiate. For instance, even for ecological movements, state’s approach to an anti-nuclear energy movement (related with state’s economic policies and investments) and another movement in terms of environmental issues can differentiate. We must revisit these propositions for contemporary movements.

(McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly⁷⁴ 2001, Tarrow 1994), the cycles of protest (Snow and Benford 1992) refer to those periods of intense and more or less continuous mobilization. Considering the importance of political context on strategies, Tilly (2004) defines social movements as “a series of contentious performances, displays and campaigns by which *ordinary people* made collective claims on others, which is the participation in politics”. According to Tarrow (1994), these could be defined as “collective challenges with common purposes and solidarity but in sustained interactions with elites, opponents and authorities”. As we could remark, there is an emphasis on “ordinary people” in “continuous” collectivities with “common/collective” claims and purposed. Moreover, Tarrow made a distinction between social movements as formal organizations and organization of collective action. The temporal continuity is important which differs from ephemeral kinds of collective behaviour like unconventional crowds and gatherings. These repertoires could be innovated for novelty in the interactions with the regime that they oppose and new recombination of identities, inspiring other movements (Koopmans 2005).

Snow, Soule, and Kriesi (2004) underlined that although various definitions of social movements may differ in terms of what is emphasized or accented: change-oriented goals or claims; extra- or non-institutional collective action; some degree of organization; and some degree of temporal continuity while they remind Snow and Oliver’s definition on collective behaviour which refers to extra institutional, group-problem solving behaviour solving behaviour that encompasses an array of collective actions, ranging from

⁷⁴The attempt to “mobilize” the contentious politics of the movements is critical within dynamic relationships, later phases, interactions in other words new approaches (with new “mobilizing” conceptualization instead of established ones) in the analysis of social movements. With complex, changing reasons and results concerning movements, the grasp of this pace is significant. Not being in prison of theories’ determined boundaries, this mobilization would help to become aware of the dynamic mechanisms, especially in terms of “identities”. Especially for a relationship between civil actions, this understanding would be useful.

protest demonstrations, to behaviour in disasters, to mass or diffuse phenomena, such as fads and crazes, to social movements and even revolution. David Meyer underlined that it is critical to propose a comprehensive approach with a “bridge-building” in the study of social movements due to different levels of analysis, linkage of politics and identity, cross-disciplinary boundaries, multiple movements (in Meyer, Whittier and Robnett, 2002).

About new social movements, I would like to refer to Pichardo (1997) who underlined the role of culture and new forms of middle-class radicalism within the discussion of middle class radicalism and “natural” existence of class (please see Eder⁷⁵ (1996)) for new social movement paradigm. This paradigm mainly relies upon the movements of the 60s, which necessitates the reformulation of Marxist explanations (Pichardo 1997). Another aspect is that this era is proposed to be defined as a “post-industrial” era; which must be discussed much more in detail. The other thing is that new social

⁷⁵The new social movements are proposed to represent new and deep social cleavages replacing old, class-based ones and identity projects in the framework of middle class radicalism which is a tendency to avoid being identified with lower class and failure to be dominant class. New “fluid” social antagonisms (in everyday life) are “issue movements”. The class is “social class” having role in rise and fall of new social movements, with new forms of class conflict, which is produced in social practices. Eder (1995) proposes culture having importance on class, as the repertoire of making sense of collective action. Contrary to old ones, a “new” “class conflict” (there is still class and conflict together), *not class antagonisms, but different antagonism, i.e.,* new social antagonisms are beyond political, religious and cultural cleavages. Culture of new middle class is really different from “dominating” class, which would lead to social movements. Although he uses terminology produce-reproduce, does he want to break this culturally? According to his main argument based on environmental problems threatening good life leading to social movements, these problems produce really an alienation and consciousness.

Although he uses terminology class, praxis, alienation, consciousness, he criticizes the classical perspective as fixed. He also give definition, characteristics of class, even he uses “fluidity”. Is not a generous attitude to give central roles to middle classes (excluded from classical theories) and new social movements as mechanism creating a new class structure in modern societies, in the restructuring of class relationships, in modern societies controlling the flow of everyday communication? According to Eder, new social movements are not class movements in traditional nineteenth century sense but a manifestation of a new type of class relationship within which “making of the middle class in advanced modern societies (becoming class “through” their action”).

movement researchers are concentrated on “urban social struggles, ecology movements, and cultural revolts” and so on. This is the return of middle classes in social movements which I argue go hand in hand with criminalisation of poor people and leftist political groups. Pichardo opens the discussion from the question: “Are contemporary movements unique?” The uniqueness and differences could come from: *the ideology and goals*. They represent a break from industrial era movements, while focusing on quality of life and life-style concerns. They are said to focus on identity politics, which situates between “the personal is political” and “anti-politics of identity”, tactics, structure, and participants from so-called new middle class, including peripheral population such as students, housewives. This shift from old to new could be explained through different breaks from the past: at the level of reflexivity as Touraine pointed out, or socio-cultural transformation potential. This could be considered as an artificial distinction since as many scholars argue; there is a co-existence of old and new elements within new social movements.

This idea could lead to that new social movement discourse is wrong in many ways. Another ignored statement is that there is a defence of society against the state. In this respect, new social movements are aiming not to seize power in order to build a new world as Gorz stated, but to regain power for their lives, as it is generally conceptualized as “life style”. On the other hand, “new middle class” conceptualization and its “radicalism” are also open to discussion in many ways. However, in this respect, in addition to “how”, as I accentuated above, “why” of movements could be firstly included. As Barker and Dale (1998) underlined new concept of class and new social movements challenge the boundaries different from narrow syndicalist connotations. What are critical are the discussions on differences between old and new social movements, with discussions of public and private spheres. The study will suggest including different groups’ and even personal involvements the multiplicity of actors and ways and reasons of

opposition challenging old methods and analyses. Proposed to be cultural, flexible, non-institutionalized, non-hierarchical, non-central, autonomous and multiple, new social movements' "cultural characteristics" are overemphasized. Even "ecology", "peace" issues are held separately from social justice, poverty and social inequality which are to be components of old social movements. Offe's proposition comparing old and new paradigms with the emphasis on newly forming values of new social classes⁷⁶ is critical while old paradigm in terms of official hierarchy, political parties, and basic struggle and new one with peace, ecology, human rights, identity autonomous movements in the civil society (Offe 1985). Another point is that paradoxically, local characteristics of new social movements are controversial. The difference of tactics should be open to discussion apart from new forms of resistances since the new social movements are proposed to be non-ordered, alternative demonstrations determined by identities, but excluding campaigns, economic social rights. Without a centrality and hierarchy, an emphasis on new identity challenging the boundaries between public and private, new social movements are the expressions of resistance against commodification bureaucratization, homogenization of social life supported by the idea that what is personal is political as asserted by Foucault. Marta Fuentes and Andre Gunter Frank (1989), in their *Ten Theses on Social Movements*, uphold that the "new" social movements are *not new, even they have some new features*. Moreover, "classical" ones are relatively new and even temporary. Even though they are classified and

⁷⁶The demands of this class are class-unspecific, dispersed, "universalistic" and concentrated on particular groups. Their politics are that of a class, but not on behalf of a class. Apart from "middle class radicals" in new social movements; he asserts the presence of "other groups" participating in social movements is "decommodified", "peripheral" social groups which are constituted of middle class housewives, high school and university students, retired people, unemployed or marginally employed youth. There are three types of alliances of the new social movements and political parties (elements of new middle class, peripheral groups, elements of old middle class), the left (unionized working class, elements of new middle class) and the right (elements of old and new middle class, non-unionized workers).

exemplified through geography, “it is vital to distinguish class composition of social movements”, being defensive and offensive and agents of social transformation, sometimes overlapping in membership and even sometimes competing with each other. New social movements elaborated with the actor, new middle classes as motor force behind, in some extent, trying to defend their autonomy gains significance for the study in terms of the theoretical relationship between urban social movements and new social movements. The new social movements are proposed to represent new and deep social cleavages replacing old, class-based ones and identity projects in the framework of middle class radicalism which is a tendency to avoid being identified with lower class and failure to be dominant class. Even though all these propositions could be falsified, it is true that there are new and open politics. In this respect, urban social movements must be considered with the emphasis on inequalities in terms of collective consumption, of the production of space and forced dispossession.

In the literature, there is a differentiation between class-based social movements which are proposed to be rooted in the sphere of production and to react to the specific contradictions and conflicts and urban political movements which emerge from the sphere of reproduction and respond to a different set of conflicts and contradictions, focusing on urban living conditions, which cannot be defined along class lines. According to the conceptualization of Fainstein and Hirst (1995), the “old” social movements stem from the class structure of industrial capitalism aiming at the material inequality produced by the mode of production giving their place to the new ones, cutting across classes with non-material considerations. Old and new forms of class oppositions and even in new forms of class oppositions we could assert inter class coalitions, non-class movements, new political cleavages on non-material issues and quality of life as a mix of new and old actors and new and old conflicts (Della Porta and Diani, 1999). It could be stressed that new social movements are not “new” and “old” classical ones

also are relatively new; moreover, the class base assessment also could be differentiated according to the countries (Fuentes and Frank, 1989). The emerging social movements in Europe carry some characteristics of workers' movements, with emphasis on ideology (Della Porta and Diani, 1999). Even though the theories reject the idea of "class", they situate themselves according to class, they propose new class conceptualizations. It is also what remains from the classical understanding of class, however, it is emphasized that the working class is not homogenous. I do attach importance to the categorizations still as old class and new identities. Apart from their authenticity, Calhoun (1994) criticizes the main proposition about the newness of identity politics –and not limited to post-materialist ideologies-, Alain Touraine underlined the "identity" with the return of the actor above all field of conflict and "historicity", which is the capacity to produce a historical experience through cultural patterns, not in the workplace, but instead, at levels of culture, creativity and knowledge are central in the new social movements elaboration in the society being reproduced again and again. In the article "An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements", Touraine (1985) makes an emphasis on "less socio-political" and "more socio-cultural" characteristic, in other words, social movements are explained as conflicts around the social control of the main cultural patterns, not pretending to transform society but in search of "creativity". Another point is the return of the "active" actor as Touraine proposed in the framework of new social movements aiming transformation of civil relations. For Calhoun (1994), we all have multiple, incomplete, fragmented identities, so resistances. This multiplicity is fragmented and minor positioning lead to new types of struggle, as proposed by Negri and Guattari. Barker, Cox, Krinsky, and Nilsen (2013, 13) argued that the inequalities in social relations of production actually in a broader way, are including the "whole world of production, exchange, distribution of power issues and culture".

Melucci⁷⁷'s explanation (1995) for new social movements is critical to understand our time: The private sphere is subject to control and manipulation so mobilization emerges from this cultural sphere. So cultural sphere and personal identity became key components of new social movements explanations. The collective identity for Melucci (1994) is neither static nor fixed but remains in motion requiring collective identity into semi-permanent institutional forms through submerged networks of struggle and reconstruction of identity: fixed but fragmented between roles, experiences and memberships especially for the process of constructing an action system. "What is new" is a relative concept with temporary function of signalling a number of comparative differences between historical forms of class conflicts and today's emergent forms of collective action; however, with the information characteristic of societies and conflict on cultural sphere. This is in fact the "process of identization" to delimit the orientation towards solidarity over solidity and the interactive process of renegotiation

⁷⁷"Class relationships can certainly affect the understanding of the quality of a particular compound. But I do not think that this concept is useful to understand the quality and the direction of systemic conflicts at the *planetary scale* today... *Production cannot be restricted to the economic-material sphere*; it embraces the entirety of *social relationships and cultural orientations*." Are class and economic-material sphere really far from global movements? Melucci proposes not a unity, a given fixed reality, but a process having various components, multiple actors in a system of opportunities and constraints shaping their relationships as a result of multiple processes. Although creative side of collective identity is ignored, socially "constructed" collective realities, collective identities ("identification" process in fluidity) with new forms of domination in fluid public space"s", interactions and negotiations sometimes with opposition of *different orientation*, plurality of meanings and forms of action are critical points in his statements. Apart from these *social relationships and cultural orientations*, he mentions "trap of political reductionism". However, social movements of planetary –global dimension based (with cultural different codes and symbolic system in global information) is political and economic-material sphere is the dominant one different from his statement "*no longer based exclusively on material resources or on forms of social organization, but on forms of social organization, but to an increasing extent on the ability to produce information*". It is true that information and culture are tools for constructing a community, a collective action. However, in what extent could new elite, new language code, new goals with culture, "Far from traditional political issues", new and multiple actors' daily life in new conflicts "producing" collective identity (and they also being constructed) in a network of changing relationship play a consistent and significant role.

occurring in social movements' networks. This is proposed to be a "self-reflexive" capacity of social actors to recognize themselves and the field of opportunities and constraints in which they are situated. Another point is the return of the "active" actor as Touraine (1981) aiming transformation of civil relations.

While Cohen unites resource mobilization and identity movements, including economic, political spheres, Laraña, Gusfield and Johnston (1994) underlines personal, public and collective identities. Melucci refers to identity as shared beliefs making collective action possible. Johnston, Laraña and Gusfield (1994) underlined collective identity as a definition of membership, boundaries, and activities for the group. For Taylor, it is a shared definition of a group deriving from common interests, experiences, solidarity, involving a "we-feeling", constructed, activated, sustained through interaction in movement communities. In other words, collective identity is shaped by commonalities. Cohen and Arato (1994) underlined both civil and political spheres' roles for the identity construction in the power struggle. For Calhoun (1994), we all have multiple, incomplete, and fragmented identities, so resistances. This multiplicity, fragmented and minor positioning, leads to new types of struggle, as proposed by Negri and Guattari. Here I think that it is useful and meaningful to include the theories of Laclau and Mouffe, Hardt and Negri. There are useful to understand social and urban social movements in the framework of composition, its dynamics, the reasons and relations with the state. Laclau proposed that the death of subject was succeeded by a new and widespread interest in the multiple identities emerged and proliferated (1996, 20). Laclau (1979) underlined: the contradiction is not production level but political and ideological level. Mouffe asserted in the *Return of the Political* (2005) that "articulation" is a key concept with multiplicity of forms of subordination as a challenge to class reductionism. A new common sense is described as

transforming the identities and articulating with those of others and creating new subject positions. This common political identity is defined as “radical democratic citizen”, which is the active citizen having a common concern with others about equality and liberty (Mouffe 1992). However, individual must not be sacrificed to the citizen but plurality of forms of identities and multitude of dreams must be our guide (Mouffe 1992). Another key practical concept is the social agent: not a unitary subject but the articulation of an ensemble of subject positions (Mouffe 1992, 2005). Whereas notions of citizenship (citizen beyond being related to *respublica* and referred to legal status) and community are losing their content, radical democracy must recognise the articulation of ideas of popular sovereignty and civic equality with constitutional rights and separation of powers; challenged by new political demands and which does mean new rights, new meanings, new uses, and new applications (Mouffe 1992). The multiplicity of demands and plurality of the social are emphasized through class alliances (Laclau and Mouffe 2001). What is critical is that they mention Castells and urban, underlining diverse forms of resistance to the capitalist occupation of the social space and proposes multiplicity of social relations from which antagonisms and struggles may originate habitat, consumption constituting terrains for struggle against inequalities and claiming new rights. Apart from socialist struggle against capitalism, the radicalization of democratic discourse includes also promotion of “democratic new social movements” in terms of urban, ecological, anti-institutional, anti-authoritarian, ethnic, regional issues and new political subjects; since capitalist exploitation combine with other forms of oppression (Mouffe 2005). From the line of Laclau and Mouffe (2001) and explanations of Smith (2002a), we could argue that social movements theories must cover the analysis of flourishing and multiple social movements –with specific form of solidarity and democratic pluralist form of *unification-due to different subject positions*-, temporary blocs through articulation by preserving their *autonomy* as a

political strategy-against multiple forms of exploitation and oppression. These could lead us to following questions: What are the key actors? What are the motivations behind? Does it create social transformation? What does it imply from transformation? What is the extent? Another theorization is possible as Laclau (1979) underlined that the contradiction is not at production level but at the political and ideological level.

The works of Hardt and Negri are inspirational in understanding beyond the analysis of urban movements. In “Declaration”, Hardt and Negri (2012) argued that the neoliberalism and its crisis produced figures of subjectivity: *These are the indebted, the mediatized and the securitized*. Besides, the corruption of democracy led to the formation of a “strange and depoliticized figure” as the represented. Being indebted is the most commonly shared subjectivity in the debt fare regimes which work on us at individual, collective and human levels (Hardt and Negri 2012, 14). They stated: “You survive by making debts...” Another dimension is that debt is the main way of exploitation now, has a moral power on us, as responsibility and guilt, which make us objects of obsession. This means that we are responsible for our debts and guilty for its difficulties in our life. Life with no enjoys and pleasure is sold to the enemy. What is worse is that debt can only deepen the impoverishment and depotentialization of our subjectivity, but does not lead to the rebellion (negativity) or liberation. The citizen (-worker) is the exploited and the alienated has the possibility to be political within the institutions of the state and the civil society. In this respect, the represented is a figure of mystification. So they propose to “invert the debt”. The subjectivation starts with the refusal to appropriate one’s own wealth by discovering new social relationships: We won’t (Hardt and Negri 2012, 32). They gave the example: “We won’t pay your debt. We refuse to be evicted from our houses.” in order to place social interdependence (cooperation and productive interdependence) at the base of the social production, so the

commons, i.e. the commonality by constituting ourselves. In this respect, counter-power is needed like environmental concerns and human necessities including housing with people's refusal to be evicted-stay there-. Another concept that the study will use is "multitude" of Hardt and Negri, which would be elaborated in terms of urban social movements. The study claims that urban opposition makes social movements beyond old and new categorizations. The main research question about alliance - whether or not the opposition will be together and unified- has been changed into questioning "multiple" in the framework of Hardt and Negri's conceptualization with the effect of affinity groups asking "Whose city? Whose urban oppositions?"

As quoted by Oakley and Verity (2003) from Della Porta and Diani, collective action in urban contexts is multiple and contradictory. *Assemblage* (McFarlane 2011, 2011a) is another concept that is useful to elaborate and understand urban oppositions as well as urban commons. Assemblages are proposed to be diverse forms of human and nonhuman agencies, which include a range of agents and causes of urban inequality, urban learning as a mutual recognition, solidarity and resistance. This generates urban meaning through alliances of multiple different groups in the process of composition of a more socially just city. Assemblage is mainly about learning-with processual, generative and practice-based nature-, but neglected from all spheres of life (mainly that of everyday⁷⁸) as well as politics. Yet this concept as McFarlane asserted is for a critical geography of urban learning⁷⁹, "urban learning assemblages" –of materials,

⁷⁸In this respect, McFarlane refers to Lefebvre, Debord as well as Scott. However, the thesis aims to propose and underline resistances of the "so-called" weak rather than "hidden transcripts" and their "weapons" in the "everyday life" in this sense.

⁷⁹This "learning" is a socio-political, economic, cultural but more crucially relational combination of two parts: the urbanism and its changing nature and secondly, individual, group experiences, perceptions, concerns, interests, memories, hopes, fears etc. (McFarlane 2011b, 6, 23). If we talk about the "critical geography of urban learning", McFarlane

practices, knowledge, personal histories, local histories etc. (McFarlane 2011b, 69)- between conceptual and empirical frames through which urbanism is produced, lived and contested (McFarlane 2011b). For McFarlane, this type of learning gains importance in terms of urban activism following: These are *the forms of organization and political strategy (Slum/Shack Dwellers International Alliance Example) composed of different actors, local groups, researchers and activists*. Another example could be asserted as –translocal- urban learning forums whose intensity, openness, quality and effects are open to discussion (McFarlane 2011b, 92). In order to create another environment, a translocal urban learning and solidarity networks are needed by challenging all of the local/geographical divisions such as North-South divide with stereotypical connotations for necessary transmission of lessons (McFarlane 2011b, 11, 66-67, 92, 111, 114). To explain these “dialogic urban forums”, McFarlane gives the example of neighbourhood discussion forums of “Movimento de Associacoes de Barrio” (Movement of Neighbourhood Association) in Rio de Janeiro and the most famous example of participatory budget initiated by the call of Union of Neighbourhood Associations in Porto Alegre in which the right to the city⁸⁰ was the most important theme (98-99, 106). It is necessary to ask whether or not these attempts of planning and forums could lead to a real emergence of a different kind of city. He refers to the Paris Commune and Lefebvre’s words which are “a scattered and divided city became a community of action” (McFarlane 2011b, 105). McFarlane, referring to Biaocchi and to Bourdieu, considers the risk of reproducing class hierarchies, the importance of the élites, as well as the political

asserts that this could be the way for alternative, more socially forms of urban learning (McFarlane 2011b, 13).

⁸⁰McFarlane refers to Lefebvre’s words from Marcuse’s text: “To the extent that the contours of the future city can be Outline, it could be defined by imagining the reversal of the world upside down.” And asks on this way (of learning) for the future city, who are involved in that learning (McFarlane 2011b, 154).

competence of the experts (McFarlane 2011b, 100). In this new conceptualisation, McFarlane⁸¹ criticizes the Actor-network theory in that the network delimits the necessary focus to the interaction between individual parts and so the changing agency (McFarlane 2011b, 26).

Chatterton and Heynen (2011) from their involvements through collective works as scholar-activists in the chapter namely “Resistance(s) and Collective Social Action”, declared that resistance and collective actions are

⁸¹McFarlane gives as an example for a legal assemblage, the Federation of Tenants Association, a “male-dominated organization led by predominantly middle-class housing activists” working to raise awareness of existing laws and regulations in “marginalized settlements” for their housing rights (McFarlane 2011b, 57). This is described as an example of urban/tactical learning with multiple histories, materials and emergent solidarities, hopes and fears; however, still with uncertainties, the future of the settlements remained uncertain (McFarlane 2011b, 59). Another influential example was the conceptualization from the international urban movement of slum activists from Sao Paulo and Brazil (namely Internacao). From this example and related interviews, for the relation between learning and politics, McFarlane (2011b, 62-65) referred to the importance of “learning –practices- from other people’s” and knowledge/knowledge alliances. These could be alternative media, websites, video footages and activism in this respect in activism/social movement campaigns and mobilization -as well as advocacy/participatory/radical urban planning in between lay knowledge and experiential expertise- (McFarlane 2011b, 65, 95). The data /knowledge could be ignored or used by the state (McFarlane 2011b, 77).

On the other hand, in the framework of “insurgent citizenship”, this knowledge could invent new possibilities for instance for slum improvements and insurgence in new spaces of engagement –but- with the state for McFarlane (2011b, 80). However, all these ones, from national/translocal to international ones, are land management associations or networks. If we return to the documents/knowledge production and data urbanism, McFarlane (2011b, 82-83) stated that these could lead to mobilizations and so these ideas could move/transmitted in speed and distances through existing and emerging translocal urban learning assemblages. This also means a discourse free from party alignments so another type of “p”olitics (small p) with indiscriminating engagement(s) (McFarlane 2011b, 87) while learning has a central role for movements in terms of activities, organization and political strategies (91). McFarlane (2011b) questions neoliberal urban learning assemblages including “institutions” producing knowledge so solutions for problems on the way for so-called development. These could be defined as ways of shaping urban learning by these neoliberal ideologies via revanchism/spatial-social decadence correlation and so criminalization in all over the world, which lead to urban renewal, gentrification, enclosures so privatizations (2011b, 142-143). From Deleuzian assemblages as constellations of singularities, McFarlane quotes from Tampio and his conceptualization of “left assemblages”, of social movement organizations and campaigns for the “actualization of ideals” and the “realization of the potential” (McFarlane 2011b, 155). All these attempts, movements could be evaluated and emphasized as the process of reassembling (157); for alternative forms of urban learning in terms of new associations, knowledge and alternatives that are produced and held in “common” (157).

relational, which are constituted through relations across space and time while power is a relation between forces effective through practice. Referring to Holloway, they underlined that there is no pre-known and established way to change and a better world and that there is a multiplicity of historical subjects and dynamic of agency. It is also a collective process, which could be understood with the phrase -“we make the road by walking”-. They put forward “geographies of resistance”, maintaining that resistance is a –multiple and ever changing- geographical activity. They added referring to Escobar that localisation could not be necessarily regressive by refusing the pathologisation of place. Crucial key issues are the historic and constant movement towards enclosure and dispossession and the countermove towards the commons. What was inspirational to the thesis is their question about who is taking action and doing the resisting so the resisting subject by challenging and questioning the “activist”, the non-militant / the ordinary citizen/ invisible people -but resistant subjects- as Chatterton (2006) proposed. Another point is that the resistance is a collective process of becoming, of solidarities and affinities and from Gibson-Graham⁸² resubjectification in the everyday. From Swyngedouw and Holloway, they underlined that the political act is the art of the impossible, which cannot be understood in the symbolic framings and added that the crack of possibility for the collective action and change. This serves to create spaces opening up while we question, oppose and resist in majoritarian but also and especially minoritarian political activities/micro-tactics of resistance. Resistance is not independent from emotions; on the contrary, as an open and dynamic process, it possesses solidarity, love, humour and friendship as parts of repertoires of collective action. As

⁸² It would be useful to examine the “iceberg” figure drawn by Ken Bryne and the figure diverse economy (Gibson-Graham 2006, 70-71). Pickerill and Chatterton (2006) referring to Gibson-Graham, claimed the possibility of diverse economies of possible-worlds through mutual aid, reciprocity and co-operation, autonomous organizations in everywhere from peer-to-peer sharing, housing squats, child care co-ops, tenants association, and even every time when we invite friends over to diner.

Chatterton and Heynen (2011) underlined the importance of progressive change as the goal of resistance and collective social action, with the multiple spatial relations and emotional core for the impossible, the study will try to be based upon the idea that the resistance is a geographical activity, from local to global by revealing resistant subjects, who are taking action and resist.

3.2.2. Urban Social Movement Theories

Urban social movements' definitions were always been controversial; yet a particular and definition is quiet impossible in the framework of all along the old and new social movement dichotomy. Trapped in the orthodox Marxist interpretations and old-new social movements' categorizations, the thesis supports the idea that the practice in urban social movements can *erase different aims and lived experiences of the groups and actors and their (new) ways of resistances*. The elaboration based on collective consumption and identity in the framework of "new social movements" theories, remain at the level of descriptions and ignoring new horizons for radical claims. Nourished by the resistances in different cities and countries, explanations remain limited in "spatial" terms. Nicholls (2008), from the conception of urban social movements of Castells underlined this problematic of localised and particularistic urban social movements outside mainstream social movements theories. This is critically significant in terms of lack of research about the *strategic roles of cities in social movements*. Nicholls (2008) referred to Pickvance's argument about the conceptual gap and mainstream social movement literature with new studies. Referring to Diani, McAdam and Tilly, network, resource mobilisation and political opportunity –from local configurations of political power- approaches: "social movements" were considered to be political insurgents connected through geographically extensive networks, commons grievances, and common ideological principles (Nicholls 2008). How we could propose

urban social movement theories which are directly related to social realities to pave the way for new possibilities in the future?

Even though a single and non-controversial definition is not possible, urban social movements are defined as “a conscious collective practice originating in urban issues, able to produce qualitative changes in the urban system, local culture and political institutions in contradiction to the dominant social interests institutionalized as such at the societal level” by Manuel Castells (1983) who studied different social movements in different cities and countries, with different socio-cultural and political contexts. Castells (1978) defined the city as a social practice in constant flux, and its social manipulation is linked to the ensemble of social and political conflicts. Its conceptualization of social movement is a certain type of organization of social practices, the logic of its development contradicts the institutionally dominant social logic. Urban planning, in this context, must be linked to the whole range of social contradictions, and the conditions and the determination of the objectives of social movements in the urban field. The interactions between urban planning interventions and the social dynamic are categorized as participatory, focused on demands, or contestatory. Social conflicts resulted from the clash of interests between dominant classes and dominated ones, in *Luttes Urbaines* (Castells 1973), social movement is defined as the system of practices resulted from the articulation of a joint urban agents system and of other social practices towards a change of urban system or a substantial change in the relations of force in the struggle between the classes vis-à-vis the power of state. The “theme of urban social movements” is defined, by Castells, as protest, dissent by consumers and the converse of the “theme of urban planning”, the demand for an increasingly regulated urban process (Castells 1977, Lowe 1986). In the “Afterword” of the Urban Question, there were signs of the City and the Grassroots, with the statement that the urban protest is important due to its linking force of

different social classes, especially middle to working class and the urban issues' cross-cutting characteristics with exposure to common consumption problems and issues. In the *City, Class and Power* (1978), there is a change in the manner of theorization in which urban social movements and their strategic role in the anti-capitalist struggle have changed and the signs of new forms of social cleavages based on collective consumption could be pursued (Lowe, 1986).

I would like refer to Castells (1983), who argued that urban social movements redefine the economic, political and social meaning of the city by emphasizing use value, social community and citizen control (Castells, 1983). In his pioneering study, Castells (1983) underlines that about urban issues has a central role especially for the collective consumption, pluri-class nature, plurality of different groups, and identity creation which generate new areas of confrontations in the anti-capitalist struggle with "advanced capitalist society" emphasis. According to Castells (1983), urban social movement mobilized around urban issues made a contribution in the encouragement of social change. Castells (1983, 327) argued that urban social movements cannot be a social alternative since the city it projects "is not and cannot be connected to an alternative mode of production and developments nor to a democratic state adapted to the world-wide processes of power". Manuel Castells concluded that urban social movements are aimed at transforming the meaning of the city but without being able to transform society: "They are a reaction, not an alternative." (Castells 1983, 327).

Urban social movements, in the literature, range from "not in my backyard" reactions correlated with middle and upper classes to "reclaiming the streets". However, it is obvious that different actors from different neighbourhoods -mainly of spontaneous/self-constructed settlements- and

organisations are *struggling in different contexts, for different reasons, in different ways*. Recently, these discussions are elaborated through “*rights to the city claims*”. Few numbers of studies point out the *attempts and emergence of different types of mobilisation mainly flexible and open ways and in time another consciousness for politics and life* in the process of *urban commoning practices*. Along with the right to the city, *socio-spatial justice* that I elaborated in related part was proposed to be one of the main common motives behind these struggles and claims for “just city”. In this respect, I would like to ask: “Could urban social movements with an over-emphasis on socio-spatial justice as an important base but also a trap, a limit could have the potential for change through the claims of the right to the city as a transformed and renewed right to urban life, a collective right to be seized as stated by Harvey and another production of urban space, life an society?” It is indispensable to reflect upon the space as the one of the most political entities by questioning and making apparent inequalities, power and capital, interest groups; even though it is been denied in many respects. Through the emergence of another creation and collectivization of the urban, urban social movements are thought to be social oppositions and struggles starting for urban issues by ignoring its potential as emancipatory movements as underlined by Chatterton, Souza and Purcell. In this respect, city as a dynamic entity will challenge static analyses in the process of changing actors and conditions. I would like to underline here the importance of leading actors with the necessity of a revisit with social movements theories that I try to propose in the previous part. These actors who are few in number are actively struggling both for neighbourhoods and common spaces of the city and commons in their life with the possibility of alliances. The importance of urban social movements comes from its potential to challenge the following theses: Firstly, class does not matter in contemporary movement. Secondly, there is no effect of identities and other factors of groups and societies and still class and relations of production is

the mere determinant in social movements. My thesis supports the idea that urban social movements neither a class movement nor a “ideal type” of new social movements, characterized by orientations of issue, lifestyle, cultural elements, environment, identity, and gender with changing social relations of production and characteristics of class. By the way, it is necessary to underline that all contemporary movements are labelled directly as “new social movements”, which is quite problematic.

In the definition of Pruijt in the Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology edited by George Ritzer (2007), “urban movements” -which Pruijt preferred to use “urban movements” instead of “urban social movements” like Pickvance- are defined as *social movements whose organizational patterns could be bottom-up or top-down, through which citizens attempt to achieve some control over their urban environment, i.e. the built environment, the social fabric of the city, and the local political process in the framework of collective consumption, urban planning and specific issues*. This does not refer to a grassroots organisation but mobilisation in forms of organisation in terms of urban issues. Another important point is that they transcend social borders; they are cross-class mobilizations. As underlined by Mayer (2009), with the neoliberalization of policies, there is a return of the so-called urban issues to the agenda of urban social movements. Marcuse (2009) reminds that it is necessary to be *aware of the dangers of the spatial focus, which ignores the economic, social, political origins of the problems, and the common roots, nature of the deprivation and discontent*.

Urban social movement theories are in general focused on the change in terms of spatial and social terms: These changes could be for short and long term –systemic- related to aims. In this respect, the state and the socio-economic order are scarcely elaborated both in practical and academic senses. The political parties, the government, municipalities with a critique

of neoliberalism are main contested issues. We must question the actors and intellectuals instead of questioning since there are not any groups with high level of representation while some people are struggling for more than ten years in Istanbul case. In this respect, not overemphasizing and fragmenting differences of ways and characteristics of resistance, we have to emphasize the necessity of organisation at local-different localities- as grassroots. Only after accomplishing this, the movements must put their claims for broader coalitions as well as city-wide and covering other cities. Urban oppositions are resulted in new types of organisation not only at neighbourhood but also outside: In this respect, while some activists choosing to organise in a more flexible terms, the others are founded associations in legal terms. Even though they have common concerns, they are fragmented even in one neighbourhood. Urban oppositions challenged social movements and new social movements theories in so-called the post-industrial era. With fragmented and sometimes controversial claims, urban social movements and their theories always refer to some contradictions and inconsistencies within movements.

In the practice and so theory, capital, state, municipalities all along with private firms are intervening in the urban space so the oppositions are being made at different levels against anonymous and powerful opponents which aims dispossession by accumulation as Harvey (2008) conceptualised transfer of property via displacement. What I attach importance is the evaluation and analysis of factors mainly by opposing groups of the success of urban movements in a self-reflexive way. This directly affects the motivation and aimed objective and change. It is necessary to elaborate every case in its peculiar conditions without losing the general framework. It will feed us in terms of experiences, to see which conditions lead to negotiations or oppositions and give the ability to evaluate every opposition

and method of resistance with its pros and cons. Is there any chance of urban commoning even though strategies are different?

Nicholls (2008), considering the city with its structural complexity as a “generative space” as “relational incubator” and specific role which engenders diverse (strong, weak) and different ties, and social movements as networks with beneficial uses for social movement campaigns. Nicholls (2008) argues that people interested in commons issues –including work and neighbourhoods-, will lead to emotions and trust. This would result in forming a ground to struggle collectively. In this respect, ties could be: weak ties to build bridges and circulate resources, which could turn into new appropriation for another cause. This cooperation could be by necessity in durable and strong ties, while urban issues could represent a structural push, as well as “cultures of resistance”. What I find significant and useful to understand urban oppositions as Nicholls (2008) proposed in the diversity, which create difficulties “for a common discursive frame”. Referring to Della Porta, Nicholls (2008) maintained the idea that in the ESF, heterogeneous organisations form a common framing identity. However, we must ask whether or not this is a temporary picture open to some groups (Souza 2010b). Since I think nobody leave its ground and especially “repertoires of contention”. Nicholls (2008), in this framework, refers to urban insurgent networks while different groups maintaining their various and distinctive traditions but in diverse and inclusive networks for complex- not merely “spatial” in the article-issues. This common framing identity, if it is aimed, the focus would be on diversity and inclusiveness of newly forming relational exchanges. As “flexible mobilizations”, there could be alliances across issues. However, Nicholls (2008), from the case study mentions hierarchies and organisations with their priority issues. Yet when interdependencies and mutual obligations could flourish between different groups, “militants” became strategically, ideologically and emotionally

obliged to mobilise on other issues. Here, there is a reference to alliances across issues, and this “practice of mobilizing” across issues and scales, learn vital interdependence between groups.

According to Mayer (2000 in Uysal, 2012), if we pursue the erosion of welfare state rights and at the last stage global competition between cities, we could realise that urban social movements reacted against these fields. From the similar line, Uysal (2012) referred to Kavoulakos (2006) who notes, urban social movements were not radical anymore by gradually becoming less political on collective consumption issues. I would like to add that collective consumption issues, by nature could not be radicalised or if it could be, it requires a total detachment for autogestion. On the other hand, urban and economic crises led to a new radicalisation of urban social movements which could include even commons people in this radicalisation. If I return to the original text, Kavoulakos (2006), from the political opportunity “structure” from the 1970s, tracked the way of emergence and roles of “radical anti-statist alternative movements”. Apart from relation between social movements and political context and the impact of changes in the political context, this study is critical in terms of “limits” of alternative strategies of urban movements. This became more visible when there are growing inequalities but declining movements as Pickvance pointed out (Kavoulakos 2006, 343). For Kavoulakos (2006), while the welfare state penetrating in spaces of social reproduction, referring to Castells, collective consumption issues are politicised. In relation with the state, urban social movements, even though carry a potential for radical changes, they remain limited and the movements gained state recognition when social inequalities became more acute. Kavoulakos (2006) gives us keys to discuss the meaning of “alternative movements” oriented towards action and theoretical background. Here, there is a critique to “autonomy”, as the main feature of the self-image and the political aim instead of a

social, cultural and economic space beyond the state and the market earlier. However, I would like to add that the problem is not “autonomy”, but as Kavoulakos proposed, “the concept of autonomy could not become a reality.” with the effect of de-politicization via dependence and cooperation with the state.

*Let me continue with an old but still relevant question. Are urban movements new movements vis-a-vis classes and attributed, gained or formed political identities? Especially after 1980s -even though the characteristics of these movements were present years before as Calhoun (1994) asserted-, different movements such as identity movements, civil rights movements, environmental movements. From neoliberal urban projects in Istanbul in various neighbourhoods to mega project in the city, the thesis considers the city as a “contesting”, while urban social movements, more exactly, urban commons from their rights to the city. A unique definition of urban social movements is impossible, especially in terms of “classes”. Moreover, in their mainstream explanations which are mainly correlated with “middle classes”, or “new middle classes” “radicalism”, politics of identity, *quality of life and the defence of the life-style and “issue movements”* apart from the general problematic problem of determining middle classes, they are proposed to represent a break from “old” movements of “working classes” mainly representing characteristics of new social movements. These movements’ actors are proposed to be from “middle”, particularly “new middle-classes”, challenging “old” movements, “class-based” movements. Through privatization, individualization, life style conceptualizations, “new middle classes” are proposed to create their spaces, the spaces of social exclusion based on “order”, “control”. Even though it is valid for different classes, this is fostered by the famous idea of Castells about a new sphere, called “collective consumption”, which is a second face of conflict, additional to*

conflict between labour and capital from an orthodox view. Here the state, as the provider of urban services defines the limits of citizenship. Moreover, different classes struggling in separate spheres according to their classes and identities, which the main obstacle of urban commons.

The study aims mainly to underline the conflictual aspect and as well as alliances in urban issues, which could be pursued along class lines but including alliances between classes, in addition to the heterogeneity within so-called middle classes and “intellectuals” while discussing their ways of involvement, orientation in the framework of urban social movements in Istanbul. As Souza (2012a, 324) made a remark that there are other groups active in emancipatory praxis in collaboration with residents of favelas and sem-teto activists in Rio for instance middle-class students against capitalist globalisation, neoliberalism, and violence. In this framework, urban social movements are mainly examined as new social movements, as “issue” movements, movements of middle classes who are proposed to be the main actors, agent burdened by a role with a proposed distinction between political and cultural versions of new social movement theory. And on the other hand, “working classes” in urban issues which are elaborated as two extremes: “silent”, or “deviant”, “radical” dwellers versus “revolutionary” classes like “angels in marble or rebels in red”, middle classes also are evaluated as one homogenous group who defend their “backyards”, differentiating themselves from “dangerous classes” and “deviance”, “disorder”, etc. or who try to defend their public spaces, their “green areas” in Istanbul. The presence of other groups different from each other formed mainly by academicians and “intellectuals” held in the framework of their “reaction” to “appropriate” “their” city, even trying to defend the rights of others, dwellers of gecekondu neighbourhoods point out the multiplicity in urban oppositions. What are critical in the discussions on differences between old and new social movements are this multiplicity and the

“commons” in urban movements, considering discussions of public and private spheres, the contradiction between the use-value and the exchange-value which is the core of the right to the city. As a solidarity research, the thesis tries to reveal different but commons causes, as well as the ways, tactics and strategies and aims of the movements. Social movement theories sometimes contradict or more exactly exclude each other, apart from confusions in terms of definitions. Moreover, urban social movements do possess additional difficulties but also new openings which would serve to social movements’ theories mainly by going beyond old and new categorizations.

The elaboration and propositions of Thörn (2012) are quite similar with the study’s theoretical questions. The general approach is to categorize *urban mobilizations in the context of “old movements” based on material issues*. From Pickvance, Thörn (2012) supports the following ideas: *Firstly, urban social movements are elaborated in isolation vis-à-vis the theory of social movements in general. Secondly, even though they became a popular issue, there was a little interest in urban resistance*. Thörn anticipated that all these aspects lead to misinterpretations of mobilization and also overemphasis on the new aspects of these movements (Thörn 2012, 155). One of my main hypotheses is supported by Thörn: social movements at global scale with the “Right to the City” movement show the distinction between old and new movements are quite inaccurate. Even though there are attempts for bringing together old and new social movements as well as dealing with Eurocentric biases of new social movements, it is necessary to work on the link between social movement theory and urban studies (Thörn 2012, 155). The political process approach in relation with urban social movements, for Thörn (2012), *is correctly criticized for under elaborating the role of knowledge production and discursive power as well as intellectuals’ roles*. Thörn’s proposition (Thörn 2012, 165) emphasizes the

need to elaborate political opportunity structure, material conditions and the construction of collective identity in new social movement theory. If the place politics of open space is considered, it is necessary to be aware of the “strong overlap between the occupation of a material public space and the formation of a counter-public sphere” (Thörn 2012, 157). Public sphere is critical for commoning the struggles too. The fights in the streets in France and Greece was for the “right to the city” in material sense for Leontidou (2010) and so, urban social movements emerge as new social movements against urban commodification, neo-liberalism in the entrepreneurial city determined by urban regeneration and governance in global competition.

Şen (2010) referred to Fainstein and Hist (2010) and underlined that urban social movements could be elaborated in opposition with labour or class movements, which became apparent from the 1990s. Especially with the effect of new social movements, the state and economy issues remained behind the culture identity issues. What is crucial for urban movements is to challenge local scale with an internationalism based on class struggles in order to cover broad-based claims. Novy and Colomb (2012) underlined referring to Fainstein and Fainstein that while *new social movements are not considered in the framework of relations between capital and labour, urban social movements are defined as types of movements with local/communal target of action.* As they noticed, one of the main prominent scholars of urban social movements, Castells, changed his definition from *changes in social relations to the resistance against hegemonic ideas and projects so urban meaning in which the way how, for whom the society defines what a city is: from collective consumption related to the state, cultural and social identity with the character of the particular place, control and management of local spaces* (Novy and Colomb 2012, 4). What Novy and Colomb (2012) underlined is the state and urban social movements’ (artistic opposition against the branding of the “creative city”) positions, their

composition, contributions and contradictions vis-a-vis the state from Germany example.

Urban resistances could possess new social movements' characteristics, which serves to redefine the "old" movements. Urban social movement definition is also related to "urban problem" created, produced by the legal discourse. This problem that is proposed to be a "spatial" in limited physical sense, points out a political issue as stated in Castells' article namely "Urban renewal and social conflict in Paris" (1972). In this respect, urban planning gains a critical role in urban development, both as a cure and reason for "urban problems". The city as stated by Castells, "the more it is a source of contradictions and the more its social manipulation is linked to the ensemble of social and political conflicts." Castells (1972, 93) made a definition: "By social movements we mean a certain type of organization of social practices, the logic of whose development contradicts the institutionally dominant social logic", linking urban planning to the whole range of social contradictions focusing on the conditions for the emergence and the determination of the objectives of social movements in the urban field." Urban social movements is also defined as "a system of practices resulting from the articulation of a conjuncture of the system of urban agents with other social practices, such that its development tends objectively towards the structural transformation of the urban system, or towards a substantial change in the balance of power in the class struggle, that is to say, in the power of the State" (Castells 1972, 329). As Mayer underlined, Castells in this study (Castells 1977) talked about a fundamental change with labour unions and political parties. Castells underlines that the qualitative transformation of the urban structure could be produced by the articulation of urban movements with other movements, especially with working class movements and the political class struggle, as stated in *The Urban Question* (1977, Lowe, 1986). The crisis has been masked by other urgent problems,

by housing question, could be proposed as accurate explanations for the study case and urban social movements relate the urban problematic and the way of production and the socio-spatial dimension of the class struggle. The concepts are used interchangeably in urban policies, if they become “dirty”, as pointed out by Neil Smith⁸³ (1996, 34) for different usages of urban renaissance, gentrification.

In the “City and the Grassroots” (Castells 1983), “new” non-class based characteristic of the movements could be seized, while in early studies, Castells recognizes the class base (“working class”) in the urban social movements. In *The Urban Question* (Castells 1977), urban social contradictions are defined by their “*pluri-class nature*”. This idea refers to the fact that not merely structural opposition between two fundamental classes, but also distributing the classes and fractions according to the opposing terms of the conjuncture. Mainly because of this proposition, they

⁸³As Harvey (1989) labelled as urban entrepreneurialism and Smith (1998) argued not an emancipatory space but a combat zone supported by zero tolerance, the thesis would try to understand and show different fronts in urban struggles. The frontier ideology (Smith 1998) rationalizes social differentiation and rationalization as natural, and inevitable within a “class conquest of the city”, based on the movement of capital back to the city and gap between actual ground rent and potential ground rent. Neil Smith defines the new urban frontier of upper, middle-class optimism as a reaction against the theft of the city by others as a defence of “middle-class” world view. In this respect, the gentrification justifies the political momentum behind this revanchist city. It feeds the self-interest of real estate developers, as a dirty word expressing the class dimensions. In the revanchist city where “race/class/gender terror felt by middle and ruling-class and a vicious reaction against minorities the homeless people, the unemployed...”, parks, streets and neighbourhoods are stolen from “the public” supported by the “blaming” of the others (Smith 1998). The revanchism -from right wing movements appealed from traditional values and the 19th century Paris, in the government of Napoléon III, working classes were cleared from the city- refers to authoritarian state forms and practices with social control, capitalist production, and role of private market.

In “From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism”, David Harvey (1987) underlined that rent was an equilibrium mechanism sorted out competing bids on land uses, with the role of cities in the capitalist accumulation-overaccumulation waves through investment in the built environment. This would result in “uneven development” and class struggle especially around the housing condition. Wacquant (2008), referring to Slater pointed out the “general tendency of public to invisible the urban poor, dispersing or containing them in reserved spaces.

were considered as “identity movements”, in the framework of life quality or civil society. In his early studies, Castells stated in the *Urban Question* (1977, Lowe 1986) that qualitative transformation of the urban structure could be produced by the articulation of urban movements with other movements, such as working class movements, political class struggle. Castells maintained that urban movements could be urban social movements if they are drawn into working-class movements, which generate new areas of confrontations in the anti-capitalist struggle.

In Harloe’s study (1977), urban social movements are defined as *defensive movements*, movements from established areas, of working class groups, housing movements, movements concerned with facilities and services and urbanite movements of other city dwellers, educated people, professional, planning alternatives.

However, at the end, political effectiveness is defined as reuniting the population, stimulating collective action, formation of class alliances by establishing social and political alternatives including different groups, “citizens”, even “élites”, experts, professional associations and working class demands and middle class participation.

If we return to Castells, urban social movement mobilized around urban issues made a contribution, encourages social change. In the “City and the Grassroots” (1983), he underlines the “new” non-class based characteristic of the movements, in his early studies, recognizing the “working class” in the urban social movements. Castells’ analysis is considered not a class contradiction analysis, but based on common goals for collective consumption in mobilizing middle-class communities, for urban issues. However, the structure of state and its dependency on world capitalist system and its moment in history of democracy is a very critical point for the evaluation of urban social movements (Susser 2006). Urban social movements oppose the endless accumulation of capital, with the association

of conception of rights, a different right to the city as a collective right. We must underline that introduced different movements which are considered to be new social movements as urban social movements, underlines that about urban issues has central role especially for the collective consumption, pluri-class nature, plurality of different groups, and identity creation. However, all these aspects are correlated with the state and related demands and positions. What about social change?

In this respect, we could examine the City and Grassroots (Castells 1983) in terms of policies (land and also “political”, “ideological” and their realistic change for delivery of land) and organizations, controlled mobilizations, changing alliances within changing mobilization for *barriadas* of squatters, especially the part namely “Squatters and the State in Latin America⁸⁴”. Especially findings from Lima example are significant: An urban movement can be, most frequently, an instrument of social integration and subordination to the existing political order instead of social change. Another aspect is that the subordination of the movement can be obtained by political parties representing interests of ruling class by the state. The results can change in each case and when movement is close to the state, urban policies could be a crucial aspect of change in dependent societies. Level of urbanization in developing countries marked by squatter settlements; depend on relationship between the state and popular sectors.

⁸⁴Even though demands from neighbourhood were modest, it gained little support because of the image of radicalism from supportive groups and its link between urban demands and political criticism. In between middle classes and poor people in *barrios*, in Fernandes’ work (2010) on urban social movements in Venezuela, the stories, lives and experiences of *barrio* residents are told both *individually and collectively*. Like in any South American city, urban *barrio* residents are seen as a threat to the property and security of the middle classes, beside economic inequalities and growing segregation on urban space. Another terminology which is very crucial is that “everyday wars of position”, combining Gramsci’s war of position for political struggle between classes in the trenches of society and James Scott’s concept everyday forms of resistance (Fernandes 2010, 25). Another important aspect, which I tried to mention in my master thesis, is that *barrio* residents were considered as “uncivil society” while middle-class sectors constructed themselves as “civil society”. In this respect, “cities as sites of a new politics” are being formed in “urban location of the *barrio*, *favela*, *periferia*, or *villa miseria* all over the world.

And finally, if squatter movement breaks their relationship of dependency to the state, they may become “potential agents of social change”, whose fate is determined by general process of political conflict. For Mexico example, the evolution of urban social movements is determined by interaction between interests of the squatters, the reformist policy of the administration and the radical left trying to lead, organize and politicize by linking urban demands with revolutionary action (like Ruben-Jaramillo example), with “urbanization” and so new “struggle settlements” where student militancy connects urban demands with political protest. The Campamento example is a valuable experience with students and academicians support from emergence of the neighbourhood, so, of the movement, and the beginning of the invasion of land.

Pickvance explored the dynamics and dilemmas of participation and related organization. Studies on urban social movements for Pickvance (1975) de-emphasize the organization and its form where so-called participation takes place, and consider organization with the contradictions and emphasize the effects, structural transformation in the urban system and change. *Pickvance refers to distinction made by Castells namely reform -type of organization: protest- as the change in an element of the urban system without any change in the other relations and control -type of organization: participation-, the reproduction of the urban system, and then urban social movements. Pickvance, in terms of effects, referred to Olives who concentrated on urban objectives successfully achieved and Lentin who considered both failures and successes. Pickvance made four categories about urban effects: their identification, relations with local authorities, relations with institutional actions and lastly, relations with organizational resources. For the identification of urban effects, Pickvance (1975) made a remark on the fact that the structuralist studies of urban social movements emphasize the actions of the movement organization at the expense of the actions of the authority. This includes the danger of the over-emphasis on movement due*

to the involvement of the researcher. In Turkey, this period is time to think about local authorities, institutional action and whether or not these are possible with various meanings of institution but also thinking about critically the integration of associations vertically or horizontally. Even though a single and non-controversial definition is not possible, urban social movements are defined as “a conscious collective practice originating in urban issues, able to produce qualitative changes in the urban system, local culture and political institutions in contradiction to the dominant social interests institutionalized as such at the societal level” by Manuel Castells. Before Castells, in terms of opposition against urban renewal, James Wilson proposed urban movements defensive and atomistic explanations as elaborated by Kling (in Bennett 1997) since there were mainly against a danger for him/her and for their families so individual objections are together for a collective protest (Bennett 1997).

John Walton (1998) made a historical elaboration of urban political conflict, concentrated mainly on urban poor and protests: from the urban poor as the marginalized urban masses to petitioners in demand-making processes to rational actors. In this respect, for Latin American and squatter communities, he referred to clientism and state initiatives for material provision, with diffusion of labour movements as well as ideologies of religion, more exactly the church (Walton 1998, 462). However, in this respect, as Walton stated, this analysis is focused on “developing countries” with its pros and cons: Since as you are familiar, you may know that urban social movements/oppositions are considered to happen in “advanced democratic societies” as Castells defined. On the other hand, this analysis gives an idea that urban conflicts from “material demands” could remain at a “conflictual level between clientism and marginality”. While Lojkin (1976) mentions socialist struggle against monopoly capital with social consumption and locally based issue-specific common interests (local competitive consumption), especially early Castells underlines that urban

system could not be held not separately from the total system except one aspect. In other words, emphasizing reproduction of labour power in “urban problems”, the urban system is not external to the social but it specifies that social structure, it forms part of it. From these explanations, urban social movements have the potential to redefine the economic, political and social meaning of the city through the use value, social community and citizen control (Castells, 1983).

Urban conflicts are interpreted as class confrontation in terms of collective consumption, according to Mingione (1981). For Mingione, the consumption process is an aspect of production process which could not be evaluated separately. The “collective” adjective leads also to questions about the difference between individual and collective consumption and the characteristic of the individual one. As Güler underlined in Mingione (Güler 2007, 237), the main characteristics of urban social movements are central in organization and consciousness of people, make conflicts between dominant and other classes apparent, achieve spatial totality of social movements, and what is important –in urban commons sense– give to different social classes to act together in the framework of common benefits. Portaliou (2007) stated about Castells’ *The City and the Grassroots*: “this alternative city comes out of urban struggles and the action of urban social movements. Nowadays these urban movements are not directly revolutionary, as Castells had hoped on the basis of his case studies, but they all challenge the neo-liberal attack on urban space and on the rights to the city.” Some groups, especially academicians and people from political parties use a discourse of some theoretical views, the site of class has moved from production to the reproduction site, the general of urban activists in Istanbul underline the necessity to put aside the political affiliations and struggle for right to the city. As Leontidou (2006) underlines, in terms of urban and grassroots, there is a set of transformations and coincidences between old and new urban social movements. Mayer (2006) expressed in

her article on the “City and the Grassroots” of Castells: “...we combine analysis of their internal dynamics (their action repertoires, organizational structures, ideological frames, etc.) with that of their context (the structural contingencies, economic and political environments, relation to other movements and political parties) while paying attention to how the contemporary conjuncture shapes our own research agenda and analytical models, we might move closer towards developing a persuasive theory of urban social movements.” Moreover, in the mainstream explanation mainly correlated with “middle classes”, or “new middle classes” “radicalism”, politics of identity, quality of life and the defence of the life-style and “issue movements”, they are proposed to represent a break from “old” movements of “working classes”. In other words, urban social movements are elaborated in the framework of new social movements, as a form of new social movement or merely a new social movement based on urban issues. These movements’ actors are proposed to be from “middle”, particularly “new middle-classes”, challenging “old” movements, “class-based” movements.

Assies proposes to introduce “external agents” into urban social movements in an actor-oriented approach to analyse the 1980s (Assies 1994, 85). In the study of Assies, neighbourhood associations with ecological associations and human rights organizations are elaborated in the framework of new social movements. Assies refers to the questioning of Lowe on Castells, in that even though urban social movements lead to social change, they could not transform society since they are dependent on adaptations in political respects (Assies 1994, 87). Urban social movements could also be considered with middle/popular classes and their involvement (like feminist activists) in neighbourhood associations up to the mid-1980s in Brazil. In this respect, Assies refers to Keck and her proposal about political identity rather than class (Assies 1994, 95).

A scholar from Turkey, Keskinok (2007) in his urban social movements conceptualisation made a distinction between Castells and Lefebvre in terms of spatiality, “collective consumption” and class dimensions by underlining that the main questions must be on *class struggle*-its spatialisations with the spatialisations of capital accumulation processes-, production, consumption and distribution processes of capitalism, and the meaning of state. Keskinok explains the *reductionism as explaining social movements both only with and without class dimension* (2007, 247). For Keskinok, urban movements and politics which do not aim the transformation of relations of production as well as the *urban-rural contradiction could not be able to overcome the capitalism* (Keskinok 2007, 252). The perception and the role of the city have vital importance since “collective consumption” would lead to an over-optimism which supports the idea that urban movements will be the leading force behind the social transformation. It is necessary not to ignore the trap of fostering individualization of the problematic from collective consumption and the reality of the different faces of the so-called alternative urban spaces as the space of cheap labour force and so reproducing capitalist relations of production. In this respect, it is practically and theoretically useful to underline and believe in a social transformation with its spatial component and a spatial praxis with a class one (Keskinok 2007, 253). However, according to Keskinok, there is a problem related to deviation from historical determinism, which leads to a mere wish and desire for “beautiful city”. In this respect, according to Keskinok (2007, 249), urban social movements become struggles “not for use value but for exchange value”, with their characteristics for autonomous local governments based on cultural identities and conditioned not as a class based but by class politics with the importance of consumption. It is necessary to remind that urban social movements must not be considered as a high level of urban struggles. Meanwhile, Lefebvre, with its theory of the production of space targets capitalism while space is the main component of

class struggle and praxis (Keskinok 2007, 250). It is necessary to remind that as a scholar who is roughly categorized as a Marxist scholar, Lefebvre did propose the right to the city in a radical and non-orthodox way. Keskinok made a remark about the importance of production of space in capitalist mode of production; but this system could recreate what is public from the use value, which will reproduce the capitalism. Moreover, for Keskinok, spatial praxis blurred, could not be possible without class praxis. As Keskinok underlined the position of Lefebvre against the state (and its urban planning) as the alienating and intervening force on the everyday life and urban space, it is necessary to re-evaluate the state in Lefebvre's thought.

Beja Horta (2006), developing the claim on grassroots' struggle for the production of new spatial meanings, refers to Leontidou (1990), "squatting itself has been specified as an urban social movement" with two main institutional discourses: *firstly ideology of illegality, secondly ghettoization in the political and mass media discourses producing new spatial representations*. Beja Horta (2006) states: "The history of this neighborhood is the history of the spatialisations of power and resistance" and "grassroots mobilizing in slum neighbourhoods becomes inscribed in the battleground of power relations, tensions, and conflicts of the social construction of space." Another critical point is that these struggles structure space as well as the consciousness of residents, shaping their experience of places, their life strategies and ultimately their own identity. "This spatial politics constitutes the meeting place where domination meets resistance, where collective struggles become expressions of a greater awareness for the intersection of oppression, marginalization, power and space." (Beja Horta, 2006).

Other dimensions which are investigated are the relationship between *local and international* levels, which I try to pave the way from scaling-up issues

for urban commons. For Chatterton (2006), it is necessary to understand “locality” not limited to a change of the locality but the potential for multi-scalar change. Routledge (2010) referring to Purcell (2006), reminds also the danger of being trapped in the localities and urban areas so *homogeneous*ness of claims in distinctive places –in fact which are “internally plural” including social, political, economic and environmental rights- and *belongingness* in that sense, which could result in “*essentialised differences*”. This will be both in practical and theoretical terms a big mistake. We could think about that issue not merely for radical claims but also as an obstacle against relational interactions, solidarities and mutual responsibilities between urban as well as non-urban groups and communities, as stated by Routledge. It is argued by Routledge (2010) referring to Massey (2005, 182) that each “social justice” local struggle is *a relational achievement within and beyond “the local” by linking together their similar ideas, projects across scales by articulating rights “within, between and beyond particular cities”* while *space* is crucial for action (referring to Dikeç 2001 in Routledge 2010): acting from space including alternative specialisations, on space, in space in order to change, produce it so tor appropriate and reshape it.

The importance here is twofold: Firstly, it is something related to or more exactly starting from our “personal” space, activism then the community, the city, the state, to international arenas and institutions as Routledge suggested. Another aspect is that the broadening is crucial for a collective struggle from the contradictions and so potentialities of the contemporary cities for mobilisation targeting a broader and radical social change. Another important aspect is the *privilege of the local, place-based cohesiveness and so perpetual struggles between insiders and outsiders underlined by Purcell* (2006, in Routledge, 2010). Considering essentialised differences, homogeneous interests and identities setting apart from other actors, for

Routledge (2010), places are multiple with pluralistic exchanges between actors with the possibility of relations across different sites. Plurality also comes from places' economic, political and cultural networks. Referring to Massey, Routledge underlines that every local struggle is a relational achievement, both within and beyond the 'local' for the urban space. Referring to Leontidou, he states that global is invoked in urban struggles in a locality. He also underlines that struggles over resources, public spaces are "process struggles" for decision-making to inhabit space with the articulation of demands for social, economic and environmental justice.

As Purcell (2006) asserts, locality does not mean necessarily to a "real" or more democratization. Purcell (2006) in his study questioning "urban democracy" and what he proposes as local trap, he underlines that especially with the right to the city in the literature and movements, *locality is wrongly proposed as the absolute way to democratise the city*. However locality represents a general trap in the academia. What is proposed to be local must be re-elaborated with scale –as Purcell (2006) stated which are not independent and pre-given entities so it is dangerous to make any assumptions about scale (Purcell 2006, 1921)-. Referring to Marston, Kelly, Delaney and Leitner, Purcell quotes that scales are "socially produced through struggle" (Purcell 2006, 1927). Purcell (2006) underlines that locality is wrongly proposed as the absolute way to democratize the city. Moreover, locality with the *scale* a general trap in the academia (Springer 2013). What is proposed to be local must be re-elaborated with scale –as Purcell (2006) stated which are not independent as pre-given entities so it is dangerous to make any assumptions about scale (Purcell 2006, 1921)-. For this reason, it could be appropriate to take the local, national and global scales in their inner relations but totality. Referring to Marston, Kelly, Delaney and Leitner, Purcell quotes that scales are "socially produced through struggle" (Purcell 2006, 1927). However, as Swyngedouw (in

Purcell 2006, 1928) stated, it could be considered as a strategy: It is even both fluid and fixed in geographical sense by the intervention of social actors with particular social, economic and ecological goals. Not rejecting the local scale, it is necessary to reject generalizations so local trap that could lead to wrong assumptions and even danger for democracy and social justice. The right to the city in this respect deserves to be exposed of “what the right to the city would entail” with “what benefits and detriments it could bring to the emancipation of urban residents” and “what this right could challenge or replace existing situation and rights” (Purcell 2006, 1929). Urban movements operate in a social space, as *the extra-local, the local beyond the local, which refer to different issues in different extent sometimes leading to global dimension linking actors in various national contexts with other actors* (Hamel, Lugister-Thaler and Mayer 2000, 2-3). However, we must ask the quality and results of linkages between actors at international level. We must think about how the support must be. As Hamel states (in Hamel, Lugister-Thaler and Mayer, 2000, 158-170), *the local politics —still matters in this globalized world*, if we consider urban restructuring in terms of urban social justice, but considering that urban movements’ actors are not homogeneous having different claims. This locality has a meaning in terms of *rural, indigenous movements having a global characteristic which could not be thought independently from the urban and the meaning of the locality*. They question the interface of the global and the local/urban asking how practices around the local economy, housing, quality of life and municipal politics extend themselves to other arenas of action in terms of interacting spaces, spheres and global expanses, referring to Albrow underlining the necessity to think about the global/locality in terms of urban social movements, theory of collective action. Even though there is no generally recognized frame of action as asserted by Hamel, Lugister-Thaler and Mayer (2000, 19), it’s necessary to recognize the dichotomy of action and thought while challenging the

understanding of totality conceptually and practically as it is proposed showing inspirational paths by Hamel, Lugister-Thaler and Mayer (2000, p.19). In the preface of the book, referring to Lugister-Thaler, Maheu and Hamel (2001), Hamel, Lugister-Thaler, Pieterse and Roseneil ask: —how do these same subjects negotiate diverse milieus of belonging in a globalizing world?, raising the issues of post-identities and —extra-localities which means new spatial constructs existing between the local and the global, from localities to global milieus and in this respect, they question the subject (2001, 14). In terms of neo-liberal urban projects shaped by urban entrepreneurialism having similarities across borders in the *geography of centrality* (Hamel, Lugister-Thaler and Mayer (2000, 7) not only in terms of urban issues but in a *continuity and togetherness of urban and rural*, so it is necessary to strengthen the solidarity of making visible, learning and sharing experiences and realizing that the locality is a part of the world—seeing that it is not lived only in one city, for instance, Istanbul—and resisting and give a voice together as global urban commons.

There are common relations between those affected by a similar political decision (Hamel, Lugister-Thaler and Mayer (2000, 4) in terms of interacting local, national, regional and international processes, from localities to extended global milieus and creating community of subjects through culturally shared global consciousness (Lugister-Thaler, Maheu and Hamel 2001, 55). As Smith (1996) asserted, gentrification is a global urban strategy that has displaced the liberal urban policy of old with a new revanchist urbanism and a frontier on which fortunes are made with an entrepreneurial style of urban governance urban regeneration policy connected with an entrepreneurial style of urban governance excluding —some groups considered as threatening, there must be a reclaim of the commons with the togetherness of the groups for a shared strategies, visions and solidarity to create an international public opinion and resistances,

linking up geographies and issues for the effectiveness of urban oppositions across the world.

On these grounds, Featherstone (2003) has discussed how the *spatialities of resistance to globalization* are woven together transnational (“transnational contention” (Chatterton 2010), the globalized “movement of movements” (see Tarrow 2005, Mertes 2004)), while Routledge (2003) has highlighted *the role of transnational convergence spaces* in grounding grassroots globalization networks. As stated by Roth (2000) referring to Swyngedouw, in terms of *cognitive frames, action repertoires and transnational diffusion, social movements and protests* are parts of “glocalization”. They combine local perspectives, orientations and identities while another -transnational (Roth 2000)-global commons (Newby in Roth 2000)) citizenship claim arise from the locality, for urban issues however challenging —workfare capitalist systems. The glocalization refers in subjective and personal spheres, to the construction and invention of diverse localities through *global ideas and information* (Lugister-Thaler, Maheu and Hamel referring to Eade, 2001, p. 48) must be formed especially in terms of urban issues. The study of Uitermark, Nicholls and Loopmans (2012) focused on urban social movements in terms of global dimensions and the right to the city and argued that *contention and movements emanate from cities but could expand outwards due to the activists arranging relations between local and beyond, the linkages that connect the present urban contention between different locales*, referring to Salah Fami. Pruijt (2007) underlines the necessity of urban movements local, national and supra-national. I will focus on these points in the field part, questioning the meaning of the local and supra-national or international as well. He reminded that Pickvance (2003) puts forward that the term “urban movements” is to be preferred because it is *more straightforward, analogous to “environmental movement” instead of “environmental social movement”*. Pickvance made a contribution for the

analysis of “urban social movements” as “movements”, between *the dilemma of old and new social movements*.

The locality which became a turning point for global social movements represents a connection and a continuation between the urban and the rural within all varieties of resistances and the up scaling discussions. Koehler and Wissen (2003) analysed struggles of local communities over their territory against *mega-infrastructure project* over -the Plan Puebla Panama in Mexico- to serve global markets interest of national competitiveness in the global economy. On the other hand, rural struggles of Mexican Zapatistas and movement of the landless in Brazil (MST) but having important points of the global social movements. They substantiate that cities play a key role in neoliberal restructuring but at the same time a favourable place where alternative practices and resistance against hegemonic projects could emerge. It is necessary to investigate the extent and context of urban conflicts for their characteristics of global social movements against capitalist globalization (Koehler and Wissen, 2003). Anti-capitalist characteristics in the variety of spatial scales and their forms of articulation in terms of “glocalization” with different types of glocalized protests (Koehler and Wissen, 2003) deserve to be investigated. Koehler and Wissen (2003), referring to Novy (2002 in Koehler and Wissen, 2003) and Swyngedouw (1997 in Koehler and Wissen, 2003) made an important contribution to the definition of the glocal usually described as one-directional, i.e, the local shaped by the global capital. They underlined *the dialectical understanding of the local*, the local and the global, the regional and the national are deeply intertwined and mutually constituted. Global urban competition and neoliberal urban politics have the potentiality to gather all who are affected all over the world with new *forms and scales of resistance with the articulation of urban protest not only on a local but also on a global scale* for dignified livelihood (like democratic participation, human rights, equal access to goods and services, reclaiming a sense of a

public sphere, environmental justice or solidarity. Urban protest's global articulation is named as scale jumping (Smith 1995 in Koehler and Wissen 2003) while information technologies play important roles as all know and discuss especially in terms of recruitment of actors in difficult conditions for communication. Globalization so related information and communication technologies have resulted in a variety of local political actors with multiple claims and oppositional politics in international arenas even though they are immobile and resource-poor for Sassen (2004). However, information and communication technologies could enable these cross-border geographies connecting places, micro-environment with global span, which means technical connectivity links even for resource-poor organizations with other similar local entities in neighbourhoods and cities in other countries, creating multiple lateral, horizontal communications, collaborations, solidarities and supports. This can enable local political or non-political actors to enter into cross-border politics. Multi-scalar politics, with the pre-existence of social networks and adequate technical infrastructures and software, particular instantiations of the local can be constituted at multiple scales constructing global formations for much lateralized and horizontal networks.

Bringing back Lefebvre and referring Souza's elaborations, Uitermark, Nicholls and Loopmans (2012) suggested that the development of capitalism "as a process effectuated through planetary urbanization" and the "local trap" as Purcell assumed are key aspects. However, the emphasis on - concrete places within- cities focuses both analysis and activism on the *local expressions and repercussions of global processes*, with a possibility of fragmentation and of particularisation of issues. This addresses to theoretical and empirical difficulties of unity and scaling and linking up to broader social movements (Uitermark, Nicholls and Loopmans 2012). *I must argue that the main aim must be to organise at grassroots level and*

international linkages could not go beyond some artificial protests underlined by many activists. Uitermark, Nicholls and Loopmans (2012) claimed literature on the “rights to the city” did not provide awareness how cities play a powerful role in social movements beyond being political, geographical, and ideological spaces. Arguing that place frames can connect struggles over distant places, Uitermark, Nicholls and Loopmans (2012) referred to Mario Diani’s elaborations (2004, 2005) on local actors as nodes with specific functions within global circuits of contention: cities as nodes in relational networks of meaning and collective identity.

Their *effect and change* aimed to be created, institutionalization and type of organization, the position vis-à-vis the state and the power [please see the proposition of Holloway -that I have elaborated in the part on social movements and will be elaborated in the part on autonomy- as “change the world without taking power”] are the points that we have to include in our analyses. The urban opposition groups not only in Istanbul but also all around the world are representing new types of flexible and non-hierarchical organizations rising from neighbourhoods. Urban social movement theories, in terms of objectives, in short and long term changes-that they create and aimed to produce-, characteristics of the changes, and actors, are in between so-called old and new social movements. The relations, claims -not only in terms of collective consumption- and critiques of movement vis-à-vis the state in this process need to be elaborated in the framework of radical theories. Institutionalization, formation of new types of associations with heterogeneity across classes must be emphasized to emphasize the potentialities of urban oppositions. Urban regeneration, not merely on the level of spatial projects, but also with its new “legal” and “generalized” discourse could be proposed as a part of the social control. In Istanbul, space of capital accumulation and real estate investment as Harvey stated (1987) there was a considerable plurality of different groups (intellectual, political),

but united around urban issues such as housing, planning, and environment. It does not also mean that the agents of this struggle are not merely “working classes” in its limited sense, but urban commons composed of people from different neighbourhoods including academicians and intellectuals, critical planners, commoning by struggling together. This commoning process could cover many neighbourhoods as well as other urban struggles, creating a new political consciousness. In this respect, it is necessary more than ever, to think about urban struggles from both-and-beyond old and new social movements. Urban movements would be the other pillar for the theoretical part which includes what is proposed by Holloway (2002, 2010) in his many works as “doing” and “cracks”. The idea behind “doing” is to be the change what you want, to create cracks into capitalism from everyday life or through various attempts to change the world without taking power. In the metropolis with its all contradictions but also commoning potentialities as Hardt and Negri asserted, this would be a challenge as well as an attempt to form a relation between the right to the city from practice to theory claim and urban social movement’s radical horizon for the effectivity of social movements in terms of liberation including Social Forum literature. I propose with the inspiration from Holloway “*cracks of urban doings*” implying the force of urban oppositions to create changes which could not be limited in the physically spatial framework.

Castells (1978) in his study namely “City, Class and Power”, argued that movements concerning the urban and ecology, organize and mobilize populations, transform relations of force between classes, innovate cultural models and become one of the essential axes for social change. For the change and effect, he adds that the direct effects of these movements are less important than their repercussions on public opinion and the elaboration of public policy at a general level, with their growing visibility and

ideological legitimacy. *Unable to transform society, urban social movements have the potential to challenge and transform “urban meanings” of city organized on use value, autonomous local cultures, decentralized participatory democracy creating another city of an “image”, “yearn” for another city.* Castells stated that although class relationships and class struggle are fundamental in understanding urban conflict, they are not, by any means, the only primary source of urban social change. He added that the autonomous role of the state, gender relationships, ethnic and national movements, and movements ... define themselves citizen, are among other alternative sources of urban change (Castells 1983, 291). Another critical aspect is sometimes “advanced capitalist society” emphasis: According to Castells (1983), urban social movement mobilized around urban issues made a contribution, encourages social change. In the “City and the Grassroots” (1983), underlines the “new” non-class based characteristic of the movements, in his early studies, he recognizes the class base (“working class”) in the urban social movements. However, urban conflicts are interpreted as a class confrontation in terms of collective consumption, according to Mingione (1981). For Mingione, the consumption process is an aspect of production process and could not be evaluated separately. The “collective” adjective leads also to questions about the difference between individual and collective consumption and the characteristic of the individual one. It is exposed different conditions of opposition/integration dynamics and challenges so-called “urban marginality”. The opposition/integration dynamics from collective consumption could be meaningful to understand the earlier period of self-constructed gecekondu neighbourhoods based on the use-value with different spatial and socio-political characteristics, from its formation to the allocation of title deeds and transformation in apartment houses. However, I would like to ask: “If housing right is taken? What will happen?” Castells asserts that if they become autonomous, they could be driving force for

social change. To challenge “urban marginality” is also a requisite for Istanbul. What does it mean? For Castells, urban marginality does not coincide with occupational marginality, but political outcome of existing political structure (Castells 1983, 187). This lies in the lack of empirical research. In the neighbourhoods, there are dwellers from different occupations (179). So we could use the right to dwell which includes different dimensions such as shelter, housing.

Castells (1983) in the part namely “Squatters and the State in Latin America” of the “City and Grassroots” argued that with policies of land and so “political”, “ideological” and their realistic change for delivery of land, organizations controlled mobilizations and changing alliances within changing mobilization for *barriadas* of squatters. Lima example is significant since, as explained by Castells (1983, 194-199), an urban movement can be, most frequently, an instrument of social integration and subordination to the existing political order instead of social change. Another aspect is that the subordination of the movement can be obtained by political parties representing interests of ruling class by the state. The results can change in each case and when movement is close to the state, urban policies could be a crucial aspect of change in dependent societies. Level of urbanization in developing countries marked by squatter settlements; depend on relationship between the state and popular sectors. And finally, if squatter movement breaks their relationship of dependency to the state, they may become “potential agents of social change”, whose fate is determined by general process of political conflict.

For the Mexico example, the evolution of urban social movements is determined by interaction between interests of the squatters, the reformist policy of the administration and the radical left trying to lead, organize and politicize by linking urban demands with revolutionary action (like Ruben-Jaramillo example), with “urbanization” and so new “struggle settlements”

where student militancy connects urban demands related to political protest. The Campamento example is a valuable experience with students and academicians support from emergence of the neighbourhood, so, of the movement, and the beginning of the invasion of land. Even though demands from neighbourhood were modest, it gained little support because of the image of radicalism from supportive groups and its link between urban demands and political criticism. Monterrey squatter's movement is characterised by political, economic and geographic isolation of settlement and movement. Squatters opposed legalization of illegal land occupation, property rights from the state due to economic-implication of unaffordable payments-, ideological-transformation into a pressure group instead of assertion of natural right to the land- and political-a relationship between state and squatters-reasons. In other words, they opposed in order to preserve solidarity, cohesiveness and strength. Squatters' leaders were supporting that struggles for urban demands if they lead to unification, organization, and political awareness. They also tried to link actions to a collective aim, subject, and to a revolutionary change in society. Urban social movements for a political change could be elaborated in Chile example of Castells (1983) which is connected with class struggle-but dependency on political parties diminishing level of grassroots participation-, due to "urban reform" for interest groups and profitable housing market. Especially Nueva La Habana, as the most active, politically organized and mobilized campamentos for a peaceful, equipped neighbourhood is a good example and experience to remember with its grassroots organization and militant leadership for a change from a campamento to working class population. It is necessary to be aware of continuous tension from ideological gap between political vanguard and squatters and individualism in social use of space and housing in the establishment and in time with different squatters from different social composition having different levels of consciousness (from the observation

of Meunier): from collective, individual, and political ones. In other words, different squatters were not fully participating in political mobilization but paving a path, in April 1973, for a militant and revolutionary activism of political battle of working class movement, for the construction of a new society. In other words, the participation is dependent on political characteristic of settlements. However, according to Castells (1983), urban social movement mobilized around urban issues encourages social change. Another related point with Lefebvre is the “*dependency*” (Castells 1983, 212) to define the *society as well as the city* “*whose space is produced by its dwellers as if they were not the producers of such a space, but temporary builders of their masters’s hacienda*” and continues adding that it is an *ecological form as a result of the residents who does not (have the will/action to) social control over urban development. This is a city “without citizens”, so the residents are under the forced submission of the state and the foreign capital* (Castells 1983, 212).

One of the most crucial parts of the book is “In search of a theory” (Castells 1983, 291): Castells cites *four major hypotheses that inspired the study*: Firstly, *the city is a social product* resulting from conflicting social interests and values. Because of the institutionalization of socially dominant interests, major innovations in the city’s role, meaning, and structure tend to be *outcome of grassroots mobilization and demands*. When these mobilizations result in the transformation of the urban structure, and these are urban social movements. Thirdly, *the process of urban change cannot be reduced to the effects produced on the city by successful social movements*. So a theory of urban social change must consider both the spatial and social effects resulting from the action of the dominant interests and also the grassroots’ alternative to the domination. Lastly, *although class relationships and class struggle are essential in understanding urban conflicts, the only primary source of urban social change. The autonomous role of the state, the gender relationships, the ethnic and national movements, and movements that*

define themselves as citizen are among other alternative sources of urban social change (Castells 1983, 291).

Castells proposes a critique about both urban and social movements' theories vis-à-vis "urban social movements". I must add at this point, even though collective action could be useful to refer to actions "aiming to improve the group's conditions (such as status or power), which is enacted by a representative of the group" in a comparative way, it has a social integrationist approach with deviance connotations. Castells explicitly emphasized that his main concern was "social change" or "how cities and societies change" as a result of collective projects and societal conflicts (Castells 1983, 293). Castells refers to Melluci's distinction between collective action, the ensemble of conflictual behaviour within a social system and social movements proposed to be conflictual behaviour that does not accept the imposed social norms of institutions and political system to attack the structure of class relationships in the society (Castells 1983, 295).

From the case of Madrid, Castells (1983) exposes four following aspects: *Firstly*, to accomplish the transformation of urban meaning in the full extent of its political and cultural implications, an urban social movement must articulate in its praxis in the three goals of collective consumption demands, community culture and political self-management. *Secondly*, it must be conscious of its role as an urban social movement. *Thirdly*, it must be connected to society through a series of organizational operators, three in particular: the media, the professionals and the political parties. *Lastly, a sine qua non condition*, while urban social movements must be connected to the political system to at least partially achieving its goals, they must be organizationally and ideologically autonomous of any political party. Social transformation and political struggle through negotiation, and management, although intimately connected and interdependent, do not operate at the same level of the social structure (Castells 1983, 322).

While Pruijt (2007) referred to the life cycle of the movements in terms of institutionalization and co-optation by arguing that *institutionalization is inevitable*, Pickvance (2003) from the Urban Question of Castells argued that *the more the state intervenes into the collective consumption, the more the inequalities deepen so the conflicts and urban social movements*. Pickvance proposed that both actor and structural change aspects in his elaboration if they link with trade unions and party political organizations. Another point which is accentuated by Pickvance (2003) is the *relative isolation in writing on urban social movements firstly, separately from theories on “general” social movement theories*. Moreover, urban social movements could be elaborated with old social movement connotation (Pickvance 2003, 105). In this respect, urban social movements’ definitions are in general related to their urban/material and political effects, not types of organizations, different than prevalent social movement theories focusing on the organization. The other positive characteristic is stated as the interest in political power at national and local levels, which lead to a productive discussion on the relations between state and urban protests including their strategies and tactics. Urban movements are not spontaneous responses to inequalities and problems but formations under social and political conditions (Pickvance 2003, 105). These contextual conditions are held as the main reasons behind the so-called success of urban movements as elaborated by scholars from political opportunity and resource mobilization schools, which is valid for debates between structuralists and actor-oriented scholars paying attention on the ability and capacity of activist groups which overcome even if the conditions are unfavourable. Pickvance referred to deficiencies of this isolation between social and urban social movement elaborations. This isolation refers to all the different approaches of social movement theories. This also means an ignorance of the elaboration of the mobilization process in writing urban social movements, which is considered as only a detail (Pickvance 2003, 105). All these aspects led to

“separate development” and elaboration of urban social movements from new social movements. They were mainly categorized as Pickvance referred, as “old social movements” mainly due to its material demands even though these demands could involve greater participation, new rights with non-material characteristics, making urban social movements neither old nor new social movements (Pickvance 2003, 106). The urban movements are not spontaneous responses to inequalities and deprivations according to Pickvance (2003). Referring to Castells in that urban social movements are new social movements, because of their so-called material character of their demand, there are ambiguities of urban social movements in restrictive and generic senses (Pickvance 2003, 103). In the restrictive sense, there are three levels of potential urban and political effect, in terms of citizen action as well as the scale of the changes brought by as following: participation -lowest: symbolic urban and political change-, protest -intermediate: minor reforms not challenging fundamental structures- and urban social movement -highest and rarest levels of change: fundamental changes in power and urban and societal levels- (Pickvance 2003, 103). However, for Pickvance (2003), the restrictive elaboration is abandoned for any citizen action notwithstanding its actual and potential effects (Pickvance 2003, 103). In this respect, it is necessary to consider the potentialities including changes in consciousness and subsequent protests; however by making a careful and exact assessment of actual effects instead of ready-made analyses as substitutes for thoughts (Pickvance 2003, 103). As Pickvance (2003, 103) mentioned, Castells formulated the theory on urban social movements and *collective consumption* related explanations from the state. Urban social movements could lead to radical changes when linked up with trade unions, party political organizations while expressing structural contradictions. So, as Pickvance argued, in what extent there will be changes is related to the underlying structural contradictions and the organization of the actors which could make these contradictions apparent.

Urban social movements could be defined as the phase of linking-up of different groups such as trade unions, political groups with urban-based groups (Pickvance 2003, 103). However, as Pickvance made a remark, Castells stated that links and combinations of collective consumption with trade unionism, cultural identity and so on could be “detrimental” to their success in creating structural change (Pickvance 2003, 103). Pickvance (2003) stated about Castells’ comment on the state and his conceptualisation related to collective consumption starting from the Urban Question. Pickvance (2003) stated that the more the state intervenes into the collective consumption the inequalities deepen so conflicts and urban social movements as well. What is the most critical point is that as Pickvance showed, both actor and structural change aspects in his elaboration if they link with trade unions and party political organizations. However, the characteristic of this linkage of trade unions, political groups and urban-based groups is quite important. Another aspect is that firstly, urban-based groups strategically must find a common point for getting together. The other point is the way how different political groups could get together. In this respect, political groups could find a common point from “urban” issues.

It is critical to think about the positions of association vis-à-vis the state. In this respect, the roles of groups outside the neighbourhoods, the platforms and the coalitions become determinant due to the independence from the legal and neighbourhood bonds. Apart from groups, neighbourhoods, NGOs, platforms, individual engagement from different classes is another aspect that I would like to put emphasis. According to Souza, institutional struggle must be pursued in relation to direct action since institutional struggle is not a taboo, but it is a means to influence public policies, plans and legislations. He states that these movements (could) do this “together with the state” for tactical reasons, but above all “despite the state” and “against the state” (Souza 2010, 2006). Recently in the literature, Yves

Cabannes (2013) opens the debate from five statements: Firstly, he recognizes that there is a growing gap between NGOs and urban social movements; even though they struggle for social justice and the right to the city ideals radically developed by Lefebvre. In this respect, I would like to refer to Souza's statements on the radical core of the right to the city ideal and the reality that the right to the city does not have similar meanings for every actor. Another point is that every movement –which could be related to a NGO- could not be radical for the other group which defines itself from radicality. Cabannes referred to No-Vox as well as IAI (International Alliance of Inhabitants), which are known and active in Turkey. Cabannes stated that they have a common distance from NGOs and professional world. Cabannes mentioned another group, an association of NGOs in Brazil, 'Central dos Movimentos Populares' (CMP) inadequately translated as People's Movement Forum for Cabannes (2013, 560) but in fact the 'Coordinating Council of Grassroots Movements' (Cabannes 2013, 561) formed in order to link active housing social movements. In this respect, we could easily see that social movements could form a central group. In time, some changes happened: For instance, the National Movement for Housing Struggle (MNLM) had left and gave the role to UMM (union of housing movements). As Cabannes stated two points of difference could be about who speaks for whom and secondly, the logic of transformative process versus the logic of project. From the groups CMP and MNLM in Brazil, and IAI worldwide of grassroots organizations, Cabannes (2013) stated that they have in common, willingness of autonomy as a people-centred and people-led movement, radicalism and the transformative perspective Cabannes (2013, 560). Moreover, the MNLM aims mainly to strengthen solidarity within urban space but to unify by struggling "beyond just land" with the commonizing slogan "occupy, resist, live" (Cabannes 2013, 561). Cabannes quotes from Cesare Ottolini, the coordinator of IAI: *"We do not want NGOs to speak in the name of*

inhabitants, citizens or movements.” and also not professionals or technicians (Cabannes 2013, 562-563), which is one of the determinants of groups mainly struggling for housing issues in Istanbul. As I argued above, Cabannes stated that there are divergences within social movements due to the growing divide, fragmentation and lack of communication among urban movements at international, national or city level (Cabannes 2013, 564). For instance, for 2016 Habitat II Forum in Istanbul could be a common horizon for a “unity locally and internationally” necessary to make a radical transformation possible (Cabannes 2013, 564). The reasons behind these divergences between NGOs and social movements is related to the lack of active commitment and engagement of universities with transformative struggles for a counter hegemony coming from organic intellectuals from the masses and linked to them. However, this is in decline all over the world. We must add differences of ideologies, lack of critiques from universities, and difficulties of interaction between. The other important aspect is the concepts like committed and organic intellectuals. In this respect, Cabannes (2013, 566) proposed that public universities must be open to everyone: who are excluded to create a critical mass for a united and transformative thinking for the society and a counter hegemony (Cabannes 2013, 566). Marcelo Lopes de Souza (2013) made an intervention about social movements and NGOs, and asks in what extent they are non-governmental, whether or not they could be independent from neo-liberal agenda. It is necessary to focus on two points, which are ideological. Civil society is complementary to the state apparatus, rather than being a source of disruptive, radical forces. Secondly, the state apparatus in civil society is minimised due to a self-image of a third sector. It is necessary for Souza (2013) to distinguish the difference between the organisation and the movement. On the other hand, there are many types of NGOs and historically managed and populated by middle-class professionals including urban planners (Souza 2013, 259). On the other hand, Souza recognizes

different organizations formed from struggles such as favela and network associations in various countries. In this respect, this grassroots organization such as Abahali base Mjondolo made a remark to the middle-classes: “Talk to us, not about us.” (Souza 2013, 260). It is related to the fact that NGOs carry many suspicions and ambiguities. They are considered as government related, semi-autonomous, and capital and business friendly international organizations. However, they are still exceptions. There is also a convergence problem, which is valid for Turkey, Istanbul too. For instance, there could be disputes about competing appropriations of poor people between NGOs. For Istanbul, NGOs about urban issues could be various, changing their positions and missions in time. Moreover, they could even have a distance, independence to movements then represent a pioneering role for an emancipatory resistance too as we have witnessed recently. The challenge for squatter movements is how to sustain a very ambitious level of thought and action with the likelihood of irregular and hard-won more or less tactical victories here and now (Pithouse 2008). Pitthouse argued that the realization of this potential requires the sustainability of the theoretical and cultural autonomy of the movement. For Souza, the left wing technocratism lead to contradiction in the framework of which too much attention is attached to the technical instruments and exaggerated expectations for the possibilities and potentialities of the formal legal and institutional terms. This result is from progressive urban strategy of the scholars and middle-classes in NGOs. In this result, according to Souza, the poor and grassroots organizations were playing a secondary role for strategy-building and intellectual elaboration. What is added by Souza (2006) and underlined by Pithouse (2008) is very crucial: *technical help of progressive intellectuals and professional planners is welcome and necessary but it is more necessary that the movement must not cease to think and act autonomously.*

Mayer (2013) in her recent article namely “First world urban activism”, made a *re-evaluation of urban social movements and their differences, tensions of different groups vis-a-vis neoliberal urbanism (neoliberal designs and enclosures)*. What she proposes is that the differences could ally different groups in post-occupy collaborations. Talking about the “first world”, Mayer (2013) suggested that there is a *deregulation in the housing market with the growing role and influence of real estate owners on planning and developing our cities*. This is not peculiar to “first world” but the housing rights violation and the determinant role of real estate owners are growing all over the world, which triggers urban resistances. These are global developers and international investors playing leading roles, which is not characteristic of only first world cities. *The right to the city becomes a label which cohere different groups such as radical autonomous, anarchist, alternative groups, leftist organizations, environmental groups, middle-classes who want to preserve their quality of life, other groups with precarious living conditions in different sectors and groups including students and in Europe, the marginalized, the excluded, the oppressed* (Mayer 2013, 11), which reminds us Lefebvre’s and Marcuse’s propositions. I could suggest that it was the idea behind urban alliance attempts in Istanbul. However, the right to the city, as a label, is not appropriated by these various groups and these groups did not come together due to this label. On the other hand, there are movements in accordance with “creative city” production, nourished by sub-cultures and situating themselves against some resistances and activisms as institutionalized for this purpose. On the other hand, there are less visible movements of urban outcasts, migrants, and paperless workers. And these struggles are more often situating themselves apart. However, its field could be heterogeneous and fragmented including different campaigns and activisms against discrimination, dispossession and disenfranchisement for different groups. As told before, for Mayer, the Occupy movements in

different cities with different dynamics (from the encampments into the neighbourhoods to reclaim vacant properties for “ordinary people”) could succeeded to go beyond fragmentations and consequently, “disconnected mobilizations” have begun to be bridged for a “new radical-democratic process” (Mayer 2013, 13-14). For Mayer, these are meaningless “unless they do not address the basic conflict between privileged city users and growing ‘advanced marginality’” (Mayer 2013, 17).

Purcell (2008), referring to Samara (2007 in Purcell 2008) argued that *movements can see their particular struggles as part of a shared struggle for a different kind of city*. Here, the spatial component is central and as Purcell stated, vital. In this respect, we can argue that “social movements” are parts, components of struggles for another city. This point leads us to the question of spatial trap that is elaborated throughout the thesis. Occupy movements all over the world from Middle East and Israel to Europe and to USA has started new ways of political actions in theoretical and practical terms such as encampment and occupation by reforming and relaunching a new and different Left. Pickerill and Krinsky (2012) made an analysis on the reason why the Occupy movement is important in order to understand both the political importance of social movements and the theoretical limits of social movement studies. To challenge and reconsider existing statements apart from normal ignorance of the mainstream media, they propose eight aspects: the claim to space, the power and the importance of the language, the importance of crafting and using these slogans, the politics of prefiguration of a new society and its contradictions, the implications of not making claim from the state, the significance of ritualising and institutionalising the protest, the messy diffusion of a potentially global movement, the confrontation with the police as a movement tactic. Another aspect that they mention is that knowing social movements theories do not make a good activist. They remind physical encampments was a protest tactic of urban social movements such as Reclaim the Streets in 1990s and

also Latin America. Another ignored point is that camps are places of exclusion and inequality (Pickerill and Krinsky 2012, 280). They thought about the meaning of occupy as to claim from corporate greed. What they imply for “crafting and repeating slogans” is the necessity to propose another slogan such as “we are the 99 per cent”, with the sense of inclusion and majority it has brought and the repetition and establishment of its own truth (Pickerill and Krinsky 2012, 281). The camp was the space where all the services are supplied by the alternative so the prefigurative alternative community based on the network of mutual aid. In this respect, they underline that social movements theories must theorise more the role of the state vis-à-vis the movements with fluid interactions and autonomy. Occupy movements have an internet dimension resulting in interpersonal and existing alliances all over the world with similar but different tactics, strategies, goals and language. This is the source of free culture and free commons, ideas and strategies to be shared easily, which reflects the non-hierarchical organisational structure (Pickerill and Krinsky 2012, 285). They raised issues for the movement such as homelessness, feminism, and climate change to be taken seriously in new forms and new directions, included different frustrations and energies (Pickerill and Krinsky 2012, 286).

With privatization, individualization and life style conceptualizations, “new middle classes” are proposed to create their spaces, the spaces of social exclusion based on “order”, “control”. The urban regeneration, not merely on the level of spatial projects, but also with its new “legal” and “generalized” discourse could be proposed as a part of the social control. In Istanbul, space of capital accumulation and real estate investment as Harvey (1987) stated there was a considerable plurality of different groups (intellectual, political), but united due to urban issues such as housing, planning, and environment. In the literature, there is a differentiation between class-based social movements which are proposed to be rooted in

the sphere of production and to react to the specific contradictions and conflicts and urban political movements which emerge from the sphere of reproduction and respond to a different set of conflicts and contradictions, focusing on urban living conditions, which cannot be defined along class lines. The study aims mainly to underline the conflictual aspect and as well as alliances in urban issues. The study will elaborate urban social movements literature, questioning the dilemmas of being a single-issue movement-mainly concentrating on urban issues in a temporary way-, an old/new social movement in a “restricted” sense while trying to propose new ideas for Istanbul from the literature as a reply to questions both “how” and “why”, elaborating the multiple composition of resistances of different actors and different types of organizations and ways of resistances with changing meanings of “urban claims” and strategies at local as well as international levels in relation with the right to the city, forums but more crucially the radical transformation in the politics and society in the framework of individual and collective transformation.

3.2.3. Social Forums and Urban Struggles

In the literature on urban social movements mainly in the 2010s, the right to the city and the European Social Forum is reciprocally discussed mainly due to the need of practical feeding within movements. This is very central since urban opposition groups in Istanbul have been organized for togetherness with the occasion of European Social Forum⁸⁵ taking action on the right to the city. We must question here from the practice in what extent the Forum, in terms of urban oppositions was open to different activists⁸⁶. I can argue

⁸⁵ For a pioneering, comprehensive and critical evaluation from an insider view, please read the article of Yıldırım (2013).

⁸⁶ I would like to refer to “intellectuals” of Gramsci (1971): In “Selections from the Prison Notebooks”, it is stated that if the working class needs to be successful in being hegemonic, it is necessary to form a network of alliances with social minorities and create its own

that the process of the European Social Forum, before, during and after initiated alliances, included many activists, and activists who came supported many grassroots groups. It could be stated that this was related to grassroots initiatives, their inner relations and conditions at that time. Leonitidou (2010) elaborates new social movements and their cosmopolitan collectivities –like rooted cosmopolitan of Tarrow, of flaneur activists flowing from cities and leading to cosmopolitan new social movements bridging the gap between the local and the global -claiming the right to the city, for innovative aspects of the roles of the transformations of urban social movements and definitions of the right to the city for the deconstruction of the north-south division. This cosmopolitanisation of movements represents grassroots globalization from below. For Leontidou (2010), this is not merely valuable for flâneur activists, but also the collectivities are formed by overlapping memberships due to the new technology and informational cultures-sometimes practicing cyberactivism-inhabiting virtual spaces and creating spaces of convergence, the WSF and the ESF as umbrella organizations, changing binary, the balance within the

intellectuals to develop a new ideology. Gramsci, underlining human agency in historical change, states that the bourgeois hegemony is based not only on economic domination, but also an intellectual and moral leadership. The hegemony combining physical force or coercion with intellectual, moral and cultural inducement; “intellectuals” leadership and position is critical between war of manoeuvre and war of position. For Gramsci, what is critical is that the revolutionary intellectuals must originate from within the working class, rather than being imposed from outside. In “Selections from the Prison Notebooks”, he stated that all men are intellectuals, in that all have intellectual and rational faculties, but “not all men have *the social function of intellectuals*”. He claimed that modern intellectuals were not simply talkers, but “directors and organizers” who helped build society and produce hegemony by means of ideological apparatuses such as education and the media. He proposed a distinction between intellectuals as an organic category and traditional one. The “traditional” intelligentsia considers itself as a class apart from society, and the thinking groups which every class produces from its own ranks “organically”. In L’Ordine Nuovo (in Crehan 2006), Gramsci asserts the presence of some philosophers, artists and journalists considering themselves as “real intellectuals”. The organic intellectual of Gramsci is critical in that each social group produce its intellectual, organic intellectual in politics and cultural area, which looks after the benefits of the group with the idea of breaking the economic, political and cultural hegemony of dominant group. The organic intellectuals articulate through the language of culture, feelings and experiences which the masses could not express for themselves, with a “responsibility” to spread information, while making critique of the existing intellectual activity of the masses.

right to the city, from the right to inhabit to the right to occupy, use public spaces to gather and protest in city centres, leading to the emergence of social centres where alternative discourses to neo-liberalism and ‘urban’ social movements contesting urban competition, commodification and marketing are born, where transnational autonomist movements and local movements merge, overlap. The ESF is proposed to be important for the new discursive formation and recognition of the right to the city. The fight for public services and institutions, even globally, is also a demand for the right to the city. For Leontidou, the city became more and more important for new social movements for their forms, demands and strategies. The right to housing is disassociated from the right to property and returned to the right to inhabit (Mitchell in Leontidou, 2010). The right to the employment could merge with the right to the city, as lived in France, in 2005 and 2006. Another aspect underlined by Leontidou is the relationship between squatting and spontaneity: Even though squatting is spontaneous, without activists and local leaders, it could be co-opted by politicians and clientalist networks and fragmented, and formed of individuals fighting each other for survival.

For Keil (2009), roll-with-it neoliberalization is critical to explain phases, moments and contradictions of urban neoliberalization, and neoliberal urban politics, which creates the possibility for contestation, alternatives and hopes: These “new urban politics” could be practiced as political liberation, the right to the city, and World Social Forum as well. In 2005, in the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil, a workshop of the Right to the City gathered many people, leading to a “World Charter on the Right to the City” based on the idea that existing laws, rights should be defined into a broader framework with the approval of an international law for socio-political action. And later, with the mobilization of the World Charter, UN-Habitat and UNESCO started an initiative from the concept of Lefebvre (Fernandes, 2007). As it is stated by Harvey (2009), in the Opening Speech of Urban

Reform Seminar in World Social Forum in Belém do Para, Brazil, the right to the city is proposed as a right to make the city as radically different so the right to the city must be at the centre of the struggle against capital. There are international alliances on the right to the city. In US, with their own statements, the Right To The City Alliance⁸⁷ is a diverse movement-building alliance organized into different regions, as thematic working groups and a national centre as well based on the principles such as: land for people, economic/indigenous/immigrant/rural and environmental justice, The Right to the City Alliance is composed of community-based organizations, which struggle for urban justice and democracy every day. Like October 2008, the Right to the City includes more than forty member organizations and resource allies in seven states and more than a dozen local jurisdictions, whose regional network of RTTC member organizations and allies meets regularly to collaborate on regional and national issues.

Marcuse (2009) in the framework of right to the city mentions “World Social Forum”’s –from Belem- role in raising debates in forum, in creating forums, coalitions, alliances (a more permanent coalition), or a movement (less organized, less clear in its ultimate goals but very clear in its solidarity and concerned with multiple issues), an assembly (a single, or many single, coming together of multiple groups for varying levels of common thinking, sharing, action). There is a convergence of all groups, coalitions, alliances, movements, assemblies around a common and global set of objectives, which consider capitalism as the common enemy and the right to the city as their common cause for Mayer (2009).

Another critical and influencing point proposed by Souza (2010b) is the position of poor activists from semi-peripheral countries who could not travel around the worlds, as “rooted cosmopolitans” of Sidney Tarrow. For

⁸⁷ For more information, please go to the website: <http://www.righttothecity.org/what-we-do.html>.

instance these activists do not speak languages and could not afford to travel. For Souza (2010a), social movements must continually reinvent themselves in terms of their strategies and tactics, as well as their language, *in order to avoid the colonization of radical slogans and concepts such as the “right to the city” and to cope with new and old challenges*. For instance, de Souza (2010a) in (Atkinson, Lipietz, de Souza, Suri, 2010) underlines that students mostly of middle class, NGOs and academics are the majority of attended people in Social Urban Forum in Rio. Activists from favelas, sem-teto settlements-squatted buildings-had had merely a low percentage, while poor population were not aware of what’s going on. He said that “we need an alternative to the ‘alternative’”, which is colonized by a few academics and activists having connection with political parties and NGOs and trying to guide and control social movements’ organizations.

This also creates the possibility for contestation, alternatives and hopes, and the right to the city claims. ESF members are mainly from the Left, who believe in politics from below (Della Porta in Leontidou 2010). What is critical in this sense, the right to the city expands through the competition and commodification of the cities, which are contested by these movements, over this “non” place as stated by Leontidou (2010), beyond state borders, challenging the commodification created by neo-liberalism since what is proposed by Leontidou is that the scale of the “urban” is enlarged by globalization and urban competition. Not merely by urban sprawl and global transformation but especially entrepreneurialism lead to shape urban livelihoods not only local but also at global level (Leontidou, 2010). The neo-liberal policies and urban renewal are for the needs of global tourism, and of capital beyond the real needs of urban inhabitants (Leontidou 2010). The fight in the streets in France and Greece was for a “right to the city” in material sense for Leontidou (2010) and so, urban social movements emerge with new social movements with the protest against urban commodification, neo-liberalism which leads to the emergence of the entrepreneurial city

where urban regeneration and governance serves global competition and transformations discussed widen the right to the city. In this sense, they're both global and local movements, with "urban" demands on globally conditioned collective consumption. The ESF has a great role for this point since it has posed concretely the 'right to the city' as one of the basic human rights since the global system lead to poverty and unequal development. Leontidou (2010) mentioned the changing demands in cities of Southern Europe from the right to inhabit and private space to the right to democratization of public spaces.

However, this is related for Leontidou (2010) to the maturation of civil societies and Europeanization, cosmopolitan activism of urban social movements, ESF, WSF, cosmopolitan mobilizations.

As explained in the framework of Europe by Leontidou (2006), there are still popular and "*spontaneous*" urban social movements with a demand of *the right to the city in the form of material possessions, housing and land in particular*. This definition of the right to the city and its related claim as emancipatory and radical urban social movements are quite problematic since it implies "possession" with "material interest" and the exchange value of the urban space.

Urban social movements must address broader issues in the interconnected world, with the coexistence of old and new forms of movements, spatialities, types of mobilization as well as organization (Leontidou 2006).

3.3. Engaging Geographies

Engaging geographies, as a seminar organized by a group of radical geographers, aimed a mutual engagement attempt in terms of *a radical change and crack in “geography” and engagement with the “public”*. This is also a creation of *a milieu of mutual learning as well as facilitating the engagement of real subjects*. Beyond being a radical opening in the geography as a “discipline”, it is necessary to remark its pedagogical dimension in raising awareness with an open and critical approach in the courses, as well as via blogs, web pages, and open access to necessary and influential sources. Initiated by Duncan Fuller, engaging geographies are in fact, a return of the radical geography in the socio-political sphere. Starting from “public geographies” of Burawoy, a seminar series whose information is available on <http://engaginggeography.wordpress.com/> were organized to think about, and create spaces and time to take action on the common themes, successes and failures, perceptions on the ends-outputs of the geographical engagements, roles of the geographers (what are the roles including geography-policy relationship and how), stories of engagements, by enduring relationships and collaborative research, outside and beyond the academy and the related expertise. A truly engaged participatory research has its difficulties and limitations in different cases. Starting from formulating and developing research priorities with social movements - articulated and implemented by those “inside” and “outside” of the academy to address the concrete needs and situations of social movement struggles for a better world-, the research could be a public-oriented while carrying out with activists (<http://engaginggeography.wordpress.com/>). Fuller (2008) considers public geographies as flexible, ever-changing and especially engaging entity. He refers to Burawoy and his conceptualisation of “public sociologies” from the questions “knowledge for whom?”, “knowledge for what?” while knowledge production process was treated as “private” and

“professional lives”. But instead, as a mutual education process, public sociology’s meaning and success comes from below, with its communicative, so interactive and engaging characteristics for Fuller (2008). As Kevin Ward (2007) underlined, the activist, participatory and public geographies (rainbow geographies) must be thought together by “the need to bring forth publics” beyond the dualism of academic (“expert researcher”) –activist (“researched community”) to be together through participation (the construction of another publics as participatory geographies in bottom-up) during the collaborative research with and for the individuals as Pain stated (in Ward 2006) and to create change the world with the activity and involvement in a self-evaluation, reflexive process about the positional issues like Chatterton (2006, also see Ward 2007) did in ‘Give up activism’ and change the world in unknown ways: or, learning to walk with others on uncommon ground.

This “active” geography aims also to “construct or contribute to construction of publics”. This could be interpreted as a missionary and also top-down approach even though it is in bottom. Another group, “Participatory Geographies Research Group” a.k.a Fuller Geographies in Royal Geographical Society wrote a “communifesto” –a participatory communiqué- which is published on Antipode (2011). In the critical moment of “uneven geographies”, in precarious but committed working conditions and research preferences, the co-construction of agencies and knowledge with communities and students were the main determinant and remained characteristics. However, they underlined the idea that we have to ask ourselves and to each other what the academy is doing to us while we were struggling to do research, to teach and learn, to work collaboratively and to make our work public and useful, i.e. fulfilling our lives beyond the academy. The group aimed to develop guidelines for creative resistance and constructive reengagement for personal and academic (more exactly

disciplinary) insecurities and solidarities. The tactics are proposed to be open-source list and social media, communication with different colleagues, forums for academic traumas for critical, cooperative and complementary practices.

3.3.1. Radical Geographies

One of the main aims of the study was to reveal the *radical core of the concepts, and philosophical and political connections which were ignored in the literature of urban and social movement theories and in sociology, appropriated partly and selectively by “critical geography”*. I must underline that the elements of the radical thought and the concepts such as the right to the city, autogestion, affinity group, urban commons, active urban citizens, cooperative social relations, non-hierarchical way of organizing, direct action *were not chosen a priori but observed, discussed and learnt from the oppositions as well as radical academic milieus in different parts of the world*. The methodology is another facet of the radical geographies. The thesis has its basis on radical geographies in the framework of action research, urban studies and social movements to analyse social oppositions emphasizing social and political transformation. Most of the urban resistances in Istanbul do not stem from radical ideas; however, radical geographies give both clues to analyse today and to propose some ideas for tomorrow. Activists organize from urban issued in their neighbourhoods and associations, platforms mainly in libertarian ways (as Souza (2013) exemplified with and without intention, Subcommandante Marcos started with an old Marxist-Leninist politics, then Zapatistas became influential with mottos: “to lead by obeying, we learn while we walk, to propose, not impose, to convince, not conquer, to work from below instead of seeking to rise” (Souza 2013, 693)) in un-hierarchical-horizontal and self-managed-autonomist. As homage to Neil Smith, Souza (2013) has written

on the hybridity of Marxist and anarchist geographies by emphasizing the reality of movements in terms of mainly anarchist and radical principles. Souza puts forward that “libertarian turn is already underway” with socio-economic difficulties but also creativity in terms of struggles and experienced even though this period will be marked by crises with state repression according to Souza (2013). Within libertarians and with the Marxist thought, for Souza (Souza 2013), there were and will be divergences and tensions. However, it would form a “unity in diversity” for developing theoretical and political potentialities against same never-ending questions. Souza argued, that the so-called radical turn in sociology and geography was a Marxist one, in 1970s while libertarian thought not considered. However, Souza asked with the sub-title: “Towards a (partial) libertarian turn?” with the return of left-libertarian thinkers such as Reclus, Kropotkin, Castoriadis and Bookchin in urban studies related to changes outside academia such as emergence of social movements in all over the world whose thinkers are mainly left-libertarian (Zapatistas, piqueteros, alter-globalization movements, Brazilian sem-terro and sem-terra movements, movements in Greece, the indignados in Spain) even though Marxists attempt to analyse from this doctrine and so ideas about social and spatial change. It is necessary to talk about briefly about the roots of radical geographies⁸⁸. Souza, in his presentation namely “Towards a libertarian turn?(Re)new(ed) directions in socio-spatial praxis and research” (RGS-IBG Annual International Conference 2013) in the session namely “Demanding the impossible: transgressing the frontiers of geography through anarchism”, made a call to (re)discover the radical turn in geography and sociology, in 1970s, but left-libertarian one, from Reclus to Kropotkin, from Castoriadis

⁸⁸ It is necessary to state that urban opposition in Istanbul of the groups and activists, intellectuals, academics from outside the neighbourhoods represent a radical stance. In fact, this radicalism has two branches which have different characteristics and types of interventions. This became one of the problematic of an allied or an effective urban opposition. So, radical geographies, apart from being the thesis theoretical basis, it represents stances of the groups in the field.

to Bookchin. However, with the important role of libertarian ideas, this turn could remain medium-sized. On the other hand, with worsening socio-economic conditions, and as a reply, social unrest, this turn will have his real place with creative struggles and new socio-political experiments. In this respect, Souza asked in the abstract, about the role of socio-spatial research in terms of contribution to understand this praxis.

Radical geographies' "emergence" could not be thought separately from what was living in the 1960s and the 1970s in terms of social issues and political events and changes (Peet 1977). This could be an attempt to situate geography not only in physical and spatial terms but in socio-political contexts focusing issues like poverty and social inequality, social justice (Peet 2000). In this respect, the foundation of *Antipode* journal by a group of faculty members and students in Clark University, Massachusetts represents an important point for the evolution of radical geography in 1969 (Peet 1977, 2000) aiming to change the focus of the geography for the study of urgent social problems (social relevancy) but also to propose organizational models for the social change (Peet 1977). Some of the other volumes which are important for the radical geography are: *Radical Geography* of Peet in 1977 which mainly elaborates Kropotkin with his ideas on cooperation and geographical imagination in "What Geography Ought to be Used" and Ward on direct action, self-help and dweller control as alternative solutions (shanty towns) to modern housing problems (Cook and Norcup 2012). The book of Blunt and Will and Ferreti in the *Journal of Historical Geography* are crucial for the interlinkages between geography, politics, public education and construction of geographical knowledge (Cook and Norcup 2012, 287). Cook, Parker and Liverpool Polytechnic, the foundation of Liverpool Community Rights and Liverpool John Moores University and *City* journal and the works of Chatterton represent important points of the radical geography and later cooperative type of research, engagement (Cook and Norcup 2012) to direct "social, environmental and

spatial justice within communities for and beyond urban locations” (Cook and Norcup 2012, 288) and new reflections of research methods like participatory action researches (Cook and Norcup 2012) and imagined and knowledgeable spaces like for education, Trapese Collective (Taking Radical Action through Popular Education and Sustainable Everything! and the book namely *Do It Yourself: A Handbook for Changing our World*) (Cook and Norcup 2012, 289) from do-it-yourself movement of 1980s (Blunt and Wills 2000 in Cook and Norcup 2012). Peet (1977) in elaborates the -emergence of- radical geographies via a critique of social sciences and its type of investigation especially at that time, which represents the core of the radical geographies: There is not any objective, value-free and politically neutral science. Moreover social science serves some political purpose and mainly to the prevailing social system by covering social problems by scientific reasons. This is elaborated by Richard Peet the stages of radical geographies (Peet 1977). Marxist and anarchist ideas are introduced into radical geographies as a necessity for the engagement in the construction of a new paradigm for social geography and its analytic constructs (Peet 1977). In the 1970s, radical geographies with action groups and revolutionary theory (Peet 2000, Springer 2012) were mainly from Marxist geographical studies and then anarchist principles, rejecting the authority of the state, underlining the human nature based on cooperative relationships, as well as mutualism, worker self-management, federation, decentralization and self-sufficiency. In 1972, Harvey proposed “territorial social justice” leading to an alternative professional expertise for disadvantaged groups in front of powerful institutions. The importance of the radical thinking is threefold: the philosophy, the methodology and its objectives not only related to geography but also education and life (Peet 1977). Peet makes a historical and ideological definition of radical geography stage by stage. The third and fourth stages after the 1980s represent differences in terms of structural and post structural,

postmodernist approaches in the radical geography (Peet 2000). The fifth stage that is underlined in the thesis is “theoretical and practical reengagement with the great social and cultural issues of our time”. Radical geographies comprise critical standpoints including Marxist and anarchist ones: Ecological, feminist studies could point out inequalities and social problems not only describing and studying as “objects” but engaging into these issues considered as “*real subjects*”. But more crucially, radical geographies must also be elaborated in a relation with engaging geographies in terms of aiming change so praxis. Engaging geographies represent and question the position of the academy/academic and the researcher and the knowledge production with geography’s potential social roles as Massey (2001) elaborated.

Paul Routledge (2009), while defining activism in *The Dictionary of Human Geography* (edited by Derek Gregory, Ron Johnston, Geraldine Pratt, Michael J. Watts, and Sarah Whatmore) as the “practice of political action by individuals or collectives in the form of social movements, non-government organization”, he elaborated it by explaining geography’s political relevance, the awareness of power relations within the research process and its relations with practices of resistances and active involvement and engagement into the studied communities which dates back to 1960s, the advent of radical and Marxist geography. Since the 1990s, for Routledge, another return for critical geography has been lived for the togetherness of discipline and activism, political engagement inside and outside the academy by names like Blomley, Castree aiming to explain and also effect change including social responsibility with an attempt to make a difference “on the ground” including beyond teaching and academic writing like Cumbers and Routledge, Fuller and Kitchen. This is conceptualized by Routledge as “third space”, opening up the field of activism to everybody. Routledge stated that all these are attempts between theory and practice,

praxis for making visible socio-spatial processes which reproduce inequalities.

Kropotkin and Reclus are essential philosophers for the engagement of geographers and anarchist geographies in a very earlier period with an anti-authoritarian and emancipatory approach about social issues (Springer 2012, Springer, Ince, Pickerill et al. 2012, and Breitbart 2012). Springer (2012) made a critique to the distinction and dichotomy which could not be separated between anarchist geographies (theoretical terrain of anarchism as a political philosophy) and geographies of anarchism (anarchism's actually existing practice). Kropotkin with his works like *The Conquest of Bread*, *Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution* and *Fields, Factories, and Workshops* addresses to cooperation, voluntary cooperation and mutual aid by underlining that capitalism is an obstacle to human freedom. Springer (2012) mentioned Kropotkin (mutual aid as voluntary reciprocal exchange of resources for common benefit) and Reclus⁸⁹ (its holism and natural universal geography) for their anti-authoritarian and emancipatory imagination. However, Springer stated that contemporary geographers failed to elaborate the importance of the state and its alternative configurations. He recognizes contributions from Chatterton, Halfacree, Heynen, Ince and Springer with participatory research of Kindon, Pain and Kesby for their interventions into both theory and practice. Now, for Springer (2012) there

⁸⁹“We, “frightful Anarchists” as we are, know only one way of establishing peace and goodwill among women and men—the suppression of privilege and the recognition of right . . . It pleases us not to live if the enjoyments of life are to be for us alone; we protest against our good fortune if we may not share it with others; it is sweeter for us to wander with the wretched and the outcasts than to sit, crowned with roses, at the banquets of the rich. We are weary of these inequalities which make us the enemies of each other; we would put an end to the furies which are ever bringing people into hostile collision, and all of which arise from the bondage of the weak to the strong under the form of slavery, serfdom and service. After so much hatred we long to love each other, and for this reason are we enemies of private property and despisers of the law (Elisée Reclus 1884, 641 in Springer 2012).

is a necessity to include innovative ideas in order to move beyond what exists in terms of hierarchy and legitimacy of the existing system. Anarchist geographies must question spatiality where individuals decide voluntarily and collectively their own direction against /free from the authority by challenging the territorial trap of the state. These geographies must follow the path of Kropotkin who stated that geography must offer a means of abolishing prejudices and creating other feelings valuable for humanity. What will be elaborated as a distinct part later, Springer (2012) referred to Pickerill and Chatterton and autonomous movements in opposition to the state and The Autonomous Geographies Collective so the negation of the false dichotomy between the academy and domain of struggle. For Springer, the future of the geography is based on its solidarity with direct action in the streets. Peter Marshall (2008) in his book namely “Demanding the Impossible”, referring to Reclus, stated that geography is a study of people's changing relationships with each other and with their environment. By looking at the spatial dimension of human life, he concluded that there are natural settings for peoples which are ignored by the artificial boundaries of States. People naturally co-operate when they share similar living conditions. For Marshall (2008), Reclus refused to acknowledge the national status of European States, since they represented the coerced and distorted legal unity of disparate peoples in different environments. While the initiative of the individual is the most important factor in progress, there is a constant oscillation between struggle and equilibrium in society.

Geographers like Kropotkin and Reclus in the 19th century with Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Mikhail Bakunin, with their critique to the property and the state are important thinkers, with their anarchist thought. Important practices and ideas which this thought led are: assertion of peoples' agency to collectively self-manage their affairs, autonomy, solidarity and equality, co-operative movement, tenants' associations, mutual aid groups. So as

Springer, Ince, Pickerill et al. (2012) stated horizontal networks instead of top-down structures like states, parties, or corporations, networks based on principles of decentralized, non-hierarchical consensus democracy are main pillars of the anarchist thought referring to Graeber. *Antipode*, in 1978 included anarchist geographies with papers of Bookchin (“Ecology and revolutionary thought”) and Kropotkin (“What geography ought to be”) which make the relationship between anarchist thought and practice on radical geography visible (Springer, Ince, Pickerill, Brown and Barker 2012). What is critical to take for today from the work of Bakunin⁹⁰ was that the future social organization must be from freely associated grassroots, bottom-up consisted of workers, then associations for the communes; regions, nations for an international and universal federation. It is said that the harmony and universal solidarity of individuals with society can never be attained in practice because their interests, being antagonistic, can never be reconciled. However, until 2000s’ papers (please examine Paul Chatterton’s (2002) study on squatting⁹¹, Pierpaolo Mudu’s (2004) study on Italian social centres resisting neoliberalism), anarchist thought is absent in the journal. Radicalizing geography in fact is an interrogation of what has been believed for the emergence of an emancipatory one. Radical geography led also a new geography education as a critique with alternative models of (creative and non-coercive) learning with student-led liberation (Springer, Ince, Pickerill, Brown and Barker 2012). Chatterton reintroduced in *Antipode* activism and autonomy with Nik Heynen. Recently, Springer and

⁹⁰ For the Paris Commune, Bakunin in his work namely “The Paris Commune and the Idea of the State”, claimed that Paris has initiated a new period for the emancipation of masses and solidarity across state frontiers with his words, where there was a critique and replacement of inequities of the old system and morality with principles of liberty, justice, equality, and fraternity and men dedicated themselves for the Commune-even they have died for it said Bakunin-.

⁹¹ Trapese Collective (2007) defined squatting as the act of reclaiming and occupying abandoned or unoccupied spaces that the squatters do not own, rent or otherwise have permission to use. They also include land squats, shanty towns, homes, social centres, gardens and protest sites into squatting act.

his concept “kaleidoscopic spatialities” which are non-hierarchical relations of affinity between entities to keep autonomous positionalities by interrogating intersections between geographical scholarship and anarchism, by questioning the state, its alternatives and Ince with his theory which criticizes the limited spatial imagination of contemporary geography and its failure to discuss how both capitalism and authority together are replicated, and reinforced via production of space by the state (Springer, Ince, Pickerill, Brown and Barker 2012).

Influenced by the ethical naturalism of Reclus, Murray Bookchin proposed ecological and libertarian thought and he became an important figure for the Left as well movement (Springer, Ince, Pickerill et al. 2012). In the “Limits of the City”, Bookchin (1986) underlines the importance of the focus on the problems created the social system and the necessity to rescue “urban life”, with a “fundamental change” in society which could not be established with a new urban design. Even though we live in a period of growing urbanization fostered by modern city planners and architects, these are “not real cities”, since with this growth, they do lose their specificity in relation with its functions of community and solidarity and as the proper arena for social and cultural development and, for the emergence of a common humanity. Decentralized, face-to-face communities lead to self-actualization and public space for the real and active citizens in anarchist society which is diversified, balanced and harmonious. Bookchin stated that his concern is not with the city as a “space for class conflict” but with different cultures which are the agrarian and the urban, the traditional and the modern, the collective and the economic, while the city as a distinct human and cultural terrain, a “world in its own right going beyond familial, tribal, economic, social ties to establish a uniquely political universe of its own” (Bookchin 1986, 6), the realm of the citizen. It is necessary to add that the citizen at

that point is “another citizen” which must not be considered in the existing system in relation with the state.

Bookchin argued in “Towards an Ecological Society”: “The power of utopian thinking, properly conceived as a vision of a new society that questions all presuppositions of the present-day society, is its inherent ability to see the future in terms of radically new forms and values” (Bookchin 1980, 280). Bookchin (1986) stated he did not interpret the past but does propose *a formulation for the future*. He elaborated the question further the antithesis between town and country in that cultural factors could create municipal solidarity over and beyond class factors with the role of neighbourhood with *collectivist ties and new municipal confederations* alternative to nation-states (Bookchin 1986). Here there is a critique of the capitalist system which prevail the city based on rivalry, competition instead of cooperation and solidarity (Bookchin 1986, 15), so there is only one way to deal with this system: it is to remove it. What was underlined by Bookchin is to realize trans-class characteristic from the example of Madrid Citizen Movement and civic solidarity for the need for community and spatial amenities evolving toward political empowerment, local autonomy by creating new spatial/social spaces (urban gardens, food cooperatives, and centres for the homeless). So neighbourhoods spontaneously organize their events along with citizen participation in decision-making processes, revival and innovation of self-empowering institutions like rent strikes, occupation of abandoned buildings –squatting-, “expropriation” (original marks of Bookchin) of space for parks and plazas (Bookchin 1986, 23).

The important arguments which are underlined are: Urbanization threatens the city as well as the countryside beyond the “antithesis” between them and the community; urbanization must be distinguished from citification (Bookchin 1986, 25, 168). Yet libertarian municipalism is proposed to be the mere viable both social and political alternative (Bookchin 1986, 25).

Bookchin reminds also that while medieval commune was using organic term brother to express solidarity and community with a high level of political participation in urban affairs on antagonistic and diverse social interests, during the French Revolution, it has started to use citizen for national solidarity. The rise of the bourgeois city was a dissolution of the civic life and fraternal, solidarity relations changing into commodity relations characterised by competition. Referring to the enclosure movement which created dispossession, eviction in the countryside, migration into and poverty in the cities (Bookchin 1986, 81), led also to social problems. The limits of the city would emerge also for Bookchin (1986, 88) from the expansion of exchange relations. These relations are so insinuated into every sphere of everyday life in physical and social terms. City planning in this term is not a remedy but plays an exacerbating role (Bookchin 1986, 126). Bookchin told about an alternative planning to create “liberated space” in the sixties in United States (Bookchin 1986, 153): Ecological countercultural movement propose alternatives to devastating, dehumanizing urban “revitalization” and “rehabilitation” projects. The emphasis on personal relations, which means that freedom and love are translated into everyday life for the full realization of the society based on self-activity and self-management where individual have its control over daily life (Bookchin 1986, 151). A new life⁹² is intended to be proposed spatially and socially. The formation process people’s assemblies from city

⁹² This is characterised by economic independence from commodity relations to get basic human needs resisting against the system, by supporting each other as well as overcoming difficulties of atomized and fragmented living (Bookchin 1986, 154). This is a vision for an eco-community integrating town and country, humanity and nature, individuality and community for the harmonization and fulfilment of humanity’s creativity (162). The libertarian municipalism in this respect offers a framework for a libertarian society (166) based on non-hierarchy, unity of diversity, self-formation, self-management, mutual and complimentary aid, underlining that citizens make a city reminding the distinction that he always makes between urbanization and citification (Bookchin 1986, 169). In this respect, he proposes another politics which must be based on self-management which makes man in real sense, “re-embodiment of masses into richly articulated assemblies, the formation of a body politic in an arena of discourse, shared rationality, free expression, radically democratic modes of decision-making” (Bookchin 1986, 169).

neighbourhoods leads to the self-formation of citizens so politics serves education and character formation. Comparing with the factory in Marxist ideology, the city, the realm of freedom which removed the limits to human development is dying with the dissolution of real municipalities by urbanization leading in regression in societal life (Bookchin 1986, 176-177).

From the similar line, Bookchin (1995) in “From urbanization to cities” with the aim to propose a new politics (1995, 1), proposes a confederal municipalist politics with a local citizen-oriented power so active citizenry (referring again to Rousseau who said that citizens make city, 37) in villages, cities and confederations via popular assemblies and neighbourhood councils. However, this localist proposition is not “self-sufficiency” and “independency”. For the localism in real sense, the citizen must claim his power over everyday life and its direct democracy and libertarian municipalism/communalism, not in “civil society”. Citizenship is a process with the self-formation to be active participants in the management of the communities (Bookchin 1995, 9). To underline that “urbanity” does not mean “city”, Bookchin proposed “urbanization against cities” from the antagonism between country and city as well as their ravages are related to the urbanization (16-17). The city from these conceptualisations is a “new ethical union”, a humanly personal empowerment, a participatory and ecological decision-making process within a civic notion of community (60). There is a new vision of a new political culture and “new revival of citizenship” with “a new type of economy” against the growing centralization (237). In this respect, the critical aspect is that the individuality / autonomous individuality is not a bourgeois egoism and the individuality is related on community support system, solidarity and community (with interdependence among communities) even for creativity and self-development so freedom for a creative collectivity (226). Bookchin proposed participation as a bourgeois trick which in fact does mean “participating in their own misery” (234).

However, the confederal municipalism has an aim to reclaim the public sphere for the realization of the authentic citizenship not only in political but also for a radical and new configuration of society with the development of a new ethics based on sharing and cooperation (260): This is an “effort to transform and democratize city governments” through popular assemblies along confederal lines; consequently, from the neighbourhood rises the genuine democracy based on a new politics (Bookchin 1995, 268).

In the paper namely the Hidden History of Housing, Ward (2005) specified that the history of housing mainly from England is based on “local and popular initiative, self-help and mutual aid” where most of the world’s population lives in these types of houses built by themselves or families, by referring to the Enclosures of the common fields, common lands and wastes lived in English history as a process over centuries. For “a different and libertarian way of stating the problem” (Ward 1976, 8) to change the terms of the debate and the perception of the issue, Ward in “Housing an anarchist approach”, referring to John Turner, mentioned “dweller control” which is based on the same principle of autonomy and responsibility in industry, education, social welfare and every other sphere of human activity (8) . Ward argued: “When dwellers control the major decisions and are free to make their own contribution to the design, construction or management of their housing, both the process and the environment produced stimulate individual and social wellbeing. When people have neither control over, nor responsibility for key decisions in the housing process, on the other hand, dwelling environments may instead become a barrier to personal fulfilment and a burden on the economy.” (Ward 1976, 8) Referring to Giancarlo de Carlo, Ward quotes a definition for home: “The home is an organism in direct relationship to man. It is his external environment, his affirmation in space. Thus the home cannot have any relationship to the state which recognises man not as individual but as a number...” (Ward 1976, 9). For anarchist approach and critique to town planning after examining

alternatives such as building co-operatives, housing strikes, Ward stated that Carlo supported the idea that the plan is necessarily related to authority so detrimental. *Another aspect is that the social life cannot be planned according to the “plan”. What must be aimed must be the liberation of man by himself and the authority could not be a liberating agent.* He added: the point about urban planning “as a revolutionary weapon” even if it could be independent from the authority that it met with needs and real problems of social life. For Ward, names like Geddes, Kropotkin and Reclus are important for the popular and participatory planning and approach to housing. To achieve this, the planning initiative must be passed from the bureaucrat to the citizen. Ward quotes: “the task of town-planning” is not to coerce people into new places against their associations, wishes and interests, as we find bad schemes trying to do. Instead its task is to find the right places for each sort of people; places where they will really flourish. To give people in fact the same care that we give when transplanting flowers, instead of harsh evictions and arbitrary instructions to 'move on', delivered in the manner of officious amateur policemen.” From Bookchin, Ward argued that the aim of the “alternative plan” must be the replacement of the hierarchical space by liberated space (93). Another “concept” which could be influential is “*Temporary autonomous zones*” of Hakim Bey, for Ward –referring to Bookchin-TAZ: The Temporary Autonomous Zone and the author’s real name is Peter Lamborn Wilson, Hakim Bey stated (Ward referring to Bookchin’s quotation from Hakim Bey page 1) “The TAZ is like an uprising which does not engage directly with the state, a guerrilla operation which liberates an area (of land, of time, of imagination) and then dissolves itself, to re-form elsewhere / else when, before the state can crush it.”

However, what is more meaningful for my study as well as geography is that the role of space in radical transformation (Brietbart 2012, 1580).

Teaching (or radical pedagogy as the core of the anarchism's revolutionary project of Colin Ward as Breitbart (2012) proposed as one of the multiple agendas for the future of Anarchist Geography) also is part of the *emancipation project* to replace nationalism and racism of geography by the harmonies of nature (Springer 2012). These practices led to critical studies on the built environment and housing as Ward did (Breitbart 2012, 1583). These studies are not generally published but written for a more general audience (Breitbart 2012, 1583). Another point which must be added is that *anarchism was not a –mere-philosophy, theory for these people but a way of life as Breitbart (2012, 1581) underlined of how to conduct relationships with others, to create and expand arenas of freedom and collaboration all life long.* Anarchist/radical geographies are significant for this study since as Breitbart (2012) suggested, some areas must be underlined and defended in terms of theory, practice and methodology: radicalizing pedagogy with engaged learning, use of space for resistance for social change and the incubation of alternative social structures –such as participatory planning against state-centred planning and decision making processes, the decentralization of decision-making for the reclamation of public space by residents- with the dissemination of new ideas with collaboration for a public scholarship and spatial/social practices (Breitbart 2012, 1587). Reclus, besides “social geography” naming, liberationist ideas in *The Earth/planet and its Inhabitants: the Universal Geography*, proposed a holistic view between humanity and the Earth with his social and ecological ethics and his life practices challenging all forms of domination. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon in “What is Property? Or, An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government” made a critique about private property which is in fact institutionally sanctioned theft from the commons, against the mutualism, solidarity and wish to be free. For Springer (2012), Bakunin mainly dealt with the establishment of a free society based on egalitarianism and mutual interaction with alternative forms of non-hierarchical

organization for humanity. Murray Bookchin with environmentalism of Reclus proposed social ecology and libertarian views influencing movements mainly with his book namely Post-Scarcity Anarchism. Mark Purcell (2013) argued that radical geography should hold together approaches in tension such as anarchist/autonomist approaches with other radical approaches from Laclau and Mouffe to Deleuze and Guattari.

The publication of “Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography” “was another turning point which reintroduced anarchist ideas into radical geography, while adding that anarchism played a significant role not only at the beginning (Breitbart 2012). Springer refers to Peet as founding editor of Antipode, inspired by Kropotkin⁹³ who proposes the anarcho-communism for the point of departure/revival or radical geography and decentralization to realize geography of human liberation. From the 1990s, global anti-globalization movements and Do It Yourself culture resulted in the togetherness of radical geographies with practice and engagement beyond the academy from solidarity and mutual aid which are the main anarchist principles (Springer 2012). The Trapeze Collective represents also a turning point in the radical geography with its emphasis on do-it-yourself ethos of autonomy, direct action, non-commodification, mutual aid new forms of organizations and production of knowledge inspired by Hakim Bey (temporary autonomous zones against formal structure of hierarchical control) related with our everyday lives like Chatterton started in 2002 from squatting as taking control of our lives (2012a, 2012b). For Bookchin (1999), today anarchism is an ambiance and within this ambiance and by

⁹³In the essay namely “What geography ought to be”, Peter Kropotkin (1885) said: “ The teaching of geography must thus pursue a treble aim. It must awaken in our children the taste for natural science altogether it must teach them that all men are brethren, whatever be their nationality; and it must teach them to respect the 'lower races'. Thus understood, the reform of geographical education is immense; it is nothing less than a complete reform of the whole system of teaching in our schools.”

creating “temporary autonomous zones”, there is a single moment of illusion for the freedom (125).

Bookchin, in this respect, refers to “autonomy” but in a Stirnerist interpretation. So autonomy is reduced into an individual’s and even bourgeois right to do as he or she pleases, which is thought to be independent of cultural factors (Bookchin 1999, 125). He states that he prefers the word “freedom”, which refers to the full development of individuality on the communal social structure and real collectivity as well as unique individuality (126). For autonomist Marxist and radical geography, apart from Antipode, the Commoner is also an important source of anarchist and autonomist thought and discussion mainly on the Commons (Clough and Blumberg 2012). Clough and Blumberg (2012) proposed “anarchisms” with in their article and underlined the importance of prefigurative politics, by “attempting to form “the structure of the new society within the shell of the old” based on principles such as mutual aid – of Kropotkin- , autonomy, solidarity, voluntary association, self-organization, self-determination (Clough and Blumberg 2012, 337-338). Another point is that affinity politics must provide a supportive common ground within as well as between groups from similarities recognizing subjectivities which extends the scale (338). Left politics must start from liberty, autonomy and the common to “turn the present (political) crisis into emancipatory movements” (348). We must the journal ACME as well as City journal creating an autonomous and radical space for theory and practice. While confronting critical and radical geographies and asking whether or not they are synonyms, Castree (2000) gives other dates of turning points for the radical geography like the AAG meeting in Ann Arbor in 1969 with the early Antipode group at Clark University and the Detroit Geographical Expedition. Castree asserted that radical geography remaining in a Left geographical community in 1970s, critical geographies was an

umbrella term covering antiracist, disabled, feminist, green, Marxist, postmodern, post-structural, postcolonial, and queer geographies in an interdisciplinary and broad base. What distinguishes radical geography from the critical one is that the professionalization and real world problems, the separation of the academy and activism. At the end of the 1990s, geographers such as Blomley, Peck and Tickell made a call from this line for the personal and political re-engagement of critical geographers with the world as Castree (2000) stated. This is also a call for the higher education with the academic engagement as activism outside and within.

Human and radical geography is not only a discipline, composed of structured theories. But instead, most of the urban sociological and political theories and practices are based on the “human geography”. Simon Springer (2013) in his text namely “Human Geography without Hierarchy” posits his idea upon the misconceptions about *anarchism (its non-hierarchical, horizontal activities and prefigurative politics) and its differences/influences on contemporary geographical thought*. What was significantly important is that scale –with over-emphasis on the word neoliberalism- would bring hierarchies and the human geography without hierarchy could be possible (conceptualized as “traction”) when the scale is rejected for welcoming the flat ontology, with a prefigurative political imagination and radical horizon. Springer, mainly from Rebel Cities of Harvey-while to rebel is to rise up and oppose authority- dealt with “hierarchical forms of organization”, “horizontality” and “non-central movement” since the book proposed the politics of authority rather than new politics of possibilities, rhizomic alternatives to life, starting from the level of everyday. Springer (2013) underlines that the “future is now”: From autonomist Marxists to anarchists namely Hardt and Negri, Holloway and Federici⁹⁴, as referred in Chatterton,

⁹⁴ Federici’s analysis (2004), by criticizing the “tragedy of the commons” of Hardin, represents a contribution to the feminist perspectives –referring to Vandana Shiva and showing the women presence in the workforce and struggles in history- and the history of

Cumbers and Russell et al., there are new concepts of the new possibilities (of walking) “here and now” (because the tomorrow could not come) beyond the state without taking power as Holloway claimed, which are assemblages, agency and resistance. In this respect, prefiguration is critical in creating a new society in the shell of the old (Ince in Springer 2013), from the Ghandian motto: being the change that we wish to see in the world. Beyond the immediacy of place and scale –a dynamic entity of strategic actions and struggle as Swyngedouw stated- debate, these are our actions refer to geographies. Ince (2012) proposes an alternative spatiality to prefiguration, while territory is considered as a processual and contested product of social relations (Springer 2013). Springer (2013), as I did elaborated before, referred to Peet who gave emphasis to Kropotkin, for the “socio-spatiality of decentralization as the imperative to the geography of human liberation”. Springer stated that even though Harvey referred to Bookchin and libertarian municipalism, he returns to the “enforced” and “policed” centralization and regulation. Instead, there are attempts and conceptualizations like Routledge, Cumbers did, “convergence spaces” and “global justice networks”, organized through networks of affinity via the rhizome of processual direct action”, referring to Day. As Springer (2013) did, we could propose a human geography without hierarchy, the geography of direct action which is the spontaneous liberation of a particular area, leading to the temporary autonomous zone (TAZ) of Hakim Bey driven by action, being and rebellion. Not the geography, but the delusion of scale and thinking the earth as an integral system (referring to Reclus) must challenge hierarchy and authority, which is only possible by a new discursive formation. Harvey stated that he does not reject ethics and social justice and the right (to the city) as the area of struggle; however, he underlined that he did reject a de-politicized geography with any mention of class (Springer

struggles on the commons dating back to the peasants’ revolts in the *Middle Ages* contrary to “history”: From the Nigeria case, Federici underlined that the enclosure is not only of communal lands but also of social relations.

2013). Since we have hierarchy in terms of class (in the market place), family, educational system, community, sexism, ethnic oppression as Bookchin mentioned (Springer 2013).

Autonomy, literally self-management and self-government, from an anarchist perspective and principles such as mutual aid and voluntary association, is pending social relationship produced through individual as well as collective self-governing activity (Ince 2014). Autonomy is a theorization of spatiality incorporating political perspectives and ideas but in fact a powerful means of building creation and resistance between the cracks in state and capital for Ince (2014). Anthony Ince (2014), about the radical/anarchist geography stated that the presence of space is primary condition in all human and non-human relationships and processes and anarchism, as a mode of political analysis and action provides the tools to understand these in a radical manner. The most influential anarchists of 19th century were the most influential geographers like Reclus and Kropotkin; however, academic geography got into contact in a limited way. This prevails throughout the 1980s and the 1990s with the dominance of Marxist political economy and later poststructuralism for Ince (2014). This is changing due to the anarchist geographers (Ince 2014). As Ince exemplified, in political (anti-roads, environmental direct action) and everyday life and counter culture (radical and experimental –guerilla- arts), anarchist ideas were always present and prominent. The return of anarchist ideas in geographies of resistance, spatialities of the emergent movements, camps, protests dates back early the 2000s after the emergence of “Reclaim the Streets” with the movements’ horizontalist and networked characteristics (Ince 2014). For Ince (2014), the paper inaugurating autonomous geographies challenging the dichotomies of global-bad, local-good of Chatterton and Pickerill as a manifesto of a new geographical imagination back into global justice movements-geographies of the global resistance networks with Routledge’s notions such as terrains of resistance and

convergence space that I referred and explained in the thesis-, and as a deeper exploration of the relevance of anarchist ideas to geographical analysis, methodology and pedagogy in a prefigurative sense a radical construction of a future world that we want to create. Geographers have developed ideas on the ways of coordination, organization and communication of social movements, ways of self-management in geographical contexts, horizontalist organizations/networks and hierarchical structures, autonomous forms of solidarity, which leads to militant pedagogy as well as “research methods” in the academy so explorations of alternative modes of organizing and relating (Ince 2014). However, apart from radical democracy, collective pedagogy and affective structures of collective trust and solidarity, it is necessary to focus more on voluntary associations, co-operatives, everyday grassroots relationships of trust and support without any reference to political ideologies; as a result, new publics and spatialities will emerge from this perspective vis-à-vis the state. In the preface of his book, John Clark⁹⁵ stated that the main goal is self-realization and self-management which require an anarchist critique of all kinds of domination. The “anarchist moment” was critical for the abolition of all forms of domination, which necessitates both theory and practice with a new vision of self, society, and nature (Clark 1984). Bookchin’s argument could be an appropriate one with the libertarian and communitarian movement which finds its roots in affinity groups as a permanent, intimate, decentralized community. For Bookchin (in Clark 1984, 207), the ecological society –libertarian communitarian society is formed from these affinity

⁹⁵For Clark (1984), anarchism must contain a view of an ideal, non-coercive, non-authoritarian society, a criticism of existing society and institutions with the anti-authoritarian ideal, an idea on human nature with the hope for the ideal, and a strategy for change involving alternatives (127). The anarchist programme for change must include for Clark (1984, 130) involves political decentralization, direct democratic decision-making, self-management for workplaces-we can include living places-, freedom of thought and expression, libertarian education, participatory communication media.

groups as cellular tissues. Since it is based on unity-in-diversity, mutual interdependence, non-domination.

To put it differently, underlining the importance of the leading actors, the presence of intellectuals in terms of “affinity groups” formation process will be one of the main points in the study. My attempt to use “affinity group” could be evaluated within “theoretical-philosophical analyses of the broader field of social change, and that attempt to assess the viability of different logics of struggle in particular socio-historical circumstances” as stated by Day (2004, 717), rather than a “contribution to the functionalist debates on social movement theory, which utilize concepts such as ‘collective action’, ‘resource mobilization’ and ‘rational choice’” Day (2004, 717).

3.3.2. Autonomous Geographies

“Autonomous geographies”⁹⁶ are conceptualised by Pickerill and Chatterton (2006) as “spaces where people desire to constitute non-capitalist, egalitarian and solidaristic forms of political, social and economic organization” through a combination of resistance and creation; it is a part of vocabulary of urgency, hope and inspiration. It also could be considered as a call to action for multiple crises, i.e. as multiscalar strategies. In the framework of multiscalar -of networked and connected, overlapping spaces, broader transnational networks in extra-local connections- and multifaceted activism, autonomous spaces and alternatives processes which could be exemplified as social canters, housing cooperatives led to the importance of the role of everyday practices in the movements’ constitutions for combining theory and practice. Yet autonomous geographies are cumulative and shared experiences in terms of being “part of a web of stories, lessons shared across the world and other periods of history, inspiring people to act

⁹⁶ For further information: <http://criticalspatialpractice.blogspot.com/2008/10/autonomous-geographies.html>

for themselves in their locality”. It is necessary to understand this “locality” with the potential for multiscalar change. They propose to use this concept “to understand alter-globalization movements as a progressive politics, not grounded through a particular spatial strategy but as a *relational and contextual entity drawing together resistance, creation and solidarity across multiple times and places.*” (Pickerill and Chatterton 2006, 731)

Chatterton (2005) explains the idea of autonomous geographies at three overlapping levels which are the territorial, *through the emergence of networked autonomous neighbourhoods which are selectively open and closed to translocal links*; the material, in terms of the development of a solidarity economy where immediate needs are met and work is redefined; and the social, where collective action and daily practice helps constitute more collective, autonomous forms of social interactions. On the web site of the Autonomous Geographies⁹⁷, Chatterton and Hodkinson, as they did in the articles that I refer to, explain from the Greek origin autos-nomos, autonomy which means “legislate for oneself” with a rejection of capitalism. From this point, autonomous geographies are spaces emerged from resistance and creation for the desire for another type of organization, non-capitalist, collective forms of politics, identity and citizenship by challenging dominant system and its norms. This includes also the rejection of the hierarchy and related power relations but also its replacement by the mutual aid and solidarity instead of competition and independence fostered by the existing capitalist system. Autonomous Geographies means also a commitment to direct action and radical change rather than policy related reforms, creative forms of resistance mainly from /of everyday life independent of parties and unions. Rather than aiming to seize power it is an attempt for “changing the world without taking power”. It implies the

⁹⁷For the information, please visit the following website:
<http://www.autonomousgeographies.org/faqs#three>

questions of scale from the local in interaction with bigger issues at national, regional and global levels.

Referring to Castoriadis (1991), Chatterton (2012) noted the individuals' capacity to manage their own affairs only makes sense when the collective has an ability to manage and distribute power equally. Castoriadis, in the studies namely *Philosophy, Politics, Autonomy Essays in Political Philosophy* (Castoriadis 1991), which exposes the autonomy of human beings with the autonomy of society and of individuals inseparably, related to praxis and the *Imaginary Institution of Society* (Castoriadis 1998), for its social dimension. Chatterton (2010) explained: "I went there to learn what autonomy means in practice, how it was being used as an urgent survival strategy for those on the frontline, or breadline, of neoliberal restructuring, how it was teaching us to manage our lives collectively, and how it could rebuild a common from which we could gather strength, establish alternatives, find hope—and each other." (Chatterton 2010). Referring to Castoriadis and the origin of autonomy as a desire of self-legislation and self-management, Chatterton (2010) stated that it is something that is fought for and a new political space of the common in terms of campaigns and new political place projects. The autonomy is both conceptually reflexive and practically strategic to develop alternatives for spatial practices while bounded, related with each other. The common is a "common and complex political ecology" but more essentially. It is also a socio-spatial practice of struggling for a better world. It is in these struggles, it is a key tactical repertoire of creating cracks as Holloway (2002) puts, against spatial "enclosure" which became apparent in terms of capital accumulation processes from appropriation and dispossession of land, resources and life worlds as emphasized by Harvey. Autonomous politics could bring out new organizational self-organisation practices based on consensus, affinity and direct action and democracy with a critique of bureaucratic organising

methods. In terms of “impossibility” of change and becoming, Chatterton (2010b, 627) underlined that there is an urgent need for new political imaginaries and impossible new directions and the political act is the art of the impossible. Chatterton (2008a) proposed that the term being anti-capitalist must be defined by a real desire to make some kind of politics beyond, and against capitalism “right here and now” rather than waiting for some hoped for revolution the future, which keeps people involved and inspired. Social centres could create political projects grounded in their communities to build strong relationships between people through political strategies which attempt to break outside the activist ghetto (Chatterton 2008). Chatterton (2010c) stated: “Anti-capitalist politics is not just about developing spaces, nor about bread-and-butter issues such as housing struggles or ecological damage, although of course these are crucial. They also concern the hidden work of rebuilding social relationships around emotional response, solidarity and trust and shared practices of working and learning together. It is about the desire to develop, as Pulido (2003) suggests, the inner life of politics—our basic emotional connections and responses to one another. This is a political process that recognises and responds to desire and emotions and embraces carnival, humour and the everyday potential of subversive behaviour within consumer society (Jasper 1998, Flesher-Fominaya 2007). The kinds of anti-capitalist currents that run through social centres attempt to break out of the nostalgia for traditional, comfortable ways of Left politics (Duncombe 2007).” (Chatterton 2010c, 1211-1212). Chatterton added: “This kind of collective self-management and the common ownership and management of spaces and services are devices to erode the capitalist logic of accumulation for individual gain. They urge us to recreate and reclaim ‘the commons’ in its many forms: material, discursive, knowledge-based, resources (see de Angelis 2007, Midnight Notes, 1991 in Chatterton 2010c, 1213)

The text namely “Beyond Scholar Activism: Making Strategic Interventions Inside and Outside the Neoliberal University”, Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill (2010, 251) defined Autonomous Geographies as virtual, local and translocal spaces where there is a questioning of the laws and social norms of society and a creative desire to constitute non-capitalist, collective forms of politics, identity, and citizenship as they defined by Pickerill and Chatterton (2006) by activists in the everyday by living in capitalist, individualized and consumption-oriented cities (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 251). So autonomous politics can be understood as the reconciliation of research with anti-capitalist direct action in which research is participatory and interactive so planned by the participants and later active in the development and dissemination of the research (251). It is also a process of self-evaluation as well as an inner and collective academic and activist trip. With the motivation to work with the social movements that they support and belong to (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 246), The Autonomous Geographies Collective, Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill (2010) stated: “We need to reject the false distinction between academia and wider society in conceptualisations of valid sites of struggle and knowledge production, and to find ways of research and engage collectively and politically, rather than individually.” (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 243)

This is an important point since the main attitude was to put distance between the activism and teaching or to join rarely in the struggle of the people on whom they do research as Kitchin and Hubbard proposed (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 247). However, from the late 1990s, scholars like Pickerill, North, Chatterton, Fenton attempted to fuse politics and academic research for the “desire of social change” with its obstacles and challenges (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 248). The participatory research could be held on this path with its aim much more based on practice, rather than knowledge production. Participatory

Action Research is distinguished with the aims of multiple participation, practical results and changes and related knowledge production. Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill (2010) questioned the position of academics in the Ivory Tower of neoliberal universities which are like sausage factories by referring to Castree (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 250) and the alienation in this respect. This represents a very significant point all over the world especially in terms of social sciences. Another important point is that research priorities are not decided collectively for the strategic wider issues to achieve radical change with social movements but instead realized by pursuing their own field interest. Solidarity Action Research of useful researchers and activists, with their three case studies namely social centres, sustainable and autonomous living development and enclosure as housing privatization and related resistance/community activism in the city of Leeds which has its roots in the Italian (Panzieri and Tronti) and Argentinian (Colectivo Situaciones) autonomist struggles is mainly characterized by an intentional practice for “working horizontally and in solidarity with groups in struggle, co-producing outputs relevant to the resistance and not to academia, funders of the careers” (Chatterton, Hodkinson, and Pickerill 2010, 252). They referred to Conti who stated: “The goal of the research is not the interpretation of the world, but the organization of the transformation.” Especially the housing privatization example is related to the thesis case study. It represents an important example since their project became a struggle to save public housing from privatization for “more collective, non-capitalist spaces from enclosure” with autonomous politics which is a self-organized resistance among working class communities” (Chatterton, Hodkinson, and Pickerill 2010, 259). This became “Save Little London” campaign and later on association namely “Little London Tenants and Residents Associations” with slogan “Improve not Remove, Yes to Decent Homes, No to Privatization”. They helped to organize but mainly helping in press release and media coverage with technical support. In time,

as they have stated in the work, they became campaign members who introduce new ideas from their activist experience and facilitate meeting. This position evolved, changed in time with the needs of the Association. Even though the campaign had disappeared, this triggered another campaign which is a city-wide housing campaign namely “Hands Off Our Homes”, gathering many tenants and residents of urban regeneration areas of Leeds and trade unionists and academicians. However, this project had, with their own words, “to negotiate a messy complexity of ideas, emotions, ethics, boundaries, positions, uncertainties and inconsistencies in terms of methodology as well as engagements” (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 260) by questioning “what working collectively means within the dynamics and tensions of different positions including academic ones and mainly themselves between the “job” and the “struggle””.

With the aim to create a better world for all with collective goals of the commons, their seven principles as a critique of the academy could be the guide to understand, to expand as well as to implement in our researches so our lives in political context: in and against the neo-liberal university, to recognise the emancipatory potential of the education, research and also publication, create a global knowledge commons with open source, copy left and putting resources online, be aware of your action research footprint, organize ourselves into collective action networks, be the change what you want to see by being prefigurative and practice in everyday life, make collective strategic interventions which are accountable and relevant to social movements with the priority on what research is needed and what solutions we are seeking. The three directions that they show for the scholar activism: to overcome the distinction between the academia and the society in terms of struggle and knowledge production, to recognize that the university also is an important arena for struggle, to approach action research as collective and political one (Chatterton, Hodkinson and Pickerill 2010, 266).

Springer (2012) referring to Pickerill and Chatterton (2006) related “autonomous geographies” with collectivist, noncapitalist and anti-normative forms of solidarity and affinity. Springer (2012) refers to Routledge and the concept of “convergence space” for grassroots activists who come together through networks of multiscalar political action and a relational ethics of struggle through direct action in non-hierarchical and non-institutional forms of political engagement for the wider radicalization of democracy.

It is essential to cite Holloway (2010) and his more-than-inspiring thoughts about autonomy, geography and resistance. Holloway proposes “autonomies” with the negation and cracks, which are not autonomies but “pushes” in that direction. The crack for Holloway is a rupture against the logic of capitalist cohesion in the framework of the theory of breaking-and-creating and alternative doing, revolts of doing as from of resistance (Holloway 2002a) which represents a rupture with the dominant logic by opposing capital by acting in a different way. Fissures and cracks are done in a struggle of human creativity based on mutual recognition of human dignity⁹⁸ in-against-beyond labour started from its abstraction of labour. In the book of *Change the World without Taking Power*, Holloway (2002a, 86) starts from the scream of “we” who have negative experience of capitalist society, from the oppression and exploitation. The word is not the beginning but the scream of hope and related negation –of what exists- is. Doing, which is “inherently social” as it is stated above refers also to movement. What is important is that Holloway considers all types of struggle as

⁹⁸Mathivet (2010) stated that the right to the city is a possibility of building a city in which people can live with dignity, as parts of the structure where equal distribution of all kinds of resources is possible meeting human needs. She also points out referring to Harvey, it’s not the right to what already exists in the city but to transform it into something radically different. It’s based on a dynamic of process and conquest in which social movements are driving for its achievement. She elaborated World Charter on the right to the city and resumed as the right to habitat for a network of social relations, to social cohesion and collective construction of the city, to live in dignity in the city, to co-existence; to access and influence the municipal government and to equal rights.

important (Holloway 2002a, 96) which make visible what is invisible, exploitation and oppression. Anti-power which is dignity is another important concept. The very core of this radical view could be resumed from what he underlined and quoted from Marx: “But there is no “them” (that we are against), there is only us. We are the only reality, the only creative force. There is nothing but us, nothing but our negativity” (Holloway 2002a, 108). The struggle is constant to get away from capital, for space and autonomy (Holloway 2002a, 116). Holloway stated that this struggle is not limited to place of employment but struggle for health and housing, environmental struggles and any attempts for anti-capitalist forms of living and eating, which are –attempts of autonomy of- “doing” (Holloway 2002, 116). In the Commoner, Holloway (2002b) underlined the scream which is the beginning of all, must be negative. The aim of understanding and theorising the world is to conceptualise it “negatively” as a moment of practice, which is a part of the struggle to change the world. The aim for the radical change is not taking power but as the dissolution of power. Doing is part of this action. For Holloway, revolution cannot be understood as an answer, but as a question, as an exploration in the creation of dignity. Doing must integrate with doing of others, past, present or future. Holloway quotes from Foucault: “The fear of ridicule or the bitterness of history prevents most of us from bringing together revolution and happiness...revolution and pleasure.” At this point, it is necessary to reveal rage, hope and dignity as the rejection of disillusionment. Another important aspect underlined by Holloway is the struggle for humanity, not only partially as an indigenous one (Holloway 2002b, 156). This hope is the hope for new forms of struggle, new ways of doing politics and being political, by walking and constructing our own path (156). From Zapatistas, by reinventing the revolution, Holloway stated: “We walk, not in order to arrive at a promised land, but because the walking itself is the revolution.” (Holloway 2002b, 159-160) De Angelis (2005) referred to Holloway, stated

that our scream, who are caught in the spider's web is the scream of a refusal to accept, from the dream of freeing ourselves, alienated subjects, from the actually existing conditions and our presence for the conceivably existing ones. For Mason (2013), it would last as a long-term commitment for this collective activism by developing militant particularisms as convergence spaces of global justice networks as conceptualized by Subcommandante Marcos, Routledge (as "a heterogeneous affinity", "a world made of many worlds" (Marcos 2001, 10) between various social formations, such as social movements (Routledge 2003, 345), "sufficient common ground to generate a politics of solidarity" *and comprised of contested social relations*, because of the very different militant particularisms that are articulated by participant movements' (Routledge 2003, 345 – 346) and Cumbers to make collective strategic interventions useful and relevant to social movements. Mason (2013) mentions Autonomous Geographies Collective (AGC) taxonomy as academic-activist and participatory research which has an aim of co-production of knowledge and prefigurative participatory politics for practical outcomes, which is open to accusation of exploitation and policy research. Referring to Cumbers, Mason (2013) refers to the formation of mutual solidarities which is not a smooth process since it has antagonisms from differences as well as agreements and political determinations'. In this respect, convergence spaces of Routledge refer to "movements need to develop a politics of solidarity capable of reaching across space without abandoning their militant particularist base(s)" and "working models are developed 'for a new form of society that will benefit all humanity' (Routledge 2003, 337) to develop a politics of solidarity. In this respect, we have to remember Mason's words about the distinction between place-based, but not necessarily place bound movements and convergence spaces may be more space-relational rather than place-based movements, *without essentializing place*.

CHAPTER 4

CLAIMING DIFFERENCE BUT BEING COMMON IN ISTANBUL

4.1. A Critical History and Theory of Urban Struggles in Istanbul

Some people mainly from the academy and even those who are working on urban issues asked when I had started my project: *Are there any urban movements in Istanbul?* The reply was both yes and no. There were always many groups and actors who are struggling since the 1970s mainly in gecekondu neighbourhoods led by revolutionary political groups of that time working collaboratively with students. However, the 2000s will be the beginning of a period of reclaiming of urban commons from local “spatial” struggles fighting against demolition of houses and removal of people and in time with an appropriation of the city to being against mega-projects (such as the possible construction of the Third Bridge or opposing the demolition of a movie theatre). It is necessary to underline that we are talking about a group of activists, intellectuals who are mobilised/mobilise about urban issues due to professional as well as political reasons by using and finding methods in the struggles. I must add that “urban” does not refer roughly to “spatial” issues, but has to be seen as socio-spatial processes and the production of space. The main intention was not only to light the reasons of resistances/activisms in/for but beyond urban space; but also to propose new but meaningful conceptualisations from the field. Istanbul was the arena of

urban projects as well as urban studies. After the mid of the 2000s, with the resistances of different neighbourhoods, urban studies started to be focused on the displacements in neighbourhoods. In these studies, the main approach was to concentrate on the neighbourhood, which as a result led to a focus on negotiations and splits in the neighbourhood.

One of my main questions was to analyse the reason why there is not any effective platform of various urban opposition groups. The thesis is written during a period when urban uprising became visible and people occupied the main squares in cities all over the world from Europe, to Africa, from North America to Latin America and Middle East. Recently in June 2013, Gezi Park in Istanbul became a symbol for all urban movements all over the world mainly for Brazil. However, all the seeds were already planted in many neighbourhoods years earlier and there had been some attempts for neighbourhood forums –kind of assemblies- in neighbourhoods struggling against urban regeneration projects.

In Turkey and mainly Istanbul which preoccupied almost the mere presence in the literature when I started to study, the literature on struggles in and for the urban space were mainly attempts to elaborate “civil society’s and middle-classes” appropriation of the city based on “love and responsibility for *their* city” through their neighbourhood associations as “urban movements”. The urban tension mainly in *gecekondu* neighbourhoods political or not is examined as a disorder which has to give its place to social order. For Erder (1997), the urban tension stems from illegal production of urban spaces: The basic tension is to be legal, to be articulated to the urban system. Urban social movements are also considered as the space of “new politics” based on diversified social conflicts “outside class conflict” (Erder 1997). However, in the 1970s, as a class-based political behaviour became more apparent within the revolutionist youth organizations and university

professors who do plans and help in the construction of gecekondu as a model of socialist solidarity, participation and organization (Şengül 2001, Aslan 2004). The study of Aslan (2004) on “the *1st May*” neighborhood - officially renamed as Mustafa Kemal-mentions the stigmatization in the media the resistance as well as its establishment as a result of this resistance as an alternative socialist urban design in the capitalist system. In the working class political movements, it targets the formal government “beyond local”. The study about the history of urban resistance of gecekondu of Aslan (2004) is critical since it focuses on dangerous edges and ignored gaps of information in Turkey within the working class movement alliances with the left/socialist movement. This was attributing more and more apolitical characteristic to these movements, creating “idealist” models, sometimes influenced by a traditionalist Marxist line in other countries. In the 1970s, the “political and organized” gecekondu movement, the struggle around the housing problem and gecekondu –both in settled areas for the urban facilities and in the settlement process- had a special place in social movements. The leftist groups were important with their emphasis on housing as a part of class struggle besides the unemployment and other economic issues at that period (Aslan 2004, Aslan and Şen 2011).

On the other hand, during this period, apart from the romanticization of gecekondu resistances in the left, protests were considered as crime, violence, and terrorism of “poor people”. The “democratic” protest characteristic was correlated with the “quality of life” of middle classes and “civil society” mainly in the 80s and the 90s in terms of environmental movements and neighbourhood appropriations in neighbourhoods like Cihangir, different from that of the 70s, which is characterised by togetherness with “working class movements” in gecekondu neighbourhoods. The other approach was the focus on the “identity of the

city dweller” who could be citizen who live –deserves- to live in the city mainly in the framework of culture, “responsibility of the citizen” in “high level of consciousness” to appropriate cities, its “democratic” protest characteristic (Mengi 2007). With an over emphasis on professional chambers, the opposition in gecekondu neighbourhoods are considered from an upper view, as momentary/reactionary movements, lack of collective consciousness and organisation. However, it is quiet necessary to ask in this respect whether or not “civil society” or “middle classes” have this collective consciousness and organization, which is lacking in the opposition of these gecekondu neighbourhoods. Another aspect which is mainly referred is “publicness”/public space and locality which is proposed to be the *cradle of democracy* or in the framework of -the most democratic and egalitarian- local governments so in relation with state.

While new and various platforms against demolitions supporting local beautification neighbourhood associations and so resistances in these neighbourhoods and sometimes talking on behalf of neighbourhood dwellers, with their social justice understanding and professionalization in urban affairs, they ignored or accused inhabitants’ and some groups’ negotiations on demands for housing. On the other hand, they immediately interpret demand-base resistances into unified, homogeneous, nostalgically romanticized “working class” “revolutionary” resistance mainly valid for gecekondu neighbourhoods. Academic approaches, which support protection of gecekondu neighbourhoods as an authentic object of resistance, but in fact, which reduce them into unified and homogeneous protests are also criticized. What is said by intellectuals and academicians is one thing but what should be considered as essence is what is lived by dwellers in different neighbourhoods, their different lives and experiences. As Pérouse (2011) questions, we will see to what extent these struggles will

be a permanent social movement developed on local base and having a meaning for public opinion, beyond being individual, punctual, reactive⁹⁹.

On the other hand, general approaches of the studies in Turkey were ignoring gecekondu resistances stigmatizing them as “criminal”, “deviant”, “violent” in media representations during gecekondu demolition processes. “Squatting” and “squatter housing” were asserted discursively to be cradles of these problems, of “physical and social decadence”, and “crimes”, with “illegality”. These arguments often served the legitimization of urban regeneration projects. These projects propose to supply affordable housing to the people. Reality shows that however not only squatter neighbourhoods but also social housing neighbourhoods and historical neighbourhoods transform drastically and result in forcing people to move outside their neighbourhoods. These projects became also a turning point for the (re)rise of gecekondu grassroots resistance(s) as well as new formation of various associations in different types of neighbourhoods in Istanbul. However, this period revealed that these oppositions are not homogeneous protests, but supported by heterogeneous groups and urban actors, leading to a new politicization in different neighbourhoods gathering people from different social characteristics. The aim of the study will be to reveal heterogeneous characteristics of the urban social movements, resistances and various protests in Istanbul which have emerged from urban spatial projects in Istanbul since the mid-2000s together with urban regeneration project(s).

In Turkey, apart from some academicians who are active (or more exactly activist-academicians) and think about urban oppositions and their studies which have flourished in the last two years the main trend is to focus on

⁹⁹ With institutional changes in the Greater Municipality of Istanbul and TOKİ, new directories on urban regeneration in 2001, Zeytinburnu is chosen to be a pilot neighbourhood. In 2007, urban regeneration is privatised till its legislation in 2010 with changes with the article no 73 about urban regeneration of the Municipality Law no 5998 (Pérouse 2011).

“urban identities” and concentrating on socio-ethnic groups in terms of urban social movements. The older concepts such as urban integration, tensions and conflicts are still used to explain urban dynamics vis-à-vis urban regeneration projects. In this respect, some concepts which carry the potential for limited interpretations are still used to analyse the neighbourhoods and the reaction of different groups. Another attitude is to focus on spatial processes and negotiations rather than oppositions and organizations. Social movements, which will be elaborated in the related parts, must be elaborated from ordinary people’s points of view and involvements. Urban social movements deserve to be elaborated with and beyond social movement theories and categorizations. In the literature, it is generally asserted that “issues” sometimes for “urban” areas are the concerns of middle classes, in the framework of new social movements. The very first approaches for gecekondu resistance in Turkey were ignoring the social movement literature or using stigmatization as “criminal”, “deviant”, “violent” or “urban tension” in the explanations, interpretations, and perceptions about gecekondu demolition and about the resistance in their neighborhood.

In other words, the thesis will also try to find responses to the major research line, the return of the old explanations of urban social movements like that of “civil society” in Istanbul based on “citizen movements” by questioning “Who are these citizens?”. In love and responsibility for their city, like a citizen’s appropriation, the story reminds, apart from the meaning in “modern terms”, the civic ideal and citizenship as a “excluding privilege” in the polis, requiring the capacity of a certain abstraction and sophistication of thought, the knowledge, excellence (Heater 2004). “Citizenship” in the city, mainly related with middle classes is associated with its local, urban participation, involvement with “civic culture”, especially in terms of beautification associations in these neighbourhoods.

What is desired as a “citizen” in the city is the rich, powerful, and expelling not the poor, the other?

These projects represent a turning point for the (re)rise of neighbourhood grassroots resistance(s) as well as new formation of various associations in different types of neighbourhoods in Istanbul in the process of forming grassroots, non-hierarchical one from below for the right to the city. However, urban resistances in Istanbul today, are composed of various actors, new platforms, new types of neighbourhoods, non-hierarchical, horizontally and flexibly organized organizations. In this respect, it is required to re-evaluate the complexity and the articulation of heterogeneous groups and urban actors through emotional factors, friendship, personal, professional and political networks. The study will try to expose this multitude with their statements, contrary to general elaborations.

It would be fair to state that urban social movements or more exactly urban oppositions of different actors are little studied. We witness many resistances occupying commons urban spaces, which aim to claim democracy and emancipation. However, the literature remains insufficient to explain these movements. On the other hand, it is necessary to work on new conceptualizations. Discussing the possibility of going beyond their localities –place-, the study asks: “Is there a possibility of becoming urban commons?”, an urban society in Lefebvrian sense claiming (a) social major change(s), in the use and appropriation of public common, as well as human self-realization.

Even though framing may be different in various sites and the dynamics of urban struggle in these different sites, there is a common attempt for another production of urban space. An attempt which is made by different groups, local level activists, and organizations in Istanbul, these social movements exist, in spite of heterogeneous and conflict ridden dimensions, tensions of

these movement(s) within their alliances and different reasons and ways, kinds of protests. Although there are differences, fragmentations and conflicts between/within different groups sometimes for appropriation of the resistance, with new formations including intellectuals, academicians, critical city planners, artists, they contributed to the changes in spatial projects.

Apart from different characteristics of gecekondu neighbourhoods, there are resistances with associations in a former social housing neighbourhood and historical neighbourhoods in the historical peninsula of Istanbul. It's necessary to point out that this difference in terms of neighbourhood associations, intellectuals from neighbourhoods of Istanbul and associations, intellectuals from outside creates tensions as well as potentials for the struggles in the framework of their objectives, statements, discourses and strategies. Another facet is that the urban space -from neighbourhoods to the whole city- became a common appropriation in the form of "multiple" resistance for different actors from various groups including gecekondu and other neighbourhoods. This results in another political consciousness and activism beyond conventional politics and leftist "activism" excluding commons people. It must be admitted that some groups' claims remain restricted to home ownership, which could be explained with the exchange value of space but also the meaning of home and neighbourhood, accelerated by the negotiation process implemented by the municipalities. This could differ in terms of neighbourhoods' characteristics and experiences, but mainly political histories. One of the critical aspects which must be mentioned here is that new characteristics which are both pros and cons of the oppositions; for instance being not affiliated directly with a political party as well as having a flexible organization and multiple involvement of groups. Yet it is necessary to acknowledge that there are activists from more determining groups in urban opposition groups. This study is an attempt to question alliance/urban commons formation process

of urban resistances, oppositions shaped by the actors in theoretical and practical senses, which lead or could lead to structural changes. There is a changing relationship and tensions between groups and actors from neighbourhoods and outside. While neighbourhoods expecting support and guidance for their oppositions, some of the groups, actors argue that neighbourhood oppositions find their way by themselves. Neighbourhood local activists often consider them as people who do not understand their situation. Moreover, based on their experiences, they consider them as “academic people” in the neighbourhoods now mainly for the academic purposes will for sure leave someday. Critical professional or academic groups became both initiating and hindering factors. They sometimes declare that they have their “own principles for urban issues,” “political approaches that they would not relinquish”, sometimes labelling neighbourhood resistances as “working classes’ ” resistances or sometimes radicalizing and alienating them, by choosing/appropriating some of them, creating camps. We must ask for whom and why the urban regeneration is proposed which has created and is still creating new deprivations and dispossessions by transferring the existing property relations, and leading to a new type of deprivations. Whose city is Istanbul underwent a process of constructing other cities of social houses mainly outside “the” city? The study is to explain the process of reclaiming the city of different actors.

4.1.1. From Urban Regeneration Projects as the Motive behind Urban Struggles and Beyond: The Meanings of Urban Regeneration in Istanbul

Urban regeneration could be defined as policy response to the social, economic, environmental and spatial problems, for the creation of vacant land, buildings to beneficial use, new forms of employment, improving

urban environment (Couch, Fraser and Percy 2003). The urban renewal in its practice means in general the displacement of people, mainly low-income residents from homes and neighbourhoods, social space where there is an attachment and the relocation is poorly realized. The demolition is proposed for a physical but also, and more significantly as a remedy for “social decay” supported but the criminalization discourse as elaborated above. The study aims to expose reasons, ways/kinds of urban opposition(s) vis-a-vis different types of appropriation and forms of resistances in many respects from urban space in Istanbul under neoliberal urbanism. This gained pace especially after 1980s (Şengül 2009) and with 2000s, i.e. urban entrepreneurship type of urban transformation labelled as urban regeneration. The meaning of urban regeneration is central for different groups and activists. Almost all the groups are organized because of ongoing urban regenerations. However, some questions around about the focus points and the way to deal with those in the resistance are approached differently, which is one of the main controversies for the groups outside the neighbourhoods. Since 2000s, urban land policies and decisions with a systematic urban renewal/transformation policy are marked by the radical change from populist to neo-liberal urban transformation projects for Kuyucu and Ünsal (2010a, 2010b). Istanbul is under the process of being labelled in different and popular ways like the European Capital of Culture to the Olympic City as a so-called powerful attraction centre as a “world city” for the international capital in the governmental discourses and for those who can afford to live and enjoy living in the city.

Urban regeneration “hygienic and aesthetic characteristic” is proposed from the 2000s in Istanbul and other cities, to be the solution, remedy for so-called “socio-spatial” problems by offering new, modern and appropriate lives for all classes not only for gecekondu neighbourhoods in Istanbul but also historical neighbourhoods like Fener-Balat and historical Roman

neighbourhoods like Sulukule as well as other neighbourhoods old social housing neighbourhood like Tozkoparan. In this cycle of regeneration, while neighbourhoods under threat of demolition are regenerated by the new construction of luxurious houses, its inhabitants are relocated in other social houses far from the city centres differently from central locations, which necessitate a payment during a long time process as a long-term debt. It is necessary to remind that conditions may change according to neighbourhood and inhabitants for instance tenants. Apart from “spatial” replacements lived as exclusions and new segregations, urban regeneration also results in social erosion in terms of the loss of social, emotional and related solidarity economic relations having legislative bases varying from changes of acts in the old legislations, new enactments of law in contradiction with its name (Türkün 2011) to the recently legislation namely the Law on Transformation of Areas Under Disaster Risk which forbids attempts of asking, appealing and reacting against. This legislation is considered to be enforcement from above on the wills and decisions of people. Türkün (2011) in this context, puts an emphasis on Justice and Development Party and easy changes of laws without approval of the public opinion. In this sense, it is necessary to add that this is valuable also for making new laws. Apart from concession, public opinion with the necessary and exact information must be the real subjects of these processes before legislations. For Türkün (2011), *neo-liberal urban policy reduced so called participation into an illusionary politically correct discourse while neo-liberal urban policy targets transforming areas which have high rent potential resulting in the evictions of inhabitants*. Türkün (2011) underlines that this type of changes means the diffusion of one hegemonic discourse for the legitimization of all decisions, representing a tautological character due to the gap between legality and legitimacy. These policies transform the cities from “Spaces of Hope” to “Spaces of Hopelessness”, who live and try to survive in the city (Türkün 2011, 64). The so-called regeneration created a

boom in the construction industry with the projects related mainly to the centrality and the exchange value of the neighbourhoods' lands. The projects are like parts of the puzzle involving not only housing but also public spaces like Galata Port, Haydarpaşa Port and Taksim Square. TOKİ¹⁰⁰ does not only produce housing for lower classes as social housing units but also for upper classes usually then in cooperation with private construction companies. Urban regeneration projects in the form of gentrification are implemented in different districts supported by different political parties and are often located in historical parts of the city centre (Pérouse 2006). These projects not only in Istanbul but also in Ankara, for instance Dikmen, the projects did not consider or partly accomplished cooperation and encouragement of civil organisation and participation (Uzun 2003). For Pérouse (2006), secondly, they take the form of clearance or demolition projects in gecekondü settlements and thirdly, they may be also supported by international/ transnational projects. They were started in the historical peninsula of Istanbul, especially in the neighbourhoods Tarlabası and Dolapdere. Secondly, projects were initiated in areas relying on the argument that they were high risk earthquake areas, which was an argument brought forward for Zeytinburnu. Thirdly, these projects resulted in the expulsion of unwanted gecekondü and Roman neighbourhoods. Finally, it is a deindustrialization project aiming at more profitable sector replacement (Pérouse 2006). This means that title deeds which were legalizing like legal titles of the present accommodations became once again invalid mainly after the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk to claim the right of housing. With a calculation according to title deeds and amount of square meters resulted in this indebted situation after urban regeneration projects to be relocated into new social houses. Not only neighbourhoods or gecekondü neighbourhoods in the periphery or sometimes situated near to the city centres and locations with high rent, but

¹⁰⁰It is the abbreviation of the Mass Housing Development Administration.

also apartment houses and middle class neighbourhoods are under urban regeneration decisions. However, what is different is that urban middle classes could continue to stay in their new houses and are not forced to leave their neighbourhoods for a TOKİ house. The poorest people, Kurdish people, Romans, and inhabitants of gecekondu neighbourhoods whose neighbourhoods lands are valuable. In the book of Çavdar and Tan (2013), Pérouse (2013) remarked that the institutional base of urban regeneration was initiated by the rise in urban land value and empowerment of TOKİ before the AK Party government. In other words, TOKİ appropriated and enforced the priority of private property in social housing policy. Many political parties, including some municipalities of the Republican People's Party were implementing these projects too. Yalçın and Çavuşoğlu (2013) stated that urban regeneration is realized into four types namely: *(spontaneous) transformation per se, big metropolitan projects, planned regeneration, and finally (urban) regeneration projects*. They underlined that urban oppositions are turning points for a humane urban regeneration. Even though there are separations, they could revise their discourses leading to conflicts and *only* "standing together" could make an imagination of future on a human base. They, in fact, place urban regeneration in the middle of these conflicts. Surprisingly, while differentiating those into traditional and new, they refer to trade unions (apart from professional chambers such as the Chamber of Architects) as traditional political groups as new while many of them do not include urban regeneration and urban opposition into their agendas.

Being against urban regeneration could be an important and common reason behind urban opposition; however, if it stays alive, this will be a reaction merely against the government party or a spatial trap. There often these oppositions remain local and highly reactionary in the sense that they oppose the party in government. We can easily see that for people who are

active in urban opposition, urban regeneration in their or even in another neighbourhood has a central meaning. For Çiğdem¹⁰¹ from Fener-Balat neighbourhood and Urban Movements (Kent Hareketleri): “As a person who is sensible about social problems, even though I did not start consciously, for Sulukule, I followed the agenda, I supported their struggle with signatures, *I was trying to behave in a sensible way to the urban struggle*. I was not active in the struggles but as you know, urban regeneration became harsher after the Sulukule project and it became apparently concrete. I think I started at the right time/period and at the right place. *With the Fener-Balat project, I started an active struggle by forming our association FEBAYDER. Earlier the attack was not so intense and we were not aware of the legislation of 5366 in historical neighbourhoods, which was one aspect of the urban regeneration project for the whole city, Istanbul*. We saw that the legislation was one facet dealing with that of historical neighbourhoods, and of the regeneration of public space and the process of sanitization from labourer, working class, lower and middle classes. After seeing that these projects were implemented and based on different reasons and laws I realized. That the main aim of these projects is to transfer public spaces to capital, the transformation of Istanbul into a real estate market, and the transformation into plots construction and zoning – *imar-*, my local struggle which had started with Fener-Balat, turned into a more general urban struggle.”

To understand the meaning of urban regeneration for activists and urban regeneration, we have to understand the meaning of neighbourhood for the city and for inhabitants as well. To illustrate, here is one quote: “Fener-

¹⁰¹ For some examples of her articles, please visit the following websites: <http://www.acikgazete.com/yazarlar/cigdem-sahin/2012/05/18/deprem-yasasi-cikti-simdi-n-olcak.htm>, <http://www.acikgazete.com/yazarlar/cigdem-sahin/2011/09/13/o-ariza-sensin-demek.htm?aid=43365>

Balat is *my home* –yuvam-; and I feel there very happy. I feel like in the village where I grew up. Since I grew up in a neighborhood, village culture...in the summer. I could not forget what there is behind the doors...you know who is ill, whose children are studying, where he/she is working. It is an amazing feeling. People who did not grow in a neighbourhood and small village cannot understand this feeling. Even though I am living in Istanbul for long years, due to my life in a neighbourhood, I returned to my “belonging”. Perhaps, for this reason, I appropriate Fener-Balat at that degree and I am feeling happy. I feel under threat as if my “home” is wanted to be demolished. Fener-Balat is a link to the past, where many civilizations were living, the soul which makes Istanbul, Istanbul. Why Istanbul is mentioned in every part of the world or when Istanbul is told, we remember many civilizations. It is this lived memories and histories, which makes the history, the history. *I could not sacrifice this. I am conscious about the importance of the history in the human development and the humanity is the accumulation of all of the civilisations.* And to destroy with a hit will take away from humanity and hollow out this accumulation and identities. ... I think that Fener-Balat is an important place to complement Istanbul, giving its soul as well as Sulukule and Tarlabası...*Firstly it is my home. Secondly, it is a loss of a value which makes Istanbul.* Apart from all, Fener-Balat is a very beautiful place at the coast of the sea, near to my university. ...What makes me so happy to live in a house which I have chosen. What is done is a process which limits the right to choose where people will live....the rooms, whether or not I live horizontally and vertically. I decide only by myself on these subjects.” Çiğdem argued.

For Çiğdem, the urban regeneration, by *targeting poor people, dislocate them and take their right to shelter*: “*Why you do not deal with the decisions of poor and homeless people.* They seem to deal with the comfort of people but it is dishonesty. You won’t deal with my living standards. There are

people who live in worse conditions. *What you have done to raise these people's living standards, for their right to shelter. People who do not have a house. People who live in tents or in the streets.* What you have produced, proposed for them and then you want to damage my order in order that I adjust myself to the standards and orders that you have defined. Even there are not these types of standards. You use this to send away. In fact, you do not even show me where I will move to...you violate *human rights and freedoms. Nobody can decide where I will live, in how many square meters*. These are rights which do belong to people. I remember the home that I really love, my tree, and the animals that are living in the courtyard of the church...a life which is alive, with neighbourhood culture, to find different life pieces in different corners, a richness of life I remember when I say Fener-Balat. In Ataşehir or in a "gated community" life, there is only one color. *Ataköy, Ataşehir, a homogenous and similar life, sociability, and no soul. When I say Fener-Balat, I remember thousand and one lives and people. I remember a colourful society.* I could not exchange this with anything else."

For this reason, *urban regeneration has a central meaning for activists and the spark behind the formation of related associations and the emergence of urban opposition*, Çiğdem claimed: *"My whole struggle is with urban regeneration. There is no struggle as Fener-Balat. This struggle must be a "total" struggle. This must be a total opposition to this process. My concern is beyond Fener-Balat. It is totally a struggle against urban regeneration."* Çiğdem put forward: *"We are mainly against the usage of urban regeneration ideologically....There must be urban regeneration in situ with people living there. We are totally against gentrification and displacement and change in social and historical tissues. If there will be an urban regeneration, it must be with people who live there.* We could say perhaps yes to a regeneration asking Fener-Balat dwellers' thoughts and shaped with their participation. We would like to use our right to build our own houses

which is indicated in the project.” For Çiğdem: *“If urban regeneration is concerning everyone, political parties also must propose solutions. But they are insufficient for this issue. They have their own agendas or they have a double faced approaches....they do not give confidence. ...But after the new legislation about earthquakes, they will react.”*

For Erdoğan from Gülsuyu-Gülensu neighbourhood: *“Urban regeneration is in fact “rentable/profitable distribution” since they are the main components of the neighbourhood who formed a culture dating back fifty years and want to live and get older where they were born. What he proposes is salient both for the definition of the problem and strategies: It is necessary to form another construction to go beyond “demolition-poverty-barricade” against neoliberal policies based on competition with conceptual ornaments like world city, tourism and financial city. One of the pioneers who put into practice alternative planning (see Souza 2006) attempts with Solidarity Studio, street representatives and neighbourhood upper committee, inhabitants of the neighbourhood Gülsuyu-Gülensu proposed another type of association-that I will explain in the following part- and organization based on togetherness. This would create potentialities based on its internal dynamics, and participatory, democratic, horizontal relations for an alternative city. It is as a reply to their real needs and opinions as citizens who fulfil the responsibilities without being evicted and displaced.”* Erdoğan claimed that these problems are not only that of inhabitants of neighbourhoods that underwent urban regeneration but also other subjects in the city. He underlined that there is *a necessity to form a common urban opposition with wide assemblies including different actors and groups and classes for resisting against neoliberal policies and capital.* Erdoğan stated: *“When our neighbourhood had been declared to be an urban regeneration area, the effects of urban regeneration became the problem so the story started in 2004. We found ourselves with friends in urban opposition since we were expressing ourselves in a collective work. Firstly, we were present*

in the board of directors in the Beautification Association of the neighbourhood...This was the beginning of urban opposition and regeneration that we started in 2004 with professional chambers, against this urban planning process. *We were considering only at the local level. Since the neighbourhood had a serious problem of existence and disappearance. Think about this. They are planning the neighbourhood without considering the areas on which we were living. This easily led to a reflex in the form of opposition. We came together with the opinion leaders of neighbourhood and stated that we had to intervene. So this made us subjects of urban opposition.*”

He told about the first collective mobilisation in the neighbourhood against urban regeneration: “For the first time, 6000 rejection petitions, 32 cases of plans were cancelled 10000 signatures for our neighbourhood. For the first time in planning history, a neighbourhood resisted against a planning process in an organised way.” *By revealing the real reason behind urban regeneration as enclosures*, he argued that *urban regeneration is our curse and stated*: “we did not form this neighbourhood with plans so we cannot save it with plans. In fact, we did not form this neighbourhood. It is a self-emergent gecekondu activity. And revolutionary groups did regulate this. We did not have any green areas before since it is not a planned neighbourhood from its very beginning. We are witnessing extraordinary transformations in the city, nowadays...*The government tries to overcome a serious economic crisis with the construction sector...*because of this dynamic, and neighbourhoods have become enclaved...Everywhere, there are constructions of shopping malls, transformation of public buildings into other functions such as universities.”

For creating another type of opposition in the neighbourhood, urban regeneration could be *a tool*. Erdoğan claimed: “My view is that *urban*

*regeneration must be a concept making people the subject of their own issues...*the representatives or political groups are in the struggle. It is the alienation itself. Our main intention is to open a space for everybody even the most deprived ones may say their own words. If we cannot do this, urban regeneration will be the tool for the alienation same in other resisting neighborhoods. Like in trade unions, in the universities, in the academy, everywhere.” He emphasized a very crucial argument: “*The deprived is represented, but not present in its own struggle process.* We with my friends tried to establish this in our neighbourhood from urban regeneration. This works better in neighbourhoods like Gülsuyu-Gülensu.”

From another neighbourhood Gaziosmanpaşa, the former head of the Sarıgöl Romans Association states in his speeches and interview on the internet that the Roman people were the first residents of this neighbourhood which they have formed sixty years ago. In their neighbourhood, like other ones, tensions and fragmentations are intentionally produced. In time, he had to leave this position; however, he was always present when there was a demolition in any neighbourhood, or a meeting or protest in the city centre, Taksim. Şadi was always underlining the importance of alliances and intellectuals, professors and planners who have technical knowledge by insisting on the fact that the inhabitants want to stay put; they want “urban renewal”, not “regeneration”. I would like to remark that this is an important point: This is, for many neighbourhood activists and intellectuals, a legitimation of urban regeneration which would lead to eviction and displacements. He underlined that they could no longer stay in their neighbourhoods when new luxurious houses would be built. He argues that the inhabitants here are poor people and they could not afford to live here or anywhere else. While these projects were planned, the neighbourhood inhabitants were excluded from projects and decision-making processes and besides they were criminalized. Thinking about the

frontiers and revanchist city characteristics of Istanbul, Kumru declared: “The name could be renewal, regeneration...Even there is no project, but a construction of a road nearby, or a residence project, this pressure can be felt. *Historical areas in Sulukule, Zeyrek and Tarlabası, people who look from a distance to these neighbourhoods do not find people who live in these neighbourhoods suitable.* Why people with high level of income and education do not live here since they are considered as people who could not appropriate this historical values of the city. But we see that there is no appropriation of history by city governors. *And upper classes would like to come to the centre due to the proximity to work places.*” Instead of urban regeneration, about the life that they try to propose through “alternative projects”, that they tried to produce and implement as Dayanışmacı Atölye (Solidarity Studio), Kumru added: “What we proposed was an alternative project, not the cooperative at that time. In *Sulukule*, there was not only Bir Umut and DA project but for everyone, the struggle was not only for urban space but these *people were struggling for their life.* Their green card – which is given to the poor people to provide unpaid health services in Turkey- for health services, children’s problems concerning enrollment to the school due to the lack of identity cards. People there, in courts, they were cooking together, doing laundry together. We have produced this kind of spaces, and there were people who are specialized in local economies. We have benefited from their experiences from abroad and Turkey. Somebody stated, criticized that groups go to the neighbourhood, and put a shoemaker if there is need for shoemaker. If this people do not have other capital, why these people do not do this together? Moreover, these activities are not brought from outside. These activities are made together. They do not have other capital”. Reminding their experiences from *Sulukule*, she stated: “In *Sulukule*, the most important thing was the model of “right to title deed”; everything is assessed from its exchange value and the use value is ignored. There are tenants apart from building owners of buildings. If we

ignore tenants who have live there for 40 years, who produced the culture there, history there. *They contributed to there. They are used to live there. They have formed their life, work, education there. We have started a struggle for the right of tenants there. This is based on the tenants' proof about whether or not they had lived there or not.* Their neighbours' statements were that they had lived there for years. The electricity, water invoice or other types of proof were used. The head of the quarter gives the certificate of residence. The neighbourhood is the smallest unit of the city and the head of the quarter is elected -*muhtar*- headman. The first man to whom people address their questions and knock the door. The first person whom they ask for a legal paper. I do not understand why the head of the quarter is excluded from this speculation. They are now taking some duties away of the head of the quarter from their hands, such as the certificate of residence. In fact, they are legal/juridical persons that can ask something for their neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood associations can do that; however, it is different if the head of the quarter asks... Instead, they must should strengthen their duties. The head of the quarter is one of the important actors, with these regulations; we are crippled by the bends from everywhere. *Neighbourhood cooperatives and other alternatives like having "right" are parts of a struggle.*"

Instead of urban regeneration, to ensure and gain back legal position, Kumru argued: "We (Solidarity Studio) use other concepts for urban regeneration. *They are neighbourhood cooperatives.* For the transformation in gecekondu neighbourhoods which do not have title deeds. Our alternative is not based on title deeds. We do not like this since in this capitalist era, we reject these property relations since possession leads to individualization. The idea that nothing happens to my house, the rest, I don't care. If there is a need of legislative status, and this is necessary for neighbourhoods to be strong, for us, *the legal securitization.* This is not only possible with title deeds. There are other methods. ...*Due to field parcellations and related*

difficulties, there can be many neighbourhood associations in one neighbourhood. In fact, these are not neighborhood associations, but, they are named with number of construction cooperatives. They are different cooperatives with similar aims and statutes. Their problems may be different and it is better to formulate this based on the land parcellations. In the legislations, there are possibilities to form cooperatives from parcels. This cooperative, after discussing all the struggle ways, methods and functioning inside, it is based on the collective transfer of the owner of this parcel. This refers to a collective property. So nobody can say that I have this parcel, I have this type of property....so this type of organization can be the realization of alternative planning. All the people who have a stake in the cooperation, they would say and decide together for the road, home. They have formed together these cooperatives to not live this again. Moreover, nobody could teach them to work together. They know very well. In fact, we learn from them the practice to work together. They have searched for a place together; they have helped each other to build houses together. We have built road, electricity. And women, when men are at work, they had waited for the neighbourhoods, they had formed neighbourhoods. The roles of women are very important. They know this practice of solidarity well. They had done for their living areas and they can continue to do this. They have experiences, and habits. They do not have confidence problems since many years. It is feasible. Nobody, technical personnel, from municipality, a planner, do not need to say them that they would participate. Instead they would teach them. Our proposition is that.” Kumru added: “We have other issues; however, urban regeneration has created big deprivations in recent times. We did pay a lot of labour; moreover, we have experience in this issue. The struggle of urban regeneration is limited... Consequently, this is a primary issue.”

Kumru continued by exemplifying *fragmentation projects in two neighbourhoods near to each other in terms of urban regeneration projects:*

“We are mistaken to think Tarlabası neighbourhood is separate from Taksim square. *Taksim project is not a mere square project. This project includes all the projects of İstiklal Avenue.* Atatürk Cultural Centre¹⁰² project is related to Tarlabası project, even Galataport. People against this must walk like on 1st of May or Hrant Dink Memorial Day. Yes, we could expect different groups of opposition. I agree with this. However, there is a problem if there is a group only against Taksim project but not Tarlabası. This is related to “legal status” of the square and neighbourhoods.” And she underlined: “*Urban regeneration is at the centre of my struggle for six years since the biggest deprivation is lived because of urban regeneration processes. Due to my profession, I know this issue and I am involved in these activities for six years. I know that this is a violation of rights in neighbourhoods which existed fifty or seventy years. People from three generations are living there. It is supported by the state. They have roads, electricity and other services. The responsible people must ameliorate their quality of life. They have all legal status requirements like a head of the quarter. They vote. Thanks to them, there is a government. However, they do not realize what a social state must do*”.

I would like to remind Yaşar’s remark about *definition, practices and perception as a process of urban regeneration*: “I have difficulties to define urban regeneration. In Turkey, it is defined by projects...However; it is realized as a transfer of wealth from the poor to the rich. *Urban regeneration is the centre of neoliberal and a global integration process*

¹⁰²AKM project created a tension around the discussions and oppositions in “intellectual” “artistic” milieu. This opposition gained a new aspect namely the “End to Dynasty” turned to be an artistic platform due to the absence of AKM, always under restoration causes problems since there is no stage to host the artists. The critiques (for instance of the trade union of Kültür Sanat-Sen) were underlining the history of AKM in the “culture” of Istanbul as a monumental building, while the others this centre is closed due to fear of music, alcohol and art. During the campaigning process, they use different slogans such as “movement, call against darkness”. AKM is appropriated as a symbol of the Republican era and ideology and its possible demolition is asserted to be an attack to the republican ideas.

*and so the city is at the centre of capital accumulation. Urban regeneration is not only the projects but the transformation of everyday life? in the streets...This process is realized by the coalitions? of the state...Urban regeneration must be defined and mentioned on every occasion. I am against the process.” Based on cruel practices, Yaşar stated: “I do not have to explain why I am against the projects since there are the cruelest and obvious aspects...They are anti-democratic, violent, and expropriate the wealth of people. It is a process against humanity. The real question must be about the reason why we are not against this. Even though we are changing urban regeneration into something else and we discuss critical problems, the peak we reached in our discussions? is sharing economic rent.” He refers to the critique of capitalism: “...Being against urban regeneration and all the investments and gentrification in the city is related to the fact that I am against capitalism. Urban regeneration is the place of crystallization in space of the capitalist exploitation order...People who are in seek of another world must be against this. We cannot say that the city cannot transform since the city transforms. The poor cannot live there...The participation must be instead of urban regeneration. *The urban regeneration in situ is the hollowed model. We have to focus on human beings and ecology. Could the planning process be done by people?...*We have to look at what to regenerate or to struggle for. You cannot take decisions about space in spite of people... we have to think with its own balances...We have to focus on micro discriminations, class differences and right.”*

Ömer thought that *titles of houses ought to be guaranteed by the state*, and he argued: “*I saw injustice in 2006, when urban regeneration started...everybody was saying that they had titles from the state. We saw explicit examples in Kanarya, what their titles became...*When I first went by chance to a meeting; I saw that they need me. I was active in some social works on different issues. We had a cancellation decision in Tozkoparan...But the constructions in Tozkoparan had already started in the

name of road construction...They were refused in the Neighbourhood Meeting. It was an experience for me. *Ordinary people had reacted there...*They had signed a protocol with TOKİ and the Municipality of Güngören. Another construct from regeneration. They are always changing tactics. ..We have to think about these tactics in advance...They always talk or do not talk because of money. *Tozkoparan, which is not a gecekondu neighbourhood, is a neighbourhood formed by the state itself, whose houses are with titles...*You cannot demolish and then construct new houses and residences. You can only construct business centers for the inhabitants here...The state cannot abolish our title rights and announce that can do whatever they want...*I would say that I am a human being.*”

Erbatur proposed urban *regeneration as central in his opposition since the present form of urban regeneration is the result of a policy which has the motivation of capital accumulation and transfer of revenues*. As a *rental regeneration* which will affect everyone, Arif stated: “The urban regeneration is in the centre at the point? Since with this *rental regeneration, everyone can be affected*. This is unknown.” İmre Azem pointing out the *systemic problem* in the film Ekümenopolis¹⁰³, declared: “It became a film of displaced people. To make a film about the city is the best way to see the system, a symbol to represent this. It is very concrete and easy to tell people. *We propose a systemic critique. We are criticising this system and order. But we do this from the city*. So people can understand the critique from *a concrete way*. It does not remain at an abstract level. We explain the system from what I see, the building, from the way that I pass from. For this reason the city. When I investigate, I have come into relations with different groups. I started to participate in their meetings and I saw that there is a broad opposition.” And he added: “*Urban regeneration is an enforced concept. I am not an urban planner or architect*. While doing

¹⁰³The website of Ekümenopolis: http://www.ekumenopolis.net/#/tr_TR

many interviews for three years with academicians, I read many books, I went to neighbourhoods, and this process opened me a window. I can only say you what I saw from this window...when the social and economic relations change, the cities change too, as a dynamic and organic thing, it changes. But by enforcing and from top down decisions, you'll go there, you'll do that, you'll live in a home like that, it is meaningless. Sure the city will change but the politics of the state must be economic and social developments so after this is established, taking these as locomotive, the city will be better. When the income of people will rise, they will live in better houses. To be angry with people who live in *gecekondu* about why you live in this house is meaningless. The average income is 700TL where he/she could live. He/she could pay 150-200TL. Without asking these questions, urban regeneration, it is meaningless. However, for the great part of people it became an expectation of rent. It was alike in Özal¹⁰⁴ period. With construction permits/dispensations, the created rent was shared by a great part of the society. By looting the city and creating a big inequality. In this sense, urban regeneration in 2000s is to repeat what Özal made in the 1980s. *The issue is to create again the rent in the city and to distribute little parts to the society.* In the great part of the society, there is an expectation of what I could get. Unfortunately, because of the need, but the ambition to gain more money, they are willing to abandon their neighbourhood and take 20 000 TL. I don't know what to do without changing this understanding of people." *From a critique of "representative" democracy and enclosures of our commons*, Imre continued: "Urban regeneration in fact is an *enforced thing from above but also it a process that the great part of the society expects to gain from.* I believe that the societies are governed by governments they deserve. We deserve that. There is a general approach alike in our society. The great part of the society could have an expectation

¹⁰⁴ Turgut Özal was the Prime Minister (1983-1989) and President of Turkey (1989-1993). Here, I must refer to the fact that Özal had initiated the privatization and transformation of the economy.

alike. But from this, we could see the primitivism of our democracy. Why? We could say that the 60 per cent want this. Our understanding of democracy is what the majority wants will happen. This is from the Middle Age. If we go backwards, in 1945, the second war finished, the UN was established and Human Rights Declaration was written. All states signed this. All these are universal human rights; education, health and sheltering, guaranteed working right. Dependent from the nation-states... So the states have to make these regulations for these rights. Our democratic understanding states that if %51 want, I can take your dwelling right, right to health. What the majority wants. But this is primitive. Manipulated by the media and people who have money, orienting? the masses... Even though %99 of the society wants, they could not demolish my home. This house is my dwelling right. *They could not take my health right. Instead of protecting my rights, we will do what the majority wants, I can take your rights, put you in the prison, to be judged fairly; we can take all of your rights. We will privatize everything; we take all your public areas.* You don't have any rights like in Middle Ages. It is the core of the problem. It is in the distortion of our democracy. People understand alike the democracy. They state that %51 voted so civil will power. So I don't have human rights violated. I see the problem as a problem of democracy. "By criticising capitalism, Hatice explained: "Urban regeneration is placed at a very important part, even at the focus. We did not form our group to work on urban regeneration merely. However, we made a promise that we have not to focus on urban regeneration. However, it is at a very vivacious place of the opposition, and we said to ourselves that we put it at the centre especially in neighbourhoods... *It is at the centre in terms of the evaluation of the oppositions having urban regeneration at the centre.* We try to open it together. The Third Bridge, selling of the schools, Emek Movie Theatre, and if we evaluate this as a total opposition. If we consider this as parts of

project...*Capitalism as a project, is in front of us. So the opposition can not be only for urban regeneration projects.*”

As we can understand from the active inhabitants’ statements, they are mainly against the violation of their basic right of housing, but also the disappearance of collective meaning and history of neighbourhood and meaning of their homes. Moreover, the first, main and easy target population who are mainly poor people and their displacement, so socio-spatial injustice of these enforced projects and rental (re)distribution, dispossession via cancelling house titles’ related rights make central urban regeneration in their urban oppositions. The consequences are twofold: Firstly, this makes active citizens and engaged different people –tenants, house owners with titles, including academicians and intellectuals etc.- by connecting them on similar problems, new enclosures of the use value of space, but secondly, this limits opposition in spatial terms. As many “activists” underlined there is a necessity to make concretely visible the definition, practices and consequences of urban regeneration projects. In this respect, opposition groups mainly composed of urban planners differentiate in terms of proposing and producing some alternatives or totally rejecting and criticising on a theoretical level from a critique of capitalism, which will be elaborated in the thesis.

4.2. The Right to the City for Urban Commoning in Istanbul: A Slogan of Some Groups or Beyond?

This part incorporates and discusses insights and experiences of authors as well as activists from Turkey to highlight the dialectic and controversies between theory, practices and struggles, between what is lived and proposed in Istanbul, Turkey. The study aims to compile and elaborate what is produced and experienced for later discussions and possible practices

underlining its radical meaning with the attributed and interpreted meanings. In a dialectic relationship between knowledge production and struggles, this chapter aims to reveal the interwoven components of this socio-political claim including new conceptualizations as well as practical influences as a slogan and an inclusive idea with different meanings and experiences for the opposition groups and different actors with different histories and political views (Türkmen 2011, Yücel and Aksümer 2011). The questions about *how and why the right to the city could go beyond a concept and are substantiated for various opposition groups for the city and the society may not be answered but could certainly be asked while the struggles for the right to the city go on*. These rights are not granted by institutions but are continuously defined by political action and active participation (Gilbert and Dikeç 2008) in the city as the battleground to claim group rights (Dikeç 2001, 1790). In this respect Isin (2002), Dikeç (2001) and Purcell (2002) propose urban citizenship, the *citadin*, as user of multiple spaces in different groups but as active inhabitants (Purcell 2002) in all the stages of the production of urban space (Purcell 2002, 2008), as well as in debates and struggles (Isin 2002, 313). This idea is based on the right to resist, starting in everyday life through struggle against the erasure of the presence of some citizens from the city to take the control and use of the city from privileged people (Lefebvre 1972, Isin 2002). The “right to difference”, to resist and struggle (Dikeç 2001, 1790) is a right to politics questioning the order of things (Dikeç 2002, Isin 2002). The right to the city also created a new horizon for discussions on the urban social movements’ definitions in terms of anti-capitalist change potential beyond the dilemma between old and new social movements of different groups.

This thesis aims to propose definitions for urban oppositions with a radical analysis with the help of the right to the city and urban commons in and out of the neighbourhoods, from and beyond Istanbul by exposing what is

discussed and experienced within urban oppositions and by addressing at the question how activists define the “right to the city” and urban opposition and what they propose for the city and for opposition strategies. In this chapter, the right to the city will be exposed, which is in the intellectual discussions as well as in the urban oppositions in Istanbul from and outside neighbourhoods with the importance and the effect of presence of intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods in the discussions and use of the “right to the city” as a slogan of some groups. The chapter questions the right to the city in Istanbul, theory and practice, different definitions and meanings. As Mayer (2009) pointed out, it is important to look at the right to the city in the “context of shifting mottos” of urban social movements. I must add that these shifts could be cyclical and the context could change unexpectedly. Harvey (2008) and Mayer (2009) underlined, the right to the city has the potential as a working slogan and a political ideal. However, some aspects could go over other ones, resulting in the fact that the right to the city remains for some critics is far from concrete demands and issues. On the other hand, due to the wording and little interest in the difficult texts of Lefebvre, it is misinterpreted or abandoned. It is normal that a concept can have different meanings for everyone; however, leading to a limitation of urban oppositions or creating new impasses. What is important is to emphasize the right to the “urban” in conceptual terms. We must admit that we have some conceptual limitations with lack of prefiguration. Both the right to the city and urban social movements must be questioned in terms of anti-capitalism and beyond the existing framework of old/new social movements covering different actors from various common people (see Chatterton 2006) defining themselves non-political before the urban opposition.

4.2.1. Origins, Uses and Usefulness of the Right to the City in Istanbul: From the Literature in Turkey to the Struggles

In Turkey, the practical usage as a slogan and discussions of the right to the city in the academic world as well as within movements are quite new dating back to 2007 and 2009 at the moments of alliance at international and local levels, which could be related to its popular usage in the world as well as to the common need for explanation and further conceptualization with the effect of these intellectuals from within and outside the neighbourhoods in international and interpersonal relations. They found their expression, starting from the right to shelter and spatial claims, against urban regeneration for newly formed neighbourhood associations thanks to the establishment of international connections of actors with intellectuals from and outside of the neighbourhoods. While I had started my project there were few academicians who are writing on the right to the city, in time, many academicians produced critical views. Especially, the European Social Forum in July 2010 must be cited as a turning point for alliance seeking mainly from the right to the city. Many of them, being academic-activists, Ali Ekber Doğan, Cihan Uzunçarşılı-Baysal, Besime Şen, Erbatur Çavuşoğlu, Murat Cemal Yalçınan, Hade Türkmen, Tuna Kuyucu, Özlem Ünsal, Mehmet Barış Kuymulu, Erdoğan Yıldız, in the interview made by Yaşar Adanalı and İmre in the editorial part of the collective bulletin “Istanbul living in exclusion¹⁰⁵”, in the framework of the exhibition Open City are some of the scholars and intellectuals who firstly use and question the right to the city as well. Recently, Centner (in Samara, He and Chen 2013) elaborated the right to the city from middle classes and comparisons with Brazil and Argentina, which is open to discussion. *I intentionally*

¹⁰⁵ Available on the website:

http://reclaimistanbul.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/diwan_istanbul_living_in_exclusion.pdf

refuse the elaborations from middle classes which reproduces exclusion and stigmatisation of claims of urban commons from neighbourhoods to the city centres. Since few number of people from different classes were struggling for and beyond Istanbul. A special issue was published on the right to the city edited by Erbatur Çavuşoğlu and Julia Strutz¹⁰⁶, the first journal published in Turkish on this issue. The right to the city as a slogan emerged from urban activism in Istanbul, especially with the influence and proposition of some neighbourhood activist dwellers, organic intellectuals, platforms, groups and actors, activists, and academicians within urban oppositions. During meetings and the preparation forum before the European Social Forum held between the 1st of July and 4th of July, 2010 in Istanbul, the right to the city in the framework of the right to shelter, housing and zero eviction is proposed as unifying in a sense “commonizing” slogan by various urban oppositional groups and multiple agents against over-imposed urban projects. Thus, discussions on the right to the city literally and conceptually are quite new and dates back to the discussions and usages within urban oppositional groups’ debates. These authors are in general engaged academics who are both struggling for these issues and carrying out related research. Using examples of struggles in Istanbul, Turkey and in the wider world, they refer to the idea’s radical potential and the importance of the right to the city as a horizon beyond urban space, while proposing that the right to the city is the necessary and urgent key which could make possible the alliance of the urban opposition groups and actors.

These projects became also a turning point for the (re)rising of gecekondü grassroots resistance(s), oppositions as well as new formation of various associations of different neighbourhoods in Istanbul. The right to

¹⁰⁶ Available on the website:

<http://www.egitimbilintoplum.com.tr/index.php/ebt/issue/view/57/showToc>.

appropriation was present from the very first formation of gecekondu neighbourhoods. To oppose the demolition of their homes, gecekondu dwellers have formed neighbourhood associations (different resistances which show different characteristics related to the neighbourhood history, to their inhabitants and the regeneration process that they underwent).

Doğan (2011), one of the earlier scholars from Turkey who has written on the right to the city, proposes that the right to the city was a demand for a slogan of everyday life, a socially just, more democratic, pluralist urban system in harmony with nature. The right to the city also represents rebellion against overly technocratic, top-down urban policies, plans and projects dependent on the capitalist rationality (Doğan 2011). The claim for the right to the city must be distinct from lobbying reformism according to Doğan (2011), who was one of the intellectuals who introduced the concept by discussing from class contradictions from the urban space, of two sides namely those who consider the city from the exchange-value those who use use-value as main concepts of Lefebvre. Chasing the path of the right to the city as a slogan and as an ideal, Doğan (2011) proposes the right as the claim for solidarity, social, ecologist public right and social justice based on revolt and democratic, pluralist, solidarity essences, in this sense, a much more plural movement. Raising the questions on the right to the city between theory and practice from Urban Movements and for conflicting and different actors, Türkmen (2011) concluded that it remains as a romantic concept so for the radical meaning of the slogan, the politicisation of urban conflict among various groups for the future city must be put on the agenda rather than the slogan itself. The struggle for the right to the city must be against disguised improvements such as left Keynesianism, taming global capitalist market, environmentally friendly capitalism and participation instead of neoliberalism, globalization and representative democracy (Souza 2010, Adanalı 2011) but instead lead to think about best practices and international examples (Adanalı 2011). It is necessary to consider the right

to the city as the key to strong alliances at a national and local level in the anti-capitalist struggle from being reactionary with protests and campaigns to the creation of another urbanity and publicness through autogestion and broad-based grassroots movements; in other words, from below (Doğan 2011). This would be possible only through the struggle for radical social change and through communal, solidaristic socio-economic relations, which make popular anti-capitalistic political alternatives and the right to the city, democratic (Doğan 2011).

Uzunçarşılı Baysal (2011b) is one of the first who applies the right to the city practically and theoretically in Istanbul by initiating many campaigns to form solidarities with international actors and groups focusing on “zero eviction” campaigns. Attributing a meaning of unifying force to the right to the city, Cihan Uzunçarşılı Baysal (2011a) made a call for the construction of a right to the city against urban renewal for different neighbourhoods including Emek Cinema Hall and the construction of the Third Bridge. Beyond the right to access urban resources, the right to the city must be realized as a collective right and a democratic demand; a claim which is shaped by the desires and ideas of city dwellers, against urban rent shaped by global capital. Attributing to the right to the city a meaning of unifying force, this approach holds an idea that it could be a way for all-encompassing defence of the city, assessing public spaces with all kind of housing areas under the threat of demolition and over-imposed intervention (Uzunçarşılı Baysal 2011a).

Çavuşoğlu and Yalçınan (2010), who are academic activists from Solidarity Studio, proposed the right to the city as an opportunity and possibility to struggle together in urban opposition groups. For a powerful and persuasive opposition, similarities could be emphasized while differences in terms of urban opposition ways would not be an obstacle any longer (Çavuşoğlu and Yalçınan, 2010). It is necessary to extend beyond

the “right of ownership” in order to create new ideas for the neighbourhoods and to conceive the right as a collective right. They propose to use “the right to the city” “in people” and “with people” for having a utopia for a powerful and persuasive opposition in this on-going process. They underline the necessity to go beyond the right to dwelling based on “possession” to create further ideas for the neighbourhood and also as a collective right which must be reclaimed, not ignoring, excluding other groups formally and informally. The right to the city could be a concrete key in the alliance-forming process of urban opposition groups, from neighbourhoods and from outside, in other words, the commons (Çavuşoğlu and Yalçintan 2010). *I attach utmost importance to the fact that every actor has his/her own personal and political history. The right to the city carries different meanings for different actors and neighbourhoods, with the influence of activists and intellectuals coming both from within and outside of neighbourhoods (see Türkmen 2011, Yücel and Aksümer 2011).*

The volume on the right to the city of the journal Eğitim Bilim Toplum (9(36)) written by academicians-activists on the right to the city is significant in terms of their contribution to literature not only for being the very first for Turkey but also for the world referring to the original ideas of Lefebvre -as well as the translations and elaborations of Mayer and de Souza-, operationalizing it and elaborating critically with the help of appropriate examples ideas from all over the world. Experiences of struggle from the past effect their appropriation of the space beyond their homes for lifestyle, solidarity and social relations for the whole city in terms of the appropriation, participation and the city as an oeuvre (Yücel and Aksümer 2011). Yücel and Aksümer (2012) put their emphasis on gecekondu neighbourhoods and their struggles of the right to the city, with their struggle experiences from the past, their appropriation of the space and leading their struggles beyond their homes, to life style, solidarity and social relations, in their words on claiming for the whole city. They reveal the

appropriation, participation and the city as an oeuvre underlining the right to the city as a radical one. The article of Strutz and Çavuşoğlu (2011), with an emphasis on the use value elaborates and questions the right to the city holistically and practically from urban services, to other rights like work, education then urban struggles having potential of getting together. In this respect, the right to the city does also have the potential of bringing together a holistic and practical ways. They refer to Souza, in terms of his critics on the capitalist city/state/society and representative democracy oriented traps like social justice and environmental issues, good and human life emphasis in the pretext that the time for utopia has passed and his elaboration on (against and in spite of the state) autonomy (Strutz and Çavuşoğlu 2011). They elaborate urban struggles as war of positions in terms of Gramsci and the right to the city as collective, total, and multiple and unfragmented right. Uzunçarşılı-Baysal (2012), one of the first who uses practically and theoretically in Istanbul the right to the city initiating many campaigns with international actors focusing on zero eviction, elaborates in a very critical and meticulous way the right to the city in the world and Istanbul not only in gecekondu neighbourhoods which represent appropriately the claim of the right to the city Gülsuyu-Gülensu in Istanbul and Dikmen in Ankara and referring to the words of local actors like Erdoğan Yıldız from Gülsuyu-Gülensu, Istanbul but also occupation movements/protests like Tekel factory's workers resistance in Ankara which is the first occupation protest before the "Occupy Movement" that is absent in the occupation literature and Starbucks occupying protest redefining the action of occupation of Saturday Mothers in Galatasaray Place, Istanbul protesting the loss of their children due to their political activities like mothers in Plaza del Mayo in Buenos Aires. She puts her emphasis on the questions of what kind of city, why the right to the city, whose right to the city from Marcuse and Souza with appropriation, people's control over the creation/production, use and occupation of urban space.

It is necessary to refer to another activist-scholar, Firat (2011), who uses “urban enclosures” and “commons” with the right to the city in a published academic text for the first time in a pioneering way referring to the Emek Cinema Hall opposition. Firat (2012) writes on urban enclosures, referring to the radical literature like Midnight Notes Collective¹⁰⁷ which is elaborated in the part for the commons for the first time in a published academic text and uses the right to the city in a pioneering way for the movements academically and practically, with the example of Emek Cinema Hall from Istanbul. In her evaluation of the Symposium namely Revolutionary-Popular Local Administrations, she points out important critics about the present municipality practices and decision making mechanisms based on populist as well as exclusionary politics against urban social opposition. For Firat (2013), the right to the city as a slogan and strategy for another urban politics which reshapes power relations and gives back the control from the state and capital to urban inhabitants by participation (in terms of the production of space beyond state-citizenship relations) and appropriation (in terms of transformation and reproduction of urban space according to their everyday life and social needs) must be discussed as a collective one in a class struggle aiming to take back urban space, referring to Harvey’s conceptualizations, *creation of “spaces of hope”, accumulation by dispossession*. She points out the line of thought and scale challenge that Lefebvre implies in the framework of the city for politics, everyday life for time and the “kenttaş” in Turkish language which could be called “citadin” for the subject on the way for an urban revolution (Firat 2013, 197). *From the line of Blomley* (2008), Firat (2011) underlined the historical line from the 18th century which is the beginning of private property, primitive accumulation and for the capitalist mode of production,

¹⁰⁷ As explained in theoretical part, Midnight Notes is an important autonomist Marxist source especially for the “commons”.

Here are related websites: <http://www.midnightnotes.org/newenclos.html>,
<http://www.midnightnotes.org/pdfnewenc10.pdf> and
<http://www.midnightnotes.org/pdfnewenc11.pdf>.

the enclosures of the commons. However, this repeats itself mainly with 1980s and neoliberalism, as new enclosures from land, water and forest with the model of accumulation by dispossession of Harvey. This new enclosures could make possible the commoning of different struggles of HES -the hydroelectric power plants to be constructed on the rivers in rural areas in Turkey carrying the danger of desertification- the Movie Theatre and so on. These struggles of rights such as the right to the city, the right of sheltering, water right, right to information, right to work) must be from a total opposition perspective against the enclosure of every sphere of life, instead of being private and special. This is only possible via a construction of a new language for Firat (2011, 111). In this respect, we see that the return of the commons (with the creation of new and reclamation of old ones through -the possibilities and limitations of- urban social movements) is important socially and politically. In this respect, there is a redefinition of “public” with the collective use still, there is a conceptualisation of the right to the city, a claim of right only for the urban space, rather than the state and its ideological context as Firat (2011) pointed out. This will engender a commons point for water, land, so rural struggles, a historical building and a movie theatre through the appropriation from the use value and the collective use against its commodification. Even though experiences and memories –representation of space- are mentioned in terms of resistance language, the main issue is proposed as the construction of a shopping centre and the homogenisation of the space (Firat 2011, 108). This makes possible the transformation urban space into living space via collective practices and new types of collective action such as film screening, alternative celebrations, and festivals to take back Emek Movie Theatre (Firat 2011, 108). For the resistance as it is stated above, the redefinition of the “public” from the collective use of urban space –of the state- is highly critical. This could be possible with as Klein (in Firat 2011, 101) demonstrated, by reclaiming while changing the privatization on the

contrary: not waiting for the revolution but acting in everywhere they are living, working by partying in the streets, organic gardening in golf areas. This could be defined as direct action; which is also developed by Chatterton as the totality of creative doings. From this line to Federici, Fırat declared that this marketization reminds us existing collective use spaces and social relations based on commons. So it carries a hope for making apparent commons, for revealing new resistance areas and practices of new commoning (“müşterekleştime”). This is valid for water and HES struggles (Fırat 2011, 103). It could be expectable of commoning through commons. For the thesis, what is critical is that apart from enclosure of what are common especially cultural spaces -turning into their economic exchange value and what Fırat proposed as the enclosure of the cultural capital, the enclosure of everyday life and social relations in the city as an oeuvre as Lefebvre conceptualized-, there is the enclosure of what is “private”. In fact, there are two ways for the private. The private could rarely turn into a collective action for the commons, from the right of dwelling. However, for urban regeneration case, it did even though it is contradictory and dangerous.

Kutlu and Tonak (2012) underlined that the danger lies upon the idea that the right to the city is considered as a human right. *However, it is necessary to be neat with its various meanings and to see urbanization processes and the relationship between capitalism and urbanization.* They underline that it is *a radical claim related to alternative life styles, an imagination of a social life after capitalism to a self-reflexive question (what kind of a person we would like to be, our relations with the nature) as Harvey stated which could not be reduced into a struggle against urban regeneration leading to reformist claims.* According to Tonak (2013), in the elaboration of the right to the city, there is an emphasis on the “consciousness-vicdan” and identity, by accusing neo-liberalism and hegemony instead of capitalism.

As Kuyucu and Ünsal (2010a) discussed the opinions and needs of inhabitants are excluded from decision-making of the projects. This exclusion but also the real meaning of the so-called participation could be expanded to all the decisions made about their homes and lives. Lovering and Türkmen (2011) explain this transformation as a radical and dramatic restructuring of the authorities for establishing a “neoliberal modernisation” in the framework of Authoritarian Neoliberalism underlining this difference of communities in different gecekondu neighbourhoods namely Ayazma, Gülsuyu Gülsu and Başbüyük having valuable land in the metropolis but also more critically alliances and changes in terms of claims, ways of organizations and militancy of “ordinary” dwellers, and women during the process of resistances by the support of activism of professional and other groups and actors including the Chamber of Architects and Urban Planners in Istanbul. Kuyucu and Ünsal (2010) demonstrated like Lovering and Türkmen by giving one of the most appropriate examples, Başbüyük (for a critical evaluation please read Şen 2010) as a conservative gecekondu neighbourhood, which resisted against urban regeneration and gained some gains in short term but resulted in a project of displacement and relocation of poverty like historical inner-city neighbourhood, Tarlabası, Istanbul. What they maintained is very critical in the sense that there were different moments and periods of resistance or some initiations by some actors, which could also change according to neighbourhoods and also inhabitants’ different situations in terms of title deeds, so being tenants or not. There are bargaining processes related to the difference of property tenure which are used strategically by construction companies to obstruct oppositions. They claim from what were experienced in the neighbourhoods that the *“collective right-to-housing”* ¹⁰⁸ *had evolved into the agreement of the*

¹⁰⁸ They used “the right to the city” in an earlier version of the article (Ünsal and Kuyucu 2010b, 53). They also underlined that these projects violate the right-to-housing of the current users, which take a position for the use value rather than the exchange one (Ünsal and Kuyucu 2010b).

project based on personal gains intensified by the lack of resistance experience and state violence (Kuyucu and Ünsal 2010, Ünsal and Kuyucu 2010).

It is necessary to underline the importance and the effect of presence of intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods in the discussions and usage of the “right to the city”. The right to the city in Istanbul must be evaluated from the theory and practice, from what is lived and experienced by the subjects. This claim was present in the construction of neighbourhoods to struggles in the 1970s and then after urban regeneration projects in the 2000s. Even though it is discussed and aimed an alliance including different groups and trade unions, there was some togetherness in some moments and protests. If the right to the city is elaborated as a concept still being shaped, discussed and sometimes contested on the way of oppositions, it played and plays some role in articulations by creating moments of alliances. Solidarity between urban opposition groups take action on the right to the city from and beyond housing, from and beyond localities aimed to be a general and inclusive term by the main actors in urban opposition in Istanbul.

During meetings and forum organized for the European Social Forum which were held between the 1st of July and 4th of July in Istanbul, the right to the city is discussed theoretically, as well as contested conceptually and proposed as a unifying slogan used by some neighbourhood activist dwellers, actors, activists, and academicians involved into urban oppositions, by various urban oppositional groups and multiple agents (Hardt and Negri 2009, McFarlane 2011b) against over-imposed urban projects, homogenization and commodification of Istanbul in Lefebvrian sense. These were attempts to build an alliance namely “Kent Hareketleri” (“Urban Movements”) of all the platforms, groups, neighbourhood associations, mainly shaped by academicians, intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods, alternative professional or academic activists by

international urban movements, organizations and intellectual discussions by using the right to the city as an umbrella term. It has gained various meanings by different groups even by associations of newly (re)formed gecekondu neighbourhoods in Istanbul and activists, intellectuals outside neighbourhoods mobilizing against demolitions in gecekondu and historical areas, as a common concept to form alliances with different urban social movements all over the world. It is necessary to remind in this respect, the role and the effect of the local actors from and outside the neighbourhoods for alliances and discussions on the right to the city.

Even though it was difficult for many reasons, a manifesto¹⁰⁹ was written collectively with different groups like actors from neighbourhoods and from İMECE¹¹⁰ and Dayanışmacı Atölye¹¹¹ as a Call to European Social Movements. In this manifesto, there was a claim for the use value and re-appropriation of neighbourhoods, public spaces collective and non-commoditized public goods and historical heritage opposing the construction of the Third Bridge on the Bosphorus, the transformation in Taksim Square. This is a claim for the creation of another public through struggles at different scales, so the “commons”. Underlining the need to struggle and alliances from local to united struggles, as a collective right to be seized generating common actions and practices, they claim the right to

¹⁰⁹ The manifesto is available on the website <http://istanbulkenthareketleri.wordpress.com/>

¹¹⁰İMECE, People’s Urbanism Movement, Toplumun Şehircilik Hareketi, <http://www.toplumunsehicilikhareketi.org/> is an open opposition group whose activists mainly produce alternative reports conveying information about urban transformation. They organize forums, discussions including neighbourhood inhabitants in which urban space is held as an important part of a wide struggle, where relations of domination are represented and reproduced (Akgün and Türkmen, 2009), considering the importance of self-organization of neighbourhood inhabitants.

¹¹¹Dayanışmacı Atölye (Solidarity Studio) <http://www.dayanismaciatolye.org/> as a voluntary and interdisciplinary working group composed mainly of urban planners, academicians, students and others having a stance based on mutually learning processes, while supplying technical information if there is a need and claim from the neighbourhoods.

centrality, refusing to leave their central urban spaces for new social houses which will be built outside Istanbul; the right to modify, shape our living spaces and the city by different groups, mainly activists -e.g. neighbourhood associations, urban oppositional groups, platforms, political activists- struggling at various levels, with different types of organizations mainly opposing to the urban entrepreneurship type of urban transformations, “urban regeneration”. However, there are separations due to political, ideological standpoints, principles and methods of resistance valid mainly for groups outside the neighbourhoods. However, they mainly underlined that the right to dwelling challenges the right of property, in other words, the exchange value. To an extent, far from being the right for reaching and claiming other rights while its usage remains restricted in some milieus and groups, the concept is for some critics far from concrete demands and issues, being too vague and abstract at a theoretical level. However, having considered different meanings for different actors, for some actors and neighbourhoods, due to the right to the city, the actors have broadened their claims and scaled-up from homes, the right of possession, to dwelling, and appropriating their neighbourhoods, their social, daily life, their social values, and then other neighbourhoods, carrying an importance covering all the claims related from urban to broader issues like environmental, hygiene, transportation, as well as hopes, opportunities and horizon for struggles at different levels and alliances.

The right to the city as a slogan and idea in the urban opposition proposed to be in some moments or possibilities for alliances, protests and campaigns between groups and actors with the pioneering of some actors. Neighbourhoods, especially actors from neighbourhoods and outside propose, learn and redefine the right to the city. We could not conclude as black or white for the meaning of the right to the city in its complexity of definition and articulation since it’s obvious that this means a lot for some

activists while they are defining the right and the idea, ideologically lead to new conceptualizations both for resistances and for explanations while being redefined from below and above even though it's not a solution as itself. *There are two levels of discussion and opposition: "housing, dwelling right" as a concept of struggle in 1970s and the "right to the city".* In Istanbul, right claiming is started as a political consciousness with an awareness/understanding of other problems while the system, municipal and state governments defining another legality, depriving already given rights of tax payers, consumer citizens. It is necessary to add the period of mainly urban regeneration as the deprivation of urban services and title (deeds or allotments) already given and the new period which started in a sense as right claiming period. Similarities and but also differences of lived experiences in neighbourhoods in terms of unique characteristics, political culture, tradition and history or having affiliation with a political party or not which is crucial for organization of oppositions are some of the determinants of urban oppositions. Actors' own experiences should be considered in the analyses and it's necessary to underline that the right to the city means different things to different people, to associations, to neighbourhoods. In this respect, it is crucial to include all urban right claims into the right to the city, not being stuck into one "word".

There is a necessity to propose some hypotheses and theories both academically and theoretically for urban social movements. In this respect, the right to the city represents an important touchstone. The concept will be questioned in what extent it could be a link between practice and theory, an integrative expression of lived experiences, discourses and statements of different urban grassroots groups of different neighbourhoods having different political identities, histories, characteristics. The right to the city, is used but also discussed, contested within the struggle especially the alliance formed as "Kent Hareketleri" (Urban Movements): it will be defined within

the struggle practically by different groups, activists from and outside neighbourhoods, for neighbourhoods or for the city Istanbul. On the other hand, the right to the city was also the main controversial issue in the meetings of “Kent Hareketleri” (Urban Movements) and at the end, accepting usefulness and importance of the concept, it was decided to take a distance by activists. Especially in academic writings, it is also seen as the main hope and opening for an “allied” struggle and for an appropriate claim from the authorities. However, the right to the city concept also remains for some critics, at a high theoretical level, being far from concrete demands and issues. It is necessary to underline that practically, it is far from being right for reaching to other rights and its usage remains restricted in some milieus and groups. As an idea, I strongly believe that it is inherent in every urban claim (right to housing, to shelter, right of living –space-) as collective right to be seized in urban oppositions. However, it is necessary to admit that different groups’ claims remain restricted to property claims and its exchange value. Or it is resulted in the acceptance of new conditions shaped by different strategies implemented by the municipalities and construction firms in neighbourhoods. In this term, neighbourhoods’ different characteristics, experiences and their political histories are the main determinant factors. The right to the city gained various meanings for different groups. The right to the city is used but also discussed, contested within the struggle, especially the alliance formed as “Kent Hareketleri” (Urban Movements): it will have a definition, will be defined within the struggle practically by different groups, activists from and outside neighbourhoods, for neighbourhoods or for the city Istanbul. Another turning point must be cited as the formation of neighbourhood associations, e.g. of Gülsuyu-Gölensu, which firstly used the right to the city as an article of the neighbourhood association regulation. The formation of GÜLDAM, Gölensu Gülsuyu Life and Solidarity Centre, on the 28th of May, 2011, is important because this neighbourhood, having historically leftist heritage is

one that experienced all types of struggle since the beginning of the urban regeneration project. It has aimed to unify openly all the neighbourhood dwellers, associations from different political views, ethnicities as an upper platform, starting for urban issues. The association was a need because of the old association's changing characteristic as a radical leftist organization, hindering in a sense the voice and the decision of all of inhabitants from different views, ethnicities in the neighbourhood. They started with the slogan: "We'll appropriate our own living spaces", to be a grassroots organization, born from neighbourhood, defending locality as well as general issues. Another pioneering characteristic which is relevant with the subject is that one association used for the first time "the right to the city" as principle in their rules, differentiating themselves and their claims from other radical non-representative groups. In the bulletin of neighborhood printed for the formation of neighborhood, they have referred to David Harvey's the Right to the City. It is also a crucial attempt to bring different inhabitants of the neighbourhood together, representing grassroots and their claim of starting from the urban to struggle in solidarity, gathering every ordinary people, ethnic and religious leaders, associations, ateliers/intellectuals outside the neighbourhood. Erdoğan Yıldız, one of the most important actors not only for his neighbourhood Gülsuyu-Gülensu, argued that they do claim the decision making processes while neighbourhood dwellers including the tenants who do not want to leave their neighbourhood in the name of urban regeneration. However, the use related to open characteristic could refer to a common ground of broader claims. It challenges the meaning of "space" and "urban" as Lefebvre did. In time, especially in new meetings for a possible alliance of urban social movements in Istanbul, the right to the city is becoming the new pillar gathering all kinds of urban opposition groups from Istanbul in other parts of the world in attempts for alliances for a collective resistance. In time, during the opposition process, we learn from lived experiences of different

urban grassroots groups and actors having different histories and characteristics.

4.2.2. Interrogation of the Right to the City from the Practices

Unless neighbourhoods share their struggles and experiences with the other struggling areas, the resistance will be incomplete....I think we should be able to unite all the opposition groups in the city. Then we can reach out to neighbourhoods suffering from urban renewal projects in Ankara and İzmir. Thus, we can intervene in our cities, and the struggle will be about not only the right to housing, but also the right to the city, not only for the working class, but also for the middle-class. Unless we unite all the actors in a city, victims and their foes, the struggle for the right to the city won't be complete. (Erdoğan Yıldız¹¹² 2010 in the interview made by Yaşar Adanalı and İmre Balanlı).

The preparation meetings and forum which brought together urban opposition groups and actors on 26-27 June 2010 for the European Social Forum held on the 1-4 July 2010 must be cited as a turning point in order to seek alliances related to the concept of the right to the city (see Türkmen 2011). The concept was discussed theoretically and contested conceptually;

¹¹² The interview is available on the website:
http://reclaimistanbul.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/diwan_istanbul_living_in_exclusion.pdf

towards the end of the forum it was proposed as a unifying slogan used by neighbourhood inhabitant activist, other activists, and academics involved in urban opposition from main urban opposition groups like İMECE¹¹³ and Dayanışmacı Atölye¹¹⁴. These discussions evolved into weekly meetings and seminars by Urban Movements (Kent Hareketleri) These attempts resulted in the possibility of an alliance entitled “Urban Movements”, consisting of main actors from these groups with the primary purpose of helping neighbourhood associations to function effectively during strategic moments.

As a call to European Social Movements, a manifesto¹¹⁵ was written collectively and the right to the city was proposed as a unifying slogan, as a bridge to form alliances between various urban opposition groups and different activists. The international call which took place before the European Social Forum, initiated by actors and neighbourhood associations, led to new acquaintanceships and to local and transnational links for information and support between new actors all over the world. One of the most important layers and most-cited components of the right to the city as the refusal of existing exclusions by discrimination and segregation in terms

¹¹³İMECE, People’s Urbanism Movement, Toplumun Şehircilik Hareketi, <http://www.toplumunsehiclikhareketi.org/> is an open opposition group whose activists mainly produce alternative critical reports conveying information about urban transformation. They organize forums and discussions including neighbourhood inhabitants in which urban space is held as an important part of a wide struggle (Akgün and Türkmen, 2009), considering the importance of self-organization of neighbourhood inhabitants.

¹¹⁴ Dayanışmacı Atölye, Solidarity Studio, <http://www.dayanismaciatolye.org/>, is a voluntary and interdisciplinary working group composed mainly of urban planners, academics, students and others trying to propose different resistance strategies such as alternative planning attempts and cooperatives. They have a stance based on mutually learning and co-producing while supplying technical and legal information if there is a need and wish from the neighbourhoods, to support their struggles and organizations with Bir Umut Association (which is another type of organization in and for neighbourhoods in terms of rural and employment security issues). The interview conducted with Erbay Yucak is available in English on the website: http://www.red-thread.org/dosyalar/site_resim/dergi/pdf/4080237.pdf.

¹¹⁵ The manifesto is available on the website <http://istanbulkenthareketleri.wordpress.com/>.

of use of centre, decision-making and politics is the right to a renovated centrality in terms of transformed and renewed right to urban life, which is not only a simple visiting right or a return to traditional city but a claim for being an active part in the decision-making processes (Lefebvre 2000, 158). The right to the city is also a demand with the right to nature, as a tendency to flee the deteriorated and unrenovated city and “alienated urban life” (Lefebvre 2000, 158; Lefebvre 1972, 120). They have evolved in time their right to dwelling, and that of others, to the appropriation of their neighbourhoods as social space for their everyday lives and then broadened this to encompass other neighbourhoods and Istanbul. In some neighbourhoods and for some actors, this struggle started to cover different claims from the urban to the environmental, from health to transportation, as well as to embody hopes and opportunities for another society. As mentioned earlier: This manifesto was an explicit claim for the use value and the right to shelter, which superseded the exchange value and the right to property. We must evaluate this in terms of people’s control over the production and use of urban space and re-appropriation of neighbourhoods as well as public spaces and historical heritage. This is also a claim for the right to centrality, to refuse to leave central urban spaces and to make their own decision about neighbourhoods as well as common spaces -such as the construction of the Third Bridge on the Bosphorus, or a new project in Taksim Square in some moments including the transformations affecting rural areas such as hydroelectric power plants- primarily for collective and non-commodified ways.

The right to centrality is also claimed in two ways: Firstly, against the exclusion from decision-making processes on the use of space as the right to modify and shape their living spaces and the city, based on their ideas and needs. Secondly, against forced evictions and social expulsion from the “centre” of the city; they refuse to leave their central urban spaces for new

social houses which will be built outside Istanbul. On the subject of centrality, Ömer from Tozkoparan stated: "...urban opposition is firstly a struggle for the existence...It is an expression for a life struggle both in urban and rural areas. It is a way to resist injustices. You believe that there are some documents from which the right to life is guaranteed by the authorities, secured by the state. Even though it is not changeable...You think that it cannot happen. However, when you get into the struggle, you realize that the institutions ignore what is human....Other things are important such money, destruction, to displace these people from the city centre." Ömer, speaking about the meaning of the neighbourhood for him, stated: "Tozkoparan where I have been since I was eleven years-old, is the place, a unique, different thing where all my memories, my dreams come true, where I had fights, made love, made friendships. It is where we identified with the mud, where we walked in its dirty water because of the service scarcity of the municipality, where we played and slept on its green...Tozkoparan is something else. It is beyond to be a neighbourhood. It would be unfair to say that Tozkoparan is only a neighbourhood. I do not see any other place in Istanbul where there are 10m² green areas per person. It is very green." He argued that the people of his neighbourhood have, out of necessity, learned many concepts and much technical information during this long range war, Ömer added: "The right to the city is everything. It is unifying...For instance, a family whose children is ill...as an overtime war...They educate themselves...We became the same in terms of urban regeneration in the neighbourhood. We are now explaining to architects. We have to do this. We stated in another neighbourhood, that you will stay and take bath in the tents. In do not want to live this dishonour. I do not want that my children and my wife live under the tents. I want that my wife and my child live in decent places...All the projects have the concerns about rents, including the Third Bridge."

Yıldız (2008) states that these inhabitants of the neighbourhood relate to the fact that they had formed a common and shared culture of living together fifty years ago, and wish to continue to live in the place where they were born until they get older.

Erdoğan as one of the most important actors not only for his neighbourhood Gülsuyu-Gülensu active in GÜLDAM, Gülensu Gülsuyu Life and Solidarity Centre, but also for Istanbul, since Istanbul Neighbourhood Associations Platform so the earliest form of alliance between neighbourhoods argued in the interview: “To live in Gülsuyu and to be from Gülsuyu-Gülensu is a very special situation for me. Even though they seem to be very heterogeneous, there is a very homogeneous identity here. Neighbourhood dweller does not live any contradiction (*of such as class, ethnicity, religiosity*) lived, felt in the country. For example, some tensions are not lived in the neighbourhood.... These differences do not present an obstacle, discrimination and difference.... it is a privilege to be from Gülsuyu-Gülensu neighbourhood, as a person who is living here. This privilege lies in its solidaristic relations, its reflex and reaction against problems. I would like to say openly: Last week, there was a rise in natural gas prices and there was a demonstration in the neighbourhood. This does not happen in another neighbourhood.” He stated: “Yes, we put the right to the city in the statute of the association consciously. However, this does not mean that it is ok now. It could only be a motivation and pushing force for its implementation. This knowledge does not mean anything in the books and statutes if we do not implement it in our living areas. We could write, prepare perfect statutes but it is important to live, realize this at the local.” ...From different methods of resistance, Erdoğan added: “ These methods do not exclude each other, we could see this in the life. The right to the city in this respect could be common for these two different struggle methods. There are theoretical impasses. For me, Lefebvre did not propose the right

to the city as taking advantage from surplus value... Harvey gives keys for that; to take an interest from surplus and orient this to a political opposition. Urban opposition could be to take from those who govern the city but expand to all the city could be a fragile point...The right to the city must include the right to intervene in government affairs and to struggle. From these points, we could create cracks perhaps. The ambiguousness of the right to the city has the potential in itself. We have to use the power in this ambiguousness. However, this will occur, formed by struggling. We could not form this in advance by sitting at a table.”

Yıldız (2008) claimed that these problems are not only those of the inhabitants of the neighbourhoods that underwent urban regeneration but that they are also valid for other subjects of the city. There is a necessity to form a common urban opposition with wide assemblies by including different actors, groups and classes for resisting against neoliberal policies and capital.

In the interview made with Erdoğan, he underlined that even within one region or neighbourhood of one city there are different groups which do not support each other's aims, so fragmented opposition groups sometimes split into two in the framework of alternative planning and barricades. He added: “We need everybody active in the opposition. With the experiences and knowledge, it is seriously necessary to construct a discourse on the right to the city of Istanbul. This task is mainly of the academy and professional chambers. People who do academic work on this subject have important things to contribute in this respect. The success of the opposition in the city is related to the strength in the local and to make the opposition of grasping the rights of the oppressed. Yet the city is a fragile issue. Even if the working class does not lose anything, here-in terms of urban issues-, he/she loses his/her home, which could trap him/her into an ownership issue.”

Another relevant pioneering turning point in Istanbul is that the right to the city is used as an article in the regulation of newly formed neighbourhood associations, GÜLDAM, Güleusu Gülsuyu Life and Solidarity Centre, on 28th May 2011. This neighbourhood has a historically leftist heritage and has experienced vivid struggles throughout the urban regeneration project which had been introduced. The centre has aimed to unify openly all neighbourhood inhabitants to become the voice of all of dwellers in the neighbourhood from the urban to struggle in solidarity, gathering ordinary people, ethnic and religious leaders, associations, intellectuals outside the neighbourhood. They started as a grassroots organization, born from a neighbourhood, using the slogan “We’ll appropriate our own living spaces”, and defending the locality as well as campaigning on more general issues. In the journal published to mark the formation of the centre, they referred to the words of David Harvey on the right to the city.

Yıldız (2008) emphasized that the formation of the association is salient: another type of association and organization must be formed which is based on togetherness, on its internal dynamics and on participatory, democratic and horizontal relations. This will create the potential for another planning and as a result an alternative city¹¹⁶. Decision-making processes must include the real needs and opinions of neighbourhood dwellers without them being evicted and displaced in the name of profitable distribution of urban regeneration.

¹¹⁶For Souza (2006, 2008 and 2010a), social movements can offer radically alternative socio-spatial strategies and plans to put pressure the state for tactical reasons “together with the state” but in fact “despite the state” and “against the state” with non-hierarchical and self-management structures as a way of struggle. These alternatives require a just society with equal chances of participation (Souza 2008) as well as a radical critique of capitalism, with the effort and need to overcome it by claiming the right to a radically new socio-spatial reality (Souza 2012c, 563-564). However, the concept of radical planning remains caught in a “top-down” academic-intellectual rationality rather than being “radical”, grassroots planning as a direct action and academic dialogue (2012b).

By struggling and by learning together, people from within and outside of neighbourhoods have become closer. From Validebağ Gönüllüleri, Arif stated: “The neighbourhood is an important part of the city. One of the most important concepts inherited from our ancestors. ...I could have the chance to catch up life in the old days of neighbourhood a little bit. For this reason, I feel very lucky. Unfortunately, they try to eliminate the concept of neighbourhood (*mahalle*) and connotation with beauties of our city Istanbul. This is very sad. That is a great contradiction to be hostile to the concept of neighbourhood (*mahalle*) of some of the administrators who state that they are close to traditions, so the concept of the neighbourhood.”

In this respect, we must underline that the right to the city is considered as mentioned earlier a superior form of right: the right to freedom, to individualization and socialization (Lefebvre 2000, 173), which must be thought on a “human” level, which is self-realization and self-determination. Appropriation as a collective relationship between human beings and the space requires “the right to be present in space” in terms of the production of space by users, essential for a “dignified and meaningful life” (Purcell 2008, 94). It is a right to the place of encounters and exchanges, rhythms of life and time programmes which permit full and whole usage of these moments and places from and beyond the right to work, instruction, education, health, as well as leisure (Lefebvre 1972, 146). For each inhabitant’s “human flourishing” (Purcell 2008), it is the right to the use of the city centre of workers and immigrants, who are entrapped into ghettos (Lefebvre 2000, Isin 2002 and Purcell 2008). As Souza emphasized, it is the right to full and equal enjoyment of the resources concentrated in cities, but only possible in another, non-capitalist society (Souza 2012c, 563). İmre Azem from İMECE and also the director of a documentary film called *Ekümenopolis* (<http://ekumenopolis.net>) underlined: “The right to the city covers every right. The right to the city is also the right to housing and also to a healthy environment, the right to education and the right to health, to

secure jobs. In fact, we refer to all of them by talking about the right to the city. In other words, it is the right for a humane life.” He added: “I saw rural struggles as a part of this struggle. A healthy environment and human life right. This is not only valid for the city but also for rural areas. The politics of rural areas affect urban areas and vice versa. To think these separately is impossible. The struggle against the hydroelectric power plants and gold mines are more powerful struggles. These are more organized, more unified. There are not the differentiating positions of the city and they are more attached to land/territory more than ours to the city. The land for them is the life. The neighbourhood does not mean that in general for us. They could accept (be willing) to leave their neighbourhoods but this is not valid for rural areas. There is a harsher struggle. They could be less educated, their relations with the world could be more broken, their struggle is more organized, rough and their gains are better than ours. I salute them with a big respect. In the rural areas. We have a lot to learn from them. And at the end, I think we are a part of the same struggle.”

Çavuşoğlu stated that he would like to define the right to the city from Lefebvre, *as a totality describing urban opposition attempts as war of barricades for this revolutionary right*. He argued that the articulation of these wars of position are articulated since the right to the city is *not merely a right of dwelling, right to access to centrality or to the urban services* but related to *an use-value oriented and democratic urban imagination*. Çavuşoğlu added: “The right to the city is a revolutionary right, not a mere right of dwelling; right to access to centrality or to the urban services. It must be elaborated as related to the use-value of space with a democratic urban imagination. Urban struggle must aim at the right to the city, targeting a more democratic, just city based on the use value.”

In the original French version of the phrase (Lefebvre 1972, 120), “the right to the city like a cry and a demand” (Lefebvre 2000, 158), the cry and the

demand correspond to “*appel*” and “*exigence*” (Lefebvre 1972, 120). We could make a remark on the translation and put forward instead of cry, “call, invitation” and instead of demand, “aim” to accentuate urgency, necessity, collectivity and agency inherent in its meaning of the right. For Purcell (2009), this is an insistent ethical and political desire to resist against neoliberalization and to imagine a different city. According to Purcell (2009), the right to the city of Lefebvre implies of reinventing social relations of capitalism and spatial structure of the city –from the tension between perceived and conceived spaces- radically. The right to the city is an “active right to make the city different, to shape the city more in accord with our heart’s desire” (Harvey 2012, Preface xvi, 3). At abstract and discursive levels, the right to the city as both working slogan (Harvey 2008, 40) and political ideal is an empty signifier (Harvey 2012, Preface xv, 136). How could this emptiness be filled? This is possible only in a process of struggle. The right to the city as a common entity (Harvey 2008, 23), as a “collective right to be seized” (Harvey 2012, 4) means also changing ourselves through these collective struggles. Çiğdem, being both an academician and active inhabitant of Fener-Balat stated: “As Harvey said, it is the right to build our own city by building oneself, ourselves. In fact, we produce; build ourselves according to the amenities, possibilities around us. If in our city, these are not offered freely to me, but according to my money, to class, this means that obstacle and limits are set down upon me. In that sense, a human being must have the right to say his/her opinion about how his/her living milieu is being shaped since this transformed city will shape him/her. If man/woman is shaped by shaping his/her city, is formed by forming it, he/she must participate in decision-making processes, to be asked about the formation of his/her city, he/she must be able to contribute in it, so in the formation of the right to the city, we must have the right of decision and to say our own words. It is a crucial right since this city at the same time will shape me.” Çiğdem argued: “There is an understanding that

people won't understand the right to the city but struggle for their house. It has another meaning for me, but I could not say the same for my neighborhood...This means that I have barriers against my self-realization...The city what an academician understands, with cultural consumption productions, with other concerns we support the right to the city. If an academician does not go to the city, they could not defend Emek Movie Theatre. A neighborhood dweller could not appropriate for instance the third bridge that he/she does not have in their life and are not aware of the vital importance. But their house is vital for them. The right to the city is vital for us for the free production and free self-realization. The city where we live determines us. The right to the city is to respire, to free self-reconstruction. People from the neighbourhood won't attach this importance and appropriate this. If we say this, the right to the city to the struggle, we won't have big support. It is important to motivate people from the issues that directly touch them, what is vital is their house and neighbourhoods. The right to the city is an abstract entity. When we say the right, we use the rights to attain concrete thing, they are the ways for attaining concrete things in life. People could not see the rights that the rights open the ways....The neighbourhood inhabitants must start from their losses and the struggles must be named from these. We stated "do not touch my house", referring to houses and neighbourhoods, but a house is more vital."

Some of the actors, together with other actors from different groups started to claim rights for others with and sometimes on behalf of those others becoming aware of the use value of urban space by changing themselves within the struggle. The common of the city found its meaning in time while resisting together against the enclosure of common spaces beyond the duality of private and public and social life in their neighbourhoods and in the city. Arif from Validebağ Gönüllüleri stated: "the right to the city gains vital importance. It is necessary that people defend the right to others in addition to their rights."

The right to the city as a collective, total and multiple right, Yaşar from Solidarity Studio and creator/writer of websites <http://reclaimistanbul.com/> and <http://mutlukent.wordpress.com/>, with unique importance in terms of information and critiques about spatial changes and legislations as well as resistances, remarked: “*What is important what we imply, express from the right to the city, rather than forming a struggle from the word of the right to the city. It is possible to collectivize...In this sense, the right to the city has a possibility to articulate, to combine...If we look at to America in terms of whom the right to the city opposition brought together, it proposes us this totality, integrity*¹¹⁷.”

Some opposition from the centre such as Emek Movie Theatre opposition and some struggles for a common space in the neighbourhood brought together some actors from outside the neighbourhoods in order to support neighbourhood struggles, thereby creating another commoning. Kumru from Solidarity Studio defined the right to the city with its unifying role: “We are talking about the right to dwelling and the right to use with the right to the city. But the right to the city does have a unifying role at the highest point. Since the right to the city does not only mean the right to dwelling. The right to the city does not only mean the right to use. Not only the right to life. In fact, it is a body/corpus of rights. It is at the peak point. It is unifying.”

In order to progress beyond the contradiction between gains from the new plan and the right to dwelling, there is a need to take everyone’s perspective into account by recruiting ordinary people for the production of another Istanbul, that of the oppressed people. Arif from Validebağ Gönüllüleri, stated: “Urban issues, problems could gather people. In this respect, there is

¹¹⁷ Please examine the related information about The Right to the City Alliance in the footnotes 57, 83 and at the pages 91, 139, 140.

a facilitating aspect to start from the city...In general; people stop to struggle when they get a result or success and thought that everything has finished. However, urban struggle is a struggle for a life time....It is important and necessary that various groups, initiatives, associations who are fighting for the right to the city cooperate so find a wide audience as base is very important and necessary...However, movements must be as far as possible from political movements and they must be independent from political parties and groups even if there are in co-operation with them. Another point is transparency. This is necessary to retain and expand a comprehensive popular base. I also think that focusing on hierarchy will lead people away from these formations.”

For the actors in Istanbul, rural and ecological issues are as important as urban ones in terms of the right to the city and opposition. Hatice emphasized that the world as a whole is an ecology, and stated: “It is that rural struggle is only pursued in rural areas. However, the responsible for the actual conditions of the rural areas, rural politics and the nature are the cities. The cities have their ecologies. These ecologies have drastic effects on the rural. Therefore, there could not be separated from each other. When we say ecology it does not mean merely the rural.”

About the vagueness of the concept and its limitations, politically active academicians Besime stated: “The right to the city is a concept with limitations: Of being politicized. It is behind the right to citizenship. The world is going to be an urban society so *the content and meaning of the right to the city expand*. The world is being urbanized. If we look at the world, the issues that we think about as archaic are related to citizenship. We could not leave behind these main issues. For this reason, the right to the city will always have a position in the shadow. In the urban struggle, the right to the city is inclusive...we have to see its limitations. What we will

say for HES. Could not we say the right to the city? It could not be integrated with that. The right to life could be in HES. The right to the city has its practical concreteness. When capital attacks and is oriented to the city, it has a stopping aim. But it is limited. We could use by knowing these limitations... It is not a concept that we reject or exclude.”

Cihan, as a pioneering urban activist and researcher stated: “We must use and I think we are not using enough international law and basic human rights. For instance, the right to the city in the academy is ignored or only used as to ally the struggles with other groups. However international law is an important mechanism. Before, there was not the UN agreement and the concept of forced evictions. This mechanism stopped TOKİ. In the Istanbul Forum, even the academicians were not accepting to use the right to the city. Deniz made a good intervention so we did. They stated that it does not fit for the neighbourhoods. They must look at the 68s movements and from the below. They were thinking to put another word. Even academicians, Ruşen Keleş use as citizen right correlating with civilization. However, the concept is a radical concept in itself referring for me to the appropriation of neighborhood inhabitants the neighborhood and the use of space. For this reason, Dikmen is important for me. This kind of city will be totally different. This disrupts the system from a part and could destroy. This is the reply for people who think that the right to the city is academic and does not mean anything. The struggle must be enforced by the academy.” Cihan continued: “Now what is discussed is the right to living areas, beyond the right to the city. It is the fact that living areas, habitats are destroyed by thermal, hydroelectric power plants and dams. While we are discussing the right to the city, this is involved in the discussions... Since when you set up hydroelectric power plants and wipe the water of a group of people, you are destroying their destiny. You take one’s self-determination right away... These are interpenetrated struggles. Another issue is that where the city ends and where the rural begins.”

Cihan referred to international laws' importance to claim the basic right to shelter: "We have to show the general principle Number 2 considering the 4th and 7th interpretations of the agreement about the right to shelter. We have to insist on the tenant's rights and squatting as a right. Since to shelter is a basic right. The state must give this a legal position. If you do not have any shelter, the poor must squat. We have to put this as a principle." On the other hand, she argued that in the world there are discussions on the right to living spaces: "In the world, it goes beyond the right to the city but the right to living spaces. We must think about hydroelectrical and thermal power plants. UN puts this as the right to determine the fate by oneself. You destroy the living space of people so destroy the fate. You grasp this from one's hands. We have to see this. They are all interpenetrated. We must see that the blurring boundaries between rural and urban and common pressure of capital."

However, for some actors, the right to the city is still abstract and academic far from realities of the neighbourhoods and Istanbul (see the pioneering work of Türkmen 2011). *This possesses some problems in terms of the right component and the relationship with the state. It also remains restricted to some academic milieus and –international- campaigning times.* In this respect, actors in the urban opposition stated their questions in their minds with the right to the city from these following points: Deniz Özgür argued: "I cannot accept the right to the city. I do not know perhaps due to the translations. I appropriate this due to its meaning beyond the right to shelter. We could use the right to life referring to rural areas. You could not appropriate the right to the city due to its development in capitalism. If you set off from this concept, the meaning that one attributes to it is very important. Do we have to appropriate something which is developed from capitalism? *I think we miss sometimes the difference between arrival points*

when you set off from the city and from the right and injustice. I don't want to say that designing the city is not important. It is not a struggle to appropriate the city. ...I defend the city from social injustices. However, at this point, what we have to do is not to put forward our design for the city. In future, this could be possible..." Hatice from İMECE and the Collective of Ecology in Turkey underlined that she still has problems with the right to the city as a concept, which is not clear in terms of what it is and what it must be: "Still, there are some people who use it practically. It could have some success using it as a material. I have also uneasiness with all kind of struggles on rights in general. I do think that the right place is not the struggle for rights. There are some rights for sure and it is necessary to defend them. But, to me, I am not sure about whether or not this struggle for rights is in its right place within the domination-power relationships.", and Hatice continued: "I have problems with the concept of the right to the city. I still do not understand what it is or what it must be. In fact; the right to the city is an empty concept. It depends on what you fill it with. There could be useful in some cases but to act from the right to the city for me does not satisfy me. It must have been practical in some sense. They succeeded in some sense it became a material. However, for me, it is not a concept from which I can do something or an explanation which satisfies me...I have concerns and feel uneasy about right struggles. The right place is not right struggle in power and governmental relations. There are rights for sure and we have to defend them. I find this problematic. If someone would like to use, could use as a mechanism."

For Yaşar, instead of organizing a struggle from the right to the city, we could emphasize the process and commonize from what we are implying from the "right". In this respect, he questioned: "The vaccine from outside could not be necessarily effective. How could we do an agenda from the right to the city in Turkey? The terminology of rights has its own

annoyances starting from human rights. In the conditions where even the basic rights such as right of life and freedom of speech, they must not rely only upon the right to the city...we give value to the cry rising from the city. This is necessary; however, we must be interested in its content...We must think about the next step from the current situation. As elaborated by Harvey, how could revolts is thought together with the right to the city from the current crisis? This is the main question. It is necessary to think about the right to the city from space and democracy.”Yaşar stated: “...Without obsessively thinking about the definition, we have to deal with its content and the relations with urban revolutions as Harvey elaborated. We have to think about “rebel cities” a step forward from the right to the city...I think that it is important and necessary to elaborate the right to the city from different angles.

Kumru from Solidarity Studio stated: “But above all, it is just a right. Right! Our whole effort is right seeking. The right to the city is above all the struggles dealing with urban issues, the most unifying type of struggle. However, before all, what is the most important is the right seeking.” Kumru argued: “Yes, we use some rights as right to shelter and use, but the right to the city is at a higher level, it has a force to ally. But the right to the city is not only the right to shelter, to use and to the life. But in fact, it is a system of rights. ...The struggle is not limited to the city. But all the struggles...If we limit this with the right to the city, we will make a mistake. We could not struggle with all this totality. So the right to the city is above all the struggles about the city. It is the type of struggle which could ally the best. But before the right to the city, what is important is to seek the right. But this is in every sphere of life. Political, social, economic, physical. ... For instance, I’m not using the right to shelter. Since it orients to a specific thing. Since the issue is not only to shelter. It is not only “four walls”. Apart from sheltering, we have many spheres of life. The life is not only in a house. There is a life in work. There is a life socially. There is a life when

we are using a city centre so if we take base the right to shelter for seeking rights, it would be mistaken. They would ask from us to struggle for houses and the reason why we are struggling for the Taksim Square. This is not included in the right to shelter then we will decrease in this sense. We have to mention every right. Yes, true, the right to the city includes every right. But we have to be in seeking rights, beyond the right to the city.”

Due to the pioneering efforts of some actors from within and outside the neighbourhoods and the power of the idea in the literature vis-a-vis social movements all around the world, the right to the city goes from being a discussed idea and contested slogan. It created some moments, possibilities of temporary coalitions, protests and campaigns, as well as conventional types of togetherness between different groups and actors. Starting from the right to stay put in their houses and their neighbourhoods, activists from neighbourhoods are claiming and defining the right to the city in terms of appropriation, of centrality and participation covering their “common social spaces” such as Taksim Square and Emek Movie Theatre. On the other hand, the right to the city has still remained in small groups of actors from within and outside the neighbourhoods. In the dialectic between theory and practice and in human and socio-spatial terms, the right to the city must be defined by different urban grassroots groups collectively from below and by inhabitants themselves. Urban opposition groups must take action collectively on the right to the city from-and-beyond housing, from-but-beyond localities and spatiality. As Chatterton (2010) states, the key role for an urban imaginer is to make today’s impossibility into tomorrow’s possibility so to claim the “right to the city” for paving the way for the possible-impossible (Lefebvre 1972, Elden 2004, Chatterton 2010, Purcell 2009).

If we consider the right to the city from its definition based on the appropriation of space of “active citizens” claiming the use value of the

urban space with a claim for participation in decision making, more exactly autogestion, self-management, it is a claim partially desired and struggled for.

4.3. Dynamics of urban commoning

Even though the framing could be different in various sites as well as within dynamics of urban struggle in these different sites, there is an on-going attempt for another production of urban space, urban social movements, different groups, local activists and organizations in Istanbul, in spite of its heterogeneous and conflictual dimensions, tensions of these movement(s) due to its differences in terms of alliances, reasons and ways, kinds of protests. There are differences, fragmentations and conflicts between as well as within different groups sometimes in tension for appropriation of the resistance, with new formations including neighbourhood inhabitants, intellectuals from neighbourhoods or not, academicians, critical city planners, and artists.

The study has an aim to question whether or not there is/will be an alliance and consequently, whether or not the alliance is necessary. The study also questions the potential to create alliances by asking what the reasons behind formation of the alliances mainly with the tensions between various groups obstructing their effectiveness are. It is aimed to elaborate what is needed by the opposition groups/actors that are in an endless process of learning, organizing like in the sentence “We make the way by walking”,¹¹⁸ from and outside neighbourhoods against urban regeneration projects, tactics and ideas for an effective struggle, alliances and tensions from inside and outside neighbourhoods. The reason why I have chosen urban regeneration lies upon the fact that many neighbourhoods have organized because of

¹¹⁸ “Searcher, there is no road. We make the road by walking.” stated Antonio Machado (in Horton and Freire, 1990 and Chatterton 2005).

these projects since the early 2000s. Yet the strategies and ways for the effectiveness of the urban opposition will be questioned to what extent these movements would be emancipatory. The own assessment of the actors from neighbourhood associations and intellectuals from outside who propose and discuss will be narrated to reveal potentialities and common aspects for alliances as well as conflicting aspects as obstacles against an effective and emancipatory movement in terms of their objectives, statements, discourses, strategies, tactics, influences in the framework of roles of the intellectuals, academicians in the urban resistances.

Actors were trying to form a type of alliance with a broad mutual and self-critique just before the European Social Forum which was held in 2010. The thesis had started with the question whether or not there would be alliances of different groups (e.g. neighbourhood associations, urban oppositional groups, platforms) struggling at various levels. It is obvious that different actors have their own priorities and inner discussions within opposing groups. In 2006, the Platform of Istanbul Neighbourhood Associations (*Istanbul Mahalle Dernekleri Platformu*) was an attempt at the level of neighbourhoods. Even though it is tried not to organize “artificial” - according to some activists-, sporadic demonstrations as it is discussed in the meetings, it could be asserted that there are alliances especially between groups in terms of acquaintanceship and working together between neighbourhoods since they believed that they have to act together.

I will focus on for which spatial issues there is an alliance or there is conflict, which contextual situations created alliances, what are the reasons behind formation and breaking ups of the alliances, whether there are tensions between political, professional and artistic groups, organizations supporting, what are the points creating differences and alliances between neighbourhood/beautification associations, what are the characteristics of

the relationship of the neighbourhood associations and supportive groups underlining the importance of the process and the changes in time.

Questioning the “spatial” trap in terms of social/spatial justice as an important starting point but also a trap/a limit for claims of the right to the city and another production of urban space, scaling-up (home-possession-neighbourhood-other neighbourhoods-city- system...) will be discussed in terms of commonalities and differences, complexities of articulation of rights on the uncommon ground by focusing on obstacles behind the radical claim, “possible-impossibles” as challenges. Narratives on the reasons why actors are resisting from urban and spatial issues and their interpretations will be analysed comparatively with the differences from new and old activists who are affiliated with political parties than merely urban issues or who have started for urban issues.

With an aim to be used, discussed in oppositional milieus, to be collectivized by actors, the study aims also to expose reasons, ways and kinds of urban opposition(s), different types of appropriation and forms of resistances for urban space in Istanbul from 2000s which is the period marked by the systematic urban regeneration projects¹¹⁹. Examining both alliances and tensions and contradictions, with an emphasis on various associations, local politics for urban issues, and urban social movements in Istanbul will be defined starting from conflicting and intersecting appropriations of space, which will be questioned in terms of emancipatory characteristics. Trying to grasp the main picture, reasons and consequences, possible alliances between neighbourhood associations, urban oppositional

¹¹⁹Brenner and Theodore (2002), to reveal the importance and role of –in terms of actually existing- neoliberalism in ongoing processes of urban restructuring, contextual embeddedness of neoliberalism produced within national, regional, local contexts defined by the legacies of inherited institutional frameworks, policy regimes, regulatory practices and political struggles. In this respect, referring to Peck and Tickell, they put emphasis on the ongoing and internally contradictory “process” of neoliberalization and its control on the urban geographies (spaces of neoliberalization) with the help of the state. Yet according to Brenner and Theodore (2002), it is accurate to refer to “urbanization of neoliberalism”.

groups, and platforms will be observed paying importance to actors' roles asking the reason why earlier attempts of neighbourhood association alliances is demised.

The moments of coalitions will be revealed with the analysis of the Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) as a dynamic and on-going alliance process, with the other moments of alliances due to the pioneering of some actors, local and international campaigns and outer factors. I will discuss what is being done already in a continuous process of struggling, learning and self-organizing to intervene in and take action on the right to the city and focusing on new types of non-hierarchical organizations, new grassroots and neighbourhood associations, and various ways of oppositions. Even though, goals and framing of different groups, local level activists, organizations in Istanbul could be different in various sites and within dynamics of urban struggle there is an attempt for another production of urban space via urban social movements, in spite of its conflicting dimensions and tense relations between these groups, associations and initiatives. The study has an attempt to make an analysis of the narratives of activists both in the protests, meetings as well as interviews by trying to reveal underlying interconnected motives behind the oppositions. On the other hand, contrary to any type of generalizations, activists have their own points of view and actions, which could vary independently from their group and association.

The study concentrates on the reasons why various activists including those who are already involved, who are affiliated with political parties as well as new who have politicized for urban issues are opposing from urban and spatial issues. This is crucial in order to interrogate urban opposition in sense of non-hierarchical, decentralized, networked and horizontal forms of organizing and struggling sparkling from the production of space.

The relations and tensions mainly between intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods will be elaborated in terms of creating potentials as well as being obstacles behind the effectiveness of the opposition. Differences in terms of political and strategic points of view (for instance from outside like alternative planning and struggle in the streets for Istanbul case), lived experiences and perceptions of the activists, which create turning points, also lead to tension between groups and activists. The study will ask in this respect whose opposition it is by focusing on “ordinary people” and “process of formation of urban commons” and their changing activism vis-a-vis intellectuals/actors from outside while assuming that urban space created another consciousness, a new political identity on (un)common ground and that urban activism challenges also “being activist” in a stereotypical sense.

The characteristics of these changing and newly formed and reformed alliances including heterogeneous and conflicting dimensions of these movement(s) including changing aspects of the allied groups and platforms within existing and changing power relations, tensions, overlapping and intersecting conflicts between political, professional and artistic groups and organizations will be the main elaborated points.

The thesis aims to understand interrelationships, networks, alliances but different frames in the variety of agency and in different neighbourhoods, their relations with political groups, parties and other social movements and their organizations based on different aspects or non-organized characteristics and recently their attempts for an alliance; while lived experiences as the main narrative of the study, mainly seeking responses for the question “why”. There will be an emphasis on three different neighborhood associations, which could be evaluated as the institutionalization but in non-hierarchical/grassroots way namely Gülsuyu-Gülensu, Tozkoparan, and Fener-Balat and three organizations from outside

namely İMECE, Dayanışmacı Atölye, and Sosyal Haklar Derneği which are the most active ones in İstanbul. These oppositions will be questioned whether or not they have created another political identity -starting from urban space questions possession relations, concrete and growing inequalities as well as power-capital relationships and interest groups-creating a new solidarity or new common issue within and between neighbourhoods including different people from middle classes, academicians, artists, planners, groups while thinking, learning, struggling, and politicizing for and sometimes beyond –sometimes common- urban issues. It is necessary to be aware of the fact that the characteristics of these changing and newly forming or more exactly reforming alliances include heterogeneous and conflicting dimensions of these movement(s) including changing aspects of the allied groups and platforms will elaborated within existing and changing power relations, tensions, conflicts and coalitions between political, professional and artistic groups and decentralized, open, organizations based on horizontal relations and politics in terms of different issues creating controversies and alliances. The main elaborated aspect in the study is the period the formation of alliance, namely Kent Hareketleri(Urban Movements) in İstanbul. This is also the history of some formations like Gülsuyu-Gülensu neighbourhood association and also an alliance formation between different neighbourhood organizations and groups. The importance of the presence of actors, intellectuals and their roles will be one of the aspects underlined in the study. Cihan underlined: “People from neighbourhoods are not figure artists. What is important is our togetherness. I met people in neighbourhoods, Erdoğan, Çiğdem, Ömer. Our ways had intersected. These people became people who forced the struggle process.”These could be considered as small affinity groups based on friendship and emotions (see elaborations of Clark 1984, Bookchin 1982, and Clough 2012 in the thesis). Wilson and Kinna (2012), contrary to Bookchin, explain these groups as groups “which could be dissolve after

action preventing ossification, small and temporary in practice work together on various campaigns.”

The main question of the thesis was whether or not there will be alliances of these groups and activists all struggling for their rights to the city, which were tried to be formed at the level of neighbourhoods in 2006, as the Platform of Istanbul Neighbourhood Associations (Istanbul Mahalle Dernekleri Platformu).

These urban oppositional groups display different characteristics in terms of neighbourhood associations, platforms struggling at various levels, with different types of organizations, formed in different periods of time against over-imposed spatial projects in Istanbul at different levels.

The characteristics of these changing, newly forming and reforming alliances include heterogeneous and conflictual dimensions as well as changing aspects and will be elaborated within existing and changing power relations, tensions, conflicts and coalitions between political, professional and artistic groups and organizations.

In the thesis, I would like to question the transformation and new attempts and inclusiveness of the strategies and repertoires of action. On the other hand, I would like to show the common ground of urban resistances in Istanbul. Moreover, there are tensed and unequal power relations between different groups, based on different factors such as technical knowledge or knowledge of neighbourhood which affects coalition attempts.

Urban opposition created new types of solidarities and acquaintances in the struggle and people affected and mobilised for urban issues. In this respect, for different actors and in terms of their different types of experiences, some neighbourhoods like Başbüyük, and Sulukule represent a turning or reference point.

4.3.1. Formation and Structure Analysis of Urban Opposition Groups and Active Inhabitants in the Practices of Urban Commoning: Differences and Commonalities of Components, Fields, Tactics, Strategies, and Objectives

In this part, I condense my argument on different groups' or more exactly activists' ways of resistance, organizations, repertoires of contention, and their changing relations with each other. *This thesis was an attempt to analyse tactics, strategies from the ideas and discourses of groups and mainly of the activists who struggle over spatial transformations.* At the beginning of my field work, I realized that there is not any neighbourhood that was resisting collectively. Besides, there are not many associations which have representation of their neighbourhood dwellers. For the neighbourhoods, there are same people, activists who were organising meetings and trying to find another type of politics. This part deals with neighbourhood associations and groups of intellectuals from outside and will be evaluated in terms of inclusiveness/exclusiveness of the core groups, type of organization pointing out non-hierarchical¹²⁰ characteristics, objectives, statements, discourses, strategies, tactics, problems and in terms of demands, identities, motivations, scales, ways of organising of the actors. On discursive and practical points, activists stated that due to political or ideological differences, principles and methods of resistance, some separations are evident mainly for the groups outside the neighbourhoods. However, after finishing the thesis, I will share especially common points by different activists and groups.

¹²⁰Darby (2011) pointed out in her dissertation that it is necessary to question the openness and closure of activism in terms of actors from outside and for grassroots from neighbourhoods. Moreover, horizontality is not a model but practice.

This period is marked by new types of organizations, being non-hierarchical, and decentralised. I would like to add at this point the variety of the opposition groups not only from neighbourhoods but also their different legal recognition. As Yaşar summarized: “After urban regeneration, neighborhood associations are being formed in spite of political fragmentations. So another association is also possible for us apart from grassroots organization.” I could argue that these oppositions for urban issues also create another political consciousness and identity and new solidarities, and more exactly a new common ground in spite of fragmentations and tensions within and between different activists. Even though there are supposed to be differences based on differences of politics, I would argue that the main difference comes from their ways of support and solidarity. Different activists chose their “affinity groups” according to their professional and academic relations, political differences as well as different emotions including amity.

In spite of tensions and conflicts between different groups-mainly due to the tension created by alternative planning practices and cooperatives-, organizations and platforms of intellectuals, alternative planners, academicians, various grassroots neighbourhood organizations, the thesis aims to reveal similarities and common aspects, as a solidarity research. Urban oppositions and their actors in Istanbul will be examined in terms of conflicting and intersecting appropriations of spatial issues varying from one issue / local struggles –from demolition of housing, removal of people to an appropriation to the city to being against the possible construction of the Third Bridge. *The thesis questions whether or not and in which respects there are controversies and tensions between intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods.* Another contribution of the study is that to use urban commons in a dynamic way, not only for the enclosure of so called “public and central spaces” but to appropriate and to commonize what is proposed to be “private”, “peripheral” so to create “autonomous geographies” as

spaces where people desire to constitute non capitalist, egalitarian and solidaristic forms of political, social and economic organization through a combination of resistance and creation, being a part of vocabulary of urgency, hope and inspiration (Pickerill and Chatterton 2006).

“Beautification” associations, mainly formed in 1990s do possess an importance both for some middle class as well as leftist gecekondu neighbourhoods with obvious differences. A beautification association of a gentrified neighbourhood could appropriate a part of the city or the “authenticity” of their neighbourhood, or could be against a spatial project in another neighbourhood. The legitimization of these associations could be pursued through class lines and their politics. While beautification associations (like Cihangir Beautification Association, The Association of Galata, 1995, The Association of Kuzguncuk, 1997, The Neighbourhood Initiative of Arnavutköy, 1999) are supported and defined as signs of “sensibility” for the city of dwellers in media and public discourse, other beautification associations in gecekondu neighbourhoods under urban regeneration projects -sometimes are founded as a reaction, or a part of the resistance against urban regeneration/urban renewal-removal with their former political affiliations are presented by their radicalizations. I must add that in time these beautification associations in middle, upper class neighbourhoods tried to come together with neighbourhood associations, and beautification associations of gecekondu neighbourhoods have become more and more politicized by being replaced by grassroots associations. At the end, active inhabitants of neighbourhoods tried to mobilise on public spaces, for the city while the approaches of activists from different classes, neighbourhoods and groups on the struggle of neighbourhoods differ.

The neighbourhoods are different in their historical, physical characteristics and social constitutions and so are their resistance. In time, different neighbourhoods which face with evictions and demolitions begun to *form*

associations, in fact, legal in front of state, and underlined in every occasion that it is necessary and crucial to be organized, which they realized by struggling. On the other hand, in time and changing conditions, the organization in some neighbourhoods could be broken. Moreover, people are not informed and asked about projects concerning their neighbourhoods and mega-projects in the city. In historical neighbourhoods, it is announced to be “urgent *expropriation for public purposes*”, which is in fact turned to be a legal way of dispossession. Another point is that neighbourhoods’ representatives in the meetings declare that togetherness not only in the country but all over the world is necessary. But it is important to add here that international groups and actors state that only neighbourhoods themselves could resist and they could give support to these resistances and propose solidarity possibilities. These international actors give some information especially from the world about global struggle and alliances and force Turkey to meet its international promises and national constitutions. Neighbourhood inhabitants always underline their living conditions under fear with unknown future. Another point is that neighbourhoods must support other neighbourhoods by being aware of other struggles. Neighbourhoods in time realized that they are not unique; but different neighbourhoods share the same destiny of urban regeneration. They have to be together and support each other in the meetings. Some actors underlines that their struggle is not different from rural ones. Some of the active actors remain the same; some new ones are involved and made important contributions. The active engagement of the actors varies according to their political but more crucially personal history as well as necessity of the local. Moreover, some actors which are former member of political parties or groups could be present and more active in their neighbourhood and urban opposition while some of them prefer to politicize only from the urban opposition.

Associations are mainly led, formed and represented by a few number of actors affiliated in a flexible way. In other words, activists are representing the main core of the opposition, instead of names of different organizations. In this respect, for the associations, it is tried to be informed about the reason of foundation, their aims, their main principles, repertoire of contention, their main propositions, and ways of resistance. I would like to highlight that there is a quasi-flexible affiliation to the outsider associations. What is important in urban oppositions is that there are no rigid or institutional affiliations with political parties. So, the study tries to reveal various personal but also collective meanings of the struggles with internal relations since as far as it is underlined that these ideas resulted from struggling collectively. It is necessary to underline that many people who are involved are constructing their political oppositions, mainly for urban issues within non-hierarchical oppositions. However, not every neighbourhood has the ability to be organised (self or with the help of outer factors). I must admit that even though we are talking about “neighbourhoods”, not all the neighbourhoods are united and organised without any fragmentation and full participation.

The leading actors, active in city-wide, were trying to organise and to be organised at the local level. At that point, there are tensions and splits even though there are few numbers of people. According to some activists, these tensions are related to the inner-problems of the left in Turkey.

Arif from Validebağ Volunteers refers to his personal story: “Why I am in opposition from the city is related to my awareness of the built environment with high rise buildings around us, far from animals and soil, traffic. I realise that they are also far from other people and sad. Trees are massively destroyed and animals’ rights are not protected. I learnt one day in 1998 that Validebağ Wood was transferred to Marmara University, a hospital to be built. I was informed about the meeting of Validebağ Volunteers and

became one of the founders of our association. The structure and way of working were appealing to me since there was no hierarchy in our organisation. Everyone is equal, including new people who are involved in our association. We listen to their words and take them into consideration before taking decisions after long discussions.” He underlined that they are struggling mainly for the preservation of green areas and nature but remaining in legal boundaries. They obtained legal outcomes such as making the wood the Site Area, which could be cited as some of their successes though it is not the ultimate success of the opposition. On the other hand, suing and expecting the results from legal ways could be disappointing because of the fact that we could not obtain any outcomes due to recent legal changes. The main idea is to oppose against the projects enforced from above which destroy nature and environment. On the other hand, “mahalle”, neighbourhood as a heritage from the past and its culture are also being destroyed. He argued: “A neighbourhood movement must before all take support from the neighbourhood. If not so, it will die like a tree without roots. Sometimes, it is needed to get support from outside, academicians, trade unions, professional groups and intellectuals who take active roles.”

About neighbourhood struggle but with a focus on what is common, Hatice stated: “*The struggle is a long run project. If you make a step, and you are unsuccessful, it becomes a disappointment. It is hard to get over...*Not every neighbourhood is the same...Every local, every neighbourhood, think that they are the only ones. *Even though they met in the forums, and they have learnt what going on, they are right but they think that they are alone and that they have the most serious problems.* Yes still they are different...The other impasse is that to act accordingly. *The focus must be common, which could be a strategy.*” And added: “Neighbourhood associations are one of the most important mechanisms, tools in the neighbourhood...It is a

structure that you can address and talk with. It serves to continue the struggle. Neighbourhoods and so associations are different. If you are not from the local, it is difficult to understand. It is difficult to bring there what is right. It is necessary to have people there, present there, to struggle, and organize them. Being from outside, you understand there after a period, that I think it's impossible, still to organize in the neighbourhood is quite difficult. Neighbourhoods understand and see each other, know their children. To spend time/ a history together. These people only can stand together. They have common things in life. They become strong when they are alike. To intervene from outside could be by supporting. To bring a technical tool or say hello. Or if it is time, for a plan information. Or introducing some people.”

About neighbourhood associations and their connections, İmre Azem stated: “Neighbourhood associations must be after their legitimations. Secondly, they must come together and work together with people who are organized around labour and working issues. Thirdly, sure, it is useful to be in relation with academicians/activists in terms of transferring information and sharing experience. In terms of issues which require expertise in terms of international support. These are all important and none of them are mutually exclusive. It is possible all these could work together. The part of capital attacks from everywhere so we have to develop the defence and resistance from every possible front.” About his involvement vis-à-vis position and representation of associations, İmre Azem stated: “I worked with different groups and went their meeting. In general, I feel near to İMECE due to their approach to the city and their different concerns with the city. I act with this group and try to be present in Kent Hareketleri. It is an experiment to bring the actors together. In *Urban Movements*, I think what is important that neighbourhood together. Yes sure, it is important to have other activists have concerns related to the city. I think we have a place; however, I think neighbourhoods have to be dominant. But due to the

reasons that I told you, there is no togetherness in the neighbourhoods. There is the problem of representation. Which association represent the neighbourhood? Who will participate in the meeting? He/she could talk with the neighbourhood? These are important problems.”

Besime argued about *the activism of few people in neighbourhoods*: “Neighbourhood associations are trees that people who are in the flood that hang on to. *They could gain something in legal, institutional sense*. Apart from that, with limited actors, they are places to do many things. This is very wearing. *It exhausts people, annoy and make fall into despair. Same people are burdened with many issues*. This could happen everywhere but these people live another type of weariness. They could be very angry when the expectations are not met. For them, an urgent issue which must be solved and why everybody is not with them. But we think accordingly, a feminist group could say that women are murdered every day. ..The political separations will create a situation alike due to its nature. There will be many organizations from everywhere. ..The neighbourhoods even the political ones re not so political. Even they are political, this issue does not make them political. ...He/she talks from the 1970s’ effect, not from today’s associations. This is more determinant...The permanent politicization comes from that time. The other one is more instrumental one. We could burden association as an association...It is a process of formation. It could go to different ways too....The struggles against HES gave pave more fastly. It is more important from its nature....There is an ideological knit. International capital does not want a risk to the place that they will invest in...Not to offend them (investors), it is necessary to solve the problems there. The attitudes become rough. They saw a reaction that they were not expecting for. There, everything left with HES, the life, the livelihood. There the relation with the nature is more direct. In the city, it is much more indirect. The relation with the house too. There is indirectness. Even though they built their house and neighbourhoods by themselves, there is the information

in the minds as a capsule in people, the house could be sold and buy anywhere else. The other one is another thing. They don't know how they could live anywhere else. ...The life is organized in the nature. If it's lost, its information could be lost too. The life formation/accumulation and knowledge. There is no other knowledge. ...There is a huge oppression and attack. ...For the urban regeneration, it tests. Since there are many places and options. From the easier one, it went into. It puts later the place where it would get a political reaction. There is always a list in the mind. They start from the weak link of the chain. The strongest links of the chain are the most political places where there will be a organized opposition." Besime made a remark about the change and process of struggle: "Like a school, they discuss main things. People change the jargon that they use. They correct each other, they refer to something, and they read something. They created many people who are well-informed in this process. If the oppositional political conjuncture strengthens, this would create an impact beyond what well-informed people were expecting. ..In these conditions, it is very difficult to have an alternative counter-city utopia."

About the *legal position of neighbourhood associations*, Kumru argued: "*Neighbourhood association is important to be organized, to be a good tool to be representative and a legal tool.*" Here there are three aspects: the self-organisation (grassroots), the representation and the legal entity. Kumru added: "There are not now "neighbourhood association based on the city where they are coming". For sure, this will create solidarity between people who come from the same city to Istanbul, however, the legal statute does not let them a legal struggle on this issue. We are trying to change the statute of neighbourhood association which do not let them to struggle. We are advising in this legal issue. *They became capable to sue.* Because suing individually is expensive. There could be some people who fear from suing or who do not want to do. Neighbourhood associations sue due to this statute. Neighbourhood associations gain reliability due to this act of suing

so the items in the statutes are very crucial for this reason. Since the strategies are important in this respect, they must have legal status and they must be involved effectively from this way.” Kumru stated: “So neighbourhood associations are places where they use existing social relations, are formations which enforce solidarity and “imece” relations. People know these associations, become members and go to their picnics, and to education courses. For these reasons, neighbourhood associations are important. The fact that we have neighbourhood association peculiar to the neighbourhood in every neighbourhood is not adequate for the totality of our resistance.”

Featuring the significance of self-organisation at the local, Deniz Özgür argues: “What is important to *organise in the neighbourhood*. For instance we went to Bedrettin neighbourhood recently. There were schools to be sold there. We had met from school issue. For instance actor Süleyman Abi was participating in many meetings in and for the city centre: the Chamber of Architects, İMECE, the centre. They took burdens too. But we could not do and know anything in Bedrettin neighbourhood. He would like to do something. He always went to Urban Movements meetings. We always underline that you have to do something in your neighbourhood. There are two, three people in executive committee. These are artists, academicians. There no common people in the association. Nobody is becoming member. You have to organise in neighbourhood...We stated that we could go door by door and speak in common spaces. You organise and we could come and explain. There were not any meeting even about plans. We could have informed from the selling of schools. ...To focus on the centre does not bring idea to neighbourhoods and took away energy...*Urban Movement became a club of ideas. People who would like to come could not be able to come sometimes.* We came across some ideas from neighbourhood actor – from Tarlabası- in other neighbourhoods –Çiftehavuzlar, Esenler- such as: do not sell your house, the price will rise. We have to support and stated

there too to appropriate neighbourhood as public space with gardens and distance to schools, which are valuable as gold. We would like to convey the idea that they would not be happier where they will go.”

On the other hand, about the vital necessity of activists from outside the neighbourhoods, Deniz added: “We could not have any need for people who do have knowledge in countries where we have tradition of organisation and opposition. But Turkey is not a country alike. *I think people who came from outside is vital...* We went to neighbourhoods to do film screening. For instance, we saw information need in neighbourhoods like in Sarıgöl, Şadi Abi. He was collecting newspapers; he was reading everything that he found. He did not have any idea about plans and laws. He told me to share our information with them. I said I wish I had had about plans and laws. I felt so bad. For instance Beyza Üstün did this for valleys where there were plans of HES construction with Gaye Yılmaz. They informed people so inhabitants mobilised... We do not have this in urban opposition. Struggles against HES are much more determinant, whereas the city is complex... Intellectuals, academic-activists from outside could not show the spark and idea from that people mobilise... They do not aim to produce an alternative and they do not use academic knowledge to oppose... They could not even appropriate their own university buildings... I could not accept this approach to be objective. If it is not, I can assume that they use of poor people to produce knowledge. You use the presence of ignore people’s existence... They could not play their role in urban opposition. Or they have little information about organisation.”

Urban oppositions in Istanbul represent differentiation of associations marked by diversity, togetherness and tensions which are within intellectuals much more visible vis-a-vis organic characteristic of intellectuals “talking for gecekondü” in general with their social justice

understanding and professionalization in urban affairs. Some of the intellectuals, “academicians” and architects are much more interested in urban issues like monumental, historical buildings in Istanbul, being against the construction of the Third Bridge on Bosphorus concerning Istanbul but also as well as urban regeneration. There are many platforms of neighbourhoods, sometimes with their alliances including international ones giving support, besides people involved political and social struggles like the association of Social Rights underlining that housing right is class-based and there is a class-based transferring of urban lands. Not merely against projects concerning the city like being against the Third Bridge, some urban activists who are urban planners, architects, students, artists struggle with urban projects in gecekondu neighbourhoods via their platforms, protests. The role of urban planners in the alternative remaking of urban space or critical approach, different from being a tool of domination by state institutions and capitalist elites is possible. We have mainly two groups of opposition of intellectuals, mainly emerged from the critique of urban planning profession and practices, İMECE and Dayanışmacı Atölye. The thesis has an aim to understand changing and dynamic interrelationships, networks but also different frames in the variety of agency and political approaches in/for different neighbourhoods.

People from outside who is supporting actively in urban struggles and oppositions are choosing groups according to their political views, professional preferences, related approaches to the neighbourhoods and their feelings. In this respect, the encounters and changing relations between different groups and activists deserve to be considered seriously. This is the main tension point between different groups outside the neighbourhoods rise from the “differences” in the approaches and kind of support in the neighbourhoods. The groups are changing in terms of their focus points: For instance, in neighbourhoods, Solidarity Studio paying importance to spatial aspects and technical, legal and organizational direct supports apart from

their campaigns on job murders, İMECE attaches importance to the self-organization of the neighbourhood and informing them apart from forming a public opinion with their documents. In this respect, the problem of language is important. Technical and academic languages of groups outside neighbourhoods are used and learnt by neighbourhood dwellers, especially by intellectuals there. Reciprocally, academicians and activists-intellectuals from outside are learning from neighbourhoods. Still, even though a collective language through struggle is formed, this could remain “too academic”. Dayanışmacı Atölye is mainly an organization composed of urban planner academicians and students. This voluntary and interdisciplinary working group in their statements underlines mutually learning processes, while supplying technical information, supporting their struggles and organizations, paying attention not to ignore dwellers and mutual learning. Dayanışmacı Atölye (DA) and academicians and critical urban planners Çavuşoğlu and Yalçınan emphasized the right of use and dwelling in the same place-against eviction and luxury housing, hotels, shopping malls and against any attempt to change the life style of Sulukule people- and defined right possession based on dwelling rights, including renters. Urban planners could play a role in the alternative remaking of urban space with critical approach and practice, different from being a tool of domination by state institutions and capitalist elites. There are also differences in academic production of academic-activists; while the declarations on İMECE and ways of resistance are signed as İMECE, academic-activists from DA are writing on ways of opposition, analysis of urban opposition and DA signed mainly with their names.

Here are associations and groups who worked most actively in alliance process and re-invention of uncommon common politics mainly in Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements Forum):

FEBAYDER

Fatih Municipality launched an urban renewal project with Çalık Holding Company in 18.04.2007 in Fener-Balat-Ayvansaray, which became a turning point and unique example in terms of urban regeneration projects. The neighbourhood, neither a gecekondu neighborhood, nor a historical neighbourhoods where upper-middle classes reside, founded the association namely FEBAYDER (Fener-Balat-Ayvansaray Mülk Sahiplerinin ve Kiracılarının Haklarını Koruma ve Sosyal Yardımlaşma Derneği) against Fener Balat renewal projects in August, 2009 by dwellers of the neighbourhood (tenants and house owners) with slogans: “Do Not Touch My House” and “Respect the history, no to pillage (and urban rent)” with an emphasis on human rights violations and historical demolition as a result of this project. The association was different from other gecekondu neighbourhood association since in the neighbourhood, there are dwellers from different social classes and different political views firstly organizing from this issue. Even though there are tensions within association, they struggle in collaboration with other associations of gecekondu, civil initiatives and activists. In this period, they, especially with leading force of dweller-activist-academician Çiğdem newly made a documentary film about their neighbourhood. It is important to remind that UNESCO supports their resistance based upon the argument that these neighbourhoods are a part of the world historical heritage. The members of the association remark their different position from gecekondu neighbourhoods, but do support different neighbourhoods’ housing rights. Çiğdem, in her almost all of her declarations and statements, underlines that the role of neoliberalism and especially capitalism in the production of space in the city and these contradictions and struggles could not be thought separately from power plants in the valleys, HES in all over Turkey. She argued that this transformation process is lived by the victimization of dwellers of neighbourhoods and a unitary, allied struggle must be realized though it is

not easy to accomplish because of the due to the difficulty of forming a common ground and language. For her, local organizations, trade unions, neighbourhood associations must come into together city-wide with the identification of common strategies and so actions. The struggle must be from a single defence coordinated from a same centre for a common solution by sharing experiences, mistakes since like threats come from one centre. There is a need of a legal commission is what she and other intellectuals have often underlined with a centre open to the public with documents, information, research results shared about urban transformation. Çiğdem underlines the importance of being from a neighbourhood since people from outside even though they support they could not feel like them. It is true that sometimes the dynamics created by intellectuals could even hinder togetherness.

Çiğdem, about the formation of the association, stated: “I formed this association, organization. I did not choose FEBAYDER; *we formed with our own initiative and consciousness according to our will. We wanted that this association will be one against urban regeneration and for this struggle.* If we do not struggle for this, beautification association will make beautiful the place that you will lose. If we had formed an association for women, there won’t be any women after this project anymore...You struggle for a presence there. So you have to assure the continuation of this presence. If you do not guarantee your stay there, your struggle will lose its meaning. You won’t be there after a period of time. So we formed FEBAYDER for this reason, for urban regeneration process and against demolitions, demolitions and the disappearance of historical and social tissue, to preserve our home, street, neighbourhood and living areas with its tenants, owners and merchants, its historical, social, architectural tissue, to preserve Fener-Balat as a whole.”

For the necessity and characteristic of local opposition, Çiğdem added: “It is necessary inform people about the process. They do not have consciousness and information about these issues. If we do not have these, there won’t be organizations. Meetings made for people are very important. The collective struggle made with people is better than individual ones. Local struggle could only be possible from the local. From outside it won’t be successful. To know, to analyse and to understand people are very difficult and especially in Turkey, people are very greasy and absolutely one day and one moment could be different than the others. To organize this people is very difficult. One day, they decide to form an association the other day after the gossip of the municipality you could not find any people because of the fear. To organize a grassroots struggle is very hard. Ideological and political struggle is easier than struggles related to possession and commodity such as house. Because of the opportunism, they could not be based on principles and do not have allying components. There is always a negotiation process, which is harmful to the struggles. In this struggle, there is a lack of formation of ideological dimension. To struggle and to organize with people who has a class consciousness and who knows for what they are struggling makes struggle more permanent. They will think that they do not succeed in this struggle if they do not obtain an aim that they are struggling for. But urban struggles aiming home or some material gains, if they are obtained one time, they will stop and leave. Or they are offered better conditions could harm the struggles. It is very greasy so we have to struggle by knowing that. With this, being in a permanent and longitudinal struggle is very difficult. When they will see the oppression and they will understand that when they must destroy what destroy them. If people are offered by peculiar solutions, the society will be fragmented so the struggle. People must understand that we are harmed all together. Grassroots struggle is very difficult.”

About the problem of representation and inclusion of neighbourhood dwellers in opposition, Çiğdem suggested: “It is important that neighbourhood associations work with people, neighbourhood dwellers. For instance, before us, Fener-Balat Beautification association did not this. It was an association related to the municipality and the municipality did not want to recognize us. To work easily with them. It was to fragment us too. As the neighbourhood did not support them, they are wiped out. Nobody applied for the membership....everybody became members of us. Our association is open to everyone and we are covering all, not segregating people based on ethnic, class, gender and ideologies. Our directing committee is formed by all political parties and views. Fener-Balat is like a sample of Turkey where different views could live together, all of the civilizations and religions. It is a neighbourhood which could tolerate all and live in peace. Nationalists and Kurdish people could live together. There is a system which tries to damage this.”

As a campaign that they were successful, Çiğdem explained: “ “Do not touch our house” started with our honest attempt. We have prepared a poster and hang out the house of our chair at that time since it was central to attire attention to our houses which will be demolished. We had done with permission from the Table of Associations. However, after a huge interest that it had created, the municipality had sent all his forces as an army, they had come only for an poster. They had attacked firstly this house...Fire brigade had taken off it with stairs. We had another poster on the window of our association. We were putting it when we were there, and taken off when we were leaving. When the managers were invited to the police station to drink tea and to chat, they had taken off this one too. Only for a poster. This shows that we could not use even our basic democratic rights. We could not show our humane reactions. We had thought about how we could use this democratic right, we stated that they could not take from our house. When we hang little posters on that it is written: “Do not touch my house” from

inside, it became a very interesting campaign for the press too so all Istanbul heard about this campaign. If they do not this type of reaction, it won't turn into this type of campaign or a slogan. Then it has been used as "Do not touch my university", "school". Perhaps we did not find the word "do not" but the campaign and the slogan which "do not touch my house" had created brought this enthusiasm to other struggles. We thank to the system in this respect. As Arendt stated the neutrality/objectiveness of the action. You conceptualize the action in a way but the result could be different like we lived after Hrant Dink. They did their action to create hostility but everybody replied "we all are Hrant." ..There while the municipality would like to silence and neutralize us, this leads to raise totally our voice...Whatever meaning you upload, you could not imagine the results of the action." And added: "We are successful to inform public opinion about the name of the association. We were successful too about the campaigns and a joint petition protest too. We have invented this type of protest. Later, many groups used this. ...The slogan "Do not touch my house!" was successful. In terms of organization, I think that we could not reach to the renters very well. It is not our fault. Even in Sulukule process, although there renters there were appropriated; there was no gain for them. It is related to the fact that they do not have hope so they think that why the system will be against us. They are generally poor and take benefits from the municipality and they know that all these helps will be abolished. They all will go and there is no gain for them in the future and think that they do not lose what they have. There are few members from them. We are good in organizing for house owners. At least, people who are not members, watch, come and show the documents that they have received. So we have created confidence in society."

Çiğdem, for *the groups and associations who supported them, commented:* "After Tarlabası and Sulukule neighbourhoods as historical neighbourhoods, we understood that we will live similar type of process.

We have visited Tarlabası. We have met people from Sulukule studio and volunteers. They have stated that they will support us. Tarlabası association, the Chamber of Architects and Sulukule volunteers have helped us a lot. Tarlabası Association gave us their statute. İMECE, the Chamber of Landscape Architects, Mücella Yapıcı and Can Atalay who became our lawyer later have visited us. Their support and the support of everybody whom we have called were emotional, personal as well as in terms of giving information in popular meetings. Direnistanbul group and these guys helped us a lot. We have organized with them a documentary screening collectively. They have provided all the technical equipment and made the announcement together. Urban Movements Forum is always behind FEBAYDER. We had support from the press too. For instance, Selin from SOL was different from everyone in the press. Bianet worked a lot for this issue. Birgün is also very important. Another aspect that we were successful in it is our web page, which is followed by the world. This was edited by me so the language was fine and this site elaborated in academic, oppositional and neighbourhood aspects. A good web site was important for us to convey our message and tell about our claims.”

One of the main problems in urban opposition is for Çiğdem is: “Struggling with negotiation mentality, what they will give us or how we could negotiate or consider this as a system and order problem, and reject what the opposing side in principle. They are two different things and exclude and hinder each other. People who did not understand the value of history and the renewal could be problematic. People who consider being modern correlated with demolition could say let’s demolish. ...Whatever the method, restoration or demolition, if people are displaced from neighbourhood, the opinion of people is not important if they won’t live there....I do not think any law could give us anything. We could not search for justice but itself it produces deprivations. The law is turned into an arm for the good of the powerful. It became a tool and in a process when all

these attacks are made with these laws, the struggle via law is finished. The legislative ways are closed and the streets are only ways. I think alternative planning, mentality of negotiation and refusal by principle are contradictory. They could not exist together. Resistance and legislative struggle would be good together. But if the legislative ways are closed, the determinant one is resistance. The only solution is to resist and to act together and to ally. To resist for a neighbourhood, a political party or a trade union separately does not serve anything. We do not have another choice rather than a mass resistance. We have to find ways to resist together with creative and permanent methods...” She added: “İmece stands with principles and Solidarity Studio and Bir-Umut proposed alternatives. Instead of a total refuse, if there is a solution, we must produce this. There are people who find one or another right. However, at the times of Sulukule, they could be right. To produce a reply for Sulukule people could have been a solution but today every neighbourhood is under attack and we don’t have any chance to negotiate. The negotiation is not valid anymore. It is necessary to oppose the process totally. These formations will realize this and they will take their place in total opposition.”

GÜLDAM-Gülsuyu Gülsusu Yaşam ve Dayanışma Merkezi (Gülsuyu-Gülsusu Life and Solidarity Centre)

GÜLDAM is opened, the 28th of May 2011, was present for the first time in the March against the Third Bridge as a component of Life Platform. This formation is crucial in the sense that this neighbourhood, having a historically leftist heritage is one that experienced all types of struggle from the beginning of urban regeneration project. The centre is the common product of different actors with an aim to unify in an open way all the neighbourhood dwellers, associations (of mosque, of hemşehri which means being from the same city of origin) from different political views, ethnicities as an upper platform emerged for urban issues. Since the association was a

need because of the old –beautification- association’s changing characteristic as a radical leftist organization by hindering in a sense the voice and the decision of all of dwellers in the neighbourhood. They started with the slogan: “We will appropriate our own living spaces”, to be a grassroots organization from local to broader issues. They also published a journal to express and inform about their organization and neighbourhood. Their another pioneering characteristic which is relevant is that one association used for the first time “the right to the city” as principle in their articles of the statute, differentiating themselves and their claims from other radical non-representative groups. It is also a crucial attempt to gather all the people in the neighbourhoods, with a real representation of grassroots by gathering ordinary people, ethnic and religious leaders, associations, and head of the neighbourhoods, supported by intellectuals outside the neighbourhood. One intellectual from neighbourhood argued that to defend neighbourhood with barricades, and resistance in the street could be situated against planning; however, for him, planning determined according to neighbourhood dwellers’ wishes could directly show what they claim for. They underlined that it is necessary to organize by themselves in the neighbourhood, according to the dynamics of the neighbourhood, instead of people who do plans and strategies for them. So the dynamics of the neighbourhood must be the main determinants instead of activists from outside. Everyone must appropriate his/her home her/himself since he or another people could not defend another’s one.

In their first declaration, twenty people, after three months-long preparation period, created a collaborative space and an organization of voluntary group. With a long tradition of social-political organizations which distinguish themselves from other neighbourhoods, this local association is marked by ongoing relations of solidarity, of a consciousness of “mahallelilik” -being from/living in the same neighbourhood-. While people and neighbourhoods are being criminalized, they are expelled to outside the

city. There is a need for an organized power, supported by petitions and signature campaigns, and press releases to cancel the plans. There is no solution for problems without organization; all of the neighbourhood dwellers, without any discrimination could be integrated to solve the problems of the neighbourhood on a path for a common sense.

In one of my visits in Gülsuyu/Gülensu neighborhood, Erdoğan underlined that they made, these lands urban lands, now they pay fees and choose their representatives in the elections like any other “legal” neighbourhood in the cities. One of the main problems of neighbourhood is that young people who do not have a job could not say that they live in this neighbourhood because of stereotyping. *People underline that everyone who could think, read and write could produce something for the neighbourhood since some intellectuals are harmful for the neighbourhood including some political groups, universities working pragmatically.* Since neighbourhood dwellers help people comes from outside, i.e. academicians, students from universities as well as artists; which results in mutual learning and producing. They try to combine different groups in the neighbourhoods, with those excluded from political groups. Even though of them have political past and organization experience, what is important is to struggle in solidarity in the neighbourhood, including every ordinary people. However, in the past, the contradiction between radical political groups and alternative planners became apparent. The main spatial threat in the neighbourhood is villa projects and new gated communities surrounding neighbourhood. Erdoğan, against these transformations and oppressions, said that they were planning a project of organic park, for the need and use of neighbourhood from the gardens of every house, so integrating and making every household productive. For him, the forum is important if neighbourhood dwellers could talk. Instead of waiting for the ways of salvation, the neighbourhood dwellers should talk about themselves, for themselves. The blockage of the words of these people is not politically correct. It is necessary to organize by

themselves in the neighbourhood. According to past experiences, the neighbourhood must appropriate their own issues and must not leave people to do politics on their issues, while urban issues are part of the main politics. Some of the important protests in the neighbourhood are: They have collectively reacted against construction/construction pollution, in the summer of the year 2011 and succeeded in changing the direction of trucks.

They organized a meeting in January the 5th, 2012 and they have done a press declaration two weeks later¹²¹. It is important because it represent a total opposition before “Zero Eviction Days” in Istanbul, held on the 28-29 January 2012. Nearly a thousand people attended the neighbourhood meeting and they have organized a walk in the neighbourhood. Approximately four hundred people attended the march with the slogans claiming that they do not want a rental urban transformation. They claimed for land development permit, underlining the government’s attacks on living spaces. They called for a common struggle, from other neighbourhoods to ensure the right to housing which could not be prevented, violated and they declared that they are victims of urban renewal. The dwellers underlined that they are not occupiers but with their labour, they established this neighbourhood so they will have right to housing. They also refer to the threat of demolition in Dikmen, Ankara in terms of collectivity of struggles. They claimed also for the rights of all of the dwellers, including tenants referring to European Human Rights. Istanbul, for them, is proposed to be the centre of finance, tourism and service sector and for this reason, they are expelled from their neighbourhoods. After the meeting of İVME, Erdoğan talked about the process with me and Şule from +İVME from Ankara, about their objective to transcend the local borders, another politics, at nation borders. However, from what was lived up to now, neighbourhood gained, learned from this process, from different people who came into the neighbourhood from outside, to support or to organize. On the other hand, in

¹²¹<http://imdp.blogcu.com/gulsuyu-gulensu-mah-basin-aciklamasi/11699052>

the Forum, there was a representative of the old neighbourhood association of Gülsuyu who talked for the neighbourhood but does not even dwell in this neighbourhood. However, in the case of when the political militants are rooted in the neighbourhood and they started to put urban regeneration as a prior problem-issue; but mainly as a tool for political organization. It is obvious that there is another reality which is ignored by outsider groups. The outsider could be from academia but also could be “in” and out” of the neighbourhood like leftist groups in Gülsuyu/Gülensu. For one activist from Gülensu, the struggle should be born from the reality of neighbourhood, not by dwellers of activists from outside. Apart from what is said by intellectuals, political groups, academicians, the essence is what is lived by dwellers.

Erdoğan stated: “To live in Gülsuyu and to be from Gülsuyu-Gülensu is a very special situation for me. Even though there seem to be very heterogeneous, there is a very homogeneous identity here. Neighbourhood dweller does not live any contradiction lived in the country. For example, some tensions are not lived in the neighbourhood...These differences do not present an obstacle, discrimination and difference...it is a privilege to be from Gülsuyu-Gülensu neighbourhood, as a person who is living here. Our children state that they are from Gülsuyu. This privilege lies in its solidaristic relations, its reflex and reaction against the issues. I would like to say openly: Last week, there was a rise in natural gas prices and there was a demonstration in the neighbourhood. We marched on for Tekel resistance to show our solidarity. We could see the reflection of problems of the country in the neighbourhood. This does not happen in another neighbourhood.” Erdoğan continued: “We have some other problems. We have a political identity like Gazi, 1 May, which are used to stigmatize and accuse us. We would like to change this into the fact that our children could say in pride and easily they are from this neighbourhood...I am struggling for not losing our house” Erdoğan made a significant remark: “We do not

appropriate from a property relation. It is related to care about our friendship with neighbourhoods, our life relations. It is not something like that I have a house and we would like to save this...Since gecekondur process is a self-developed process in Gülsuyu. It was continuing based on social, relative, community relations or relations with people from the same city.” He referred to old days and talked about the old protests: “Before 80s, revolutionary groups prevented not to turn into mafiotic relations. It succeeded in providing a more selective way against territory mafia. One of the discourses, arguments at that time was to give a house to who needs...the relations of revolutionary people are organised according to the ideas that who work with his/her labour could afford to buy a territory. In the 70s. It was a very short period of time, between the years 1977 and 1980. These revolutionary relations marked and shaped seriously the political identity of neighbourhood...At that time and time to time, we lived demolitions too. Neighbourhood dwellers resisted in a serious way against demolitions. We are lucky these days. We are doing oral history research here and talked with fifty two persons. The first residents of the neighbourhood stated that they were protesting for hours and blocking the road for the road-the overpass to be built since there were many deaths by passing by E-5. Then it is built by the authorities due to their enforcements of people. Later, the roads are being closed because of price increases. These are some anecdotes from the mobilization history of neighbourhood. ...However, after 12 September 1980, the military coup, there is an important break process. Revolutionary people left the neighbourhood slowly. ..This is a natural and self-transformation of the neighbourhood. There is a title deed allocation in 1980s in special sworn offices. The development and rehabilitation plans were done...This is the beginning of a period of armoured concrete buildings and gecekondus with crude metals. It is the typical process of gecekondur neighbourhoods in Istanbul. However, until now, Gülsuyu had preserved its social and solidarity

structure...relations. Comparing with other neighbourhoods, it is less degenerated and dirty. So these kinds of reflex are expected. We did not do something special. We only move, activate something in the neighbourhood tradition. The head of neighbourhoods always did this. Our beautification association did alike. The opinion leaders walked from this line. There was not a conscious act; it was spontaneous, intrinsically. People came to our house talked who want to refuse and what we could do. Including the head of neighbourhood, ...we went to Urban Regeneration Directorship, in Üsküdar. We made our appeals with 6000 petitions...This strengthened our motivation...and specialization too. ..We learnt what the meanings, scales of the plans and urban planning. We became urban planners. To appropriate neighbourhood anticipates the appropriation of the city. At that time, there were mega-projects of Galataport, Haydarpaşa port. We thought that we have to interfere it. The buttons, seeds of urban opposition came up. Gülsuyu-Gülensu opened the way for a formation of a reflex against urban regeneration all over the city beyond saving their own neighbourhood and houses.”

TOZDER

TOZDER, established in 2009 in the neighbourhood namely Tozkoparan established as a the 1960's social housing project where twenty-one thousand dwellers live, became one of the main actors in the coalition against the Third Bridge and Life Platform and Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements). They mainly work on exposing reasons why urban regeneration must be contested not merely related to neighbourhood or urban regeneration, but also about nuclear energy and education. Urban regeneration project was launched in 2008 for “modern spaces” to be built but which have resulted in the increase of urban rent due to central location and proximity to the main axes, according to dwellers. TOZDER publishes a new journal on urban social movements: Two issues are printed as a

collection of articles from academicians and neighbourhood dwellers with personal but also collective memories and meanings of the neighbourhood. The reasons why urban regeneration must be contested are exposed with articles as well as legal papers and meetings to inform people for in future a unified grassroots neighbourhood struggle. The articles are not merely related to neighbourhood or urban regeneration, but cover other issues like nuclear energy and education. In their declarations, they mainly state green areas (neighbourhood as one of the greenest neighbourhoods in Istanbul) and the common history of the neighbourhood (as a lived space) are under threat of urban regeneration. Another important aspect for Tozkoparan is that m² of the houses are small and new construction disables them from relocating in “new” Tozkoparan yet they have to pay the difference between new and present values, i.e. rent gap. According to inhabitants, the common culture, shared memories and solidarity in the neighbourhood must be defended. Children were and still are growing up in the green areas, with fruit trees that they were proud of, with the tradition continuing. They want to protect their living areas, with neighbourhood values, culture; so they claim the right to continue to live together. An old social housing district created a sense of “neighbourhood”, “togetherness” since they have grown up together, their youth had passed in this neighbourhood and for this reason they emphasize that they want and claimed to continue to live there. The association underlines that Tozkoparan must not be “indifferent”, but must claim for social and cultural activities since young people are under threat of malicious people and especially for this reason, social, cultural, sportive activities must be in the neighbourhood. Solidarity must be a habit in the neighbourhood and they must claim their future in this neighbourhood together since there is not any choice for them. In other words, trying to say put and survive, they try to defend and protect their solidarity and common ties. They refer to the problem of representation in that all the dwellers of Tozkoparan must be together allied with the association since there are still

people who do not act with association. They have stated that TOKİ and municipalities violate the rights while humiliating them. Salaries could not afford new living conditions in Tozkoparan and debts after urban regeneration; which is means to be a slave. They argue that people who have power want to get rid of people living in Tozkoparan and replacing them outside the city, violating also their property rights. The future of people living in these houses must be guaranteed and shaped according to their wishes, not according to the possible rent from the neighbourhoods like Tozkoparan, namely Dikmen in Ankara, Sulukule, Fener-Balat in Istanbul. They have organized film nights in the association for neighbourhood with the solidarity of other activists coming from outside. The neighbourhood was also one of the stops during ESF of the activist groups. One of the important events was that the popular meeting in Tozkoparan organized by the Municipality to inform about urban regeneration already planned in this old social housing neighbourhood. It was an open meeting in terms of open to everyone who would like to join, near the park of the neighbourhood; however, members of the associations are tried to be expelled from the meeting, which turned to be a dispute. The responsables from the municipality argued that urban regeneration was a chance, to be accomplished for their favour. When people rejected and started to question the conditions of their relocations, the municipality assumed that there is “no need to make politics there”. The oppositional voices are tried to be quitted. Especially one speech raised many discussions with the following claims: “We do not leave our neighbourhood; we do not be indebted.” After this opposition, the responsables in the municipality suggested that everyone who wishes to stay in Tozkoparan will stay since they will give houses so that inhabitants could pay like paying rents. The neighbourhood dwellers also opposed that the municipality decide the protocols instead of/in the absence of them. However, the municipality said that “urban regeneration could not fall to everyone’s share”. They also

added that they do everything for the neighbourhood dwellers, including this meeting and those dwellers could come whenever they want to the municipality. After this meeting, a grassroots opposition emerged from Tozkoparan.

About the meaning of the neighbourhood, Tozkoparan, Ömer told: “Tozkoparan is the place that *my dreams come true. It is the place where I had friends, made love, walked in the mud due to the lack of infrastructure of the municipality, played and slept on its green.* It is somewhere special, different, even beyond a neighbourhood. It is totally green, 10m² per person...It was even felt by a girl who is blind...She stated that it smelt spring. Even blind people could see that.” About the association, Ömer gave some information: “I am trying to organise the journal. We have a political identity of our neighbourhood. It was populated mainly by workers and survived demolitions. For this reason, to form an association was not difficult. It is up to people who could take responsibilities. We are against everything that violates living rights, social rights and human rights...In our formation, we have young people from neighbourhood, people who live with their labour force, and ready to struggle. Everybody knows the association. They are people who work against but we are more....%80...We are publishing journals, we are organising house meetings and panels. We have responsibility to inform people. I think that we are successful about urban regeneration, about the fact that people have rights. We are explaining ourselves who came and visit us and offer them tea. We could change their minds; it is a success. The main problem is people who think that to claim rights is to oppose the state with undeveloped social and political consciousness. They could not show their opposing approach. But all these are experiences...there are many people who say that they will struggle till the end. There are experiences about people. There is a woman who shows the title of her house given by

the state says how they could ignore this...Some people listen to these but think that they will not live anything...Some conservative factors play important roles; such as religion...You can create an awareness there...”

The Coordination of Housing Right

The Coordination of Housing Right (Konut Hakkı Kooridnasyonu) being mainly active in Derbent, Sarıyer by claiming the right to shelter, considers that the main struggle should be pursued in the streets. Even though it is won via struggle of law, it is obvious that the demolitions do not stop. The critical point is that if another alternative plan is proposed, it is a justification of “distorted urbanization” and “unplanned development”, which are the reasons of urban regeneration projects of the municipality. The main activist of the group tries to collect information to defend the neighbourhoods and stated in every occasion that the defence could only be possible with barricades during the demolition. For them, this is not ethical as a leftist stance since it is the same attitude with municipalities who decide in spite of dwellers. They underline the “labourer” characteristics of the evicted dwellers. The Coordination is supported by some political and “intellectual” groups and as a branch of some of them, which results in their consideration as “radical”. It has some connections with some international groups such as International Alliance of Inhabitants. Many groups who came for the European Social Forum were aware of their struggle and organization attempts. The Coordination of Housing Rights is in fact a small group of people who are politically active and also keen on urban issues, mainly active in the neighbourhood Derbent, Sarıyer in Istanbul. *We could even state that one intellectual inhabitant who was the main actor of the group and responsible and organization of all their activities, which leads to some difficulties and questions on characteristics of urban resistance and the platforms and representation.*

Since 2008, they defend the housing rights/sheltering rights of different groups like Roman people against demolitions in different neighbourhoods such as Esentepe. Before the European Social Forum, in February, 2010, under the slogan “All the urban poor of the world, unite!”, they had organized an international forum and protest with the representatives of associations and activists from different parts of the world such as Asia to Latin America. On their recent web site namely <http://konuthakki.blogspot.com/>, we can easily see their main agenda and information about the Institute of Mass Housing Construction, its wrong and risky choices of urban land for new housing, and entrepreneurial type of urbanism, legislations from their interpretations on urban regeneration and segregator consequences of projects. They are mainly accused of being so-called “radical” by different groups including other urban opposition groups and some academicians due to their defence of their neighbourhoods against demolitions. They even refused to participate in their international meeting namely “the Poor of the World Meet”. However, for some neighbourhoods, and according to the Coordination of Housing Right, “labourer” characteristics of the evicted dwellers and their ideological point of view are the main determinants. However, other neighbourhoods with a high level of representation, as a grassroots association, they left this approach or more exactly shaped according to conditions. They consider the type of opposition of İMECE from outside neighbourhoods more appropriate than the other groups due to their political proximity. Another important date was March 2012, when the spokesman was taken into custody due to the urban opposition.

Ayazma Solidarity

The solidarity is established in 2008, in Ayazma, with the initiative of tenants and the support of groups outside the neighbourhoods, which lasted more than three years. After the first demolitions in 2005, they lived for

three years in the barracks. Inhabitants have created another type of resistance, living in the park in front of Küçükçekmece Municipality by occupying the space. They united many platforms, associations also in the period before, during and after the ESF since they were representing the most disadvantageous ones in Istanbul, faced with total deprivation from sheltering and solidarity bonds. İMECE, independent urban activists, and in time Dayanışmacı Atölye and Bir Umut Association had given support. What was crucial is that leading figures of the neighbourhood were actively present as “neighbourhood” in the Meeting of Life Platform against the Third Bridge as well as in the meetings and forums. In one of the meetings organized for the support of international actors, one of the main actor from neighbourhood underlined their position as the poor facing these evictions and demolitions, as a reply to their emphasis on their Kurdish ethnic identity. Since needless to say, firstly Roman and Kurdish people, then mainly poor people who inhabit in central areas of the city became the target of urban regeneration projects.

Especially in the park near municipality where they have resisted, they took attention of people passing by and took different types of support from them. The counter-publicity for Ayazma was produced to criticize the construction of new gated communities on the neighbourhood by one of the main constructors Ağaoğlu gathered many people around the same action. In 2008, in one of their first declarations, they underlined that many people live in similar conditions especially because of urban renewal based on rent seeking, and there is a need to develop a cooperation of share and solidarity, as well as a common sense to create public opinion. They opened as a petition these declarations to be signed by different groups, people. Some of their declarations are written with the support of the outsider groups and activists; however, in a process of mutual learning and solidarity, they also gained a consciousness, and an own way to express and to resist. For instance, in one of the declaration, it was said that each platform,

organization must protect their own autonomous structure, and keep their own freedom. They declared that there was a trend toward participatory democracy in the entire world in the form of management. Their problems in the neighbourhood were infrastructure problems, lack of education facilities, accessible health care fields to be qualified, green areas, public spaces, road infrastructure, water, electricity and unemployment, which have special priority. Other focus points were on the urban renewal projects accomplished by without asking decisions of dwellers due to the rent of land speculators instead of public interest, which are also experience in other neighbourhoods in Istanbul. They ask another participatory solution without displacement of inhabitants, for the interest of people living there. They claimed for social housing, job, and tenant help/rent assistance according to the mayor's promises. They started and continued to live in the barracks during the winters at the outskirts and after to demonstrate in the park, especially after the end of May, 2010. There was an outer call and press declaration, in 27 May 2010, to support their demonstration, to state that there is a collective struggle in solidarity for their right of housing, in the park generally every Saturday, in front of Küçükçekmece Municipality. In this collective declaration, there was reference to demolition of neighbourhoods, schools, hospitals, cinema halls, parks and public spaces, reminding that the Republic of Turkey and local governments were obliged to implement the rules of the Constitution and the laws, the right to housing. Neighbourhood associations like that of Başbüyük, Fener-Balat, Tozkoparan, Gaziosmanpaşa-Sarıgöl, The Coordination of Housing Right, Sulukule Roman Kültürünü Yaşatma ve Dayanışma Derneği, Gülsuyu-Gülensu, Validebağ, from Ankara, Dikmen, Kaletpe, associations from outside like Solidarity Studio, İMECE, Association of Social Rights, The Platform of Sulukule, UN Habitat AGFE, The Association of Contemporary Lawyers, The Collective of Ecology, GÖÇ-DER, The Association of

Human Settlements, The Chamber of Urban Planners Istanbul were some of the groups who supported and signed for them.

Cihan as an urban activist and former UN-Habitat AGFE representative who supported Ayazma inhabitants and initiated international support stated: “Every Monday, I was giving courses in the form of conversations as a voluntary in Ayazma in 2005. At that time, there were demolitions and children were talking about their lives. I went to their houses to inform and be informed about and they welcomed me with a warm hospitality even though it was very hard for them due to their economic conditions. They were pitching up the tents in 2007 addressing to the Municipality. At that time, there were not any urban opposition. And nobody was interested in. We were writing to our friends, groups and calling the press. And at that time, I wrote to Mehmet Altan and put the entire letter to his column. We have produced cards on that there are the articles of the Constitution and international agreements on the right of housing. At that time, Kasım phoned me and stated that Erdoğan had visited the neighbourhood, as The Platform of Neighbourhood Associations. At the New Year eve, the 31th December 2007, I wrote an article about it. We met with Erdoğan and friends from İMECE there. Then there was demolitions in Başbüyük and asked me to come to explain what they will live after the demolitions. Later I decided to write my thesis –to be announced and shared- on these right violations.” Cihan continued with her efforts to inform international institutions about Ayazma to get support vis-à-vis difficulties of neighbourhood organisation: “Then I wrote to Yves Cabannes about human right violations for the functioning of related system. They told that they talked about Ayazma with Sulukule in Nairobi, Habitat Meeting. I learnt this use of international mechanisms from Hacer, the Sulukule Platform. We have formed a translation group. It was a horizontal solidarity group and everyone had a mission. When I said the Sulukule Platform, everyone knows us in the UN. Even though reports were written by the High

Commissariat of Human Rights, it did not have any result in Turkey. We could state that Romans had no practice of organization. Moreover, it was beyond us. Even leftist groups could not accomplish that since they do not talk the same language.” She made a self-critique about her emphasis on entertainment culture: “However, we did a mistake to emphasis not on the right of housing, but “40 days and 40 nights”. If we had done this, we could have articulated with other struggles. We must be aware that since it was a roman struggle, it attired attention of the EU. However we did the best that we could have done. The last rose house had survived. Şükrü, the member of the Roman Orchestra became the leader. Kasım from Ayazma had been changed a lot from the early days. The language has been changed in the struggle. The hundreds or ten of people has not been appeared but some leaders, of different types had emerged. In Dikmen too. It emerged by itself. Neighbourhoods became visible by referring to the others. They understood that if they do not organize, they will live the same. At the end, TOKİ made tenants as right owners for housing. Only 18 tenants did not have this. I tried to explain that the houses in Bezirganbahçe are not appropriate for them. They would not pay but they want this. This is a big dilemma. I am against this in the struggle but they want this. For instance, we did Tokludedede visible with the struggle of Çiğdem and the photos of Nejla. There were other groups which were taking photos there too. The process is documented and made as an agenda in Amnesty International. However, this could not stop the demolition.” What she did the best, Cihan refers to her orientation of İmre, the film Ekümenopolis to Ayazma neighbourhood: “At that time, İmre visited the tents. He was doing the movie on the Third Bridge before. We did many interviews in Ayazma. I am happy with that. The film Ekümenopolis was distributed all over the world with academicians. The press after a period made news.” Referring to her international pioneering and its effects on TOKİ, Cihan added: “AGFE is a good success too. Habitat report was important especially in front of TOKİ.

Since before TOKİ was having prizes of good practices, now it became the institution of forced evictions. Now we have academicians who do field researches, artists, photographers, public art field. However, what is important for me to convey my message in the journals for commons people.”

Cihan underlined the self-organization of neighbourhoods and their peculiarities: “I state people and inhabitants that I could not state what they must do. They will find their way by themselves. The Romans in Sulukule will be different than Ayazma. First of all, we have to put the alternative about what kind of city we want. Nothing happens if we did not do so.” Cihan also underlined the transformation of people vis-à-vis “ideological and outer groups” who came to support them: “In Ayazma, they told that people came here and we also changed in time. You go there to say that you are not alone. However, they are groups and people who go there to benefit politically. They try to make ideological. In Ayazma, The Coordination of Housing Rights excluded from their protests the inhabitants who carry the flag of Turkey. They stated that we did not go since they excluded him. We could not think about to impose our own ideologies and approaches. You know they are conservative neighbourhoods. I could not expect people to be like me.”

İMECE

İMECE, Toplumun Şehircilik Hareketi, People’s Urbanism Movement, is a independent civil association founded in 2006 with their slogan “*Dönüştürücülere İnat, İmece usulü Hayat*”. In their earlier times, they introduced themselves as urban planners supporting working classes and human labour resistances by “working with them” and “side by side with them” and criticized urban planning practices in the crisis of the professional ethic. Their initiation was a critique and re-appropriation of urban planning against “professional specialization” with market-led plans,

decadence and understanding from up to bottom. Later, in their principles, they underline that they are composed of people from different professions, students, academicians, and more crucially “neighbourhood dwellers”, by distancing and criticizing the practices of planning profession and claiming: “The Urbanist is you!” They declared in their principles that planning is a process which everyone must participate in equally to attain public benefit, against so-called “participation”. Public benefits and spaces are being sold, centres reserved for the capital, while citizens are considered to be consumers and poor people exiled to the outskirts of the city. Since all the spaces *including rural areas where they had lived and produced, all along services like health and city history were being sold out*. In this respect, public spaces could be open to the society’s ability to take decision. Due to the fact that their voice will be weak if they do not stand side by side, they stated in their statement that they are commonizing existing struggles on mobilization and production and trying to scaling up the struggles against the attacks to *natural and cultural values* for rights for human living with hopes for another life. The rights to shelter, work and life are principle, refusing class segregation due to property relations.

One of the most common concepts used in their reports and statement was questioning social justice from “the conceptualization, understanding of social justice of middle classes”. Underlining that they give importance to the usage of “language”-“radicalization” of their “professional” language-, their slogans have a political approach by emphasizing human being and its labour. Even though they are still mainly composed of urban planners, instead of proposing alternative projects, they emphasized the necessity of struggling with systemic problems, mainly earlier times defining neighbourhood as “working classes” neighbourhoods. Instead of being supporting, advocating, the organization considers the alternative as forming itself and covering everybody. In their principles, being independent of ant professional civil, political and professional organization, it is open to

everyone based on the principles. *The last principle is worth mentioning: They argue that according to basic ones which remain as they are, these principles could be changed, and redeveloped and new ones could be added in time.* It is underlined that they are learning urbanism in the streets and stated that they offered the science to the service of solidarity in life. They use technical and academic knowledge to write critical reports, articles in different sources and to inform people not only *technically but also “theoretically” on urban issues*: It is as they underline in their principles, “to push people to think about”. They support the idea that knowledge is a social fact, must be produced together. *Even though some activists mobilizing with İMECE thought that they could not predigest their language, in their principle, they argue that another living language must be used against the academically clumsy language far from the society.* What is important as stated by *many activists even from neighbourhood*, İMECE was like a school with seminars and discussions. They do reveal theoretical dimensions of the reasons why people have to struggle for Taksim Square, for neighbourhoods *based on the use rather than the exchange value of urban as well as rural spaces* like commodities.

They mainly struggle in/for every neighbourhood in the streets and with their declarations and reports. Their meetings and forums as well as e-mail groups open to everyone inform many people from and outside neighbourhoods and create an open, inclusive and common milieu. They organise film screenings if neighbourhood wish and organise some meetings to inform about the process of urban regeneration to *reveal the importance of the use value of urban space*. As they underline in their principles, *it is a non-hierarchical group, while decisions being made collectively*. I do attach importance to the principles as an open call to people who are interested in these issues, to produce *common living spaces and for another life*. Even though they are open to everyone and every urban, rural issues and beyond, as a systemic problem, they reserve their position outside the

neighbourhoods according to their principles and experiences. So in time, new activists from different political and professional background could join or only attend these meetings. However, apart from their presence in neighbourhoods, *they support self-organization of neighbourhood and necessity to struggle from where we/activists are. I must underline that they are keen on this issue that they find critical, which determines and differentiates their standing point.*

In their forum, March 2011, they underlined apart from struggles in neighbourhoods, the necessity of appropriation of public areas, 2B areas, forest areas, historical buildings and neighbourhoods, Emek Movie Theatre, educational buildings, schools claiming must be allied with trade unions and other types of oppositional groups. In the article of the members of İMECE, Akgün and Türkmen (2009) accentuate the necessity to think together all the struggles over space and the *similarity between the struggle for rivers in Black Sea region and “right for living”, and especially with workers’ struggles based on “labour”*. In that sense, space is an important part of the struggle, being an area where relations of domination are represented and reproduced. The struggle must include a claim for a new public space shaped through urban social movements against bourgeois public space.

We have to think about the protests and their meanings for different groups and activists. The protests while bringing together different people and neighbourhoods, they could turn into “artificial occasions”. However, it is true that many people get acquainted with different neighbourhoods and intellectuals due to meetings before and on the day of protests. Deniz Özgür, one of the important urban activists in Istanbul, stated that groups outside the neighbourhoods must evaluate and question themselves as İMECE did, who they are, what they will do. The forums which are organised every year were an open self-searching, self-evaluation. It is urgent to include urban agenda into political groups. It is sure that many groups do this especially in

the turning moments or in case of some problems or change in terms of tactics and strategies. About the roles of actors outside neighbourhoods, İmre Azem stated: “This could change for everyone. I do not want to say that the roles must be this and that. I do not find this right. This (support from outside) must be based on confidence. This must be open. Neighbourhood dwellers want to protect my neighbourhood and then if the municipality gives more 20 000 TL so live in/sell their home is not a sincere act. People coming from outside, saying that I am with you, and leave when he/she finishes her/his thesis is insincere. Both of the two sides must be sincere. The confidence here is important. I do not care about the way.”

In their speech namely Housing Right: Discussing once again Social Opposition, November 2011, in the 7th Urbanization Congress in Turkey, İMECE underlines the importance of discussing today's of urban struggle for its future shaping. They stated that there are many projects in rural and urban areas, with different scales. Even though the fact that the opposition is divided is normal, it brings a very problematic structure with itself. With different negotiation grounds and new regulations, the oppositions are broken due to new rent sharing speculation, which leads to consent construction mechanisms and to hinder groups who are directly affected by decisions and projects from being subjects of the struggles. Within urban movements, there is a tendency of preserving discourses which were produced long time ago, which represents one of the main problems. They refer to the power of being shaped and to shape of the space with the importance of everyday life. TOKİ has one of the main roles with its renaissance as an infinite authority while local services are centralized and people being excluded. This exclusion does mean also “disinformation” – mainly for the property- and short-term solutions in the urban politics area. This is an illusion of inclusion and information indeed. Apart from over-imposed urban regeneration projects resulting permanently indebted positions, mega-projects such as Galataport, Haydarpaşaport, and the Third

Bridge in these “mad, brand cities” (which were the main aspects of election declaration) are the focus points of urban opposition. However, different localities could not gather in protests for these different issues. New legal means- such as the consent of the half of a building- became new methods of the capital and the government by praising private property as a security for the future. One of the main problematic of the urban oppositions are cited as no institutionalization in a sense that not turning into an institution but not being capable of accumulating formed relations and power. This also leads to discuss around the same issues but not to be able of practicing. They explicitly proposed that if there is a total resistance against negotiation without creating a hopeful horizon as a counter-hegemony project, this will result normally in a negotiation/bargaining. One of the main problems is to stay within neighbourhoods even though there is a claim of forming unity. Every day, the detachment from urban struggle is gaining speed, without being commonized and expanded/broadened. Being reflexive struggles against urban regeneration, they need to form a common base. This could only be possible by being together in action, which does not mean to support each other. There is a need to commonize critiques to the core of these attacks with the total reject and an attempt to form another life from today, which will be more effective than platforms and similar types of structures. This alternative vision could be supported and shared by political parties and trade unions. The counter-hegemonic alternative agenda is not only a problem of organization but also new ideas formation in the framework of a proactive and positive agenda: This could be possible by thinking and producing new dispossession forms. Some related examples could be the radicalization of cooperatives, finding right and security forms not based on possession, new initiatives for the tenants. While localities are not directly faced with problems, the opposition against mega-projects is another pillar, different from housing areas. For instance, the Platform against the Third Bridge could be an example for the formation peculiar to

every issue and project. However, every group send its representatives to the platforms and so could not expand to its ground, which represents one of the main problems. Another problem is that there are upper administrative organs in the legal and hierarchical organizations for example during decision-making. Distrust between people and platforms with rising bureaucracy and reflexes slowing down, organizational contests and competition reproduce again this bureaucracy. The interrelations between problems for instance in rural and urban areas could create more resistant and powerful political subject. Yet the platforms, as they underlined, are functional when they are focused on problems and could affect fast. They are not formed around ideology and political line but commonize on an issue/problem at the minimum and while struggling for this issue, they are characterised as structures leaving aside controversial aspects. They point out the fact that, especially for struggles on public spaces, divisions along class and differences could be problematic. However, in this respect, there is a need for commonizing from privatization and selling by emphasizing the production of space (a collective space) and the use value as a social fact eliminating the prevailing perception of class difference (integral political movement including shelter, transportation, health with common claims of lowest classes to middle classes, so sectors who lost) . However, there are some problems for sections who are not using these spaces in their everyday life such as Emek Movie Theatre and again leading to class differences reflecting in struggle. For me, there were many neighbourhood dwellers who were in this struggle but there was a complaining about people who appropriate these spaces but not reacting against demolitions in the neighbourhoods. They ended up with the idea that there are must be continuous discussions (on utopias as radical breaks) and forums organized from everyday life practices and to create a togetherness on the attempt to form another life from today: like togetherness of rural and urban movements, considering all the issues in relation, urban issues not only as

sheltering problem but exploitation of labour and labour, autonomy as direct involvement into decision-making processes against fake participation discourses. To sum up, they emphasized the necessity to socialize urban struggle not from neighbourhoods and property but from taking back our living areas on a permanent and productive struggle ground for a long-term struggle line. Another necessity is to expand representation and local participation. There is a necessity to edit a new language which does not exclude scientific area and social area, to build another life from today, to discuss, produce and struggle together.

Hatice stated: "I am urban planner. In the university, I was questioning our relations with the Chamber. In fact, a group of friends has initiated İMECE. In general, urban planners then other people have joined us. The main reason is that I am urban planner. What I observe in terms of profession and also we live in the city, what is going on in the city. What we could do? *Is there a chance of intervention?* How we could arrange our relationship with the Chamber. We were unhappy situation of the Chamber at that time. Before the formation, we have discussed. Not only limited the Chamber, but it could observe and expose what is going on in the city. It was the starting point. There are now five, six years. When İMECE was formed there were some neighbourhoods which were organized and were trying to do something. In Mimar Sinan University, there was Bir Umut (One Hope), Halk Evleri (People's Houses). There could be other groups that I could not know in detail...Approximately, the city became directly what the city must take benefit. Why it has started at that period. The economic accumulation began to work on the urban space and the city. It has direct effects on people's life. So some movements have begun. We had some connections with other movements too. We have worked in some fields, not in the others. ... İmece did not go to any neighbourhood to organize them. It is one of our principles. We do not have a concern about organising and saving

somewhere. We do not have a force for this. If we had, we think that it is not a right thing. It is better to support the neighbourhood having problems.- We supported them but they have nourished us too. A type of opposition that we shaped together. -We have knowledge from our professions. We asked ourselves whether or not we are doing the right move. Is it better to go and organize there? We discussed a lot but we are continuing from the same line. Some of the serious problems to have contradicting groups in the neighbourhoods. We are trying to stay at the same distance to every group as people coming from outside. It is important to wait and understand what is going on at the local at that time. It is necessary not to move very fast. What we learnt in Sulukule was perhaps this. You evaluate this neighbourhood different from outside. It seems to be there are only roman people there. On the other hand, there were Kurdish people. In the painting, we witness that Kurdish people were uneasy that there are only roman people and the opposition from this culture, music. So you lose Kurdish people in the opposition. It is necessary to wait and not only Roman people's neighbourhoods...but acting by learning. It became an urgency in everyone. This is a problem. Groups not getting in the others was the other problem due to the political or other separations." She continued: "Our position was neat vis-à-vis alternative project. We are strict in this sense perhaps but we think that it had to be like that. We criticized and are criticized. They are saying that we won't do that, what we will do? It is not a real question. It does not take us as an addressee. Instead of this, everyone does everything. The plan of Beyoğlu, Taksim Plan. What we will do instead of this plan in Taksim. Nobody asks us this? But we think that some people ask us, and we have to reply them. Yes there is a social perception. If they do not this, what they will do? It is meaningful but we have to think from power relations. There is a structure on the government, which is very powerful. Nobody asks us. To propose an alternative is harmful: to draw and propose the concrete plan is not so different from the plan from above.

A spatial plan even though it has social data it is so obvious that a spatial plan is not the alternative. The issue is not only urban regeneration. The issue is the economic structure, the capitalism. Everybody ask we won't do anything till revolution. Yes sure, we will do and for this reason, we are doing. Not spatial and done and finished. The alternative project for us is the alternative mentality, philosophy and how we could live better in the city with which characteristics. And the world...The alternative must be a way like that. To propose alternative politics. What we are doing as an alternative will be accepted by the government and used and became a gun against you. Or became something which is ignored. It has a place which impedes the struggle sometimes. You think that you have solved a problem. In fact, not but only pass over it. Yes for sure, it will be an opposition when there is demolition but if there is no opposition in the neighbourhood, you could not do something. Few people you could do something but there is not a real effect. You go there but you do not carry any force with you, only morale/pep, which is very important. For instance Başbüyük was somewhere amazing. Everybody has given morale to each other including us."

Hatice added as a turning point for İmece: "The turning point of İMECE was about whether or not we *have to be in neighbourhood, at the local*. It is not only this, but it is about the increase of information mutually. It is another way of working. Here is Istanbul; it is hard to go to every neighbourhood. If you go there, *you could not do sometimes...*" Apart from principles, it is related to the impossibility to be present every time in every neighbourhood where there is urban regeneration. She asked in the atelier about the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk: "What we could do, to what urban regeneration will evolve? What will be in legal terms –then we lived-?What are these laws? What we will do? This is a period to focus on this type of works. Two years ago. We were organizing every year İMECE Forum. This year it takes six months, a little longer. To

revise our principles, to form another type of work, the ateliers, talks, film screenings. We are trying to do this. But it is a slow process....The forums and ateliers, meeting which are held every week are open to everyone. Email group too. In the Turkish Airlines protests, many people stated that they know us. We were surprised. It's meaningless to be close. We are few people. It's good to coordinate works. Email group is a little bit big. We were trying not to form another email group but we did two weeks ago. What we say could be transferred wrongly. Still open but we include people who want to continue this. The other group is to be member to email group from web page”.

By referring to Ayazma, she argued: “Ayazma taught us many important things. These three examples with Don't Touch my School were very important. Before Don't touch my school initiative with Eğitim Sen, we had been involved and worked a lot in the Blind Person school. Many parties, platforms were organized on a unique issue for the first time. It is successful since the school still is present. But this platform/organization does not last. We always say, if there is a problem, there is a movement. If not, the movement goes back...there was a contentious work on a period with different methods. For the legal struggle, it is a part of the struggle. You could be informed what you will live. You could push. The laws are tools of the power. Even though you have legal rights which were given by force...It is necessary not to focus on legal opposition but not ignore it. On the other hand, to write rejection letter is also a way to organize. It is a reason to be organized....”

Hatice argued: “The academic view become day after day more close and strict. There is an academy going after the government. There are academicians going outside this. They try to be in these platforms. Not so directly. They could not stand against. They could be criticized but I won't be so harsh to them. The academy has a problematic approach. Form the

first year. Its relations with the capital and the power. And they orient to this side. Their support could be with their names. They give force. There are people who think about these issues and try to theorise. There are people who are going personally to the field. This is also precious. To write PhD or master theses in neighbourhoods. I found this possible since there is a problem of academy not being able to go outside the doors. Not being able to plunge what is living in real life. While writing these theses, you meet people and if you could perceive there in a right way, there are many people who came and stayed in İMECE. I think it is an important process. Sometimes people think that they come and write and then leave. It could be. There are other cases that it does not happen like this. This is not harmful to us. There is knowledge. It must be open to everyone. Everyone could use this in which way they would like to. I think there are positive since they come and could stay with us. I went there and met people so I could be in the academy and stay/prefer to stay here. There were many people. What I could do they have asked. From translation...They stayed here or worked with other groups.”

Deniz Özgür spoke about his involvement in urban opposition and engagement with İMECE: “As an activist as an anarchist, anti-capitalist and anti-militarist, I do struggle in problem areas...Since if I struggle ideologically, it would create distance between problem areas...I did read texts on space. I met Erdal Abi. I would to do something but I did not have any organic relation with the neighbourhoods even though I had lived in Tarlabası...We had met and organised Direnistanbul in 2009 against IMF and World Bank meeting in Istanbul...We had thought at that time that we had to organise something with contributions, which does not finish after two days of protest...We had some themes, commissions: city, ecology, labour...The groups of Immigrant Movement and Karadeniz is Uprising Platform. I went to different neighbourhoods, Fener-Balat, Tarlabası...I heard from friends from Direnistanbul that there is İMECE and there was

some coalitions forming between neighbourhoods. At that time, we have organised a protest of 1000 people and met Erdoğan Abi from Gülsuyu-Gülensu and Adem from Başbüyük there. ..I followed meetings of İMECE every week. I began to love people there. I was like a school. I read materials and tried to learn. There was at that time TEKEL workers resistance; I moved there (to the occupation) and lived under the tents. After I returned back, I learnt that friends from there were a protest for Emek Movie Theatre. There were 6000 people protesting at the closing ceremony day of the Festival. We did screening. This protest gave motivation for public struggle.”

He continued about İMECE and the position that they took: “There were some blockages in İMECE since it is an organisation for 6 years. There were thinking that there must have a distance from the organisation of neighbourhood. They believe that they could not orient and organise on behalf of neighbourhood. Yes they could share information; but I think they must play active role in urban opposition by organising and orienting. If you have knowledge, you have to share this with people. You have to change it into utilizable form and mobilise people. The sphere that we could organise is “public sphere”: commons space, public space, commons space struggle. We were meeting every two weeks in İMECE. Rather than neighbourhoods, there must be a mobilisation from a common and then appropriation of neighbourhood. We have to appropriate what is public today. Since if we went to neighbourhoods, they will ask about property. We have to struggle in public space and then this must have a place in minds. We have organised as 10 people, 6000 people came. This has motivated us. The transformations in Beyoğlu, Taksim and Beyoğlu is as a whole a public sphere. If you could not build an opposition from the public, it is difficult to build in neighbourhood. Then we put schools in the agenda, hospitals, and cultural and public service buildings. We went to “Do not Touch to my School!”

meetings...The school is at the centre of urban regeneration with right to education. ...It became a part of negotiation. We produced brochures, protests and exhibitions. We carried this in the street of Emek Movie Theatre. The protests of "Do Not My School!": We brought children from one school to other one...We delayed their selling...We have to have these actors in other areas. We are living a loss of energy. We have to be together Emek Initiative and Taksim protests. There is a problem that urban opposition do not get into relation with socialist organisations. For instance, Taksim Square is big in terms of square and special. Socialist organisations must appropriate it. We had some few people and became the protest of some parties. It must be a mass movement. For instance, a meeting of 3000-4000 people is few. We have to do something for Taksim. By the way, we have to relate struggles: ecological struggle, immigrant, labour, social. The intersection area is urban struggle. We do not perceive this as urban regeneration. This is a missing perspective. As urban regeneration became visible, the city requires being active from where we are. The public square could accomplish this. To appropriate the neighbourhood could be a contribution but not a contribution to the city by itself. I became involved intuitively and I think that the city is the area where 21st century struggles will be. We are putting some seeds of organisation and struggle and later they will grow hopefully. I believe that rural struggle will be done in the city. Class struggles are in the city. The city will include the closing down of factories, the problems of sheltering. It includes many issues. The exclusion of poor people, labourers from the city centres. Beside the fact that there is segregation along class, it creates a perception according to classes: there are classes who deserve the city centre and who do not deserve. These classes are made invisible and excluded in the outskirts of the city. This is the struggle to return to the city. We know from social houses in 2005, France. We know from the history, Haussmann and one year later, the Paris Commune. In 68s, it was the uprising of pushed to the

outskirts of the city. ...We are as a group of few people, planting seed. We are trying to organise a group of commons with the involvement of other groups together. We are trying to form this intersection group. ...I do believe that togetherness must not be artificial.”

Deniz underlines: “İMECE believes that we have to have an idea for the city as a whole and struggle for that. They have a mission of carrying all this information to each other and to form binds between the city, public sphere and neighbourhood. It is difficult to form these linkages. If it does not have any meaning in practice, we have to think about this. It would not be appropriated directly by neighbourhood dwellers. We have to have a gain from the common space and this idea must have a meaning in people. It is important that people who came in our meetings must return and share this with the neighbourhood. If we do not have any gains, it is difficult to mobilise. We have to share neighbourhood experience and these gains as well. For instance, Başbüyük influenced people. What I attach importance is self-organisation in the neighbourhood.” He made a self-critique and argued: “There are few numbers of urban opposition groups. İMECE puts importance on giving neighbourhood information, on preparing documents that they need. I was saying that I could do everything that they need, I did some film screening. It is important to accomplish things that neighbourhood inhabitants need. If you do not form this from outside... There must not have any separation: you do not have to say that you are from inside or not. It depends on the way that you associate. We have to determine the agendas of neighbourhood associations and political organisations with city focus. I must underline that neighbourhood could organise only in neighbourhood. We could not accomplish this outside.” Deniz continued: “I saw different ways of association and I feel near to İMECE. It was like a school. They were giving education to people from and outside neighbourhoods. The reason of formation was to produce

documents and information that are needed by neighbourhoods. They were all professional formation. When I participated in, three years ago, there were few people who did not this professional knowledge...They do not prefer to talk on behalf of inhabitants and neighbourhood. They do not organise in the neighbourhood. They have some principles and they are keen on this. They are anti-capitalist; they do not compromise with any government. They do not negotiate on any issue with any municipality. They do not make housing issue as an exchange issue. They consider this as a part of a whole neoliberal damage. However, we see that it works different in neighbourhoods...We could not get into communication. We have to think about and bring new angles to ameliorate this. ..We imagine a classless society over the long term. They are mainly urban planners and sociologists. We were active in the campaign namely "Do not touch to my School". We have delayed the selling of Blind People's school. We are sharing information and writing reports to initiate their own organisation. We would like to put into circulation this knowledge. We are in attempts to explain that urban issue is itself a struggle area. All the political parties came into contact with IMECE. But we are deprived of tools which affect neighbourhoods which neither are nor organised at all. We have to have and convey an idea about the whole city. We are connecting with people through films, articles. However, we have to get this work off to people but instead we are waiting for their own initiation. We do not have to consider like this. IMECE think that we could produce and put on our website. You make an effort for months to produce this. The problem is that people get this document. It is our mission. If you could not do this, it is your/our failure. We have to think about language too to break the alienation. Even I have problems with the language. I went for two years to meetings like having courses. I went to all the forums. Not everybody could get over this. We have to explain in its easiest, basic way. People are selling their house. We have to explain this in a very easy way and in short time. We have to have a

simple language. For instance we are organising Müştereklerimiz (Our Commons) with 6-7 groups together which struggle with a city focus to think about how to form connections between these struggles. We are organising workshops. They are groups, people who act on something which cross cut with the others. We are thinking about what we could do in common/collectively. How we could spur the struggle and form commonalities. We were together in 1st of May. We are now together and doing something. Our matter is not singular. Cooperatives and neighbourhoods walked with us.”

After the call for Forum, in the forum of İMECE, there were many urban activists and urban academicians. It is discussed what they could find new areas of struggle and they declared that all the reunions were open to everyone; especially for new transition period for four months. It was necessary but it did not succeeded in practical and theoretical evolution without a practical and political way, they made as an inside confession, self-critique . They also criticized themselves not continuing and institutionalizing their relations and force they have constructed. It is said that necessarily we could talk new issues about the city and what was said must be brought to the neighbourhoods. However, they have underlined that it is not merely based on neighbourhoods. It is necessary that the discussion base must not be personalized. The tenants must be included in the struggle, with sanitary and educational institutions, which are related to an initiative “do not touch my school”. They have mentioned their internet sites, their reports and they have declared that their roles must be to write new reports, publish them and so inform people. Since their formal reports have risen many discussions. This is what nourishes new ideas through interrelation between practice and theory as a school to put forward new ideas. Within this process, especially for new struggle areas, it’s necessary to underline particular characteristics. They have also added that this transition period is

not merely for İMECE, but also all the urban movements. It's necessary to be more programmatic quantitatively and qualitatively. In other words, the programs must not be daily, occasional but must be more planned in short and long terms. They frequently underlined that there is no "fix member" of İMECE and everyone could be whenever he/she wants. Another aspect they mostly underline is "2-B" areas/legislation. This must be evaluated in the Third Bridge framework. Other struggle areas are within ecological struggle, the Third Bridge, public areas and also TOKİ. Another aspect is that new areas gained forest characteristic. However, the city is extended into north (Marmaray, Avrasya, the Third Bridge); but the struggles are separated. The other issue is that HES and struggles on Karadeniz must be included into urban struggles, with historical peninsula and EMEK cinema hall struggles, our common space imagination and memory. They said that there's no common, unified struggle and systematic programme. For this reason, it seems to be a brand new start. The other aspect is that we must extend struggles from gecekondu neighbourhoods into middle class neighbourhoods.

It is underlined that syndicalist struggle must support and include urban movements. The other thing is that many groups from many neighbourhoods with different characteristics with different problems said that İMECE was with them all the times. This struggle is not neither possession/private possession question, nor housing issue. This must be pursued in relation with other struggles. Çiğdem added that it's necessary to build a wide and unified web of struggle, solidarity including historical areas like Fener-Balat. The platforms sometimes lose their scopes and prevent them to be widened and we do not have time to wait till demolitions. Erdoğan added that Kent Hareketleri do not succeed in strategically unification but İMECE succeeded in reunification and inclusion of everyone. It's necessary that the struggle of EMEK and the Third Bridge is one form of appropriation of the city. This appropriation is

lived/experienced into “Right of Living” like “we do not do sell our sanity!” like in Başibüyük. For specific atelier idea, he said that it will develop also İMECE. Ömer Abi remarked that they expect many things from İMECE since the very first informant was İMECE in the neighbourhoods. İMECE do not have right to stop since neighbourhoods have expectances from them. He said that they wish to be in the areas and work/struggle together. He said that “3.Köprü Yerine Yaşam Platformu” succeeded in to unify all of the different struggles for rivers, houses to remind that we do not have right to split out and we had to struggle together. Cihan reminds that we must think on right to the city as a human right and include this issue into the democratization of the Constitution like in Mexico City. The right must be named as “assignment of city’s fate” of one citizen/city dweller. This will be realized through imagination, which will be nourished by urban utopia atelier, not struggling with TOKİ. The ateliers will provide theoretical base for the struggles with the solidarity of other activists, LGBT, feminist movements, include HES struggles into urban regeneration one. They’ve also planned to organize a solidarity night before 1 May, to prepare for 1 May. They’re ossified political groups and to change a society begins from neighbourhood. They also remind that when they said they won’t be leaders in a neighbourhood, they have been accused of their positions. They’ve been accused also when they’ve made their self-critics. They said also they did not form a platform but support neighbourhoods. There’s a necessity to form a campaign and the slogan could be “We want back Istanbul!”, instead of earthquakes, big projects. Çiğdem said that the platforms are for self-satisfaction and became motionless. She said also they expect nothing from her neighbourhood. Şadi Abi and Çiğdem said that people discuss in the meetings and nothing happens then. Adem, from Başibüyük argued that historical neighbourhood dwellers are different from them, gecekondu dwellers. They also planned to organize ateliers for different issues, gathering and informing different people to struggle together. It’s also said

that what must be revealed is the “earthquake” reason in the legislation 5393, 73. For them, for an urban struggle “Okuluma Dokunma” and 2 B, the Third Bridge could be pursued together, based on self-organization of neighbourhoods. Syndicalist struggle must include not merely neighbourhood but also public space, like Adliye, Çağlayan. This is also crucial in term of discussions on “possession”. This must include also public services and selling of public spaces (schools, universities’ areas and buildings). This also means that publicness is erased totally. Hatice told about the real situation that they have been exhausted of being in every neighbourhood and TOKİ, with new construction areas. The main mission must bring the local information, while producing information. There are joining new members and outsiders; so they must extend into new neighbourhoods, producing İMECE words. It’s important what they propose to the neighbourhoods. They made a distinction between working classes’ neighbourhoods and luxurious villas. Hakan made a description of İMECE as a “movement” not an organization. What is aimed is that neighbourhoods must appropriate their own neighbourhoods, organize their own cooperatives. İMECE must organize in a programmatic way, including urban utopias and produce new ways of social opposition on issues. Çiğdem said that TEKEL squatting and sittings must be an example and before the elections, there must be new action/resistance programme. Erdoğan Abi adds that via struggles, we learn and teach each other codes of struggles. Onur said that we/they will learn via ateliers-violence which gains importance after Ayazma anti-publicity-, city films and new urban struggles atelier-, like Planning Workshop to understand much more from a map. It is asked also what will be after six months. The ateliers must be aimed to the struggles, actions.

Dayanışmacı Atölye (Solidarity Studio)

Dayanışmacı Atölye¹²² is an organization mainly composed of urban planner-academics and students since 2009, resistances in Sulukule. This voluntary and interdisciplinary working group underlines that their main principle is mutually learning process, by supplying technical and necessary information and everyday life support needed by the inhabitants of neighbourhoods. They support the struggles when there is a self-organization of inhabitants and along this line, they define their work as a supportive one based on solidarity based on field studies. For them, urban regeneration is for capital and surplus, which results in injustices, anti-ecological consequences against social values. What is critical in their stance is that they underline the mutual learning and co-producing, not talking on behalf of people with a more democratic decision-making. The main actors of the Studio with Bir Umut Association¹²³ (which is another

¹²²In earlier periods, they used “STOP”, Turkish abbreviation for “No Frontiers Autonomous Planners” with a forum “Another Sulukule is possible!” and slogan: Another Solution is possible!”

¹²³The interview conducted with Erbay Yucak) is available in English on the website http://www.red-thread.org/dosyalar/site_resim/dergi/pdf/4080237.pdf.

Pelin Tan and Ayşe Çavdar (2013) asked Erbay Yucak from Bir Umut Association not the right to the city itself but in what extent the mechanisms of commons language and action/event production work. Erbay argued that there could be no conceptualisation for urban movements in Turkey. The right to the city could only be an integrating concept for the political groups and subjects of people in a limited academic circle. This is in fact what the concepts do serve. However, it is the matter of the issue that it could be furthered in terms of real struggle practices, the expansion of limitations of the problem and the reply for the question of which kind of city do you wish for. He underlined that there are some problems because of the fact that the opposition groups did not take seriously the struggle practices related to space. And if we are putting forward a concept, it is necessary to link with the practical conditions of the space. It is necessary to develop a total approach for the space, starting from the direct and near concerns, then the city. It is necessary to be aware of this reality for Yucak. It is obvious that squares have different meanings for people from different neighbourhoods of different classes. It is necessary to make these squares, usable, and reachable. To achieve this, it is not necessary to destroy capitalism but to form the possibility of struggle from making a concern, the fact that the exclusion in spatial and infrastructural terms. We must struggle for a formation (in the city) with who live there. It is also necessary to reveal what has been experienced in the city, since there is a discontinuity. He emphasized the necessity of forming concepts and struggles from the needs and realities of people. Yucak stated that the time that he spent in Bir Umut is time

type of organization in and for neighbourhoods in terms of rural and employment security issues) are working, writing, speaking reflexively to be an intellectual/academician and to work in urban regeneration neighbourhoods¹²⁴.

They introduced themselves with the following manifesto: “Our cities are trying to be converted into rent areas gain ambition of the capital and attitudes of the municipalities that enabling this. For years, settlements established by labour resistance established were plundered while the people living in places are evicted. People who are living there and their lives that they have established during the years are not appreciated and they are ignored. We, university students, academics, as volunteers specialized in various fields who believe that cities are for people who live there and who believe in equality of all of the citizens in gaining access to urban services say stop too to this plunder. We are using our energy, savings to produce information considering public benefits with the community/society and to add power to those who are made to despair and those who are looking a way out. We helping these parts ignored of the society which are made helpless for that they do works in legal, technical, intellectual, economic, social and cultural terms during their right seeking struggles. Our name is Solidarity Workshop. We are standing next to neighbourhood dwellers who object to the urban regeneration projects focusing on capital and rent in which they are ignored and made as nullity after being aware of the injustice done to him and then take action and trying to take action. We take care of

for him; there is no separation between personal time and time spent with Bir Umut, by forming relations without hierarchy and hegemony. On the other hand, people will realize the sincerity. Another reality is that people who feel the pain would like to stand together and see that they are not unique.

¹²⁴<http://www.planlama.org/new/yrd.-doc.-dr.-erbatur-cavusoglu/kentsel-muhalefetin-akademik-ve-aydin-aktorlerinin-degerleri-ve-kapasite-sorunlari.html> and <http://istifhanem.com/2011/12/23/kentseldonusumvebourdieu/>

working together with organizations which care about to cover the majority in the neighbourhood and which object to decision-making in relation to the lives without consulting to them and to the decisions taken in this way. We are not people who walk in front of neighbourhood dwellers with whom we are working together or who teach and talk on behalf of them. We believe in mutual learning and co-producing. We support both within ourselves, as well as in the neighbourhoods that we are walking together, methods which oversee the implementation of the equal sharing of information and stand for the truth of the interaction with each other. To produce information, collect and share without any professional or academic pursuits via field studies and case studies on urban injustice and inequalities. We are producing together and share legal, administrative and scientific knowledge against interventions which ignore the city's ecological and social values to facilitate getting together of those who are victims of these interventions. We are trying to develop together decision-making mechanisms for that the victims feel themselves stronger and that they exist and they are made visible. We, as members of the Solidarity Atelier, we welcome our newest member who believe in equality, injustice and consider stand against injustice as sine qua non of life, who react against conditions of ignored people of the society and feel discomfort of this situation, and who consider walking beside them as precious, and not leaving this at discursive level and who believe in acting together with the community. So far, we did not stop while learning, knowing and seeing. We have to be side by side with people with people who are ignored and those lives are tried to be victimized for rent aspirations. And still we continue on ...”

The academic-activists from the Studio, Çavuşoğlu and Yalçınan emphasized the right of use and dwelling in the same place against eviction and luxurious housing, hotels, shopping malls and any attempt to change the life style of Sulukule people- and defined right possession based on dwelling rights of the tenants as well. What they criticised that municipality

removed a historical and cultural neighborhood in the name of European Capital of Culture. Even though the plan is not changed in Sulukule, they attract the attention of European Union and United Nations and raised awareness. In the picnic in May, 2010 in Sarıyer, DA (Dayanışmacı Atölye) introduced themselves as not plan producers, but people giving idea and information necessary in everywhere there is a risk of demolition. During the picnic, an urban park is planned as a direct action by voluntary planners and inhabitants, which would be used collectively for wedding and other special days. That day, people there had planted trees, mentioning real needs of the district such as lack of hospital in the hospital with their right to stay put.

Their “another type of opposition” which they consider in the framework of urban opposition, the alternative planning, local strategy of Dayanışmacı Atölye as a support to the neighbourhood’s dwellers is criticized due to the fact that it is proposed as a “solution” in collaboration with “urban regeneration projects”, not as a means of struggle, which comes from also the features of the neighborhood Sulukule (Gündoğdu, 2010). If we question the possibilities and limits of “urban planning”, Gündoğdu (2010) asks whether it’s a social responsibility –stated in their declaration- or a struggle for the right to the city. This attempt proposing itself a solution, but reconciling with the system, does not represent a social-urban right model. Concealing the real reason behind conflicts, it became an apolitical acceptance of problems are mainly “physical”, “spatial” and alternative urban planning falls into the trap of municipalities and legalization of urban regeneration projects. Alternative planning could vary according to political culture, peculiarity of each neighborhood, according to Şen (2010). Sulukule case was an advocacy planning and Gülsuyu/Gülensu will be self-organization, self-planning: radical planning. The association think about other projects which enable social, economic opportunities against evictions and displacements from neighborhood. It also with its focus on music-

entertainment sector, the urban regeneration became an identity struggle of Romans. Some of the academicians, intellectuals are against this “counter-plan”, because these plans could turn to be negotiations in a sense of the defence of private property, the acceptance of a need/justification for planning and this limits against potential urban struggles within the neighbourhoods. Gündoğdu (2010), referring to Harvey underlined that this project carry controversies of urban planning between private property and public interest in the capitalistic production and its reproduction. These types of projects, for him and for some academicians and neighbourhoods, concealing the real reason behind conflicts, became an apolitical acceptance of problems are mainly “physical”, “spatial” and alternative urban planning falls into the trap of municipalities and legalization of urban regeneration projects. Alternative planning could vary according to political culture, peculiarity of each neighborhood, according to Şen (2010). Dayanışmacı Atölye admits their position being used and abused in a sense by TOKİ in Sulukule case. Neighbourhoods under threat of demolition-eviction in general admit that especially technical support of Dayanışmacı Atölye have played crucial role in their resistance against demolitions in the neighborhood. However, in one of the urban regeneration neighborhood, Sarıyer’s dwellers –including Gülsuyu/Gülensu- said that the technical support of Dayanışmacı Atölye have played crucial role in their resistance against demolitions in the neighborhood. But what was significant is that Murat Yalçınan said “the process of learning”, deconstructing technical and ideological domination and to be and to write about neighborhood when the neighborhood wants. Since the point, which is to be underlined, is that the atelier does not necessitate from above a plan, but gives technical information and legislative support with Bir Umut Association. Sulukule case was an advocacy planning and Gülsuyu/Gülensu will be self-organization, self-planning: radical planning. What was important for Yalçınan is the process of the dwellers of neighbourhoods, process of

reciprocal, interactive learning, but not the plan. Moreover, this position does not exclude total struggle in the streets and on the legislative level, they argue. However, this reflects a controversial position of “alternative planning”. What was lacking for Yalçintan is the mutual comprehension and collectivity of the opposition. Since merely resisting against urban regeneration in the streets with barricades lead to an impasse. Another statement of a local intellectual and activist from Gülsuyu/Gülensu is that what is critical is the decision of neighbourhood’s dwellers. Since what they resist against is who plan instead of them. What could change the neighborhood is neighborhood itself, not the activists coming from outside. In a sense, this atelier creates this dynamic, sometimes conflicts; but thinking about neighborhood. Some neighbourhoods without insistence on struggle in the streets, believe in another possibility of urban regeneration is necessary as their mere solution.

So the main criticism about the Solidarity Studio was to be co-opted and to tame the resistance in the neighbourhoods. It would be useful to refer to Souza (2006) and his article where he explains the “autonomy” (from Castoriadis with individual –a particular individual who makes choices in freedom- and collective aspects-conscious and explicitly self-rule of a particular society-) vis-a-vis social movements (sem-teto movements, favela activism) and urban planning agents. Souza (2006) proposes some possibilities to influence the state from together with, to despite and against. However, at the last instance, the state regulates power relations in accordance with capitalism. In this respect, we have to be careful of “civil society”, which could be harmful to social activism and co-opted, and manipulated in political sphere. Civil society, if it is in the attempt of social change in a proactive role, must be “autonomous”, its autonomy in thinking and acting and “critical” to the state, its myths and capitalist power relations. This article gives important clues for “alternative planning

attempts” of DA (Solidarity Studio) that will be discussed later in the thesis. He remarked that technical help from professionals and intellectuals are welcome but this should not control social movements. Souza (2006) argued that not only being critical to the state, social movements have to plan alternatives. In this text, we have inspiration for togetherness or influence of rural and urban movements especially between Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Teto and Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra.

Yalçintan and Çavuşoğlu (2013) stated that urban regeneration is realized into four types namely (spontaneous) transformation per se, big metropolitan projects, planned regeneration, and finally (urban) regeneration projects. They underlined that urban oppositions are turning points for a human urban regeneration. Even though there are separations, they could revise their discourses leading to conflicts and only “standing together” could make an imagination of future on human base. They, in fact, place urban regeneration in the middle of these conflicts: Firstly, being totally against urban regeneration and secondly, according to people and groups, different positions. Surprisingly, while differentiating them as traditional and new, they refer to trade unions (apart from professional chamber, the Chamber of Architects) and political groups while many of them do not include urban regeneration and urban opposition into their agendas. What they propose in addition to protestations, demonstrations are academic productions including conferences, symposiums etc., and exhibitions, and other artistic productions to create alternative agenda and process, which lead to create awareness in public opinion and an impact in decision making processes. It is necessary to make a critique about the positions of the syndicates apart from the professional chambers namely the Chamber of Architects and of Urban Planners. They also underline the problem of coordination based on conflict of interests and the “chauvinism”, the ambition of leadership –apart from material annoyances- in spite of their

critical position against neoliberalism. Yalçınan and Çavuşoğlu underline the necessity to expand struggles into intellectual, urban and everyday life. Apart from basic problems of NGOs, they underline the necessity of standing together. Politically organized groups, for them, mainly in political neighbourhoods must use other methods apart from defending with barricades since these methods result in exclusion of women and people older than middle-aged groups, so they must go beyond the position of trap/syndrome of poverty and barricade. However, we must add that many groups from different gender and age groups are involved into barricade struggles and they could only defend their neighbourhoods by this way even though they have other types of organizations as mentioned for Mamak and Dikmen neighbourhoods. They define groups formed by academicians, students, experts and ordinary citizens as civil initiatives (such as İMECE, Direnistanbul, SOS İstanbul, Sulukule Platform, Solidarity Studio) with their “creative ways of opposition”. They argued that their motivations behind are appropriating urban issues, stopping wrong Professional wrong practices, forming solidarities with people who become deprived by these processes, and more crucially, learning, sharing and changing. They cite lived problems in terms of the legitimating, organization and coordination, discourse formation, by not being permanent and stable. For me, the points about the suspects due to discourse and methods discussions between different civil initiatives and problems during the process of solidarity with neighbourhood organizations are the main ones, which are the obstacles behind togetherness. In their explanations of neighborhood organizations, they stated that their methods (of resistance) ranging from barricades to alternative planning. In this respect, we have to underline solidarity relations between civil initiatives in terms of these mentioned methods and the usage of different methods in different periods and neighbourhoods. As they mention, the main problems are representation and inclusiveness due to the organization around three or five people so their ideas and preferences.

Their oppositions remain mainly as a reactive level; and they take action only for their neighbourhoods as NIMBY (Not in my backyard) approach in the literature. However, it is necessary to remind that this approach is not used mainly for the violation of the right of dwelling and sheltering, but an urban intervention –of generally (upper-) middle classes- concerning their neighbourhoods and so ordered lives. They cite the problems as being interested in only their neighbourhoods and to differentiate themselves and their struggles from other neighbourhoods according to the title deeds/property and type of neighbourhoods. However, I could say that there is a growing solidarity inner and between neighbourhoods, different from civil initiatives outside the neighbourhoods, which erase these obstacles. Moreover, they appropriate other parts (mainly the centre) of the city, more than “middle and upper-middle classes”. They refer to radical political groups in gecekondu neighbourhoods in terms of representation and inclusiveness. It is true that it is the main obstacle behind a real grassroots movement and organization especially in terms of inclusiveness. On the other hand, there is a reality that these neighbourhoods whose urban lands are precious and whose political meaning is obvious only defend themselves with the related methods and ways. Even though they cite Platforms and Initiatives concerning the Third Bridge, and the boats etc. as umbrella organizations, I do not think they include different groups and initiatives. In general, they were campaigns in general led by some groups. They referred to inconsistent discourses, conflicts of interests, rivalry for being in the centre, avoidance from taking initiative and responsibility. For the universities, they underline that there are many academicians, students who produce critical and group such as Solidarity Studio which is based on voluntary contribution. Another aspect is that they refer to the statement as “Akademi Ayakta”, with its critiques as one of the togetherness. However, these are merely campaigns signed by academicians who are not in discussion, which starts and ends with this signature campaign.

The opposition from the universities is not preferable because of the apprehension from the Higher Institution between Universities and the state's anti-democratic practices. The problems behind are mentioned as personal ambitions and conflicts besides avoidance from taking initiative and responsibility. For the media, they stated that it is necessary to use the media (not only oppositional one) well as they did for Sulukule. International support with the integration of civil society into these networks such as No-Vox could be a good example for Sulukule case for the enforcement on the implementers of the projects. They stated that they have common problems; however, the hierarchies due to differences separate them. For the possibility of being together, they stated that the main problem of this normal conflict lies behind the question of "a urban opposition but how?", the way for the aims and the aimed audience. The urban opposition for them is a field, where different actors situate themselves according to their habitus. They underlined that their target audience and actors are people who are faced with inequality, injustice, deprivation and the discourse and utopia must be produced by and for people including different groups with both white and blue collars workers. In this respect, the pursuit of gaining power is up to these people, forming relations with opposition groups near them so an urban opposition from the right to the city so a persuasive and powerful togetherness. Then I must refer to the question of taking power as Holloway pointed out. Even though they stated that the split is the same in the left, while having potential of smoothing the path, it is necessary to state that the neighbourhoods could come together. Referring to Hardt and Negri's words on social conflicts and Mouffe's radical democracy and the commoning attempts of upper-identities instead of forming alliances/engaging in confederations for other cases, they underlined the necessity of formation the common principles of an urban opposition in spite of different motivations, aims, methods, and

problems between opposition actors. As Gramsci stated, they said that it is indispensable today to a counter-hegemonic bloc expanding into different parts of the society via the claims of urban rights from dependent, equal and autonomous struggle areas. They propose to go beyond the right of dwelling, to shelter with its legal meaning as a basic right but it is not necessary to form togetherness and relation with the society. They ask whether or not mahalle/neighbourhood could be redefined from self-organization and the capacity of decision-making, and asks under the control of which groups this could be possible. However, in this position, still space and the city with central positions lead to new traps and dead ends. As they remind basically that the right to the city in Lefebvre is the right to control and determine the city and urbanization processes. Moreover, apart from what I had elaborated in the thesis, they refer to Harvey who stated that the right to the city is to form a democratic administration on the use of the surplus value. They stated that if we want that the city has a future; every “formal and informal groups” in the urban opposition do not have the right to exclude and disapprove each other. According to Yalçintan and Çavuşoğlu (2013), we have to form agoras and to mobilize people and to realize political actions, which could only be possible by joining into fields and position according to their habitus (of actors). Only from this way, the right to the city could be mature and redefine itself, departing from being an ideal (Yalçintan and Çavuşoğlu 2013, 105).

As for the support outside neighbourhoods, Erbatur explains his support to the neighbourhoods in that he has to do, he owes this to the neighbourhoods since they are victims of capitalist urbanization processes and of exclusionary urban policies. The kind of his support to the communities living in these areas is to be interpreters of the bureaucratic and technical language of planning by reminding them rights as urban citizens and so as a support of their struggles. He considers this as an ethical responsibility

however he questions in what extent they can support. He gave an example about neighbourhoods who demand this support: In 2004, Gülsuyu Gülen neighbourhoods and in 2009, Sarıyer. Apart from these ones, there were other struggles in other neighbourhoods. He said: “My attitude is to stand side by side as I do my utmost when there is a demand and an invitation and to build a relationship with them horizontally as I can.” He said that he avoids doing something on behalf of them and being a leader but the local community describes a task that he could do, so he does this as he does his possible. Erbatur continued with the reason why he have chosen Solidarity Studio (Dayanışmacı Atölye) is that there were friends who he loves, has trust in and believes in and at that time, there weren’t any alternative apart from NGOs that had several problems. He said that he had already known them, as Solidarity Volunteers from their extraordinary solidarity what they did in 1999 Earthquake; he said. He added: “I took part in this initiative but I am not a pioneer, as I try to avoid this kind of vertical relationships and hierarchies in society, but sometimes due to the established types of relationship and labour, a division of labour and the hierarchy can occur.” He said that he took active role in DA with these sensitivities since 2003, but because of the fact that most of the participants in his department were students and other young people, so this kind expectation and such a role could arise by itself. As for Sulukule, he stated that it was a project supported by a wider platform and the coordination was my mission but there were many people with different formations who were working hard. With his colleagues Çılgın and Strutz, Çavuşoğlu (Çavuşoğlu, Çılgın and Strutz 2011) ushered once again the analysis of actors in urban opposition including urban activists from Bourdieu. In this respect, the “academy-centred actors” could only contribute only if they could go to the streets.

About the reasons for the establishment of Solidarity Studio and its basic principles and goals, Çavuşoğlu states that even though it is not agreed on a formal constitution, on a manifesto and alike, there are some common basic

principles which are strengthening local communities against the increasing urban grievances without any discriminatory politics, not accepting any upper/ below role of “teaching”, and being in relationship with local communities without any academic etc. rent seeking relationship. As a reply to the question: “Do you have another idea or construction instead of/ for urban regeneration in terms of its position on the struggle and its practice?”, Çavuşoğlu stated that urban regeneration has become a concept that is full of negative connotations because of the existing practices; however, they think that urban regeneration is necessary, with the necessity of producing proactive politics for a democratic and fair transformation/regeneration with the use value. From this point, he added that they support that informal neighbourhoods could sign contracts with politicians before the elections, and recently, the struggle by establishing co-operatives for grasping the legal ownership of their living areas. They said that they try to vary the rules and actors of the field oriented by the exchange value, considering the urban dweller as consumer and challenge the idea that who pays gets the service. While DA was concentrating mainly on urban issues, Bir Umut (One Hope), as an umbrella organization, is struggling from rural settlements’ problems like organic agriculture. In DA, there are academicians, students, people who are from different professional fields who are conscientious. The structure is already open for participation and involvement, so everyone who wants to work with them can participate in the group at any time. In various special events, groups or organizations, other urban movement groups, professional associations and so on could support; however, this relationship can be sometimes problematic.

Sulukule issue could be a meaningful example for this study for Çavuşoğlu. He said that they have done an alternative plan, being in negotiation with local authorities, and the results that they got were mainly criticized during that process. He said that he still believes that it was necessary and appropriate but this does not mean that this strategy could be applied in

every case. He underlined that he was present both in the barricade and the table of negotiation. He stated that their presence could differ in the sense of the unique state of the local community in Sulukule since the Sulukule experience was much more near to the advocacy planning comparatively with the other struggle practices. He said that he remembers by regretting that even though their wide team got a national and international support, they had had to struggle with other actors in urban opposition as well as regenerators. For him, my study has to focus on obstacles, separations in terms of principles and methods against a common and total struggle for the right to the city, the solidarity of various opposition movements.

For Solidarity Studio, Çavuşoğlu stated that the problem is to remain incomplete and ineffective in terms of time, labour and human power. About the roles of the actors from outside and inside, he said that every struggle depending on people/actors from inside and outside is problematic. Especially the presence of the actors must not be in terms of speaking on behalf of the community and of struggling instead of them. What is important is the support of making capable and the solidarity, which should not exceed beyond the local. Çavuşoğlu stated that he found the support instead of and in spite of neighbourhood dwellers weird. The role of the activists must be a support to the struggle led by local actors, being inspirational and encouraging. He added that this must be done without any hierarchy between intellectual and manual labours, finding problematic that academician writes on the barricade and neighbourhood dwellers are confronted with sticks and pepper sprays. For the international network and support, even though they are not for long-term, Çavuşoğlu said that it is crucial that struggle practices articulate within themselves and share their experiences, being mostly useful for the visibility in local media. For the question about the political parties' role in the struggles, he stated that the negotiation and the struggle with parties and politicians are important since the resolution of the problems are in great extent related to political and

legal processes. He reminds that we could not find any strong arguments about the right to the city in most of the party programs and there is even no alternative vision of opposition parties, apart from the government. For Çavuşoğlu, both the struggle process itself and the result are important since he said that you're struggling because you believe in; to be successful is mostly difficult and in most of the times, successes are partly and sometimes, experience is what is gained. However, if you are focusing in success, you could have probably frustrated and so resulted in giving up.

Yaşar commented on Sulukule platform: "We were planning and thinking about other possibilities of local development at the university in London. So we have formed Sulukule platform and Solidarity Studio. It is very important how you situate alternative planning. Advocacy planning practice dates back 1970s...due to the planning based on economic rent. There is a need for an alternative to the discipline of planning, which the highest point of enlightenment ideology from above...The alternative planning could be a revolutionary practice... While searching for the alternative outside the capital, I think it is important to search for the one outside the state. We have to feed this with Harvey. I know that there is no solution with a locality and libertarianism without a chance to be popular. We have to be aware of these contradictions...Planning is a state field; it refers to the public and public good. However, the history showed that it is not so...If you did not include revolutionary democracy, you could not get a solution. In the neighbourhoods that there are alternative planning implementations, but people have everyday life problems and we have to deal with that...However, in places like Dominique Republic, people need it. For instance, there is a group of "organic city" working in gecekondu neighbourhoods...There people, platforms and networks in neighbourhoods realized that by themselves. We could not complete with planning language in our struggle...urban poor must ameliorate their capacity to do plans and own mechanisms according to their needs...every citizen could be planner.

Every city could be able to produce its alternative. We could refuse or think that some points could be changed in Istanbul or Sulukule. We must discuss this, the reasons why these are done...There are academic studies in the platform. The Department of Development that I am also graduated came two years, to make local planning study...They made action plans how to ameliorate the life there. It was the aim. There is a working period before STOP and Sulukule Platform. We have to evaluate STOP from this line. There is a planning process which aims to demolish Sulukule and wish to bring new people there. What we call alternative was to create a process for people stay put in their neighbourhood against demolitions and evictions and to abolish social and spatial problems. I do not think that it is true that alternative planning is demonised. It is open to discussion how it breaks the resistance...We have to think about Sulukule with its sociology. I do not have any criticisms about STOP 1. It is a project totally made for population there against urban rent. In the conditions of STOP 2 times, there were some parts who have survived after demolitions in the neighbourhood. We had a call from the head of TOKİ. ...There was a planning of living spaces excluding inhabitants of Sulukule. There was an open discussion process whether or not/how we have to reply to this call...It was an experience. When I look at from today, I could be in an effort to produce an alternative but with a red line for investors. I will not do more but I will do less. I will exclude this.”

Kumru explained the functioning of DA: “Not with a view from above or an approach that we know the best, we are trying to fill the gap of the state. Our intention is not to be a buffer, even though people criticize from this aspect. We have a legal status but we do not have a legal and political power. By the way, solidarity examples are not obtained very easily...Our intention is not to preserve the life there as it is. When we look at from professional lenses, there are unhealthy conditions...There is a necessity of solidifying, sanitizing, and ameliorating life conditions. We could do there

with dwellers. Solidarity Studio is organised and came together from the need the observation from what the state and government did not do. Our main principle is not to lead, dominate people and engage them our political view. We do not aim to produce political discourse and state that this is our way; you have to follow this way. Our main principle is to decide with them and say that we are always with them. It is not to follow us if you confide in us. If you wish, you come.” Kumru underlined a very crucial aspect: “We are not behind or in front of the neighbourhood inhabitants. We are side by side. This does not work by pulling from the front and the back. We have to walk on the same way side by side with the same rights...But the priority is to them. If they say that let’s do, we’ll do. If they say no, we don’t do. We are hosting, guiding but we do not enforce. We tell them what we could do. They choose what they want. We don’t say why you have chosen this, not that. Ok. We say we walk together on this way. The aim is obvious. Not to diminish but eradicate the deprivation of all kinds. Not only urban deprivations, but this includes everyday life problems. We have lawyers inside. We could help them in their divorce cases. If they could not find work, they could not furniture solidarity.” From her involvement in urban struggle from Solidarity Studio, Kumru added: “We started this kind of works in order to produce knowledge together with neighbourhood dwellers such as we did in Gülsuyu-Gülensu. Since participatory urban planning was remaining as a plan note or just a word. We are supporting earthquake survivors, deaths of workers because of different reasons while working, or students who could not find houses to stay with Bir Umut Association.” Gülsuyu-Gülensu was the first neighbourhood who reacted against the plan at a high percentage of refusal petition signatures. With our intervention, a note on the plan is made on the necessity of asking inhabitants about the transformation of neighbourhood. Before I went to Istanbul in 2005, there were other formations such as “City and Human Being”. Thanks to Erbay Yucak and Özgür Temiz, there were some relations and works in

neighbourhood due to their political approaches and struggles. After this work, inhabitants struggle were willing to struggle. The confidence in what we could do something together has guided my struggle practices, I realised that we could change something and I decided to do my responsibility. I had an urban planning education. However, after this education, I saw that there are wrong and superficial practices without considering human being at the centre...In any neighbourhood I could do that. It could have been a luxurious housing area. After this period, middle classes are also under threat even though neighbourhood of Sulukule lived the biggest deprivation. This was the motivation for me to oppose for urban issues. It is not only an urban opposition but it is at the centre of my life. I work a lot to her name...My main aim is to share my education without expecting anything from them. But in a way that I am educated and you must believe in me...since I see that this has social and technical dimensions. I am saying that I am with you to walk on the same way and to produce knowledge, document to strengthen them. Urban opposition is also the works of professional chambers, to oppose the present from a legislative and non-political point since in fact they must be political. These processes make them political. They have statutes....They sue....The opposition could be done like this. This could be by walking on the same way or by correcting the faults, for instance if there is a project. During the implementation project, association could come together and think about how it could be better; this is urban opposition. I think negotiation is urban opposition. We must not consider this as a bargain...It is not money but to claim that we have a right to say our word. It is an opposition...This could be a reaction against a –small- project or a project concerning the entire city. This urban opposition could be abrogated after finishing its mission. There are some examples, against the Third Bridge or Taksim Solidarity...If the Third Bridge is being constructed, the groups there must be abrogated and find another field...The scale must be all of the country. This must be overtime,

without focusing on a mere place...I am not talking about whether or not the opposition is right or wrong...People, artists, merchants who support Taksim Solidarity could not support neighbourhoods under urban regeneration. This is two ways relation.”

Kumru underlined the significance of the sincere relationship that they have formed in the neighbourhoods: “When we finish our work there, we do not leave the field. We continue our relations of friendship, of sisters and brothers eternally. It is not that we finish our mission here so we won’t see each other again.” From their objective position in the neighbourhood due to differences in their group, she added: “People in our group have its own individual political preferences. *Nobody is thinking about commoning from these political aspects above this group. We have within our group different people, from the most radical one to the most passive in political sense.* People only vote in the election times. I don’t exactly in fact. If there is outside, we have also inside us. So we do not produce a political discourse. Yet what we do could be political but we do not do this to produce political discourse. We don’t expect people to have a political idea. This does not mean that we do not expect this but we do not choose aspects which correspond to these points. Cause deprivation has no politics. Vice versa is valid so we could continue this struggle and process in the most leftist and rightist ones. ... Even in the conservative neighbourhoods, if there is a demand, we don’t say to nobody that you are voting for this people and they do this. We only talk about the process, valid for the previous ones, so in fact, we find necessary this approach. Other groups could have their own preferences, we don’t criticize them. We don’t criticize people and their groups, we only make criticisms about the general. Who we are? We could only criticize ourselves and the neighbourhood dwellers could criticize us. We are open to criticism from outside to make feasible and to function aspects which do not function. Our struggle area is all the fields that produce deprivations. This could be “urban regeneration” if I talk about

association. This could be work murders. Everybody who is in DA is active in the association Bir Umut. We choose urban regeneration in prior due to our profession; however, to struggle is a way of life. We are doing this as a way of life. I did this. My friends also did this. But if I talk about myself, I did realize this. It's better and always precious to have an organization, to be organized. Since its inclusion, solidarity, friendship, we could find our common points from this way. To be organized does not always mean to be together in a political party. Our force is our organization. Ability to be organized." Kumru continued: "We have different people in our organization. When I am engaged into this group when I was in the second year of my studies, I had a few experience. I was not able to do something. I had to learn. But we have teachers and brothers who teach us this. These are people who have more experience and specializations in their issues. Every struggle requires a specialization so we don't have only urban planners in our organization. We have different people from different areas. Different people from different specialization fields. Students, professors. We have a nucleus who does meet every week, who does produce politics. Who does determine our priorities. Moreover, for the production of knowledge and the field studies, of for the production of an alternative project, we do call people who could orient and lead us. As a result of this call, we became a huge amount of people, a family. If we state that we have twenty people in our nucleus group, we could augment this till 100. Sociologists, economists, political scientists, local development specialists, lawyers, architects, we have different people from different groups when it is needed. If we need something related to architecture, and we try to do by ourselves, we could go into the trap that we criticize. Since we always criticize the fact that people do things on that they are specialized. We must not do the same mistake. We have supervisors in this respect. We had other groups who support us, who struggle for urban issues apart from us. These could be groups or people from groups. University professors are coming. People

from local governments, who work in municipalities but think that the project done there is false. We had their contributions too. Other NGOs. But we could say that the main group who support us the most are neighbourhood inhabitants. We think this is the most precious. Since our struggle and work are shaped through their demands. If they do not support us, we could not conduct this. We could do but we don't find right and appropriate to conduct. We find appropriate to conduct together so we find precious their support. So the contributions are on the aims that we determined together, is up to people's abilities/capabilities. They do not have to come to the field with us. They could contribute from another city or from their houses. We have a great contribution hope we contribute them too."

Kumru defined alternative planning: "We have produced an alternative planning. And I find this necessary. In fact, universities do not have to produce an alternative planning. They transfer existing knowledge. They can define methods. In Sulukule, while we were exposing mistakes of the existing projects, they said that we could do, then, DA, all people have concerns about this issues, an alternative planning. Neighbourhood cooperatives are alternative solutions in fact. These are in fact alternative solution propositions. They don't have to be alternative projects. We are using very often this method. You can prepare yourself and then in this process if there is demolition, you can resist. We can join you. However, it is not the time to resist with barricades or to demolish and burn. We are criticized due to the fact that we are negotiating and bargaining, instead of resisting. It's not a bargain. We have learnt that the planner has many roles: mediator, negotiator. So it it's a part of our discipline. We do not give any people to the lap to nobody. We don't say to nobody, that he/she could negotiate so that the problem will be solved. For me, negotiation is a resistance and opposition. So resistance is not only a bodily activity. I care about the legal character of resistance, which will make us powerful. For

this reason, we form neighbourhood association and cooperatives. We are trying to establish that legal government address directly to the legal entities in the neighbourhoods. Before they were going to the municipality as groups of people (of ten people) and when they were asked who they are, they were replying that they were “neighbourhood inhabitants” and where the rest are, they were replying no. But now, they are replying that they are members of neighbourhood cooperatives and that they have the representation of this number of people. So the municipality sees all the neighbourhood in front during negotiations so the legal entity is very important, so it is a good too of resistance and the transfer of land would become legal process in time.”

Kumru emphasized the decision of people who live in the neighbourhoods: “It is true that there are methods thought to be excluding each other. The search is different in principle but it must not be so since the search for a solution is one. We support that who is living will determine what they wish for, not us. ...The differences come from the aims of the protest and supports. It’s important on which subject people come together. They come together if they could but I believe that we must give support everywhere and every time. I’m sometimes criticizing DA in this respect. We could not decide sometimes by ourselves. I don’t know because of the capacity or we don’t want this, I don’t know, but I respect this since it is the decision of the group. I can support by myself but what is more valuable is to support as a group. We are the only group which did not sign the common declaration against the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk. We did not talk within our group. Bir Umut did not sign anything. I believe that DA could sign. I shared this with DA about the common declaration. Some of us proposed to sign but we did not. I could not understand the reasons why but I could not know what people thought. It is important who have written and open this text to signature but essentially, the text itself is important. If the text, even if one sentence is referring to something were are opposing, or

something contradicting with our method, it is not valuable for us...since we are a group who define very clearly the principles and methods and appropriate these. Even one word and one sentence contradict these,...I do not say that there was in this declaration. I can easily sign but these are sensitiveness of DA. I could say that many similar texts come very often; they don't find its place. This is also a way of resistance and I respect this. It's not related to the fact that these won't change anything. It is a signature. I will say that what will change we sign or not, will lead to the idea who will sign."

Not merely about urban regeneration, resisting is to form solidarities in everyday life and education at grassroots level for Kumru. She continued: "Apart from resisting against these processes, they are places where people come together. We have student solidarity in Bir Umut (One Hope). In the courses/lessons organized by neighbourhood associations, they give courses. They have invited writers and organized talks. They are teaching theatre, pantomime, they are giving education to women. They can use the places with other reasons like weddings so they are trying to find spacious buildings."

There were some other groups which were active in limited way and time period in the meeting of possible coalitions. The Association of Social Rights as an association underlining that housing right is class-based, supports the idea that there is a class-based transfer of urban lands via urban regeneration projects. Their claims are on a political-economic stance evaluating urban issues in a more holistic perspective; the housing question could be evaluated with other social rights. The association participated in some meetings of *Urban Movements* especially in the Forum, their claims mainly remains on a political-economic stance and evaluating urban issues in a more holistic perspective and so did not continue to be present in the meetings. For them, the housing question could be evaluated with other

social rights. They have some relations with TMMOB and whose members are some academic figures. They believe in changing laws; however, they accuse –a member of them accused in the Forum before European Social Forum-, the approach of Dayanışmacı Atölye for making plans for neighbourhoods and serving to the aims of the municipalities. In the forum, a “personal” affair is also lived between the members of these two groups and hindered in a sense the possibility for being together.

The Association of Social Rights favouring that housing right is class-based issue; argued that there is a class-based transferring of urban lands. Their claims mainly remain on a political-economic stance evaluating urban issues in a more holistic perspective; the housing question could be evaluated with other social rights. They have written some reports on violation of social rights from 2006-2007. They define themselves as anti-capitalist, solidaristic, equitable, participant. They believe in citizens who are in socio-political struggle, non-governmental mass organization for public opinion, a class organization, a solidarity organization with social, economic and cultural dimensions. They supply legal consultation for victims of social right violation with reports (since October 2006), social rights (observers) monitoring centres, public opposition, law and education working groups, legal support in call/application centre/emergence team for consultancy, in some centres in Ümraniye and Kazım Karabekir. They are engaged in developing and unifying the social rights movements -underlining labourer characteristics of the citizen movement (citizenship social rights movement)-for all of the people, against their destiny to be poor, a result of deprivation of resources, policy preferences, and their non-egalitarian use: “Social Rights to everyone!”. The collective resources must be used for the realization of social rights, anti-poverty programs, and the regulation of the budget for social prosperity, education, health and housing against neo-liberal policies, unemployment, secure, healthy working conditions, health, housing, nutrition besides disability, sexist division of labour, child abuse in

the workplace. They are for trade unions' struggles and their strengthening at the national, regional, global levels.

Another group, *Istanbul S.O.S* was a group mainly interested in urban historical heritage, historical neighbourhoods and buildings. The members are in general artists, intellectuals, journalists who are keen on "history", and historical identity with its preservation. They are supported by Atlas Journal, and The Association of Nature. They represented the main actors of Istanbul Urban Movements as well as of some of the neighbourhood associations and platform namely Sulukule Platform. They organize some excursions that they call "loyalty excursions" to create a consciousness not merely for historical heritage but for other neighbourhoods under threat of demolition. This association is important also for its "urban" and "architectural" stance with a more neutral position comparatively with other associations, rather than mainly "political". They define themselves as people who are aware of interference with living areas, and related rights, resulting in social exclusions, destruction of cultural values, and natural spaces. They refer to UNESCO's World Heritage list where Istanbul is listed as in danger, and declared that "Istanbul is giving alarm" due to natural, cultural and socio-economic damages created by the implementation of urban projects. They declared that it is urgent to act against these damages with the construction of the Third Bridge before it is too late, not only as the citizens of Istanbul but also as the citizens from all over the world.

4.3.2. Potentialities and Difficulties of Urban Oppositions in Istanbul

This chapter will discuss assessments, ideas and experiences on potentialities and obstacles, mainly political and strategic differences which create tensions between groups and activists. Although the goals and

framing of different groups, local-level activists and organizations in Istanbul may be different in some respects within the dynamics of urban opposition, it is necessary to find effective ways for generating common actions and practices, common solidarities. It is necessary to underline the importance of actors in organizing grassroots oppositions as well as alliances in terms of intersecting and commonly shared and conflicting aspects underlining dimension of process. The focus on some limited locations as well as –mainly international-campaigns, petitions and press releases could be cited as dangerous traps for urban oppositions. For oppositional groups and actors, the ecological struggle could not be thought separately from urban oppositions, this could pave the way for another politics and new coalitions. However, to focus on some points, mainly “spatial problems” could be considered as the limitation of urban opposition. I would like to underline that recognizing the importance of space in urban oppositions, urban social movements must return to its meaning that “urban space where many struggles occur and come together”. This idea would open our understanding and will save from the traps and limitations of so-called “space”. Another aspect is that while people from neighbourhoods expect support and information from activists from outside the neighbourhoods, this turns relations in new tensions and even hierarchies -which were not intended before- and spatial traps for opposition. These could reflect in relations between different local actors as well as between intellectual groups.

A potentiality -but the main difficulty as well- is the necessity and need for a “common vision”. For some groups, this is not an achievable objective but in the process of the practice of commoning, this need as well as potentialities became apparent. Still the main obstacles behind are proposed to be different political approaches and ways of opposition, which deserve to be discussed again and again in the movements. If we talk about neighbourhoods, with similar problems and experiences, they could get over

differences and put possible coalitions as necessary objectives. In this respect, the *representation problem in the neighbourhoods, with new and existing fragmentations and emotions like fear are problems and obstacles for urban oppositions in Istanbul*. For instance, the demolition in Sulukule, Roman neighbourhood or a project in the city centre are protested in a great number and popularly by some groups but the project in Zeytinburnu (gecekondu neighbourhood) is not, especially not by artists and some intellectuals, artists. *The meaning of international groups does possess two facets in terms of: initiating moments of togetherness and new acquaintances, and motivation and on the other hand representing temporary alliances, which lead to artificial protests for many activists*. Togetherness remains at the level of protest; in this respect, we could talk about the presence of an affinity group which is mobilising for urban issues. Same people active and sometimes exhausted, in time could focus more on difficulties but not solutions. In terms of fragile relations, emotions do matter. This will recreate old problems of leftist politics, strengthening by differences and controversial aspects of ways of opposition. The division of space/neighbourhood between activist groups outside the neighbourhoods led to fragmentations and lack of information and connection between neighbourhoods. On the other hand, they expect support from each other without talking explicitly about the characteristics of these supports as well as common experiences and processes.

Cihan underlined: “The appropriation of the space is to create another city as we live in gecekondu neighbourhoods which change the social content of the city. You are transforming the city within the struggle. The tactics could be different. However, they must support themselves.” She continued: “There could be different ideologies in neighbourhoods. For instance, in Sarıyer, you could see there are many differences. There is an initiative of cooperatives. However, there is no inclusion of tenants in right to shelter struggle. So tactics could be different between neighbourhoods; however,

not in terms of tactics, but in terms of principle as a struggle of right to shelter, they could be together. This is a solidarity not based on the property rights.”

Cihan refers to the positive and negative effects of some outer groups in neighbourhood: “However, people could be considered by the municipalities as “anarchist” because of ideological groups. This could lead to fragmentations and fear in neighbourhoods. Since they came here because of forced evictions in the South Eastern part of Turkey. This eases the struggle. How could it be if people will say we must resist with barricades? We must put the right to shelter as a principle and insist on it against the forced evictions. We must not accuse people who accept and negotiate. We see that people ask how much they could have. I think the cooperative of DA in Sarıyer is alike and disrupts togetherness and the upright approach. However, in some neighbourhoods, people with the pressure of could ask more since they will lose anymore. The breaking point is negotiation and property. Here, the tenant has no place here.”

About the *potentiality to generate awareness due to their exclusion from decision making process*, Arif stated: “Urban opposition is the awareness of people who live in the city about the fact that they are ignored when some important decisions are being made and their act of raising their refuse as a result of this.” He referred to build and natural environment: “It is a concept with many dimensions which covers people, trees, green areas, roads, buildings, parks, sea, animals, shortly, everything which is and could be in the city. For this reason, I find it important. If there are governing people in the city, so there is urban opposition; if not, it must be.” and added: “*Urban opposition, as a life long struggle, which does not depend on the successes...*” About the characteristics of urban opposition, he argued: “...apart from everything, must be *democratic, transparent, and egalitarian*

and must target one or several problems of it and their solution.” One of the main obstacles is to determine many aims do not serve to anything for Arif, a waste of resources. Moreover, this leads to the exhausting of people’s energy in a very short time and leads to pessimism. Urban struggle must be pursued through protests with a great participation as well as if it is needed, legal struggle could be used on the other side for him: “There must be an action based on information and acceptance of all the participants in a democratic, transparent and equal method.” About the outer support and independency: “We could use of *international* support and linkages time to time. We have to be attentive about two points: We have to *be independent from the supportive groups*. I do see political groups and parties a part of right to the city struggle. When a protest is made during a signature campaign, these supports gain much more importance. *However they do not have to have determinant/guiding roles. They must remain at a mere component. Otherwise the right to the city struggle will be a sub-institution of a party or group and this perception will harm the struggle.*”

From a similar line, Imre maintained: “In general, political parties, when they take from one side urban struggle, they want to shape *the formation according to their benefits*. Even some organizations use to find militants and members, and supporters...It is the natural structure of political parties. With neighbourhood inhabitants and local struggle and these organizations could have some relations in the framework of mutual confidence and sincerity. I do not see any problem here. These could have some effects of dividing and destroying. If they have sincerity about these people’s right of sheltering, they would care about these issues.” About political parties, Besime stated: “They did not perceive yet urban regeneration. They don’t know the issue. Since 2004, we organized hundreds of seminars, meetings. *The same group, we are talking to each other. But the parties are deprived from this in a great extent. The parties could not be intellectual places in*

Turkey to observe the current situation, to revise the issue from their political filter. This does not happen so. Even the social democrats solve the problems from the expectations of neighbourhood dwellers. However, they did not perceive yet the issue. They are pretty involved in construction sector. This is related perhaps to that reason. They could not be so objective. They are fragmented in their groups. ..In Kartal municipality, there was a cancellation of project. In some localities, it could happen according to person's subjectivity, approaches. According to ties formed in the past with neighbourhood dwellers...But there is not a total politics. If there is, it could save people's needs. Not ours, but theirs. This does not save our definition to the question "how the city could be". Hatice for the party politics, stated: "There is a big a real politics in the world. It works between parties. So from here we could save the world. Outside these real politics, for the left, even though I believe that there is a class struggle, it is not a strict struggle, but it is always considered from here. Every party has its prior politics. For urban regeneration and urban politics are held as secondary. Ecologist and feminist movements are considered alike. I don't think it is right. For the left, it is broken from the society. But relation with the society is formed like that. You go to neighbourhood and the society is there. To make relations with other parties or in party rooms around a table don't work. If there is a problem of socialization in the left, they must go from the issues that they consider as secondary. The life is there."

Arif underlined that *urban problems connect and equalize people*. "In this respect, to move from the city has its facilitating dimension. On the other hand, it is very difficult to keep alive people's attentions/concerns.", he added. İmre made a remark about the *utmost importance of urban oppositions since it covers many issues*: "I think that urban opposition is very important, the most important one. Since the city is in relation with other oppositions. *Health, education, sheltering are issues related to the*

city. I think David Harvey told us something very important: He stated that it would be more effective if you combine the opposition related to work and living areas. So for instance, trade unions. We state that working class neighbourhoods. They could be organized in the workplace. We have to be after the fact that neighbourhood organization work with trade unions. It would give force to urban opposition...The *trade unions* must be in a special relation with Urban Movements. *They must act together. We have to tell this to the trade unions.*”

There is a necessity to *propose and achieve new methods*. Imre underlined *the necessity to be informed and inform*. To realise, he argued: “*We have to do a mapping. Who are dwelling. In which neighbourhoods? How they are organizing? Where they are working? What are they eating? We need a centre of information which collects this. Imece could have this responsibility.* Two years ago Arif Hassan had come from Pakistan, an activist/architect. They had a right of sheltering office in Karachi. They are very successful...What he told, what is important is to collect and to archive information. In the beginning, what we did was to collect information and archive it. Later, *it became an informing centre*. I think we have to do this. For this reason, I do pay importance to *mapping issue*. These two strategies will accelerate the urban opposition.”

About the *composition of people affected from the capitalism and related problems in the city*, Imre accentuated: “There are many groups and they are heterogeneous who are affected by urban politics. However, it is wrong that one group will assume the opposition. We are saying working class. But this is changed. For instance, people who are working in the finance sector in the plazas are workers so white-collar or blue-collar workers do not change. If we consider them from the class perspective, they are people who are working with salary. They do not screw the nail but they spend all their life

in front of the computer. *So middle classes themselves must not consider themselves separately from working classes. Working classes and middle classes must act together.* All these are the tools which could be used in the struggle. We could not state that this is right or wrong. This could be used or not.”

About the *characteristic of urban struggles which must not be confused with the one against capitalism*, Besime stated: “*Urban opposition is a conjectural struggle. It is not based on a main contradiction; it is not a struggle from capitalism. It is a reflection from other areas.* It is a struggle which rise from problems and groups targeted. But when we look at to some periods of time, urban struggles are intertwined by social struggles. However, this could remain limited like in 1968s. Or if there is an uneven development with direct erosion in some places in the world, these places could have some struggles against dispossession and homelessness. All of the politics which struggle against displacements could be a part of urban struggle. However, it could be sometimes difficult to pick urban part and define it could be difficult. So the boundary itself is conjectural and geographical. If we look at to the city, urban struggle is shaped by the politics like urban regeneration, which lead to displacement of people who are considered as “occupier”.” And Besime added to connect urban struggles with movements in the *rural to have a common utopia*: “*But this could meet with other practices and experiences. For instance, with HES struggle.* Or it carries the hope to meet with HES struggles. They can flow in each other. If it is a struggle, it must aim a gain. *This could be possible only if they combine/fair and if they have a common utopia, word, and thought.*”

Pointing out one of the main obstacles, which is “*property struggle*”, Şen debated: “Urban opposition could remain at a low level of property struggle.

And it interests only some groups. It could only be some groups' issue. Taksim could not hear Tarlabası. They are face to face. I don't talk about a gecekondu neighbourhood and Taksim." *Departing from the city could be an obstacle by itself*, Hatice argued: "If you act from the city, how we could be together with class movement, women movement. These questions became enforced questions after a moment. If you put the city as an issue, you could not be together with other movement." She argued that *it is necessary to develop the focus of the movement appropriately*. And added: "If you do not, *it remains so artificial*. You think how we could be together. Apart from some protests, some petitions, you could not do something. *The problem is the city, labour and social gender. It is a hard task. It could not happen suddenly. By learning, slowly.*" *From the impossibility to separate labour movement, ecological movement from urban struggles*, Hatice added: "I hesitate to put something in the centre comparatively with the others. This is valid for the city too. Urban opposition which is related to urban issues and taking place in the city, we could name it as urban opposition. Labour movement, ecological movement could not be separated from urban struggles. These politics go hand in hand and they could not be separated. Urban opposition begin –this is also one its problems- from a reaction against an intervention to our lives. *This must be proactive. But due to its nature, it could not be proactive. We have to think about this. It is perhaps to think about our starting point.* If there is not an intervention, there is not an opposition. To make this as a proactive, perhaps, is related to form this again." She continued with the importance of ecological struggle and *its allying force* and stated: "“I struggle ecologically. The world as a whole is an ecology. The ecological struggle is pursued in rural areas. *Rural politics and current conditions in the rural areas are the results of what is going on in the cities. The cities have a serious ecology which affects the rural areas.* Consequently they are inseparable. The Third Bridge became an allying issue...If the struggles on women, on rural and urban areas are separated,

this causes problems. Later, it was difficult to bring them together. Groups come together and you know that every people have their similar mind sets, but we live problems at some point. I don't know whether or not it is relate to ways of working. There was a perception that it interests people who are directly affected by the bridge and groups like us. But the Third Bridge affects also other cities... There were groups, organizations and people in the platform who wish to do this. In the *Ecology Collective*, we would like to do this too but we could not manage. It is big and hard task but it lies to the perception that they are separated problems, urban, rural so ecological issue."

From the danger of being co-opted through so-called participation form the urban space, Deniz Özgür argued: "If you start the city, you could come to a point, whereas you depart from the right and injustice, you could arrive in another one. It could be important to design the city but it is not the problem for us now. We could propose some new spatial functions such as a cultural centre, film archive for Emek Movie Theatre. For instance we delayed the projects for the Movie Theatre. We will come at a point that we will determine its use. We have shown an example of a struggle for the use value as value!" In this respect, Erbatur, considering urban opposition importance related to the fact that capitalism nowadays produces inequalities considerably by reproducing space, argued that struggles related to urban oppositions for a democratic and just society are little but crucial as war of positions of revolutionary movement from a Gramscian perspective he interprets the struggle area as relational from Bourdieu's perspective. *For an effective struggle*, with a differentiation of victims in the neighbourhoods and activists from outsider groups, Erbatur argued that *the victims themselves must be actors, propellant of the movement and so the activists must walk beside them, not in front of them. People from neighbourhoods mobilising from their house, neighbourhoods appropriated the city-wide*

issues, while “activists” starting to think about and mobilise from the city, they also appropriate the use value of inhabitants. So in this sense we could refer to Hardt and Negri, Chatterton, Russell et al. and Harvey, “the city as a factory to the production of the commons”. *The thesis does use the social practice of commoning the struggle or claim against the enclosures of the use value of the city, as urban commons.*

For Erbatur, tactics and methods could change according to *the situation and contexts* but the group who carry on the struggle must not be affected by discriminations based on ethnic, religious, ideological, class, gender issues. About the difficulties of the urban struggle, he stated that usually within a struggling group, there are mainly *problems related to discrimination issues based on ideological differences in the groups who wish to support the struggle of the local community and the illusion of the local community for taking interests from urban rent.* In this respect, *urban struggle must aim the right to the city, targeting a more democratic, just city based on the use value.* One of the main problems is the inability of an effective taxation of urban rents in Turkey. He added that he considers defining and formatting categorically the struggle problematic. For some examples, *the solution could be resistance and the barricade, but the negotiation, making the public agenda, the legal struggle to produce an alternative plan could work too so there are various and flexible tactics to fight effectively.*

According to Çiğdem, *urban oppositions separately in neighbourhoods do not serve to anything.* If this struggle will be gained, and the legislations passed step by step limiting our human rights and freedoms must be withdrawn since with these legislations, *our human rights and freedoms are not in guarantee.* She added about the relation between urban opposition, rights and legislation: “Nor our right to shelter and property. *Nor Istanbul*

and living spaces are guaranteed and our neighbourhoods as well. So our struggle is turned into the fact that the legislation concerning our lives is passed and a law is formed, we have to struggle against the drawing back of these law. These legislations will be used in a bad way and we will be under risk.” Çiğdem continued: “Especially, in this period, urban struggle has a special meaning. The city is always where the intellectuals of the society are living and a field which more open to social opposition compared with the rural. It has another meaning. *The formation of urban opposition is the social opposition of the country.*” Referring to the city’s vital importance in *the survival of capitalism (see Lefebvre 1976) as an exploiting system*, she argued: “If there will be an opposition against the system and the order, so I attach a special meaning to urban opposition, so capitalism today will survive from selling of abstract and concrete values of the city, and if we obtain capital accumulation of the commoditization of the city, it means that the main target of the capital is the city and living spaces in the city, the living standards of people living in the cities and their rights and freedom. Today the economic capital realizes itself in the city so struggle rising from the city or struggles rising from urban deprivations will furnish opposition against system and order. In this respect, after fordism, in the post fordism process, the fragmentation of labour, of the stages of production, and of the space, at the result, fragmented social opposition. It has moved the base of the social opposition. To get together, to socialize. It has abolished the conditions to make possible to struggle together. So the meaning of working class has been changed. We, the socialists, we are talking about working class struggle. But today, it is necessary to mention a different social opposition. Rather than an organization from a class base, an opposition which is anti-capitalist but not having a class stance and there are movements which are not socialist but all these ones are oppositional to capitalism and the system. *The expectation about the transformation of the capitalism could be different. Or the definitions could differ. But the starting*

point is that capitalism does not allow people the right to live, exploits the nature, and humanity and is vanishing, an exhausting system. We could not explain this only by class relations. Even though they do not accept this, all is class for sure. I explain class that I attach importance: To have a home, a car does not mean to be capitalist. To be capitalist, to be from the capitalist class is to possess means of production. In this respect, if you exploit one labour, one person's labour and gain surplus value, you are capitalist. ..There are groups which did not consider this as a class struggle but struggle as an anti-capitalist struggle...As Arendt stated, we must recognize differences and make another definition of class.” For the inclusion of different neighborhood dwellers in the opposition, Çiğdem noted: “It is difficult to organize with the renters. Being woman who knows better and work with men in the association. Even though they have accepted to work together, they want that I leave my political view and my milieu. On the other hand, they know that our struggle could not carry on without them.” The city is has a crucial importance in social opposition. For Çiğdem, *social opposition must organize in the cities since the cities are the places where there are the main interventions because the impoverished people are in the cities. Çiğdem added: “The unemployed people are living there. People lose their homes without considering class, gender. This deprivation affects everybody...There are also big deprivations in the rural areas, there are attacks in terms of HES projects. The urban opposition must not remain infertile. Rural oppositions must ally with urban movements, with all the components of the social opposition, with trade unions and political parties. If there is a claim from the system, if this conveys this, they are making politics...I consider politics as a totality, NGOs and political parties, trade unions.”*

About different ways of urban resistance, Çiğdem argued: “There are approaches for negotiations and refusals. There are practical and theoretical oppositions. The practical opposition is the organization and realization on

the field. For neighbourhoods, *their self-organization at the local is very important*. Their types of action are very important. The collective petition action and the campaign such as “Do Not Touch My School” are important. *The web sites via that they raise their voices are some methods that they can use. The flyers, meetings for people, the press releases...* The struggles bases where different oppositions come together are important. On the other hand, theoretical discussions on the urban regeneration are important. How this process is reproduced via academic methods and neoliberal discourses.” Çiğdem in the interview and her each statement argued about the devalorisation of people: “*How this serves to legitimize the interventions, de-valorise the living areas and people? This must be dealt academically and return to people.* The opposite side is using some strategies: Firstly, they *glorify* what they do with the universities that they have and the mainstream press, billboards and they address to the public opinion. They expose what they realize as a city with high standards and opportunities. So they propose a dream to people. On the other hand, to cover what they had done and to *legitimize*, there is a politics of devalorisation. The politics of *devalorisation* are implemented on Sulukule people with the prejudices like normal people could not go there due to the risk of being robbed. By clearing there, we make Sulukule, Tarlabası as a place where everyone could go by devalorisation of people and place of Sulukule.” It is necessary to be aware of strategies of the authorities, such as to create and manage uncertainty. Çiğdem discussed: “There is another strategy of the municipalities: *the management of uncertainty*. This is used in the process of urban regeneration projects and laws. ..You can fill as you wish. This government does this very well, which leads to deprivations and taking neighbourhoods from people. They give false information, they lie, they secrete information, prevent participation or they pretend to do something. They divide and rule. ..Always a process of negotiation. They do not act according to the rules. There leave as indefinite. They try to make consent

with negotiations methods. Or sometimes by enforcing...They choose and fragment one by one people and areas. They create conflicts between two sides of the avenue. ...For the first time, in the city there are mass demolitions. There are not special approaches for neighbourhoods as if they have similar characteristics. It is not a renewal but a reconstruction of the city through a mass clearance and gentrification with state forces. ...only with a project..with laws. This is unacceptable. The legislation “of earthquake” aims to demolish buildings in good qualities, which does not aim earthquakes, but only the implication of that project.”

Çiğdem made an important remark about *the same people who are struggling in every issue as one of the main difficulties in urban opposition*: “In every opposition, the same people are struggling. There are always same people burdened with responsibility. One or two people from one association, one or two people from neighbourhoods rise for the opposition and make connection with other struggles. Yes, there must be leading person but number of these must increase. The burden on some same people would lead to the *fatigue of some people and they will exhaust*. This could be cyclical, in turn. They must be catalyser together. But for sure, there must be people who orient and lead. This is how it works. ...Some people must give consciousness and do leading in the organization.”

In between local opposition and support from outside, Çiğdem argued: “I think local opposition will be from inner dynamics. The help from outside could not create this. If the support from outside could save, Sulukule will be saved. Everybody was uprising for Sulukule including press who was silent until that day. Everybody has talked including intellectuals, press, and the world. ...So if there is no organization of people there, and people do not resist, it is impossible. *The inner dynamics of the local are determinant to gain, to be successful.* If there is a support from outside, the process will be faster and stronger. ...this makes for sure visible and successful the

struggle of people. But to be successful, the inner dynamic is necessary...If people give their houses, you could not do anything. They say that it is my property and I did my contract. The resistance of neighbourhoods against capital is important.”

Urban struggle must not cover merely “urban space”, but we must think about “*living spaces*” for Çiğdem: “This is not a struggle for the city but living spaces, rivers, agricultural fields are living areas. Like peasants are taken from their fields and meadows, they take our houses and neighbourhoods so all the living areas. And the approach is the same i.e. *transfer of these spaces and the uses of the spaces for the capital. ... A city based on solidarity relations...centres open to everyone, to young people.* Opposed to the rural, a city is where I can find books to read since in the city where I was born in Hopa, I could not find any books. So the freedom to read and to find whatever I search for. A city where I can find artistic productions, cultural possibilities where there are big universities, libraries, different tastes which could be together. The possibility that you can meet new people. I do not like gated communities, alienation, traffic and concrete houses. The city is where the struggles from workers were born. The city where there is struggle of trade unions in the universities. There is a possibility to struggle for different groups, women, LGBTs, the poor, the animals, the city...the diversity of civil society.” About the success, Çiğdem argued: “*If you don’t have the result, the struggle means nothing. Even though I struggle a lot, if I don’t get the end, the result, my life won’t change. ...if there is an obtained aim, there is success. Even though there could be successful campaigns and strategies....but the legislation of earthquake must be abolished.*”

Erdoğan from Gülsuyu-Gülensu neighborhood argued from local self-organization and their togetherness and its objectives: “However, this struggle is so slow in the neighbourhoods where political relations are weak.

There must be a *local association* or association of people coming from the same city could cover ordinary people and their struggle for their rights (not of property). They could say their words and decide for themselves. We must orient urban opposition to the decision making processes. Even an opposition from urban regeneration must result in people who are transformed into the subjects of the process. This is the success. We must create a new organization form from which even ordinary people have the right to make decision...We have to appropriate the issue together...*Our regeneration process was related to other seven neighbourhoods like Başbüyük*...However, they announced three neighbourhoods as renewal areas. The others have dealt with their plans due to their relations...They have started from Başbüyük because of its conservative identity. So they thought that they could easily imply their projects in a neighbourhood alike where there are not a problem with the state and the police forces. But it did not happen so. Women reacted there. Since they understood that there is no place to go. They have written a history. From this resistance, there were many precious works. In fact, we met with urban opposition. They attracted attention of urban opposition. For instance, Solidarity Studio and İMECE worked there. They were an example for different neighbourhoods. They came to visit them from Ayazma, Tarlabası...We met with these friends. Our relations get stronger. We learnt a lot. We are a leftist neighbourhood. They stated that we organized them. Inhabitants of Başbüyük are good people and you provoked...However, they only thought that we were sharing the same fate. ..Their approaches and type of resistance (sometimes nationalist, sometimes creative ways) were different and we were not used to it. They surprised us.”

About the *methods of resistance and struggle for neighbourhoods*, Erdoğan stated: “Under this attack and closure, I do not think that we could save the neighbourhood with the barricades when there is demolition. My friends

think so. We think that another process is possible without being a tool of this transformation, enforced to leave our neighbourhoods, to be exiled for another place or for TOKİ houses. We do not defend this. We only say that we could discuss this with inhabitants. The solutions could come only from these discussions. We do not say that there is a need of planning so we bring this. But revolutionary friends react directly against, refuse this and state that they will save with barricades...They say that they could come and state that we won't let them demolish. It points to Dikmen's conditions nowadays. But we could not continue alike...It is not to say that this is the best for the neighbourhood and for you. The aim was to open a space for the neighbourhood to discuss. For those who say that you are thinking as a liberal. These contradictions are lived in our neighbourhood too. My concern is to decide one or another. We are defending the same issues and we have common sensibilities. How we could accept that they will demolish our houses and neighbourhoods. It is unfair to accuse some people they market the neighbourhood but there are theoretical and political differences. This broke up the opposition."For the involvement of Professional (Architects and Urban Planners) Chambers, Erdoğan commented: "The Chamber of Urban Planners was not so active in urban opposition until 2005, 2006. Our struggle of urban regeneration pushes them to be mobilised and it became more apparent. Tayfun Kahraman at that time worked a lot. This is my critique, until that time, they were following legal process. In 2007, they became active in studio study of Solidarity Studio. There were urban planners at that time. They supported a lot..."

Erdoğan underlined the significance and potential of urban opposition in every sphere of life: "We have to expand the way of opposing in every sphere of life and its affecting subjects. Every human being, who is oppressed in ever sphere such as the student, the worker must be the subject of its struggle form. If we do not do this, we will lose all of the struggles

including urban...” What Erdoğan argued about doing politics by *creating cracks* (see Holloway 2002) from the city has the ultimate prominence: “We must break *traditional methods of politics*. Urban opposition is a good candidate to break this..in every neighbourhood that we go. Last week, we were in Kanarya, where people are not political. There is a good potential to break this there. *From the “political”, I do not imply any political party...*For instance, friends in Dikmen Valley try to do this, think alike...But we have two impasses: What we propose at the end? Negotiative planning, alternative planning and barricades focused on resistance...When we could not propose a new forming thing, opposition could not develop. It is the process that we came by accumulating experiences. *We could not wait for the revolution but we must create cracks. Waiting for the revolution affects struggle and strategies...While we are trying to form another social order; this affects our existing struggle form. It makes us stagnant...We are waiting for. But every struggle, every action that we do from now create a new foundation....so every form of struggle must be a part of social order which will be found newly...This does not mean that today’s order will collapse totally and tomorrow a brand new order will be found. We have to leave this strategy and create cracks from today.* The form of opposition is fragile and we create every moment. We are doing by losing. This is meaningful. I am always trying to think positive about my confusions for three-four years. *The confusion is good.* We saw that a political organization had chosen its own struggle way from the very beginning. If you follow this way, you will be successful, they say. We see that this does not lead to success. The form of struggle will determine the success. When the oppressed people will become the subjects of this opposition, this will determine way out of the struggle. I am happy. It is good to see the results of our efforts. For instance, the meeting in the wedding hall was very good. It was full of people. We stated that we don not have any reply to their question whether or not our houses will be demolished. The reply is hidden

here. *If we appropriate this, and form together something, it will determine the fate of our house. On the other hand, the reply must not be limited in the question whether or not our house will be demolished or in the city. The replies could come by appropriating the city.* The march after the meeting was a part of this...To be in this neighbourhood which is organised is very good. We have to use this chance.”

For the fragmentation in terms of issues and cities, Erdoğan supported *the relations between the cities and related projects*: “If we find a powerful position here in Istanbul; this would determine Ankara, İzmir and even social oppositions in Europe...We have to propose an alternative to the city governors...We have to have a perspective that the problems of İzmir are ours too. As the protest last month of Taksim Solidarity was a part of this to appropriate Istanbul. It is much powerful thing to appropriate Istanbul...Local struggles in Istanbul could appropriate the city. We are living in Gülsuyu but we could go to Taksim to say that Emek Movie Theatre is ours...Or we went by buses to the protest against the Third Bridge in Kadıköy from Başbüyük. *..Local attempts could meet with urban ones. For this reason, I attach special importance to Istanbul...We went many cities and examine urban opposition areas...we have an absence of appropriation of the general.* Dikmen for us is an important resistance focus point. If Dikmen loses, it would create a very disappointment for Istanbul. As people from Dikmen stated, if you are cold there, we are here. Oppressed people feel the same...If every local does not connect with the general...these are limitations of the opposition. Taksim Solidarity could say easier that I do not care about Gülsuyu. Since the local could feed the general but the general must have a foresight of the local and support their struggles. There is always oppression on the local: Why you are not in the protest against the Third Bridge or in Taksim Solidarity. But you are not there too...” Erdoğan added: ““We could gain success only we could

transform the struggle of oppressed people into a right struggle. For instance, the working class does not have anything to lose. Here man/woman loses his/her house and this is trapped into a property issue. Friends from İMECE asked a question in Başbüyük: We are struggling for your right to shelter here but you are for your house to be three stages. We do not have any word for rent...*Urban opposition has its own risks. There is a thin line between the right claims and the property.* ”

About the elaboration of the local and power relations at the local and everywhere, Erdoğan underlines: “What we do not have is academic qualification. For this reason, we have opened our doors for academic production about opposition. We have problems to produce local language of the right to the city discourse. The academy plays an important role to form this bind between the local and urban opposition. There culture and art institutions which produce alternative art have functions too. Here is not a field. Here is not an object. *Not a laboratory.* It is not a place that you came from outside, do your research and then you leave. Since till now, it happened like that. We were expecting something but they left at the end. There is no continuation. It did happen so with Solidarity Studio. They do not foresee and intend this. But at the end, it lived so. People here were expecting...Like cultural workshops here. If the study did not give any feedback to the neighbourhood, it remains what researchers have taken. It is alienation...We live power relations everywhere, in every sphere of life. Urban planners did so on us by saying that you will like this and that. There is a need of green areas there or social housing. But we live here. We have to have our right to word and decision about the imagination about the future...”

About effective struggles, mainly mentioning the effective result, Kumru suggested: “For an effective struggle, *we have to have a belief that we*

could pursue an effective struggle and have an effective result at the end. If we don't believe and we do according to the demands of someone, we do false. We have to struggle for our aims. The main active motivation in our struggle is that *we could do, gain, and practice this.* According to this, *we are moving together, collectively, not individually.* After the belief, we have to be organized. This organization is in ourselves but also other groups who struggle with us. After being organized, what is necessary that who and how many people of the population in the neighbourhoods the leaders, opinion leaders in the neighbourhoods represent. There could be a mentor but this could not represent a great amount of people. It is not his preference. There could be thirty mentors. This could include elderly people. However this people could lead great amount of people when he decides to do something. What is important for us is the representation. This is not a classical democracy. For us, this does not mean that %50 is the representation. The percentage must be higher. People who have representation for %60 is not the presentation for us. We aim to augment this percentage. *We aim this in legal organizations such as neighbourhood associations. We do not mean a functioning of cooperatives which is led by a leader group.* Neighbourhoods also do not wish this. We have small tactics for this. We do consider and pay attention to supervision committee composed of 50-60 people. Apart from the administrative board, we have street representatives. There are many representatives in case of the former absence. We have representative for every 4-5 buildings. Every people who is involved in the cooperative could not act active in working conditions. Their ideas to the platform, and legal positions could have people on whom they could give their representation. They must confide in these people. They must choose these people by themselves. We prefer that this is chosen by inhabitants and for every 5-6 building, they confer their representations to this people if it is needed. This representative became the one for every ten household. The aim is to self-participation. These are tactics and ways for the high

representations. It is also the way to form acquaintances in the neighborhood, to confide to each others and to augment the capacity to work together.” Kumru, *underlining the importance of self-organization in the neighbourhoods vis-à-vis the limits of support from outside*, stated: “The struggle in the neighbourhood must be pursued from these neighbourhood. Secondly, if there is another, we only help them. We don’t get involved in this struggle and say: Let’s struggle in this way! The demands come from them. *There are always three or four people who did some related concerns, they are hearing our names or neighbourhoods that they work together stated that we have some connections with this group.* They search for, find and confide in us. We say that for the first visit, please don’t come with three or four people and please come with a higher representation. Please come in numbers. We don’t accept one or two people. We could accept but when he returns back to neighbourhood, he could miss some points (tell mistakes, with lacking points). He could hear and transfer false. In terms of complementing each other, they must be in numbers. From the first visit, more number. For this reason, we prefer doing these meetings in neighbourhoods. We are expecting from them a date and we are going there on that day so it became a popular meeting. We don’t meet in closed doors. If we would like to create a confident milieu, we must be open and transparent to everyone. Everybody must see and know who we are. We must trust in each others respectively. So for an effective struggle, to be in number and to meet in number is very important.” Kumru added: “Yes, we could resist when there is demolishment. However, this discourse lost its validity to the point that we came. Because it is a method to avert a current problem. *One day, the second, the third day, you could resist. But one day, your force could diminish.* “We don’t allow that you will demolish” *does not bring solution.* Even, it could be the reverse since you could be the one that attires attention, you can be angry, you can feel pain, and you can suffer and even be arrested. You can harm somebody in the neighbourhood or in

the opposite side. So it is a method to save the day. It does not have the validity. Because before they were coming more to demolish but now they do not come. Since the project is determined before. The demolition became the realization of the project. What we have to do, is to show resistance before the realization of the project. We have to do this in the preparation of the project and even the project does not exist. When you look at the place, you can see before what people want. Every process is very obvious in fact. The reaction must not be at the moment of something happening but before to be prepared in terms of information, documents and organization. We have to be, neighbourhood dwellers and us, prepared and be strong firstly. It's very easy to resist when there is demolition. It's an escape from struggling in fact. There are some cases and groups in the neighbourhoods and stated that they could not come here. If they do, we won't let them so. The third day, those who want to demolish, will demolish. They will take all of you and they will. On the other hand, the resistance at the moment of demolition is a means to make powerful and make visible the status of the legal and illegal groups. They are always saying to the neighbourhood too, come; we won't let them to demolish this neighbourhood. They resist when they come and stated after: "See what we have done. They couldn't demolish." People who resist against the methods other than resistance do this due to the abolishment of this tool for their status."

Kumru, *about the obstacles and the approach of DA* (Solidarity Studio) argued: "The main obstacles are *divergences of ideas basically*. I say independently from city governors. Apart from legal difficulties, divergences in the neighbourhoods could be the main problems. At the first instance, when we go into the neighbourhoods, that's the problem. What is important to reveal from which points, reasons these convergences are arousing from. For this reason, we would like to hear everyone's ideas in some place. If these could be gone over, we could gather all this in one

point. However, this requires time. We do not come face to face to the problem whether or not they would trust us. We have acquaintance almost with every neighbourhood in Istanbul. We do not have suspicions how we could enter in this neighbourhood. We have already known each other. This does not require that they know everyone in our group but they know from names. We are trying to go over from every kind of obstacle. We are trying to do this from legal way to legitimize our struggle. We have problems in organizations as well as representations. We could have also mentors' ideas. These were not gone beyond. We did with neighbourhood dwellers.”

About the aims of urban struggles, Kumru argued that it must be the whole city to see the “common enemy”: “The main aim of the urban struggle must its target to the whole. In fact, *the enemy is common and only*. Not only urban struggle, but it has effects on our every day life and human relationships so as a totality, we must struggle with this. To move from the city has the potential since the city has a direct effect on people's life. Their homes comes first we compare with work. You can stay without work but not without house. Living areas are taking shapes from this so it is necessary to move from the space. Not the city but the space. Since the city is the next space after the city. People reflect their experiences gained from this area of right seeking to other areas, fields. For instance, people who have struggled for their living spaces and if they face inequalities in working places, they aim to the same organized way of struggle for them and they start to work. So it has a teaching aspect. We could not think separately from everyday life this urban struggle. The impasse could be the deviation of the aim. If we orient this aim only to the urban space, we could lose this aim. To react only against the Third Bridge or to focus only on gecekondu areas could disorient us in many aspects. Consequently, we must go from totality, we must react against a totality. We must struggle effectively in every area where this problematic mechanism did create. The city is a part of the system with which we have to struggle. An effective part, a good means. It shapes its

status and presence from the city. The city is important for this reason since its presence comes from the space so the struggle from the space could challenge/break its presence and domination. So all these types of struggle, there is a saying: *Let's see the big picture. Must focus on seeing this big picture. If it is trapped in one area, we could not see the big picture. So we could not enlarge our struggle. So to gain in one area could not mean nothing to us. We must ameliorate this at most.*"She added: "...for an effective opposition, there is a need for a *permanent* struggle. The struggle is not only the pillar of struggling but there is before and after. If there is a gain, there must be a togetherness to share this gain. It is necessary to be together about how this gain could be evolved in. If we aimed not only coming there and leave but sharing a life with them, after that struggle found its place, we have to spend time together with people in the locality. There won't be solution for problems in Istanbul for a long time so we will struggle together for a long time. I am not optimist in this sense."

There are *many methods of resistance, which are proposed to be main problems behind possible coalitions.* For Kumru: *"One method could exclude the other.* It is not a necessity but it could unintentionally. If we could control and know what we want, we propose very well what we aim, the possibility of ignoring something could fall. So we must think together. For instance, our search for justice in working area (working homicide) in One Hope (Bir Umut) could be valuable in this sense too: The families who struggle for this issue and with our contact learn from us that in urban regeneration issue too, they could come together with whom who struggle and who are in solidarity for urban regeneration issues. They support each other struggles. Lastly, we initiated something. For instance to the turn of conscience and justice, we call families with whom we struggle and even we say that nobody call us if you do not come to this turn. It is not a necessity; however, they already know us and they come with zeal. Not only with a necessity. Since they are also workers and they can live this too. Our main

aim must not be urban regeneration or what is being done in the city, they could live this and lose their life. So this organized struggle that they did from the space, they could carry to this issue too and they can learn from these families and struggles too by coming together. This will lead to an augmentation in capacity and emancipation of struggle areas as well as the concentration in functioning. So it is necessary that they come together in other areas. In “hope nights” of One Hope (Bir Umut), we call everyone in the functioning areas of the association; it is their night. They take their microphones in their hands and tell about the reasons why they came together. So for instance, families from Davutpaşa came and families of urban regeneration are listening. For instance, depremzedeler, so people who lived deprivation from this issue take the stage and tell about what they have lived. So they started to know each other so they see their struggle areas. They practice each other ways of right seeking methods. For instance, survived people from earthquake have started to construct collectively houses after having their lands. *Its continuation in a collective way is precious so there will be the need for a construction worker.* So this man could be from a gecekondu neighbourhood and he will say that I could help you in this issue and will go there. An electrician for instance. Sure, we could find this everywhere but he will say that he will help them. Another person will have an acquaintance so will buy something cheap. So it is the construction of a solidarity network. This is what Bir Umut would like to do. They do not think to see different groups separately from each other. We gather them at most it is possible. For instance in Bir Umut nights so they can take the microphone and speech possibility to tell about their own experiences. We gather in the picnics. We started this organization with the idea that the poor also have the possibility to do bbq with their families. We organize dinners there too. People who could afford give money whereas who could not, don't. We buy meat with a common budget. We do bbq in a common place so that we distribute this equally. So nobody is different from the other. It

could be so simple but it became so precious. For instance, somebody from a neighbourhood stated that I renovate my furniture, and I give the old one so you can give to a family who needs it. This is valid for work information too. We orient people who search for work to people who need it, have appropriate source. In this respect, we are mediators. We are only mediators for their gathering and getting in touch. So limiting struggle in one area is to depart from our aims. We have in other cities as well as in different districts in Istanbul. We have forming a syndicate namely Umut-Sen in Bir Umut (One Hope). For instance, existing syndicates are for those who have an employment, but Umut-Sen is for those who do not have. People who are unemployed come together in this syndicate in terms of security. They give working educations. After the discussions of methods and functioning, now, education has been started. Umut-Sen is both for workers without security and work give working education. So our struggle area is very wide. Every individual in DA has its place in this struggle areas, do what he/she is capable to do.”

About the dilemma between *petitions and declarations* (as well as the process and way of writing) and change, Kumru argued: “Which text that we have signed *does not change anything even though we continue to sign*. If it does not make you visible, it does not change anything. You can go outside and make a mass demonstration. This makes you visible. I’m bored of this. *But to sign, every day a campaign of signature, it does not change anything. What happened? We had any gain as a result of these campaigns*. Do we read the whole text that we are reading? Don’t we have points of disagreement? There are. It does not work. What is important is not to sign a text but to make the struggle efficient and permanent paving the way to the victory. DA does not consider unnecessary but we find weak. If we propose a common text, we have to formulate the next step. Yes we shared with the public and signed, and then? Not after but we have to think before. If there is an organization constructed before/in advance. I would like to support

everything which does not obstruct our way of working. So “Urban Movements” do. And other platforms are or more exactly were meaningful for me. However, the functioning does not give any hope to me.”; continued: “These declarations do not make us powerful. Since the groups like us, DA, İmece and Urban Movements (Kent Hareketleri), try to realize these groups. It’s important to make a public opinion, it is important to inform the public. All the people who have signed have some concerns about these issues. But we have to make, determine our strategies after this text. We inform the public but we don’t do anything. It’s very easy to sign and to produce a text to share with the public. What is important to go on a way from the practices and strategies form the text.”

About being from and outside of the neighbourhood and unequal conditions, Kumru argued: “There is a huge difference between being from neighbourhood and not; we have to reduce this difference as possible as we can. We have different people working in these neighbourhoods. *I do not see myself from outside.* I could not live there but if we give the feeling that we are from outside, it won’t work. If you do this when you go there for the support, there will be a consideration that you have only come for the help, and see him/herself : “I am a person who needs help and he/she has the means to help me. He/she will help me. I am not in a good situation...If we go to a field, we have to show that we are coming from outside but we are one of them. Not only for urban oppositions but including other ones. We can face all kinds of unjust treatment. There will be no meaning that I have the title of my house, I will be a part of this struggle very soon. Who could guarantee that I won’t live any work killing? The role of academicians and intellectuals is important and problematic in this respect. *There is a need to support a neighbourhood without any benefit. Nobody must do something to strengthen his/her status, and his/her place and also not have a material benefit from something.* These people must neutralize/make zero their own positions. Nobody has to go there as an intellectual or academician. If you

go there as a human with conscious, the other status will neutralize/invalid themselves. It is good to have a professor there but I was as a student there and we do not witness that the respect did diminish at all. As a result, they know that we are doing something for them, and they do not consider this difference. But it is important that *outside neighbourhoods, academicians must resist against with their own roles*. Since they are person and a group in whom it is confided, with their approach, position, and their roles including artists. Otherwise, it could be a bottom-up approach. Political parties and groups are sometimes there sometimes not. Sometimes visible, sometimes not. They have to be present. But in the right to the city struggle. Not for strengthening their political positions and status. We won't let them to demolish neighbourhoods slogan includes this. This is not a struggle. It's a beneficiary struggle. *How is possible to be purified from all the identities and then struggle*. What will make us together is that we are human beings, our ethic, our conscious –vicdan in Turkish-, to be decent, to make ourselves with something, so our main identity must be this. The political parties, in legal and political senses, they have power for sanctioning. To use these forces and take support in this sense could be important. However, this depends on mutual interviews. They could come and tell about their concerns and we go and tell ours. It is not important to come before elections and to give support. *The main thing is ego, the benefits of people and groups*. If this leads to a political platform and make this feasible, this is important.”

About the relations between neighbourhoods and actors from outside, Yaşar claimed: “The support must be form *equality, democracy and solidarity and the neighbourhood must not be instrumentalised*. Another world could be your dream but you must not see the neighbourhood as a step and go there with this approach...You have to see *yourself as a part of the city, more than a support to the neighbourhood*. You are involved in other struggles too. You are in contact and support. However, it depends on the need and

demand. It is in fact our struggle. If it is not so, ...the way that it goes won't be good."

About being actively in the struggle, resisting according to our limitations and aiming to some changes, Yaşar continued: "People who struggle are people who have annoyances and some concerns. You would like to take risk and to be heard. *Everybody screams in the emptiness*. If you did not do this, you were not in the struggle. You believe that it would change some day. This could have many reasons. There are some platforms for this. Or you have to produce. *We could be in some organised association and solidarities at some level. If I could not be present in a platform as often as I wish or I could not able to mobilise with them, we are asking by ourselves who we could resist as people live with table in the academy*. My blog practice (<http://mutlukent.wordpress.com/>) comes from this...It is a platform to share what I am doing. I was not imagining who will follow me but in time, the feedbacks were good...However, we always follow the agenda. You remain to be at a level of opposing but determining the agenda...It is a scream. In this respect, while supporting many groups and involving in campaigns, we have to ask for support too. It must not be one way relation." *In this respect, we could return to what Holloway proposed, "scream" and "cracks"*.

About being successful and struggling, Kumru underlined: "*To be successful is to struggle always. The result is not important. Our struggle does not give a good result about the displacement of people in Sulukule. However, we had some successes. We made Sulukule visible. People have started to discuss alternative project*. We were informant about the process for all the sections. We have brought support from abroad and from artists. We informed the public opinion and we revealed the mistakes. Apart all these, we have touched people's life there, we have obtained green card (in Turkish sense) for them. We pioneered them to form an association. Now,

there is an education for children there. Still continues. There could be an unsuccessful process there but some successful processes still continue. Therefore, success is not to obtain some aims/targets but there could be some gains on the way to these aims. There would be always some struggles. We are always struggling for something in this country. It will never stop. If we limit our struggle with the city, it will finish but if we don't it won't. What is important is a continuous struggle."For the total characteristic of urban struggles covering rural areas, Kumru claimed: "Urban struggle must be pursued in terms of issues interesting urban inhabitants and urban space at every level such as the Third Bridge, Haydarpaşa, Galataport. These projects are important in a sense that it does not interest only some groups but everyone. *People from neighbourhoods also struggled against the Third Bridge. Even some people who would not use the Third Bridge have struggled too.* Since the third bridge is not only a project of road. It has some dimensions related to nature, to the transformation of space. The struggle of HES is not dependent of urban struggle. Being as a local movement, it is more important than a total urban struggle. Since it interests the local, it points out the local. Like gecekondu inhabitants, these projects are mega projects which target and will victimize peasants, we have to continue this struggle. We have on our agenda as DA and Bir Umut. This must be pursued from/in the local. Due to the distances, there could be some problems. These distances are shortening in Bir Umut and DA. We have every two week some people who go there to struggle with people in HES struggle. We are doing some legal things: suing, motion for stay of execution. In this respect, the solidarity in legal issues still continues. *HES are not based on the right to shelter but projects, based on all the spheres of life, what I say about urban oppositions is valid. It is obvious that there is a very effective opposition on going there. Since urban regeneration could not happen on urban space soon. But HES projects find its reply very soon on space.* A forest area could be razed. People who live

there could directly see. For instance, in the neighbourhoods, this is not visible without practice project. So the process there affects very rapid. For this reason, it is effective. Consequently, there is something they live there from their born. *The locality is very important.*” Arif said on the necessity of struggling together for *urban and environmental issues*: “I could admit that I heard about the right to the city statement in the past year. It could be quite late. However, it is a phrase that I really like. It seems that with environmental struggle, the right to the city struggle will hold the agenda of Turkey more and more. The attacks on the city and the environment are not happening in a single city and a single point. *We have to defend ourselves as a unity against all the attacks in every aspect of life.* I do not consider all these struggles separately from each other. In every occasion, I supported and support by taking part in protests related with urban regeneration projects for Sulukule, Third Bridge, Kadıköy, Taksim, and Haydarpaşa.”

Yaşar pointed out the meaning of *democracy* and argued: “The market works. People go and vote. However, when you look at from the space and the city, you see that this does have any meaning. This is the question of representation. You do not have the right to say your word about your neighbourhood, street and home...It is an imaginary play of democracy. My perspective is to search democracy and public. We have to see the intersection points with other lives, which I think will enrich struggles. This will be more visible in time. Urban struggle is in the intersection point from different countries...The urban space makes possible to see where we are in decision making mechanism...” He added: “The struggle does not finish. Little gains are important. It touches directly to our life. For instance, to stop demolitions is a gain. *We live revolution every day...The history continues as a spiral. It does mean anything if there is not a life practice...Urban struggle is related to other struggles in life.* If urban struggle is a sub-activity and sub-struggle, it does not mean anything. This could not be able to become an expanded, massive struggle. Even though we are a part of a

whole and bring together all of different struggles such as worker rights, this does not change the main impasse in the perceptions. Urban oppositions are considered to be marches, protests on the 1st of May. I think it is important to conceptualise again the class in the city as Harvey emphasized. Everybody prioritise and attaches meaning to the struggle that he/she is involved in. Nobody could connect with other cities. When the interventions would expand including legislations, this will change beyond fragmentations of struggles and beyond classes.”

About the meaning of struggle and success, Yaşar added: “We won’t have neat gains and losses. We will even be hurt from the place that we trust in more. There is no escape. The result is important but to struggle is more important I think.” He argued that we have to question massive characteristic of urban opposition. Even though we are thinking about ourselves as urban movements, and trying to form this, there is no movement alike. There are identities, class differences on different sides. *However, it is useful to consider in a totality. These issues could create togetherness.* We must continue on this line. We think that it must be together and think about the reasons why these opposition areas could not be massive. For instance, in Stuttgart with 600 000 people population, against high speed train, 50 thousand people protested. We were recently 10 thousand people in the most massive urban opposition. Yes, the labour and opposition is so real. We do respect people who have participated. We are a part of it but there is no movement alike. It is precious, in some places, there are not same opposition but there is no movement. We must realize that. For instance there were not 2000 people in “Two Million People Protest”. It is interesting.” Yaşar underlined: “In this period, legal struggle does not mean anything...since we are living different legal regulations. (After this interview, we had the new regulation/legislation namely the Law on Transformation of Areas Under Disaster Risk)...The executive branches are determined by the legislative ones. Even though we scream that it is unjust,

what does it mean if you don't go the squares? For sure, a legislative struggle could be important, but without this, it does not have any meaning. If we do not base this on an international context and right struggle, it won't have any meaning in the country."

Ömer told that urban opposition was *existence struggle of human beings* and added: "I am in Tozkoparan since 1971; I was 11 years-old. I became active in 2008. *Urban opposition was the existence struggle of human beings*. I think rural struggles are alike too, related with life...We have the right to life in our hands. You think that the state gives you social guarantee since you have a document given by the state in your hands. They ignore human beings...They emphasize money...and to destroy. To move people from the city centres. He stated along with others: "Urban opposition is not different from struggle with *capitalism*. Why? Because they were attacking our labour before 1980s. Now it is a rent issue of the country whose society is turned to be a consumer society...*The struggle for workers without security and trade unions...The agriculture is finished by the politics*. Our society is merely a consumer society. Urban struggle is not different from the others since the aims and the ways of struggle are same. All the projects are because of money and rent seeking and the attempts to take something from people. I do not think any difference from struggle of working classes...I am coming from Kanarya. They have titles 60 years ago. They are still thinking about whether or not they must form an association. Urban struggle must be organized in democratic right seeking framework. It must aim a civilised and human life. They have to include, centralise on human beings in the projects...It must include all their rights and it must be an opposition which respects all their values. It is a very critical question with its pros and cons from starting from the city...Its main importance is the struggle for life...It gives honour to people who struggle...The difficulties is to be faced with people who do not have a developed social consciousness...Even though we explained people whose titles are cancelled that they will live in

difficult conditions, they are hesitating about formation of association...It is not our neighborhood. Due to my position in Urban Movements, I have to be in this struggle. I do not regret...” Ömer, about struggling and being successful stated: “Being successful is to oppose as a human being against injustice, *as a necessity of being a human being*. It is not to lose or not lose. You are successful in terms of educating people, explaining people what is going on. The honour, dignity will win when people who do not exchange their dignity with money will be many. I do not know how the balance will be. We will see. What is important is to struggle and to say that I was in this struggle.”

The starting point of Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) formation attempt is to expose obstacles, necessities as well as potentialities. In the first meeting before the European Social Forum, the main obstacles are proposed to be: *some groups’ ways of oppositions until that time, the lack of being organized and act together, the laws and their usage as tools, the necessity of resistance in the streets, a total understanding of planning*, to reveal different breaking moments of resistance, different methods used in the neighbourhoods, *the lack of press interest and academic studies*. In time, this last point has drastically changed in a positive way. The points raised from neighbourhoods were following: from Güzeltepe to evaluate *the past experiences, ways of resistance*, from İMECE to have an holistic approach to problems including labour, woman, environment, the necessity to perpetual support to different neighbourhoods, critical knowledge production and diffusion, support and solidarity side by side with neighbourhoods, from Solidarity Studio, the opening of university and the challenge of the relations between university and the market, to destroy the “hegemony of technical knowledge”, as well as political groups in neighbourhoods with support and solidarity, but in neighbourhoods where there are associations, an alternative school and mutual learning process,

behaving according to neighbourhood's wills, self-planning processes in two neighbourhoods finished for different reasons at that time, from The Coordination of Housing Rights the necessity to look to the city ideologically, to orient people against demolitions, organization of big meetings with different groups and trade unions, to be critical against plans with struggle in the streets, from Kurtköy the necessity to form a struggle network especially in demolition times, from Sarıyer Fatih Sultan Mehmet the necessity to stay put against urban regeneration and to organize with different groups and associations, from the Association of Social Rights the reports not only housing right violation for an holistic ecological city instead of alternative plans in social state with the use value, covering tenants' rights and housing rights, from Mersin necessity of neighborhood assemblies, and challenge of the state which could do anything about our housing rights, from FEBAYDER the necessity to connect and share information, document and experience between neighbourhoods, the necessity of grassroots to be organized, to inform and make visible for public opinion and dwellers, conflicts within neighbourhoods, from Tarlabası the necessity of academic field studies and indifference of media, from TOZDER the necessity of organize and form associations, necessity to struggle in the streets, the rent of urban space, from Armutlu the necessity of a permanent organization, the contracts with the municipality for guaranteeing legally housing right, from the Sulukule Platform the fragmentations in the neighbourhoods and necessity to organized and holistic stance, to understand people's priority for their house and calculation of m2.

The problems in the urban opposition have similar characteristics with the problems in the Left. Some activists are more interested in the problems of the Left which replicates itself in the Left of Turkey and stated that urban movements must be gathered in the neighbourhoods rather than in the city centre and must be less academic but oriented to the solutions. The left in

Turkey must make a self-critique and self-evaluation about what they did, against what they reacted, including the left in gecekondu neighbourhoods. People do not contact directly with neighbourhoods' problems apart from their political organization. Urban opposition could be a way to overcome these obstacles. After the legislation of Urban Regeneration and the (re)“start” of the urban regeneration in October, the actors in the opposition became much more critical to themselves rather than the projects.

To sum up, for everyone and every group, the city has its *own characteristics as the core of social opposition and as a totality, it has the potential to cover and mobilise from different issues*. On the other hand, to mobilise from the city could be problematic by itself. This relies for intellectuals on the *critique of capitalism in two senses: The struggles must have “the city” at the centre or not*. It is underlined that it is necessary to be proactive mainly from the use-value due to the danger of co-opted through so-called participation or “indefinite solutions from the space”. Urban oppositions have a risk to stay fixed to local and spatial issues and to be an obstacle for a broader claim and political project. On the other hand, for others, a struggle against capitalism could not be from the city since urban struggle is conjectural and one of the struggles in life. It is necessary to *meet with rural oppositions, agricultural issues and labour struggles* for a common utopia. It is underlined that it turns to be a struggle for existence of human beings. One of the main problems is always the same group with low level of representation and active opposition at neighborhood level in general of people struggle, think, write which lead to *fatigue*. *Due to the fact that there are different levels of exclusion, awareness emerged for people who live in the city. In between/on the thin line of property struggle and egalitarian claims, same people are involved in urban struggle resulted in exhaustion*. Both from the meetings and interviews, for activists, urban oppositions must be independent from any “political party or group” and

“outer supports and their relations” and be inclusive for ordinary people. Here urban politics are considered to be “beyond political parties”, which could be shaped according to their politics. In this respect, international groups and actors could create a motivation; inform people and serves to be heard. However, the expectations may be great which could not be met. There are also expectations of international groups, which could not find its reply in social reality. For some groups and actors, there is a need to act together with trade unions while they do not show any interest in urban problems to put in their agendas. Consequently, urban problems connect people cross groups and classes. Urban oppositions cover many issues such as health, education. For this reason, beyond conventional politics, urban oppositions must represent another activism and another way of doing politics. For an effective struggle, “active inhabitants” propose the openness as necessary. Another aspect is not to struggle separately: This separation is valid for both the parts of the city (neighbourhoods) and projects and groups of oppositions for neighbourhoods, against the Third Bridge so on. This is valid also for ecological issues as allying factor. The struggle for activists is the struggle for living spaces. Different people argue that while the authorities cancelling the rights based on titles, this will bring different people together. Consequently, nobody will have the guarantee ensured by the state. Based to their inner dynamics, at the locals, the real subjects *must organise by themselves* to struggle: This could be valid for different localities; neighbourhoods and cultural centres and squares as a city-wide opposition in Istanbul. *There are limits of outer supports.*

This process is interpreted as devalorisation, deprivation that affects in different respects everyone in the city while the oppressed poor people are the mostly affected one. The necessity to be informed and to inform openly and publicly plays crucial role in urban opposition. This is a prerequisite to break the management of uncertainty of the authorities on urban

regeneration projects. *Obtained gains and concrete successes give inspiration and motivation for every group and activists. It is necessary to have a permanent, continuous struggle with non-hierarchical and two-ways-solidarities.* There is necessity to meet with the aims of urban oppositions throughout new methods and strategies, while considering and appropriating *the city as a whole including neighborhood as urban commons, social practice of commoning against all the enclosures also in everyday, every sphere life: The exploitation and oppression are in every sphere.* The relations beyond localities and issues, the necessary connections must be made. Neighbourhoods are not separate units which must be thought as laboratories. Due to heterogeneous characteristics and related confusion within the opposition, there are different contradicting repertoires of contentions (legal solutions, street struggle, “alternative planning”), which create tensions. However, due to flexible and indefinite characteristics of opposition, this is quite expectable. Moreover, they do not exclude each other and used sometimes at the same time. Different affect people must be involved in the urban opposition. At the beginning –mainly before the Forum-, some groups of middle and upper class residential areas mobilised from issues of their neighbourhoods were excluded. “Activists” underline that it is needed to have creative methods and ways to be heard and to connect these differences. People underline that they try, lose, become confused and as a result create cracks. To imagine and be hopeful from today must emerge from divergence of ideas.

4.3.3. “In Between the Moments of Encounters and Fragile Alliances”: Is Forming Alliances an Artificial Problem in the Practices of Urban Commoning?

Even though I have elaborated the meaning of togetherness from activists, I would like start with the words of Deniz Özgür: “I think that it is plastic and

artificial if there is not any organisation between them. Even Istanbul Neighbourhood Association Platform was an upper roof and plastic if there is not any struggle at the local. It is valuable to have three and four neighbourhoods there but we have to think about attempts to bring together and about its urgency. I think it is the main problem of opposition...There are all binding and forming platforms: there are solidarities formed by the same organisations. There are platforms on water, the bridge but always with the participation of same people at maximum 300 people. We have to ask whether or not forming platforms is important if it does not create a force. To build platforms does not mean an effective opposition. Is it a real togetherness? We have to question its meaning. We have to evaluate togetherness from two and three groups, from the practice. Since this togetherness could be a friend meeting. There is no transference of information into neighbourhoods. You could not organise neighbourhood from public space.” He added: “There must be an organisation based in neighbourhoods. This was the area where people face directly with social problem...However, this remains at the level of “property”, tenancy does not become an issue. The authorities were ignoring property rights and were evicting people; the property was transferred. There was not a perception of city, but on property. However, from this, there won’t have sustainable struggle...However, the meaning of property changed.”

While elaborating differences and commonalities of urban activists, their tactics, strategies, privileged struggle fields, as an aim and impossibility, to form alliances was always one of the common point which is thought to be a way for effective struggles. The discussion was focusing on a grey zone what the thesis defined in-betweenness: from moments of encounters and fragile alliances towards permanent and meaningful coalitions. On this path, the main question for some activists: To be together is it really a problem or

an artificial aim that we are struggling for and a factor to lose motivation for other strategies and potential of urban opposition.

These strategically temporary alliances could be cross-localities as well as cross-issues by forming new interlinkages including international ones. Although the goals and the framing of different groups, local-level activists and organizations in Istanbul may be different in some respects within the dynamics of urban opposition, it is necessary to find effective ways for generating common actions and practices, common solidarities which emerge for urban issues. Even though there are separations, contradictions and tensions, there could be still some strategic or temporal togetherness. The legislative and historical turning points as continuing socio-spatial layers could be seized with overlapping and controversial aspects for the city and the locality in terms of associations and key actors (Duncan 1989, Massey and Jess, 1995 in Şengül 2009). The situation in Istanbul and in other parts of the world raises hopes about the possibilities for new types of non-hierarchical, horizontal ways of organizing social and political action, and for new relations between local and global types of struggle aiming at social change. Şen (2010), in her article on urban social movements in Istanbul, underlines that even though it is open to discussion, some neighbourhood movements went on to make global connections beyond their localities (Şen 2010, 343-344) with different types of organizations attempts, neighbourhoods tried to find a place in global movements and networks with the help and presence of different types of actors. Even though these interests and linkages wouldn't be permanent or continuous links and networks which would lead to permanent change, urban movements and struggle experiences must be formulated globally since urban policies subjects overlap and necessitate common actions. In this respect, Purcell (2008) stated that resistance against neoliberalization through different organizational attempts tried to find a place in global, as well as national, movements and networks. It must be admitted that different

groups' claims still remain restricted to property ownership or spatial issues in the negotiation process; in these terms neighbourhoods' different characteristics and experiences, but mainly their political histories, are the main determinant factors. As Pérouse (2011) puts forward, we will see to what extent these struggles will be a permanent social movement developed on a local base and having a meaning for public opinion, beyond being individual and reactionary.

In this chapter, I will firstly expose *some spontaneous moments of encounters which create a motive for urban oppositions*. This was also a way to broaden opposition and to form some linkages with other campaigns. Secondly, I will try to reveal *some turning points of forming alliances by struggling for instance in a neighbourhood*. Lastly, by criticising some protests and some campaigns due to their formation with limited meaning as events, I will try to emphasise *the meaning before and after these campaigns considering this as a process*. When some temporary coalitions were being formed, it is necessary to be aware of activists' own concerns and priorities for urban opposition. A campaign, a protest and even "to form an alliance" become the main aims, the successful points while claiming urban commons, potential and gained motivation could be lost.

Firstly, the protest in June 2011 about murdering of Metin Lokumcu, the 31st May 2011, a political activist, in Hopa, a settlement in the Black Sea Region because of usage of excessive gas during on people who were demonstrating against hydroelectric power stations in the region where the Prime Minister came for election propaganda. On the 5th of June, this gathered many activists including some who were not present in the meetings of Urban Movements no more. After the protest, protestors from Urban Movements found themselves haphazardly in the demonstration of "Do Not Touch My School!" Lived experiences show that some protests with the force in it could lead to some unexpected consequences useful for

the urban opposition, in terms of reorganisation and involvement of new people. Especially, the “Platform of Life Instead of Bridge” gathered many people, from civil initiatives, +iVME, Professional chambers, political groups and People’s Houses (Halk Evleri). There were activists released after being arrested at the protest of the 1st of July, in Taksim. In time, groups against the Third Bridge that I will tell about later, increased in number became more inclusive as a platform of namely Platform of Life with environmental justice discourse changed into “right of living”.

Some protests reactionary against some discourses gathered different activists. The “Mad Project” discourse of the Prime Minister, new demolitions in Küçükbakkalköy and Dikmen in Ankara just after the elections (End of June and July, 2011) initiated new opposition by underlining the importance of being together has raised another time. However it engendered new difficulties and obstacles. İMECE, in their report published in newspaper namely Birgün, on the 13 June 2011 underlined that even though these projects are legalized in the pretext that they are for an earthquake danger, the topography of this new project carries risks. Even though Taksim Solidarity is formed in 2011, with a protest in March, 17 is organised with the participation of Urban Movements. In 2012, the Taksim Square project in a limited sense, led to protests including some neighborhood dwellers. As Pérouse (2011) argued that “brand city” discourses and the projects like Çatalca, Silivri dates back in 2005. The demolitions and violation of right to shelter in Ayazma have created togetherness in this process. A counter-commercial for Ali Ağaoğlu’s project is collectively produced. Later the project namely Maslak 1453 became a common contested point, which is collectively criticized with a statement. However, at that time, misunderstandings and conflicts between activists had raised between groups outside the neighbourhoods.

Secondly, demolitions in some neighbourhoods namely Sulukule, Başbüyük and Ayazma created a motive for alliances or the necessity to *struggle together by struggling*. All these neighbourhoods became a motivation for activists from and outside neighbourhoods. However, I must add that this could lead to cleavages as lived for Sulukule and Ayazma according to the positions and approaches which will be elaborated in the part related to Solidarity Studio and Ayazma Solidarity. Even though Sulukule will be mentioned in the thesis in other occasions, I would like to give some information to illustrate the case. Sulukule as a historical Roman neighbourhood located one of the central areas of Istanbul so the inhabitants are relocated in a social housing area was one of the neighbourhoods which were demolished, with its legal determination as an area of urban renewal in 2006. The neighbourhood does not exist anymore. After the demolitions, another construction of housing has started for new dwellers. Sulukule is very keen issue that the thesis could not cover all the processes; however, what is intended to underline is that Sulukule was the opposition which get together many people, from (national, international, institutional, political, artistic) different groups, especially actors. *Locality* is formed by different activists outside the neighbourhood who were firstly experiencing an urban opposition and in time a grassroots organization. Besides, with international support from different sources, it started an awareness what is living in Istanbul, as well as for other neighbourhoods. This year, Sulukule has regained its rights just before the new drawing of lots for the new residents, as a first neighbourhood after demolitions, which is resulted in a similar decision for another historical neighbourhood namely Fener-Balat but before being demolished. Being a European Cultural Capital, Istanbul was proposed to be transformed according to aims for “contemporary arts”, “cultural heritage”, “historical background”, with discourses of “multiculturalism”. This aspect is critical for the thesis since it would question artistic and intellectual resistances’ relevance and efficiency.

“Culture” as a controversial and complicated word, with “Europe” component of this new label became legitimatizing tools for urban projects of neoliberal urbanism determined by the benefit of this “cultural industry” in some cases, excluding Istanbul’s residents (especially in the first periods of the “project”), especially lower classes, leading to one question: “whose culture, whose city” (as Zukin stated in “Whose culture, whose city” (1995)). The ideal as cultural capital for Istanbul serves to justify and to legalize some of the spatial, but more exactly economic decisions. For Istanbul as one of the 2010 European Cultural Capitals, urban regeneration¹²⁵ is proposed as one of the aims determined by the responsible committee. Anesthetizing diversity, and fear as stated by Zukin, and creating images and stamping a collective identity, cultural landscape has the possibility of generating other commodities and “high” cultural producers, visual artists, art curators present a docile and cultural persona while gentrification and historical preservation used as a cultural strategy; in other words, the “culture” is also demolished by urban renewal projects “in the name of culture”, for instance in the historical Roman neighbourhood, Sulukule, “a colour of the city with “its culture”” protested by many artistic groups, but mainly appropriated as a “cultural” symbol of “cosmopolitan urban life in Istanbul and its “contribution to the entertainment” in the city. Sulukule was the first and unique example of gaining support from international and

¹²⁵What is critical is that “cosmopolitan culture” of Istanbul and its artistic cultural commodities became legitimating tools for urban economic and “spatial?” regeneration/renewal: Firstly, it is pursued in historical urban areas concerning historical peninsula of Istanbul, especially in neighbourhoods namely Tarlabası and Dolapdere. Secondly, it is realized based on reasons related to earthquake, which is proposed mainly for Zeytinburnu. (This project is explicitly mentioned in the framework of projects.) Thirdly, it is actualized as a spatial purification and refinement of gecekondu or Roman neighbourhoods and finally, it is a deindustrialization project aiming at more profitable sector replacement (Pérouse 2006). It could be categorized as firstly; it is realized in historical areas and city centres as form of gentrification. Secondly, it became a clearance, demolition project in gecekondu settlements. Thirdly, these two branches are supported by international or transnational great projects, concerning the new constructions for an ideal of “cultural global capital for Istanbul”, or it is necessary to ask whether or not it is a world city, a competitive city, a global city as a dual, polarized, divided city?

different neighbourhood organizations, artistic groups¹²⁶, and intellectuals. It was crucial in the sense that both artistic ways resistances and for the first time in 2009, the “alternative planning”, with the presence of different platforms, activists when we compare with gecekondu neighbourhoods’ demolitions at that time. Dayanışmacı Atölye (DA, Solidarity Studio) , composed mainly of urban planner academicians and students which proposes for the first time the alternative planning for Sulukule is voluntary and interdisciplinary working group in their statements underlines mutually learning processes, while supplying technical information, supporting their struggles and organizations, paying attention not to ignore dwellers and mutual learning. Dayanışmacı Atölye (DA, Solidarity Studio) and academicians and critical urban planners Çavuşoğlu and Yalçınan emphasized the right of use and dwelling in the same place-against eviction and luxury housing, hotels, shopping malls and against any attempt to change the life style of Sulukule people- and defined right possession based on dwelling rights, including renters. The demolitions were contested with artistic projects, and within organizations composed of urban planners and their counter-plans, supported also by other “gentrified neighbourhoods organizations”. Intellectuals outside the neighbourhood namely “The platform of Sulukule”, supporting the right of dwelling in Roman neighbourhoods was the first organized urban opposition. The media and artistic initiatives defended the right of the neighbourhood. Another important aspect is that Sulukule became a turning point for actors, their mutual acquaintances, their personal and struggle histories. What is critical in this example is that it gathered various people around an urban issue

¹²⁶ What was critical is that these platforms gained support from different countries, academicians, artists (one of them, a group namely Hafriyat Karaköy which is a radical artist groups, continuing their works and installations realized in Sulukule in their atelier-exhibitions of photographs, objects, projects, street arts, paintings with a map of “plundering” showing the evictions in Istanbul, installations, documents namely: “They have taken Sulukule, they have broken my darbuka-the music instrument, an original percussion-: Renewal, Deterritorialization, Sulukule”), music bands (Gevende, Sakin and Gogol Bordello) and from other neighbourhoods affected by urban regeneration.

concerning mainly a neighbourhood, not a public space and it is appropriated as a “cultural” symbol of “cosmopolitan urban life in Istanbul”, a “colour” with its music, its “authentic” history and its “contribution to the entertainment” in the city. However, the struggle for the one of the most disadvantaged people in Turkey, Roman population, the struggle became a dwelling and housing struggle with many groups. As Uzuncarşılı-Baysal said (interview made in April, 2012, Istanbul), Sulukule is the first experience of organization as well as for housing (right of dwelling for everyone) and human right claims in an international public, institutions (the UN for the Forced Evictions) and groups (IAI for the right to the city). What is critical in this example is that it gathered various people around an urban issue concerning mainly a neighbourhood especially after 2008, not a public space and it is appropriated as a “cultural” symbol of “cosmopolitan urban life in Istanbul”, a “colour” with its music, its “authentic” history and its “contribution to the entertainment” in the city. Sulukule neighbourhood, even though they complain about their representation in media and public discourse, in the alliances with other groups supporting their reaction towards urban regeneration, re-appropriates the entertaining role and uses as a resistance tool. Sulukule, represented mainly as a centre of culture, history, music triggered also another signature campaign on internet about urban regeneration practices. The main actors of the opposition were the Association of Protection and Sustenance of Sulukule Roman Culture, UYD (Association of Accessible Life) and İYD (Association of Human Settlements), “STOP” (“No Frontiers Autonomous Planners” which has proposed for the first time for Sulukule: Another Sulukule is Possible social-economic and physical alternative plan, and which is evolved into Dayanışmacı Atölye (Solidarity Studio) as one of the main actors in the urban opposition in Istanbul), neighbourhood associations, İMECE (People’s Urbanism Movement). This lead to a visit and report of Advisory Group on Forced Evictions of a commission of UN-HABITAT about

Forced Evictions on every neighbourhood affected by violation of housing rights and evictions because of urban regeneration, in Sulukule, Başibüyük, Ayazma, Kurtköy, Güleusu, Küçükbakkalköy and Tarlabası, to report conditions in the neighbourhood. Consequently, from the internet and via mail groups, another mail campaign (with a model of letter) was launched and another platform simultaneously formed is “40 Gün 40 Gece” which is named inspired from the number of days “40 days 40 nights” remained till the date of demolishment in 2007.

I must add that by struggling together neighbourhood associations came together and found the Istanbul Neighborhood Associations Platform and focused on urban regeneration, announced the reasons why they are struggling and what they claim for. Moreover, external groups, in different periods due to long time period, find themselves and experience and practice different methods that they find their own ways. They knew each others, which form the affinity group of urban activists in Istanbul.

Lastly, I would like to mention some protests which created togetherness, which motivate the necessity to struggle together. *All these campaigns and protests are products of seminars, discussions, and meetings to organise “the day of protest”. While some of them remain at strategic or campaigning levels, the others created togetherness after days of protests and lead to new formations like it happened for Emek Movie Theatre. Even though seminars and discussions before the demonstration were aimed to organise the protest, it could be inspiring for participating groups, for example the Life Platform against the Third Bridge.*

At that point, I would like to start with the campaign against the construction of the Third Bridge. The March against the Third Bridge under a new coalition the Platform of Life with the slogan of right of living, environmental and social justice was one of the moments of these significant coalitions. This was the result of meeting series open to everyone

mainly representatives of oppositional groups. In December 2010, the construction of the Third Bridge was also an issue which became common for different groups, even not politicizing for urban issues or newly gathered around their housing problems. After the unsuccessful meeting with a limited number of people who participated in October 2010, aiming two million people this *Platform of Life Instead of Bridge* with the “slogan to claim the life, water, forest and nature” created a motivation both for Urban Movements and the activists from neighbourhood who work for organization a mobilisation against urban regeneration in their neighbourhoods. In December, public spaces were open to discussion because of the fire in Haydarpaşa Train Station on 28 November 2010. A main issue, which could not be realised till now, mapping was brought to the agenda. A visit to Sarıyer, Derbent was planned to support inhabitants there.

The March against the Third Bridge (under a new coalition the Platform of Life with the slogan of right of living, environmental and social justice) became also a milestone both for movements and actors. The Platform of Life Instead of the Third Bridge was a coalition, which lasts three years. They have mainly bases in People’s Houses¹²⁷. The 2nd of October was a

¹²⁷The last declaration of the “People Have Rights” Forum is read with the other subject points. While returning, the Black Sea region passed without paying in the subway to the bus station AŞTİ. However, they’ve stopped and police came but later then they were able to go. This togetherness “against Third Bridge March” and in time groups against the Third Bridge increased in number became more inclusive as a platform of ‘Yaşam Platformu’ (Platform of Life) and environmental justice discourse changed into “right of living”. Articulated with struggles against the construction of the Third Bridge on the Bosphorus, it changed discursively into the “right of living” in the framework of leftist political platform namely “Halk Evleri” (Homes of People). This is a good example for indirect emphasis on “urban spatial” issues, but considering all the struggles as aspects of labour movements. Different political groups could appropriate and in time could be a hope for local, neighborhood movements to be allied to these groups. This protest with the “People have their rights” conference lead to another concept, the right of life, living, proposed by the “Platform of Life”, including all of the neighborhood organizations and outsider platforms as components. The right to the city is conceptualized and understood as a whole, including right to a secure job, right to the transportation. Another period for environmental issues has begun in Turkey. In general, environmental issues were appropriated by middle or upper middle classes, intellectuals. However, the possible construction of HES

meeting namely “2 milyon İstanbullu 2 milyon ağaç için” (Two million people from Istanbul for two million trees) which has mainly an ecological emphasis and started with a petition campaign and having later being a protest like a “spectacle”, mainly organized by Yeşiller, TMMOB and OMO. For instance, it was the first march of new neighborhood organization GÜLDAM, which claims to be the main actor for common people in the neighborhood. In the last declaration (the 26th of December), urban regeneration and its consequences are explicitly said which the

(hydroelectric power reactors) has emerged another consciousness from Black Sea Region of Turkey, being a local and grassroots movement spreading all over the country as a “right to water”. The construction of the Third Bridge also is contested by neighborhood associations where there’s threat of demolition in the name of urban regeneration projects and lead to articulation and alliances between movements on urban spatial and environmental issues.-This differentiation is made according to the discourses of the movements. – However, this approach possesses a danger of being one of laws –even if it’s impossible to be- which does not have a practical sense because of its abstract characteristic. In the Forum of Halk Evleri, namely “Halkın Hakları Var” (“People Have Rights”), the main discourse is based on a struggle of labour against capitalist-imperialist system and securitization of labour and against commodification of nature urban policies determined by capital. They propose new urban policies for working classes by claiming rights of dwelling, energy, communication, culture-art and all the free public rights, including all the “secondary citizens” like Kurdish people or women and also based on a unified rural, environmental and urban allied class struggle. In the session on urban issues, the right of dwelling was the main point for the urban struggle. The following five main issues are discussed: the form of urban project in the neighborhood, the result-success after the struggle (like whether municipality consider them, there’s change in plan, there’s a concrete result), the type of organization in the neighborhood (association, active organization, neighborhood committee), problems in the struggle of dwelling (ways and tools of struggle like march, press declaration, newspaper, posters, how they go beyond differences like ethnicity, sectes, political views, have they peculiar works about women and children). They have underlined the importance of the restoration of collective rights in the crisis of citizenship. The space has the force of unifying, erasing differences in struggle ways. These collective rights, for Çiğdem Çidamlı, are to struggle both for water, for homes and also Haydarpaşa including retired people’s rights. This understanding implies not merely personal but also the others’ rights. The main aim is to demolish capitalism. In the Forum, policeman talks about his demolition experience with other neighbourhoods. However, it’s understood that there are many groups struggling without knowing each others. Their struggle is also on legislative area but the main struggle is people’s organization against possession relations which refer to individualism. The right of dwelling must be supported as a public right since the neighborhood and homes are not related to possession relations, but more emotional and collective relations. Tarık from Dikmen neighborhood said that they firstly introduced the right of dwelling and revealed the claim of right, teaching consciousness, being human. They said that the city is ours and it’s us we must decide while struggling “effectively” and “practically”.

success of the neighborhood organizations is. During the march, influenced by togetherness, people said to each other: “We must be together!”.

Articulated with struggles against the construction of the Third Bridge on the Bosphorus, it changed discursively into the “right of living” in the framework of leftist political platform namely “Halk Evleri” (Homes of People). This protest with the “People have their rights” conference lead to another concept, the right of life, living, proposed by the “Platform of Life”, including all of the neighborhood organizations and outsider platforms as components. The right to the city is conceptualized and understood as a whole, including right to a secure job, right to the transportation, the possible construction of HES (hydroelectric power reactors) has raised another consciousness from Black Sea Region of Turkey, being a local and grassroots movement spreading all over the country as a “right to water”, the construction of the Third Bridge. This differentiation is made according to the discourses of the movements. – However, this approach possesses a danger of being one of laws –even if it’s impossible to be- which does not have a practical sense because of its abstract characteristic. It is necessary to go beyond what is firstly asserted: these associations are formed against urban regeneration. Urban regeneration became a first factor for local (from neighborhood) to collective struggles, but it is indispensable to add that while questioning urban regeneration, in time, with the orientation of some groups and some actors from or outside neighbourhoods, these associations and resistant groups are organized against the Third Bridge, other projects concerning the city. This collectivity was a turning point in terms of protest. In a meeting, an activist complained about inability of writing together, which will form our common language. The necessity of discussing violence and self-organization in the neighbourhoods is one of the mentioned issues. Çiğdem underlines the importance of being a movement and being totally organized in the neighborhood because of obstacles and differences. Cihan states that even though there are differences in and

between neighbourhoods, there is a need to include conservative neighbourhoods in this opposition. The struggle aimed to gather all the neighbourhoods, beyond their own neighbourhoods, even intellectuals from neighbourhoods struggle against the Third Bridge, sometimes with Planners and Green Party-like an city-rooted, ecologist intellectual.

The protests against the renovation of the *Emek Movie Theatre* was organised in 2010 Spring, re-initiated after 1st of May 2011, every Friday in front of the Movie Theatre. On the week of May, the same day of protestations against Hopa events, people from neighbourhoods meet the platform in front of Galatasaray High School, which led to a protest with a photograph “exhibition” of *schools which will be sold so no longer to be school*. This spontaneous demonstration gathered many people who were not present in the meetings for a time. It also informed many people passing by the İstiklal Avenue about urban regeneration so common people came to be informed and gave their e-mail address to keep in contact. They even signed the petition in a great number. That day, the demonstration continued with few people with photographs in hands to Emek Movie Theatre. In December 2011, another demonstration is organised after the demolition with the slogan “Emek is ours! The streets and squares are ours!” led by Isyanbul Art Variety. In April 2011, with the high level of participation of different people, activists occupied the shopping centre namely Demirören on the other side of the Street. These activists have initiated the group namely “Müştereklerimiz” in June 2012, with newly involved groups.

Some campaigns initiated by some activists, with its before and after time periods, created a motive as well as hopes mainly for neighbourhood activists to say their words, to be informed and to know each others. However, here, it is necessary to underline that when campaigns and protests became “the aim”, in the process of urban commoning, these would result in disappointment and loss of energy at the end of the event, so

consideration of the whole process as a “failure”. In this respect, The European Social Forum held in 2010 (the 1st - 4th July), with the preparation Forum before the ESF was an attempt to form “urban social movements” in order to resist together, as a transition from short term and strategic coalitions to an alliance of associations in spite of differences and tensions. There were meetings to organize collective seminars which are still ongoing for a long period of time. It has initiated a period for paving the possible ways of an alliance namely “Urban Movements” of activists which are struggling from platforms, groups and neighbourhood associations. This period has triggered ideas on new types of organizations and new collectivities from below. Here I must underline the importance of the support of international activists for neighbourhood activists as well as in forming forums, workshops, and exhibitions. This interest has started from Sulukule, the Roman historical neighbourhood demolition. These were attempts to build an alliance of all the platforms, groups, neighbourhood associations, mainly shaped by academicians, intellectuals from and outside neighbourhoods, alternative professional or academic groups, via international urban movements, organizations and intellectual discussions. Struggles from their localities had built global links, networks with different groups including not only international but also from Turkey. As it is stated before, this alliance organized a forum and wrote a manifesto together to be read in the meeting of the urban movements in ESF, to express themselves in a clear, consistent way to global urban opposition platforms.

Even though the thesis will elaborate more the following related chapter, I would like to give some points which are elaborated in the forum. During the ESF, the meetings about city were on the right to housing and zero eviction and right to the city and urban social movements as well as visits and meeting in the neighbourhoods. This was considered to be an opening for the alliances of urban social movements in Istanbul. In an attempt to make an information network from –local- neighbourhoods to the city

Istanbul, including other cities in Turkey, a call is made for an international resistance (in transnational networks and flaneur activists mobile people who travel from town to town in order to attend militant rallies- as Leontidou states, 2006) especially with European Social Forum to be in global network of resistance. The forum before the ESF (The main actors in the meetings for ESF are Dayanışmacı Atölye, İMECE, Gülsuyu-Gülensu, Fener-Balat, Ayvansaray, Tozkoparan, facilitators of European Social Forum, Konut Hakkı Koordinasyonu, Sulukule Platformu, Başbüyük and urban activists) was mainly concentrated on the controversy between alternative planning and total struggle. This became the main conflicting point both between critical professional groups, between these professional groups and some of the neighbourhoods and between different neighbourhoods. Especially since the organisation meetings of the European Social Forum, the right to the city, with international and intellectuals' influences is tried to be proposed as a unifying slogan "in the making" by various urban oppositional groups, multiple agents against over-imposed urban projects, abstract spaces of homogenization and commodification in Istanbul used theoretically and strategically from discussions and experiences in the practice. It gains various meaning by different groups even by associations of newly (re)formed gecekondu neighbourhoods in Istanbul and activists, intellectuals outside neighbourhoods mobilizing against demolitions in gecekondu and historical areas, as a bridge to form alliances with different urban social movements all over the world.

Another discussion was locality and generality in the struggle which could be defined as the possibility of a neighbourhood struggle of being a wider struggle, for instance a neighbourhood dweller fighting for his/her housing but also against the Third Bridge. However, togetherness was at that time "against Third Bridge March"-which was successful at neighborhood level but not established for outsider groups- It's still preferred that alliances and commonalities could emerge from discussions, not "artificial actions" which

is not appropriated with a great support of neighborhood dwellers. Groups against the Third Bridge, in time increased in number and became more inclusive as a platform of the Platform of Life and environmental justice discourse changed into right of living. Another controversial aspect was the language of “urban movements” in Istanbul. While some groups, especially individual activists insisting on flexibility of the language, the others defend a language much more based on class or including ethnic emphasis. Class emphasis for these groups was important to have a political claim, underlining the use-value of the urban land. *The right to the city is proposed to be much more general and including term, compared with the right of sheltering or housing.* Another aspect is that the right has a “legislative” connotation, which was not referred in Lefebvre’s texts. For a neighbourhood association mainly connected with international actors and groups, neighbourhoods must be in the struggle of “labourer’s with barricades, instead of negotiation.

The ESF was a great opportunity to be informed about other neighbourhood international alliances and struggles from other cities and all over the world which experience similar processes. Even though groups came together and tried to pave and walk on a common path, this process led to new fragmentations. For many people from neighbourhoods, the intellectuals could not go beyond and remains at the theoretical level since he/she did not live any demolition and neighborhood dwellers who are directly affected should talk, take initiative. Resisting the day of demolition is critical; however, it’s necessary to resist together but some of the neighbourhoods are blamed to cooperate with “academicians” which blame political neighbourhoods or prepare plans for them. In other words, the academicians and activists from outside could not seize the reality. For some political “intellectual” and “neighborhood” organizations, it’s necessary to build a coalition with syndicates. The transformation of gecekondü resistance is related also to the alliances with “middle classes”, professionals.

If we return to the meaning of The European Social Forum, it was a milestone for “togetherness” of activists. Before the organization of the European Social Forum, there was another forum which in a sense represents an alliance and also a split. Before Forum and after the Forum, ESF became both an alliance before and conflict during and after this process. Before the European Social Forum, the meetings are being made for discussing their positions together and they plan to organise a local Forum before the week of European Social Forum, with participation of all neighbourhoods and urban activists, to discuss tension and conflicting points between them. It is underlined that it must be written without “academics” or much more exactly “academic discourse, discussions” because they say that we already listened too much on theories and TOKİ and now they have to make something practically, discussing the ways of resisting together. Even though the Social Forum could not create a total alliance, it leads to raise public consciousness and an alliance and discussion milieu for different groups in the urban struggle in Istanbul. The international call before European Social Forum initiated by actors and neighbourhood associations, lead to acquaintances and some alliances of actors for information and solidarities, new actors and new formation of neighbourhood associations discussion milieus on urban social injustices, to politicization from local issues to common global resistance with multiple agents gathered by the commonality of urban issues. The right to the city concept for the struggle has emerged also in this period with the influence of international network but much importantly intellectuals who are present and active in this network and struggles after Open city exhibition in Istanbul and Rotterdam Architecture Biennial. As it is stated, before the European Social Forum, the meetings are being made for discussing positions all together to plan a Istanbul Forum before the week of European Social Forum, with/for the participation of all neighbourhoods and urban activists, to discuss tension and conflicting points between them instead of

“academic discourse, discussions” in the pretext that they already listened too much on theories it is necessary to make something practical, discussing the ways of resisting together. However, after ESF, some tensions became apparent between international and different neighbourhood associations.

Even though the Social Forum could not create a total alliance, it led to a rise in consciousness, a new political identity¹²⁸ as well as discussion milieu for different groups in the urban struggle in Istanbul. It paved the way for a debate of different ideas and practices of resistance. It turned to be a field for the exchange of information and experiences through meetings. It is aimed organize collective seminars and campaigns which were going on for a long period of time, which created a moment and started a period of searching ways of alliances. The international call before the European Social Forum initiated by actors and neighbourhood associations, led to acquaintances and some alliances of actors for information and solidarities, new actors and new formation of neighbourhood associations discussion milieus on urban social injustices, to politicization from local issues to common global resistance with multiple agents gathered by the commonality of urban issues thus linking both locally and globally later on with international meetings and campaigns to share experiences with involvement of new actors at the local level¹²⁹.

To reveal the commonalities even the temporary ones is essential in order to point out a common ground, and awareness raising and mutual informing in the process of long-term commoning with the potential for a common ground from the urban which refers to the space and beyond. These could be

¹²⁸This is another activism on uncommon ground with unknown ways for social change with another solidarity of the actors who are not “activists” before as Chatterton (2006) asserted challenging the mainstream activism and related explanations.

¹²⁹The -construction of- “convergence spaces” of Routledge (2010, 2003) for the formation of alliances between different urban groups and campaigns could be useful while analysing their togetherness in terms of exchange of experiences and strategies.

seeds for the possible transitions from moments of togetherness to urban commoning. In this respect, *it is necessary to reply to the question what is understood and expected from being “together”*: A fastly mobilizing group/coalition around an issue or a long-term or more exactly continuous alliance. Even though every group and actor stated that common denominators are important and they do exist, there are some separations due to the ways of resistance, emotions, past experiences in the commoning practice. Another important aspect is that this coalitions and moments are flexible, non-hierarchical and comprehensive, which could turn into a more also creative process by using and proposing different concepts and slogans. It is necessary to think about the possibilities of extending in the grassroots of the affinity groups. Within these groups, there are different activists from different socio-economic characteristics and political groups including common people who did not engage in any political activity or protest before. I could state that one of the main problems was this new formation of urban uncommon commoning in terms of language and practices of politics. In this respect, the perceptions, the practices and the expectations could differ, which represent main controversies and tensions. However, it is obvious that there was an over emphasis on these tensions rather than aims and the fact that broad coalitions on common issues could cover many struggles, for instance of labour, is generally ignored. It is also critical to elaborate the impasses with the possibilities and potentialities after understanding different dimensions and components. We will see in the future, in what extent the campaigning against “mega-projects” will arouse some attempts of resistances and of alliances with the effect of international groups, associations. In this respect, we have to analyse “campaigning as a process”, mainly focusing on before and after the “event(s) of campaigns”.

-Activists talk about togetherness, ways and possibilities: In between a necessary strategy and overrated objective?

For the *necessity and urgency of togetherness*, Çiğdem argued: “We have to find ways to resist together with creative and permanent methods like Tekel resistance by squatting a space and saying that this space is ours and we will save this. This will make struggle visible and your will visible. To show how you are decisive. Not as a soap bubble. Not as a press release which started and finishes. It is necessary to develop ways of resistance staying in people’s minds. I proposed a resistance like Tekel resistance, occupation but even trade unions could not decide. But I believe one day, we will come at this point. *For a total struggle, neighbourhoods could be total within neighborhood.* They must be *together region by region then get together.* For instance Maltepe neighbourhoods got together since they are near geographically and their problems and reasons of urban regeneration are similar. Firstly, neighbourhoods must come together and then later a total neighborhood movement. Maltepe, Sarıyer, Avcılar must be in communication and solidarity. After this, a total neighborhood movement will emerge. We are trying to do this. *In every neighborhood, they are implementing in different ways.* Neighborhood must propose their own strategies for their own peculiar problems. However, for common struggles, they must determine common strategies. Walking in one cortege on 1 May as Urban Movement together for instance.” She made a call: “If there were different problems whose sources are different, the specialization in opposition could be important and effective. If the reasons of the problems are the same, if the same mentality and approach behind are the same, the fragmentation of the energy does not serve anything. If the capital is global, the opposition must be global. As Marx stated, all the workers in the world, unite! It is just the time. ...Against all the attacks all on our lives around the world, we must save the world not only Turkey. If you save the world, you’ll save Turkey. If you save only Turkey, the capital will find you.”

“Togetherness in urban platforms is very difficult. This is related to fragmentation of social struggle, of Post-Fordism, so this results in allying

people. Their values, expectations from life, and educated people contribute to and legitimize this process...”: she added by underlining that the right to shelter does not have any meaning for everyone. Çiğdem stated: “*The values are so fragmented so this make difficult people could not act from common values and a common ground. We could not create common values for the struggle. The Legislation of Earthquake will affect all of our living areas and streets could play the role of a catalyser.*”

Deniz Özgür stated that urban groups and associations *spent the chance of being together and forming coalitions because of discussions. It is necessary to go beyond localities but to find a type of “rotation” in coalitions and groups for a better and fair representation.* Deniz argued: ““What I see groups from neighbourhoods and from outside with the focus on the city are the same people. I do not believe that *city-focused groups will have contribution in neighbourhoods. I believe that togetherness is important and necessary; however, is it impossible to make it sustainable.* It is valid for togetherness in the outside. Moreover, we also see that there are some people who became the actors in the neighbourhoods who were already active before or became active in time. We get into contact via this people. However, this not accomplished at a level of organisation at that time. We lived something different in Ayazma. There were 10-12 families who stayed in the neighbourhoods after demolitions and they organised another type of sitting-in protest. The contact was possible with them. Groups visited neighbourhoods. They have organised some events in the neighbourhood. We had organised in other neighbourhood associations some events but if there is not any vital problem, the participation was always few. The groups with city focus have an aim to carry these struggles with “city/public space focus” in the neighbourhoods. ...To be successful is to seed for tomorrow. To resist every day the wind. I am living in Tarlabası at the border of the project. I am living in the remnants of the houses. It is like a war. It is like a film set. You know when people want to show socio-economic segregation,

they still came to Tarlabası. The demolition is a big loss both for social injustice as well as the loss of common life sphere. It is an urban space of togetherness of different people. ..It is very hard to resist this. We have to think about theory and practice together.” By emphasizing, the necessity of thinking urban and rural struggles (Lefebvre 1972) together: “As well as urban and rural together. Since when the city expands over the rural areas. It challenges all the survival struggle of the rural. The need of the city affects the existence of the rural areas....We have to have a perspective of considering urban and rural areas together. Even though theories does not have a notion alike, it would develop in time slowly....for instance rural struggles are both in the cities and rural areas by organisations who would like to make rural survival struggle visible in the city. *Urban struggles could form these organic relations...These struggles will feed and determine each other.*”

About the significance of togetherness, Kumru argued: “It is important that *different group come together*. These groups must be political parties also. *Not a togetherness of groups illegal and NGOs which are not legal entities. There are something like we won't go to the meetings of X party, or we won't be together of X party. We have to be together with X Y Z parties and tell about our concerns. We have to learn the ideas of people for this issue. If we don't do this, we are condemned to be alone.* We have to get rid of our *political, personal egos*. Every group has to support us and we have to support every group. We have to work with every group, with every neighbourhood having different approaches. I remember from one of the meetings of Urban Movements. Even one person has the idea of working together with an organized neighbourhood, this is a mistaken idea. *Yes, we will work with an organized neighbourhood but we will support a neighbourhood to be organized.* We don't have the luxury like this. By the way, who we are. Firstly people have to question themselves who they are

and why they come together under these groups. We could know each other but why are we struggling? Against what? How must be our position here? *Who we are, we are pursuing this struggle? Who we are we are talking for the local people? For this reason, not behind or before but next to this people.* The support must be total, not selective. We have to go there with many aims, not only one. Not only for urban issues but if we could help, everyday life must be one of the other aims. We don't have to orient ourselves to only one aim." Referring to personal relations, Hatice stated: "Personal relations are very important. *To know and love each other, it gives force since you know and confide in each other. On the other hand, not breaking hearts, not say in anything and intervene in, but it is like this.* Personal relations. Ayazma is a very important place, where we live these personal relations a lot. *There are reasons we did not want to leave Ayazma till the last moment. We love a lot people there. We must not hesitate to do this.*" And continued: "They were some togetherness between neighbourhoods and between groups some times. A group working in a neighbourhood and making an organization possible, our preference was to work with them. If there is a group working there, we did work with them. We worked in different groups, such as Chambers and syndicates. It depends on neighbourhoods, local(ity)."

To form platforms and its necessity, Yaşar argued: "*Without erasing differences of neighbourhoods,* we have to think about the ways how to form platforms by enriching publicness...However, they have difficulties. Their houses could be demolished tomorrow. *People come together according to their priorities and interests. This is necessary and inevitable...* Not only as a struggle, but how to transform it into something which forms a life. We have to consider this association formation as such. We have to think about democracy, without excluding nobody and being equal to everyone. These are not easy questions. However, neither neighbourhood associations nor the groups that we are involved in could not reply. Without

association, it is impossible. You have to be together.” Underlining the significance of commonizing imaginations by not instrumentalising our relations, Yaşar added: *“To commonize the imaginations, it is necessary to be together. The process of association and cooperatives formation is important. We have to find commonalities rather than interests. This is very sensible issue for the groups outside the neighbourhoods. You have two choices: to instrumentalise and not the neighbourhood. Why you connect with neighbourhoods? Why you consider neighbourhood struggle as important?..How to establish a collaboration of good character?..Neighborhood inhabitants know that: When people becomes closer and by their sides.”*

About emotional factors which became main determinant in struggles in commoning, he added: “Within struggle, fragile relations and sensibility could be difficult. *You could see tension points which are not so important. All these could discourage possible cooperation.* This is a serious problem. Tensions could counteract strong collaborations. This is a serious annoyance. It harms struggles. There are many hostilities. If you start with these, there is no end. It is a serious problem...The fragile relations in struggle are crucial; which makes annoying for those who do not want to situate themselves in a group...We have to be open to be in relation with people that you could not think about and who is not in struggle process. *This is necessary for mutual solidarity practice.”*

In spite of differences, the support could be motivational. Erdoğan pointed out a very important aspect: “Other neighbourhoods and political components have supported us. We do not have the same political thoughts but if the issue is the city and appropriation of a neighborhood, *it is fair enough to see that people with different views could struggle commonly.* We see the sparks this in the march after our meeting as well as struggle of neighborhood. It is a *motivational factor.” To overcome the impasses of*

urban oppositions and groups from outside, everyone and every group are necessary. He suggested: “We learnt a lot. The groups from outside must learn too. *The universities and professors have more to learn. We have to develop learning and teaching dialectic.* We have friends who are accused of thinking as a liberal. There are people who are thought to focus on resistance not the future. We could show that both could be in the same opposition. It could be created a space where all these differences could go from the concept of the right to the city. We could do in Gülsuyu, in our neighbourhood. For instance, we invited all the friends who do not think like us...We would like to open a space to struggle in a common way. They must not think that they are weak and they do need us. We could for sure walk together...But this fragmented opposition, which do not affect each other and give energy will not benefit...We could not transform dynamics of different opposing groups and neighbourhood associations. We do not have urban planners when there are architects...For instance, even for Sarıyer; there are the Platform of Sarıyer Neighborhood Associations, the Platform of Life Right, and People’s Houses. Maden neighbourhood does not join them. I am only talking about a region, not even a city. Our work is so fragmented. They do not feed each other. And even harm each other. From these conditions, TOKİ, the government and the municipality, so the oppressors gain. We have to open a space that we could produce this. We must do together what neighbourhood dwellers do, plan, resistance...We will be there. Still urban struggle is not brewed yet. It will continue like that for sometime. It has a big potential. It could offer serious perspectives for the future. We need everybody who produces knowledge and contribute with experiences including academy and chambers in this process. Since neighbourhood associations and urban movements groups have a power till a level. *There is a necessity that we have to produce an urban right discourse, a discourse and knowledge about Istanbul.* In this necessity,

missions are to the chambers and academy. Everybody who produces knowledge in this issue in the academy have a lot to contribute...”

The main reason behind the impossibility of togetherness is related to main approaches to the urban rent. Erdoğan underlined: “Friends from DA (Solidarity Studio) think that there is an urban rent, so oppressed people also must have their part. It is normal that they have their rights. But friends from İMECE think that they do not see this as a rent issue. They became a part of this pollution. We have to have some replies to these conflicts. We have to transfer this housing issue to a common thing that we will form from other interventions. In this opposition, we need some new people, everybody and their perspectives. *We have to leave the fetishism of protest...* I feel broken...Last week there was a threat of demolition in Dikmen...We had an e-mail about what we could do for Dikmen. *But they have organised a march in Galatasaray. Dikmen deserves better. You must be either in Dikmen or in Gülsuyu, being Dikmen. This does mean a press statement from Galatasaray to Taksim*”.

He referred to his attempts for togetherness of neighbourhoods: “When our neighbourhoods are announced to be urban renewal area, we came together with neighbourhoods in Anatolian side. *We met together with them. We tried to form relations for an association for the Anatolian side of Istanbul.* We have even thought that we could form federations, like the federation of neighbourhood association of the Anatolian side...We, our neighbourhood association has weak local relations and without strengthening this, and without having an integrated and internalised association with neighbourhood, attribution to us a title beyond federation won’t have any meaning. We have to strengthen our local relations, and make our associations, real neighbourhood associations. This must not be merely for urban regeneration related problems. There could be cultural activities for

children. We were refusing on the fact that if we could come together as a federation from local problems. We carry this to the Platform of Istanbul Neighbourhood Association and it was the core of urban opposition. We met with 17, 18 neighborhood associations and derived coordinated works. The motor force was Gülsuyu-Gülensu Beautification Association. We could not drive this. As Beckett stated, lose, lose better, and lose always. This Istanbul Neighborhood Association Platform does not work, but KH (Urban Movements) works instead. It is turned into the Platform of Sarıyer Neighborhood Association. These are associations that we met in 2006, 2007. The activists are the same activists...I think that there is a big potential in urban movements. My main objective is to bring together neighbourhood association at the Anatolian Side and articulate this to Urban Movements. This could be a dangerous process. This is a process of transition from volunteerism to responsibility. This must be a structure not remained at some people's initiatives but with people's responsibilities and missions. The oppressors have their own strategies at short and long terms with their urban imaginations...We have to have a more equipped structure with our Istanbul imaginations, as oppressors. ...We must not transform into groups who read/write their press releases. Taksim is just a protest. Mobilisation itself must not transform into this."

Considering the life as a whole with rural struggles, for Ömer, "Due to the fact that we are considering life as a totality, hydroelectric power plants, the Third Bridge must interest all of people who consider themselves as human beings...We have founded this country by struggling against imperialism...Now, we are going back by abolishing social conscious of people. But the revolution is everlasting run. At that point, we could not quit struggling. The struggle will continue." About *togetherness against the attacks in Istanbul*, Arif underlined: "The attacks on the city and environment are not only in one city and at one point. We have to defend

ourselves at every field of life as united against these attacks. I do not consider separately these struggles, Sulukule, the Third Bridge, Haydarpaşa, Taksim and urban regeneration projects.” and added: “It is necessary and very important that *different groups, initiatives, associations who struggle for the right to the city must cooperate and find a broad mass ground*. These movements could have some points intersecting with politics. But these movements must be in distance with political discussions and even though they are in relation with, they must not be in the orbit of any of them. Another point is transparency: I think that these are necessary in terms of broadening and not losing their mass ground. The emphasis on the hierarchy, I think, will distance people from organisations.”

Underlining the *necessity and importance of togetherness*, İmre Azem stated: “Togetherness is important but *I’m not sure about its type. We try to formulate this by discussing. The critical point is to act with labour organizations*. They have to perceive better urban issues and take them important. Everything has its time. It is necessary to discuss to be matured. I think that Taksim Solidarity is an important turning point. In terms of bringing many actors together. One of the most important parts of the city. Many people could commonize from this space.” From the film Ekümenopolis, he referred to the importance of togetherness: “There are many issues and different groups...They stand in different parts of the issue. I tried to develop a tool for allying these groups. Our main concern is the same and if we go into the core of system, we are struggling for the same thing so we have to bring them together. Perhaps, I hope that *this film could be a tool* for this. The other mission of the film was to bring together the academic circles with people. When I start to make the film, I went all the meetings and symposiums that I saw, many important professors were talking about important and critical things in the conferences; however, these were not transferred to people. Other aim was to make visible what is

told there and transferred in a comprehensible language. It was for this reason to use animations and graphics. Academic sentences were made comprehensible.”

Even though neighbourhoods or spatial oppositions are near physically, they could not give support to each other. For Besime, “*Even though they are near, they could not combine with each other.* In the countries like us where the state is poorly socialized and institutionalized, the urbanity as the organization of the social world, the democratic and political, collective experience are very back. What is unique is the gecekondu world. *This is also trapped in settled power relations.* This is trapped in the legitimization of the property, and manipulated in rent politics. Therefore, what we have brought is a very weak public and social consciousness. *The struggle for urban regeneration could not become a women struggle or a Kurdish question, or a forced migration struggle or struggle of LGBTIs entrapped in the niches of the city.* The spatialities which carry the problems of the most marginalized people could not flow in urban struggles directly. The sheltering issue is not a question that I disdain. This is as a basic issue. But this issue must include other issues. This is also related to the fact that we have to have a general political perspective by not loading urban movements with big issues. The perspective must not be to change the city but the whole life. If it does not so, the word could not join, unite.” Besime continued: “The issue of grasping the house of gecekondu people, waste collectors and Kurds came from forced migration, gypsies; African migrants don’t come together on an issue in a platform. *These are groups/sections that live victimization from similar issues and living in a same space.* If there is no word for a big picture, *we have to meet in big words.* There is no meeting in little words. The importance of the little word has carried a hope for some groups in the 90s. They named these as local politics, local economy, civil society entrepreneurialism....It has some prospects as a

democracy experience because of the failures of socialism, the hulky capitalism and its crises. There was a view to big regimes with suspect. It is stated that big prospects had lost their validity. Some hopes of some more localized things came forward. But this view became elitist. This approach itself remains limited in some sections and spaces of the city. For instance to preserve historical spaces for the future. However, at that times, there were no meeting with dispossessed people with the transformation of agriculture having their hopes. It became elitist due this fact. If there is a political success, this could not be a problem. It became so localized and temporary (with projects, with mall teams without being institutionalized since it was not aimed) even though they said not to say big words, they did not say big words even there is a necessity to say these with the big politics concerning big groups in the society. I still believe that –I could be considered as orthodox for this reason- *if there is a no horizon and thought for the totality of society, there is not a good politics*. Secondly, it is necessary to aim doing politics. There was an approach that not to touch politics or parties in civil society. The apoliticization approach was dominant. To put a distance to the politics was always there. The life is formed with politics. The Modern Age, before and after is like that. What is important is that different groups, ethics...must find the place in the politics. By finding the place, you shape the container but everybody are together by struggling even with each other. There are hard works. But if you look at in Turkey too, people who do politics are frazzled very soon. This is a fraying process. To pursue after an issue is a fraying thing. It requires a lot of devotion. If you don't have any gain, it regresses. There have to have always a gain. For this reason, articulation and continuation of struggles carry importance.” Şen continued: “The recent example is about the Third Bridge. In the protests against the Third Bridge, neighbourhoods struggling against urban regeneration with intellectual groups and university milieus were present in 2010. This period of time was times that there was rising political oppression in every sphere.

Different opposition groups need to stand together...Conjectural in the sense that there is an attack, it happens. As a reaction, it emerges. It is not formulated to transform the life. It comes to the agenda from an attack. To stop this attack, to cancel ten to sit, to go back. And again and again. Political organization structure also continues from this line. So it won't never be the continuity in the general political issues....There big problems in Turkey. When you look at the front page, there are other problems like Kurdish question. Women struggles. They are settled struggles. And also known struggles. How to continue and find ways. It is necessary not to ignore parties. Organizations from parties are in front of the other organizations. Yes, we know that there are problematic aspects of this fact. I am not saying this to glorify or criticize this. I am mentioning as a fact. They have organizations. They mobilize some people. They keep their concerns in the agenda by updating and politicizing this.I am thinking if I do politics, from where I will move on, I am woman so women struggles. I try to see, write, and contribute from woman consciousness. People who do politics must move from himself/herself. ...Big issues result in big effects and they are determinant in the history. What I see, the struggle from Kurdish issue is the most political, big, comprehensive, since this people could not say they are Kurdish. They could not read, write and speak their language. It has daily bitter faces....On the other hand, due to the war, the women issue begins to have many components...Labour issue, unsecure jobs, loosing jobs increase...social policy field also is aroused. What is mostly affected in this term: women, Kurds...in working life and other fields. The most disadvantageous people remained excluded. These main areas will be the most transformative ones. Urban struggle must meet with these big struggles. The conjunctures are determinant. If one law is passed which take houses of 1 million people, ...you can be in the streets; however, if you don't include an assembly proposal, one pillar remains interrupted and when the legislation is passed, it's over."

Referring to the necessity of togetherness of urban and environmental associations, initiatives, platforms and formation, Arif declared: “Beyond the usefulness, togetherness of urban and environmental associations, initiatives, platforms and formation is necessary. However, this does not mean to be “always together” in every subject, and side by side physically. It is vital to support and form solidarities for different issues and protests. We have to use of the opportunities of electronic communication and time to time, representatives could come together to determine strategies...I am active in many platforms and I find they could not meet with their deserved support, they give hopes about the future of our city...I am still in the process of learning. I do think this togetherness is compulsory these days. Istanbul is a huge city and to deal with its big problems, which went over the dimension which could be carried out with an association and formation. However, in the last four years, I do observe not only urban but also in all the opposition movements, there is a tendency of dissolution. There is an exhausting dominating the society. I consider this very important danger to get rid of.” As an obstacle behind togetherness, because of this exhaustion, we could give up struggling and we will lose. During the struggle, some groups and actors could grow tired due to their unfinished efforts and when they reprove to other people who do not do this, there could be some susceptibilities and related splits. There could be some misunderstandings due to personal reasons. I think that people must pay attention to the way of talking in these conditions.

About her experiences about visiting and supporting neighbourhoods, which creates togetherness, Hatice argued: “The first neighbourhoods that we were together were Gülsuyu-Gülensu and Sulukule. We went Güzeltepe. But the first one was Sulukule. We made a workshop of children of painting. At that moment, any neighbourhoods knew each other. We thought a work like this to be together and to give solidarity. We want paint from each

neighbourhood we were in relation. It was one of the first places that we met neighbourhood dwellers. Also it was one of the first places that some problems of opposition were visible from our view. After evaluating these problems, we decided not to work there in the field in Sulukule no more by saying this with words. But we continued to observe. We tried to be in the discussions. Later, Gülsuyu-Gülensu became one of the neighbourhoods that we ameliorated ourselves. Another place was Başibüyük. We went there a lot. Alternative project was discussed in Sulukule and negotiation was in Başibüyük. One of the places that we learnt a lot was these neighbourhoods. At this period, we learnt a lot and this is not a personal process. I wasn't in Istanbul at that moment but it is an accumulation put together and transmitted to me. The film namely "The Migration" was important and there we learnt that visual material was very important. It was a good material to tell about us with what is going on. To tell about organizing and how to convey information. It was a successful work both for telling about our organization and there –Başibüyük-. To create solidarity and to be together, we organized three events of "Urban planners come together." I was working in the Chamber in Ankara at that moment. We were some in the Chamber, in the governing committee. Also others criticize the Chamber. We had some friends in İzmir. We had organized another group *Kentsiz* at that moment in Ankara, almost similar to İmece. Every city has different structure. We realized at that time that every city has its peculiar side. You could not work with the same model everywhere...We stated that three cities could do something together with the support of the Chamber. First step was in Istanbul, Sulukule and Başibüyük in their important times. We had seen them, we visited them and the Chamber make a press release. The first press releases in the field were these ones. At that moment, there were introverted, not going to neighbourhoods...the second step, with the presence of representatives from neighbourhoods, in Dikmen and Mamak, there were some meetings. There

were differences between cities. In Ankara, there were big divisions due to the organizations. Not going to each other neighbourhoods. Forced and being forced, we tried to include people. People from Istanbul have seen there. It was a mutual experience transfer...These were important works.”

From the necessity of being together with people who live similar problems, Kumru argued: *“There must be an “upper-formation” where all the neighbourhoods which live the same problems and deprivations. They are continuing to struggle in a same way and why they don’t come together and struggle for upper something. They must not stay in their neighbourhoods. We tried this before with İMECE, DA as a platform namely “Istanbul neighbourhood association talk.” It didn’t work with its deficiencies and mistakes but it happened and came together. This does not mean that they will come together and struggle together. Apart from this, Sarıyer has another characteristic: There is a neighborhood association in every gecekondü neighborhood but there is Sarıyer Neighborhood Association Platform. It is a unique example and it is very important. Their formation process is similar. They are living in similar physical –geographical–environment. They have similar characteristics of class too in Sarıyer. Why they do not come together? Then they did. More than ten neighbourhoods came together and formed a platform. This platform was an enforcing characteristic for their resistance. They even changed the mayor. They had prepared a pledge before elections and they showed this to every candidate. In this pledge, there were not only items of urban regeneration, but also concerning their life, road or boat sailings or bus timings so their life spaces. They put all the items to be signed to all the candidates. They stated that there is no vote if they do not sign. The representation was very high before the cooperatives. If you don’t sign, we will return to neighbourhood and say that they don’t sign this pledge....so they changed the government of Sarıyer. After the mayor is elected, at some time period, they stated that the mayor, you have promised this, where these promises are. This became*

binding. If he had signed it, it had to be kept. Every Friday, The Neighborhood Platform, they were coming together, with a secretariat and governing committee in a different neighborhood. So they had commuted to each other neighbourhood and they started to know each other. They were struggling together. Every Monday, they were transferring these decisions to the vice-mayor who was assigned to this issue by the mayor. They were saying we have decided this in the platform, so that they had to abide. Because of the cooperative process and urban regeneration, the platform has slow down this functioning. It is not abrogated. Before, every neighbourhood was organizing its picnic but this year, for the first time, they have organized the neighbourhoods and cooperatives their own picnic covering all Sarıyer so that they know each other. The togetherness of these neighbourhood associations is very important. The importance of the actors from and outside the neighbourhoods is very important. To guide, to form solidarities, and to give advices, these actors are important mainly with their technical knowledge. However, these actors have to have missions and some principles. Not having a gaze from above or with an attitude that I know, not you, and not being there in de facto situations but at every moment, these people have to be there with them. Not only by conducting a project or writing an article and writing theses, composed of academicians, lead to disappointments. These actors must be included in every sphere, every time there. There is gecekondulı tourism, it is on the way, it is emerging. Some people come to see how the neighbourhood is. They find a mediator from neighbourhoods or people like us, and ask the help to visit the neighbourhood. We would like to end this tourism now. We do not mediate and come with people and groups that neighborhood inhabitant do not want. We are saying to go and ask neighbourhood association. This is valid for people from Turkey and abroad. Groups from abroad would like to come and do their workshop in Turkey since they are aware of urban regeneration and its processes. We mediated some of the groups but they

weren't people who we do not know. These were people that we know, confide in and believe in and who could produce knowledge which will help the neighbourhood after to struggle. We don't say that these groups would come and you will help. We asked neighbourhoods before they came. But these groups outnumbered and the knowledge that they produced does not serve nothing, we believe that we have to find a solution. These groups could come from a best university, but neighbourhood inhabitants are bored from this. Like in the zoo or a clan in Africa, they come and take photos. And neighbourhood dwellers are to tell about their pains, it is difficult, boring. They don't get anything and they are bored of this. If they don't want they come, we say that don't come and go elsewhere. It's important to carry the words of these people abroad. It is also important in Turkey to form the agenda of these groups and carry to different platforms. We believe that we have to put some limitations, determined by neighborhood since there are more disadvantages than advantages...The information could be harmful for neighborhood too. This could serve to constructors, since they will see all the positive and negative socio-economic sides. The actors coming from outside does not have to have aims to ameliorate their status. They don't have to do something for them. I do not do for six years so it could be done. I did not struggle for this but after six years, I can ask neighbourhoods to ask that I can produce knowledge to propose some concepts for the literature. I can get permission and do something since they know my thoughts. What is important is that this struggle is permanent. We have to share a life with them not only a struggle. Like people in Sulukule are doing. Even though the project is over, they are continuing to work with women, young people and children together."

For the question on the urban struggles commoning moments in different scales and related like being against the construction of the Third Bridge and hydroelectric power plants and the view about the association of his struggle with these ones, Erbatur stated that for sure the projects about

Taksim Square and Emek Cinema Hall or another regeneration project could have *unifying effects periodically; however, it should not be forgotten that even this commoning* is a marginal movement in the society and making invisible via media and much more marginalized via discourses. Erbatur argued that a permanent alliance is not necessary, which could lead to homogenization. However, there must be a support for the struggles yet, most groups are not mature enough and open to work together. *The Neighbourhood Associations Platform was an important undertaking, but because of the reasons like the distances between neighbourhoods, budget issues, conflicts between the representatives of the neighbourhoods and so on, it could not work effectively.* Fractional ideological differences between the groups of urban movement are mostly effective. However, in acute situations, such as demolitions, alliances and actions are established but these remain mostly artificial. For the efficiency of the oppositions and alliances, what Erbatur stated is crucial: “It is natural and healthy that there are differences between these groups in terms of different ideologies, methods, etc... However, I couldn’t understand and became sad because of the fact that these differences hinder the solidarity and common struggle because of being competitive and even hostile from time to time.” It is necessary that these groups need to be able to act in common for the success of the right to the city but it is not easy, he said. In the neighbourhood associations, discriminations must be undermined with the pursuit of *common purpose and strategies must be commonly determined with dialogue via democratic decision making processes.* Neighbourhoods where there is not a political past could be one of the most resistant ones, becoming later an exemplary opposition and inspiration for the other neighbourhoods and actors.

Remembering Sulukule, Çiğdem argued: “The conditions in time of Sulukule were different from nowadays. There was an understanding that Sulukule was peculiar and everybody tried to save Sulukule. It is a system

problem. This is obvious now. For this reason, we could get together with different groups and people. For instance it is easy to get together for a historical neighborhood with a gecekondu neighborhood. It was before in terms of saving their own neighbourhoods with their own problems. Or historical neighbourhoods were connecting with other historical neighbourhoods. Even though the reasons and pretexts were different or the attacks were different, they are under attack of the same enemy and capital and they share gentrification, displacement, and they will all lose their houses. Legislative struggle has no meaning so the difference of the problem has no meaning now so the resistance is the same and must be common everywhere.” She continued: “Sulukule is an important and starting turning point. First legislation 5376 was concerning historical neighborhood which results in mass gentrification and mass displacement and dislocation, then which turns into “Law on Transformation of Areas Under Disaster Risk”. Sulukule includes important lessons, experiences. This new legislation is covering everywhere by saying that everywhere is under risk and this will make every intervention possible. This is the main turning point which starts everything. If we lose, we will lose together and if we gain, it will be together. This legislation will create a mass reaction and I think a new period will start.” Kumru explained: “Sulukule was an important urban opposition example. However, it could find its place. It was not only an opposition against the project. We have tried to overcome their everyday life deprivations and to ameliorate their conditions. However, nobody will be oriented as such to Tarlabası. They won’t since there is a Roman population there. They will separate from title deeds and property relations. There was an emphasis on culture in Sulukule. People will say that they do not consider Tarlabası as legitimized. They will say that I won’t be together with Kurdish political party. Or people who are sex workers. People who have talked about Sulukule remained silent for Tarlabası. What is sad is that even though they did not say anything, they remained silent.

For this reason, reactions for neighbourhoods change according to differences of neighbourhoods.”

Without a doubt every group and activist are both for and against togetherness. Togetherness is urgent and necessary; however the common ground to be concentrated on common values and purposes could not be established due to some differences in terms of methods, personal relations and experiences. It is true that urban opposition as an indefinite area is composed of different people from different positions. Even though difference between external and neighbourhood group and some periodical tensions are valid, we could easily say that the fragmentation between activists from “outside” is determinant, which affects both neighbourhoods and possibility of being together. To start from the local (from neighbourhoods, from regions –the Anatolian side- and so on) has vital importance otherwise it will be a hollow and empty platform according to the “activists”. Instead of platforms, new coalitions, new groups, it is necessary to form a real solidarity and communication. In this respect, new associations and groups such as Bir Umut (One Hope) and Müştereklerimiz (Our Commons) is formed in relations with other groups and associations. Here, I must add that here the split in terms of politics, view, personal relations do matter for activists outside neighbourhoods. Not only in terms of methods and meaning of struggle, but also their priority differs (for Bir Umut, neighbourhood, their every day life and urban and work life problems and for Müştereklerimiz from and critique of changes in the city in a holistic perspective). There is a problematic that I will mention in international campaigns part, the problematic to be organised for protests and events for some days. The “fetishism of protest”-to be together only in the protest- could not lead to aimed togetherness. On the other hand, different groups and people who could not form platforms together could come together for a neighbourhood or to protest a project in a neighbourhood such as Ayazma, Gülsuyu-Gülensu and Sulukule. However,

as it explained in the thesis, these also created some splits due to different approaches and results. Here I must add that protest are becoming more and more few and if there is, happen in the city centres, rather than neighbourhoods. The togetherness could be mobilised from urban, environmental, rural and related initiatives to make oppositions sustainable. On the other hand, due to difference of populations and neighbourhood characteristics, neighbourhood and other projects near to each other could not create a mobilisation together, could not combine with each others (such as Tarlabası and Taksim Square projects). What was underlined is to get rid of personal and political egos. Personal relations and emotional factors could have positive and negative effects: People who love and feel near to each other could come together and produce new methods and ways to struggle which cross cuts being or nor from neighbourhoods. In this respect, we have to think about “active inhabitants together”. On the other hand, as a negative side, people could be fragmented focusing more on their differences. It is necessary to propose new imaginations for commoning to overcome the impasses of urban oppositions. Theoretical aspect is critical and to accomplish this, the support from the academy is necessary since it paves also the way of practices. However, theoretical discussions beyond housing issues prevent practices, which resulted in new fragmentations.

CHAPTER 5

ONE URBAN COMMONING ATTEMPT: “URBAN MOVEMENTS (FORUM)” (KENT HAREKETLERİ) IN ISTANBUL

5.1. The European Social Forum: From the Days of Togetherness toward the Intended Formation of “Urban Movements” (Kent Hareketleri)

Even though goals and framing of different groups, local level activists, associations in Istanbul could be different in various terms within dynamics of urban struggle, there was an attempt to form alliance by emphasizing its necessity in spite of its heterogeneous and conflictual dimensions and related tensions. *As an urban commoning practice in terms to struggle and learn to struggle for urban commons together*, “Urban Movements (Forum)” (Kent Hareketleri) of neighborhood organizations and different groups in Istanbul is analysed from its formation just before the European Social Forum and the period after to discuss togetherness possibilities and agenda in practical and theoretical senses this on-going process. Different groups came together organized a forum and wrote a manifesto together to be read in the meeting of the urban movements in the ESF, to express themselves in a clear, consistent way to global urban opposition platforms. On the other hand, this was also a mutual and self-evaluation of urban opposition groups; or more exactly urban activists. On the prompting of the ESF, one of the main objectives till that time is to form a coalition form, a

platform of different urban activists. Underlining the necessity to fight together at the world level, the first call and manifesto were written during the forum before the ESF available on: <http://istanbulkenthareketleri.wordpress.com/>¹³⁰

¹³⁰Here is the first declaration of Urban Social Movements in Istanbul was a call for European Social Forum and a call to European Social Movements: “We, Urban Social Movements in Istanbul, are inviting all the Europe-wide resisting urban social movements and organizations to VI. European Social Forum, *with the need and urge to fight together against the ceaseless attacks of capitalism*. We, who are thrown out of our homes and neighbourhoods, kicked out to the streets, whose ecologic values are looted for profit, whose memories are mortgaged, we, as the dispossessed, as the outsiders, that is, the real owners of the cities will be gathering in the European Social Forum which will be held in Istanbul between the 1st and 4th of July. We will be searching the ways to mutualise our problems and to develop organized means of struggle. We will discuss the future of the endlessly transforming cities and the meaning of this transformation for the dispossessed and oppressed. We will gather to discuss the ways to synchronize the partial resistances in the city centres and slums, to talk about the inseparable destiny of the urban and rural struggles, the possibilities of common local and global struggles and to create a solid action alliance out of our discussions. Let us get together in seminars, in workshops, at stands and in the actions. Let us gather our voices and raise our cry this time from Istanbul.”

The manifesto was written during the forum of attempt for urban social movements' collectivity in Istanbul as a Call to European Social Movements: URBAN MOVEMENTS FORUM MANIFESTO 26-27 JUNE 2010: 1. We stand against the marketing of our cities to capital via urban transformation/renewal projects based on change value and profit; we are against the appropriation of our cities which are our living spaces complete with their neighbourhoods, public spaces, schools, hospitals, parks, shores, natural, historical and cultural heritage. 2. We demand foremost our right to shelter, in other words our right to adequate housing as stipulated in international law and independent of property. We believe that right to housing should be under legal guarantee regardless of income level or access to economic resources. 3. We demand from the government not only housing, infrastructure, access to work, transportation, education and other such social and economic rights, but also the right to modify/shape our living spaces and the city. Against all the urban transformation/renewal projects that are forced upon us and shaped by the interests of transnational capital, we are determined to continue our struggle for the right to shape our city according to our way of life and our desires. As such, our goal is to spread our right to the city beyond shelter and access to urban facilities, to the whole of the city. Defending the right of the residents of Tarlabası to stay put in their neighborhood, defending Hasankeyf, and Emek theatre, while at the same time opposing the 3. bridge and hydroelectric power stations, struggling against the marketing of our schools and hospital to capital are all parts of this whole. 4. With the passage of consecutive laws on urban transformation/renewal, the government uses the law as a tool to further its interests. Thus the need to take the struggle to the streets along side the legal struggle is apparent. In its demand for social and economic rights from the government, this movement may utilize mass demonstrations as well as creative public actions. It does not regard legal recourse as and limited to a defence of personal rights. It makes a new legal ethic and practice in life part of the struggle. 5. Theory and practice, ideal and reality may differ. It may be unfair to expect a holistic perspective from local struggles. However if we give up on our ideals, we may never get another chance to realize them. Local struggles have their own reality, nevertheless it is

While this group was formed in June, on the 26th and 27th 2010 just before the European Social Forum, The European Social Forum was a milestone for evaluating the possibility, necessity and limits of “togetherness” namely “Urban Social Movements in Istanbul”. The European Social Forum was though to be an opening for the alliances of urban social movements in Istanbul. In an attempt to make an information network in the first place from (local) neighbourhoods to the city-wide Istanbul, including other cities in Turkey, they made a call for an international resistance with the help of the European Social Forum to be a part and form in global network of resistance. Before the European Social Forum, the meetings were made to discuss together their positions and to make an Istanbul Forum before the week of European Social Forum, with participation of all neighbourhoods and urban activists, with a focus on discussion of tensions and conflicting points within the opposition. The local Istanbul Forum aimed a high representation of urban activists of different groups and neighbourhoods. This forum before the ESF¹³¹ was mainly concentrated on the controversy between “alternative planning” and “total struggle” to resist against

important to seek ways for a united struggle and to try to sustain them both. In this regard, local initiatives and neighborhood associations have important responsibilities.⁶ We have to project local issues to the entire city making sure that Başibüyük residents come to protest the 3. bridge, those struggling for the Ataköy shore-line come to the defence of Tozkoparan.⁷ Our struggle has to be united. In order to act together, we have to meet at the widest common ground and only in doing so can we carry the struggle into the future. We have to be flexible with one another. We also need to be inclusive in our communication with other movements, trade associations and unions. As the participants of the Urban Movements Forum, we regard this manifesto as a work in progress, as a first step in this process. The incomplete discussions on procedural suggestions, principles and other issues are topics to be covered in the future. Nevertheless we can also say that the most basic topic the forum agreed on was acting together on urgent agendas and generating common actions and practices. The concrete suggestions that were discussed in the forum can be summarized as follows: - A periodical to create and enhance interaction between neighbourhoods. - A legal commission for urgent intervention and consultation. - An urban resource and consultation centre for defending our neighbourhoods and our city.

¹³¹The main actors in the meetings for the European Social Forum were Dayanışmacı Atölye, İMECE, Gülsuyu, Gülensu, Fener, Balat, Ayvansaray, Tozkoparan, facilitators of European Social Forum, Konut Hakkı Koordinasyonu, Sulukule Platformu, Başibüyük and other urban activists.

demolitions. This became the main conflicting point both between critical *professional* groups and some of the neighbourhoods. In the Istanbul Forum, the main question was whether “Urban Movements” (Kent Hareketleri) could be formed from this variety or not. However, the report was commonized on the following subjects: There was a common approach to struggle both from urban (from public spaces to neighbourhoods, schools, parks) and rural commons against the marketing by urban regeneration with their exchange values. Independently from the property, the right to decent house was proposed as the prior claim for everyone. Apart from the basic socio-economic rights (to shelter, infrastructure, work), against urban regeneration projects based on urban rent, there was a claim to shape and change the cities and spaces where we live according to our desires. While new laws were being made and existing changed, apart from legislative way of struggle, the necessity to be organised at the local and necessity to struggle in the streets with creative methods. Due to the difference between theory and practice, it was underlined that it would be unfair to expect a total struggle from neighbourhoods. *From the reality of neighbourhoods, it is up to neighbourhood associations to find the ways of total struggle.* There is a necessity to commonize struggles at the minimums to pave the way for long-term and inclusive struggles and to form solidarity networks with different chambers and trade unions. That period was both commoning and fragmenting period. The preliminary propositions were to organise an information/advisory centre mainly on legal issues, a broadcast or a bulletin and to form an information network between neighbourhoods. *In the preparation forum*, various approaches of methods of resistance were the main controversial point namely alternative planning which is mostly accused and street struggle, which is stated to be insufficient for a total struggle. The main issues which did not bring about an agreement were mainly the position of opposition groups vis-à-vis planning: we have to claim a change of existing planning processes. Due to the general view that

the alternatives proposed to these existing ones take base the right to property, this initiates through defence of property negotiation processes so the struggle became shot-turn. It is proposed that in fact, planning, on the contrary is the way to produce alternatives of people where they are in socio-economic terms, outside the state. We have to claim public space, produce our plans and living spaces, and even neighbourhood inhabitants could produce their own plans without planners. Another related aspect was that the right has a “legislative” component. For the Housing Right Coordination, laws could change in one night but neighborhood is still in the struggle of “labourer’s with barricades, not via negotiation. Apart from barricades in demolition, acts of walking, and legal and social strategies, some preliminary solutions are questioned to be co-operation with trade unions and to find something for the contradiction between associations, small capitalism, cooperation’s, political pressure for urban infrastructure vs. gentrification, and re-appropriation against squatting of (international) capital. The solutions are only possible with a fight in context and in solidarity including international dimension. Another aspect is that we will defend or not middle class neighbourhoods since they did not defend gecekondu neighbourhoods. This pictured also discussions on differentiation between bottom-up and top-down organizations characterised by self-organization/appropriation of inhabitants. Another discussion point was locality and generality in the struggle with the possibility of a neighborhood struggle in a wider struggle, for instance a neighborhood inhabitant struggling for his/her housing right but also against the construction of the Third Bridge. Another controversial aspect is the language of “urban movements” in Istanbul. While some groups, especially individual activists insisting on flexibility of the language, the others defend a language much more based on class, and including the emphasis on the Kurdish identity. Class emphasis for these groups was important to have a political claim, underlining the use-value.

The other topic was about how the local could be informed and organized to struggle for right to the city. It is necessary to refer to writing process and the choice of the concepts: “Anti-capitalism” discourse is proposed to be in the declaration; however, it is refused under the pretext of not being appropriated by neighborhood dwellers and instead, the use value was written. The class struggle discourse is also refused since urban social movements are ecologist, feminist. The right to the city is proposed to be much more general and including term with possible meanings and connotations, compared with right of housing. It was discussed in theoretical and practical terms with the initiative of “intellectual/academic-activist” beyond the usage as the “right to shelter”. As a tool and a unifying slogan to bring different actors together, this was proposed as a practical key to create alliances between different groups, which precede the discussion and consciousness beyond the right of property. The right to the city was also conceptualized and understood as a whole, including right to a secure job, right to the transportation. However, on the other hand, the right to the city was even rejected by some activists from outside neighbourhoods in the pretext of being a vague concept, which does not conform to the practical needs and inequalities. Activists mainly from neighbourhoods underlined that they did not want to include “academics” or much more exactly “academic discourse, discussions” because they argued that they listened enough on theories and now they had to make something practically, discussing the ways of resisting together. Even though the Social Forum could not create a total alliance, it leads to raise public consciousness and an alliance and discussion milieu for different groups in the urban struggle in Istanbul. From the early times of struggles against urban regeneration, “the right of housing”, “to shelter”, in other words “of dwelling with the meaning of home and neighborhood” were mentioned in discourses of neighbourhoods’ dwellers as well as groups’ supporting them. However, in time, especially in new meetings for a possible alliance of urban social

movements in Istanbul, the right to the city is becoming the new pillar of urban opposition groups from Istanbul and the world in attempts for alliances, a collective process of resistance. This is reflected also in the opposition from below/from above organization. However, according to the spokesman of the Coordination of Housing Right, if it is not extended to the grassroots, it remains merely an intellectual discussion. The forum was also a step from right to housing to the right to the city and “urban commons” including other neighbourhoods and privatised and transformed public spaces. However, it was obvious that the housing rights’ violation had a priority due to direct consequences on the survival of inhabitants (Mitchell and Heynen 2009). On the other hand, they claimed for urban commons actively in the protests and participating in related meetings. Another period for the environmental claims began in Turkey. There was a general idea that environmental issues were appropriated by middle or upper middle classes’ intellectuals. However, the possible construction of HES (hydroelectric power reactors) has raised another consciousness from the Black Sea Region of Turkey, being a local and grassroots movement spreading all over the country. The construction of the Third Bridge also is contested by neighborhood associations, which lead to the idea of articulation and alliances between movements on urban spatial and environmental issues. On the other hand, the necessity to have a commission of legislative and technical support was proposed as a need and necessity during the forum and the meetings which are organised after for a long period of times in different forms with different groups. The main discussion and fragmentation point was the ways of struggle and its political meanings. In some extent, discussion in the Forum led to personal, emotional hurts and due to the “high level” of intellectual discussions, some inhabitants declared their feeling of exclusion uneasiness.

In the forum, İMECE declared that they had a holistic approach, including labour movements, environmental issues, and feminist movements so they

underlined that there must be regular relationships and support by writing critical reports about TOKİ, the Third Bridge. This is the way to convey critical information and serve to organization of neighborhood meetings. DA (Solidarity Studio/Dayanışmacı Atölye) underlined that their aim was to deconstruct the relationship between the university and the market, and the domination of technical information as well as ideological domination of political groups in the neighbourhoods. They work on providing solidarity, technical support, and advice for neighbourhoods. Underlining the importance of the self-organization of neighbourhoods, they search for a representative organization. They consider neighbourhoods as an alternative school to be educated from each others. They produce information if neighborhood need and ask from them. If so, they produce and convey information. They produced two alternative plans, one for Sulukule and the other for Gülsuyu/Gülensu. For Sulukule, they produced advocacy plan at the last stage before demolition. The Housing Right Coordination explained that their approach to the city was ideological, to orient people against demolition to struggle with trade unions and political parties emphasizing the importance of street struggle. The Social Rights Association stated that they write reports not merely for right of dwelling, but also for other rights. They claim from the state social state practices, to revealing the city's use value rather than exchange value. FEBAYDER underlines the importance of organization in the neighborhood, to make visible neighborhood via flyers, web sites. The Platform of Sulukule stated that they became a symbol for urban regeneration. The municipality divided neighbourhoods, so organized and total resistance became impossible. To organize for urban issues concerning the entire city is difficult since they mainly care their homes. Other associations have complained about the image of the federations claimed to cover struggles in Istanbul and being an exemplar resistance. The ESF was also a great opportunity for the study to know other international alliances and struggles from other cities in the world which experience

similar processes. To put it briefly, the main problematic became the difference and the tension between “alternative planning” and “street struggle” in the Forum before the ESF and other meetings. However, as I elaborated in the related parts above, for some activists, alternative planning is a part of total struggle, for the others, the main obstacle. *The oppositional characteristic of the forum in the framework of the European Social Forums should be discussed*; however, firstly we must add that urban issues created a door for the impasse of the European Social Forum, against the disappointment of the forum in general. Even though in terms of urban movements, there was a divided picture. On the other hand, the ESF created a possibility of meeting and discussions on a “united” opposition. Another event was the common march (with common repertoires) of urban activists together, including international groups like No-Vox, Reclaiming Spaces, Alliance of Inhabitants in the general march at the end of the Forum. Kent Hareketleri sent petitions to protest evictions in France and in South Africa –whose activists were present in ESF- via internet. During the March, the association which was mostly represented was The Platform of Sarıyer Neighborhood Associations. The last meetings are much more concentrated on seminar workshops to “constructing ourselves”, “being together” – instead of “plastic protest”-which will be in the framework of “Kent Hareketleri” and the meeting against the Third Bridge. Newly emerged group SOS –much more concentrated on public spaces, historical monuments, including Emek Movie Theatre, and historical neighbourhoods, started to work on Haydarpaşa, in other words, they claim the city. This group is mainly formed by middle and upper middle classes, photographers, academicians, artists. As Mayer (2009) argued, the Social Forum process and the re-together of anti-globalization movement lead to shared experiences and commonalities in terms of urban issues. In other words, urban issues have the potentiality to gather people from different groups and create a world network of activists; in other words, an alliance in the

fragmentation. Another critical point is that there are two levels of discussion and opposition: “housing, dwelling right” and “right to the city”. The right to the city is the recent discussion in the urban social movements in Istanbul, especially around European Social Forum. The main actors in the meetings for Urban Social Movements in ESF are Dayanışmacı Atölye and neighbourhoods namely Gülsuyu, Güleusu, Fener, Balat, Ayvansaray, Tozkoparan, facilitators of European Social Forum, Konut Hakkı Koordinasyonu, Sulukule Platformu, Başbüyük and urban activists. The right to the city is tried to be grasped and elaborated from discussions newly emerging in Turkey, on Istanbul, through urban social movements. It’s tried to be defined and used theoretically from discussions and experiences in the practice. This attempt to use the right to the city as a unifying concept was accelerated by the European Social Forum, which was held in July in Istanbul. This process was also a period for paving the ways of an alliance of neighborhood organizations and different platforms, namely “Urban Movements”. This alliance organized a forum and wrote a manifesto together to express themselves in a clear, consistent way to global urban opposition platforms.

Before the ESF, there was a strong belief in international groups struggling for urban rights. However, after the ESF, some tensions became apparent between international and different neighborhood associations. The ESF did not arouse togetherness that key actors were dreaming of. Groups were represented individually and even some of them were absent (see Souza 2010 b). However, the general two urban sessions-one of them including Reclaiming Spaces and No-Vox was really comprehensive and created a great discussion milieu. Before the Forum, it is discussed that these movements are fragmented and they do not know each others. It’s also that we must discuss the right to the city outside the academy. In the Forum, the reasons why urban social movements were emerged and how they were organized are organised: The struggle is described as the fight against the

wind. The general view was that trade unions must be included into this struggle in order to broaden the movement and also to solve the internal problems. It was also mentioned that neighborhood associations and activists from the neighbourhoods also must be appropriated by neighbourhoods. There was also a discussion about political groups; it was said that political groups must leave their weapons for the right of housing. It was also discussed how we could attract people into urban movements. However, it is argued that desperately even the demolition in Sulukule could not be stopped with the help of media and academicians. The Forum was organized to form a grassroots organization; to make actors active subjects; however, the intellectuals could not pass beyond to theoretical approaches and old discussions. The reality in the neighbourhoods was the demolition which necessitates an urgent reply. As underlined before, the main contradiction was proposed to be barricade -type of action- vs. negotiation. Indeed there are differences between different neighbourhoods, different cities on the approach about the right of dwelling (shelter, housing); which lead to tensions. To illustrate, Fener-Balat was considered for some neighborhood organization as “middle or upper-middle class” neighborhood, different from them gecekondu neighbourhoods. However, these tensions in time were erased. The need for intellectuals (in other words, outsiders) was intended to be oriented to a formation of “law commission” or an “alternative technical group”, to write reports. Some objectives were proposed: Those who are directly affected must talk. However, it is discussed that in the common idea in Turkey, having a house is one of the most important assets. It is also added that one neighborhood must struggle for the other ones including tenants’ rights to develop the idea of use value and dwelling.

It is necessary to evaluate in the process: *Not only before and during, but especially after the European Social Forum*, Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) gained different characteristics and roles. Even though it was

pioneered by activists from and outside neighbourhoods, the key actors put emphasis on neighbourhoods in time. Mainly for the actors who are involved in many struggles, this became an exhausting process with meetings on the same subjects every week. The main objective turned into self-organization of neighbourhoods forming a solidarity and information network. These meetings and information led to the awareness of neighbourhoods, making their struggle not only a matter of possession. They went to different neighbourhoods to support and inform mainly about the processes of urban regeneration and procedures of forming association. Urban Movements as a flexible and open group brought mainly neighbourhood associations together and facilitated new formations and the way for a collective struggle of urban commons. The process is now on the way to enable information and so organization within neighbourhoods and later starting from every region, to form a new “the Platform of Neighborhood Associations” with the most representative characteristic. *Urban Movements represents itself as a platform and forum of different groups, initiatives and activists from different views struggling for urban rights.* However, groups and initiatives of intellectuals and academicians consider this formation as a grassroots network by distancing themselves. This is a two fold distance: Firstly, they consider this group as a grassroots platform and forum. Secondly, their tensions and some so-called political differences are accentuated. The most important role of Kent Hareketleri was to organise meetings including current agendas of neighbourhoods and organizations of seminars. However, in time, these meetings which were held every week concentrated on fragmentations and conflicts mainly valid for groups from outside became exhausting. Moreover, discussion points before were mainly repeated but not realized. Another important point is that the meetings mainly organised in Taksim, city centre leads to critiques based on the physical and symbolic distance from neighbourhoods. Consequently, meetings are organised in neighbourhoods focused on their

problems and association formation. On the other hand, still from the city centres, meetings are both focused not only neighbourhoods but also city as a whole, urban commons.

Here are the main themes of Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) agenda which are summarized from my participation at meetings as well as discussed through Urban Movements' e-mail group: The early 2010 was marked by the discussions on the characteristics of urban oppositions, about the necessity of the holistic and intensive urban struggle. The critique of the Forum was in terms of the necessity of a united struggle and the pursuit of legal process. The main issues were proposed to be: negotiation, definition and primary roles such as to inform others by standing together of Urban Movements, difficulties in formation of alliance and its politics and characteristics. All these aspects were the main discussion points till now. Since forming coalitions and alliances was a tidal issue, both desirable and denied. The first declaration of Urban Social Movements in Istanbul was a call for European Social Forum, read in the support protest of a gecekondu neighborhood, Ayazma dwellers in front of the municipality. The necessity of registering what was being lived and experienced and for this reason, of producing a brochure from it was proposed. At that period, the importance of organizing especially in the neighbourhoods was recognized. The importance to be present in the meetings with the face-to-face discussion was underlined. From the very beginning, not only being reactive but struggling in a proactive way was emphasized with common struggle strategies on the right to shelter and to the city. The discussions were covering the role of political parties, press, professional chambers, trade unions and international groups. Meanwhile, since April 2010, there was a resistance of neighbourhood from İkitelli Ayazma-Tepeüstü neighbourhoods in the park near the municipality building. At that period, activists from different groups-which form the core/affinity group of Urban Movements-, were supporting their occupation. *The production of a*

counter-advert against the advert of the project of Ağaoğlu -one the main developers in the construction sector in Turkey and one of the billionaires in the world-in the Ayazma neighbourhood was raised in October as a common work, which is collectively made in December 2010. After the discussion on Ayazma publicity, there have been some splits between activists and their groups from outside. The main objective was to form a common ground mainly for neighbourhoods firstly on regions with the pioneering of the key activists in Urban Movements from neighbourhoods. The month of September, 2010 could be evaluated as an acquaintance formation period; consequently one of the main aims was proposed to be alignments based on activism. At that time, according to the statement of İMECE, because of the some strives between groups, points which must be discussed are ignored. Due to the problems of interacting via mail and remaining at the personal level, concepts which must be discussed politically lead to many problems. The necessity to discuss some methods must be discussed conceptually; however, this must be pursued by not connecting personally. At first moment, even though these discussions about concepts, methods, practices and effects could result in separations, this would serve to struggle line which could last for a long period of time. The Social Rights Association also was keen on being a part of this formation and necessity of being able to meet face to face and one representative was present in the meetings like Solidarity Studio. This meeting formation process was critical and necessary to challenge the illusionary idea that there is an alliance between groups.

The campaigns and loyalty visits of the group namely SOS working for a common urban ground valid for communication beyond politics and localities and gentrification were important issues at that time. In this respect, due to the presence of the actors from this group, the main emphasis was on the historical and environmental issues. Consequently, these issues were referring to some transformations in middle and upper-middle class

neighbourhoods. Urban Movements announced their support for urban resistance group namely No-Vox from France on the displacements in the banlieue La Courneuve. In this period, Urban Movements Forum was shaped as information, support and discussion network thanks to email group as well as systematic face-to-face meetings. The month of September, 2010 was the period of the campaigning and struggle for Emek Movie Theatre has been accelerated. This is also the period of attempts to organise against the governmental discussion on demolitions. By the end of September 2010, many people started to form emotional relations and started to know by trying to form a common language and front together. However, problems emerged, which lead to discussion on a “common discussion ground” which must be concentrated on “concepts”, methods, practices and effects. Even though it would emerge new fragmentations, for a long-term struggle line, it would have a structural role. This process is a mutual questioning period, which made apparent the fragmentations and the differentiations between different groups outside neighbourhoods. There was an attempt to discuss the period before the European Social Forum, which had resulted in reproduction of splits. The problems raised at that time still represent main divisions such as being political and apolitical, being at the side of negotiation or not.

In October 2010, as an evaluation after the forum and its fragmentations, the question of “who we are?” was discussed to determine firstly the main principles. The necessity to form commissions specialized in different issues was proposed as the main practice. One of the propositions was to publish a journal, or a bulletin to inform everybody about urban regeneration and neighbourhoods as well as seminars about for instance the right to the city. With the help of these seminars and discussions on the right to the city could lead to form relations and linkages between different locations and projects. The main idea was that urban oppositions were beyond being working class movements and conventional politics as well. In spite of

differences of politics, the necessity to organise short-term coalitions based on action, mobilisation is strongly proposed. This necessity comes from the urgency for local people. An issue that is always one of the points in the agenda was to form connections with different neighbourhoods and the necessity of a sub-group on legal and press issues. The campaigning as process, started months before the event were significant especially for creating acquaintances not only between neighbourhoods, but also with its dwellers and international groups, and actors. For instance, there were some discussion possibilities before and during the event/protest with open podiums where inhabitants could talk about their various but common problems. There were some other ideas about occupations such as occupying Taksim Square with tents, which did not arouse any interest. Since as a group which was newly being organised, the protests were thought to be artificial and even meaningless. The discussions during the meetings were not only on neighbourhoods but also issues and public spaces in Istanbul. This was a very significant aspect for me since people who even did not go to some central parts of the city, they started to include in their agenda and defend them. In December 2010, the necessity was proposed to reveal the aims of Urban Movements to be together with different approaches and traditions. The discussion was on where the aims would gather: from a conceptual point or focus on struggle methods. In this respect, the main concern of activists was to save their peculiarities, so not to be similar. It is proposed that these aims could depart from the urban space, the practice to find its theoretical way. However, it is necessary to find ground of commonizing.

In February 2011, the meetings in different sides of Istanbul such as Anatolian and European were organized to be mutually informed, to (self-) organize and to form solidarities. This was considered as a remedy for the lack of connection and the path on a possible alliance. This was a mutual confidence formation process from solidarity to friendship. Meanwhile,

some neighbourhoods were about to found new associations like grassroots association GÜLDAM, at the end of May 2011. In July 2011, protests and visits were made in Tokludedede neighborhood. In January 2012, to initiate the campaign of Zero Eviction (in October) and to welcome the visits of activists from International Alliance of Inhabitants, a meeting-protest in the Gezi Park was organised. This was pioneered by some activists in Bedrettin neighborhood with the participation of urban activists from neighbourhoods and intellectuals from some platforms. This protest will be elaborated in the following part. In January, the open call to find an emblem was met with the “umbrella” picture. In February, these actors who were organizing these meetings formed an “enforcement board”, which is in fact the affinity group of urban oppositions in Istanbul. But this was both a re-formation but also a fragmentation period of Urban Movements. An activist from this board, in time, would leave the group due to the meetings in the city centre instead of neighbourhoods, which requires time and money and postpone the grassroots organization. This period was marked by recruitment of new groups and activists from neighbourhoods and the determination of new principles of the forming common ground. The necessity of neighborhood representation in the meetings in a responsible and disciplined way was one of the discussion points. The main objective was to form an open and non-hierarchical group which could determine an agenda and act accordingly. In March 2012, there were arrests of active neighbourhood dwellers in Derbent neighbourhood, one of the turning points of the struggles. The aim of the Forum was revisited such as to find/be a common solidarity ground with common approach and mobilisation and with the executive council as the first resort which has mission to organize, to transfer information and to be addressed by the “deprived” at the very first moment. In fact, activists revised all the aims that they had determined two years before since the very first forum. Here are some aims for Urban Movements: to be the first group with determined objectives and address for people who lived grievances

because of urban issues, a group with a legal identity –open to discussion-, which was proposed to require responsibility, a contact and reference centre like right to shelter office in Dikmen, with the distinction between platform and association must be made and with a conscious attempt for a non-hierarchical, flexible and independent organization, the systematic visit to different neighbourhoods to improve relations, while every neighbourhood strengthening their inner organization, meeting every week or every two week, specialized commissions for legal issues, media, education, evaluation about who we are, what the potential is, giving priority and importance to the relations between international platforms, giving up fatigue to believe in for what aims we are claiming, the necessity of organising workshops, seminars on education to convey information and transference of experiences, simplification of language by starting from concrete and positive examples with an emphasis on the change created by the movement, the necessity of an ideology, working with inhabitants of neighbourhoods street by street. Another aim was urban movements not remaining as solidarity ground for a common action, but to emphasize information, experience, and organization. In the framework of the practical actions, academic and theoretical dimension must be considered including grassroots with the help of panels transferring experience and information. It was underlined that urban movements must be a “common memory” and a “common body” which acts. The politics must be revisited during the process and could be redefined. Every neighbourhood must organize its own neighbourhood for its permanence. It is discussed that urban movements must not be a mere urban opposition against demolitions but must appropriate all the city, right to life, history, culture, green areas and public spaces. However, this also represents a spatial politics. It is necessary to expand the components to enrich the representation. The representatives of the neighbourhoods must come in the meetings of Urban Movements. It is

necessary to form some commissions still based on hierarchical organizations.

In this period, some neighbourhoods addressed Urban Movements and even though it seems to be difficult, they have organized themselves. Urban Movements informed and supported neighbourhood organizations. Urban Movements' neighbourhood representatives started to plan a common march, the 1st of May. "Walking in one cortege on 1 May as Urban Movement together." was proposed to be one of the main aims. This in a sense created togetherness, an evaluation of existing active groups. This led to the engagement of new activists and neighbourhood associations. Different formulations to be together (without any priority of some groups and necessity to quit any affiliation) were proposed with the motivation of walking together. However, this resulted in inner discussions and questions about who we are and how we define Urban Movements so new fragmentations besides. Apart from neighbourhood associations, the groups namely The Platform of Plaza Action, group of white collar workers, and the Movement of People without Security. However, this togetherness created a partial coalition to work together. Like any campaign, this resulted in inner discussions about involved groups, about division of roles. In June, the main discussion point was about the difficulties in togetherness even about sending a common declaration and working effectively with neighbourhoods. The questions about how we could work with neighbourhoods were discussed within the group. These discussions resulted in 2013 as the involvement of new groups and activists. But the reasons why these questions, the disconnection/place of the meetings in the city centre led to rupture of some leading activists. However, the meetings of solidarity and information (including film screening such as Ekümenopolis) in the neighbourhoods with the help in organization are accomplished in two-year period.

In the declaration of Urban Movements written at that movement about “who we are”, we could find the periodization and main aims of the group. By starting “We are not stronger than all of us”. It is stated that people, groups and activists from different views who struggle against the attacks of neoliberalism on urban space and life spaces came together before the ESF on June 26-27th, 2010. Their main aims were supposed to organise an urban opposition and to come together with international urban struggles on the minimum commons (asgari müşterekler) against the commodification of public, rural and urban spaces for the seek of urban rent and the exclusion of urban poor and labourers. In the statement, it is argued that respecting the peculiarities and ways of organisation of every local resistance, their first aim was to search for the potentials, possibilities of an effective reply against the attacks with their experiences and knowledge. With the help of chambers, universities and sometimes political groups, apart from inner ones, many meetings and seminars were organised with the priority of its practical problems against the urban rent and mega projects in 2011 which demolish neighbourhoods. Activists and neighbourhood associations claimed their right to say their words together. The second period was to resist against the demolitions in Tokludedede, Kanarya neighbourhood by forming solidarities in terms of organisation, legal issues to make visible deprivations and related struggles in the media. With the support of two important urban/housing right activists, it is stated that they organised an event in Taksim Gezi Park, January 2012, before attending zero eviction campaign of World Habitat Days in September and they put in the agenda the right to the city. Urban Movements gave (active) support to Taksim Solidarity –before the Gezi Park resistance-, the signature campaign against the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk, Tokludedede neighbourhood via criminal complaints for the Fatih Mayor and active calls to architects, planners not to be part of rental projects. Urban Movements stated that they continue to struggle: In the short term, they form solidarities

and support neighborhood with newly involved ones and claim for living spaces. Moreover, in the long term they claim for all of the urban spaces which must cover all of the urban spaces as commons to be produced by the inhabitants of the city.

In March 2012, the visit to neighborhood namely Kanarya not only engender hope, solidarity, motivation and push for self-organising a neighborhood which do not possess any tradition of organisation but also became a contribution in the self-evaluation of missions in Urban Movements. At the end of March, a demonstration is organised in a historical neighborhood namely Ayvansaray under urban regeneration project whose inhabitants were forced to move, against the demolition of historical city walls. This protest, even though not many activists could not be able to come and mostly poor inhabitants of neighborhood were not a part of the neighborhood, became a claim for urban commons and created a public awareness from a historical point. In April, the preparation for organising the commons declaration and March in the 1 May Demonstration gave rise to a common discussion open to everyone who would like to contribute in. The early April, end of March 2012 began with the point raised by Taksim Solidarity about its aim for an upper platform for movements, initiatives against urban regeneration after protests that they had organised for Taksim in March. This has triggered inner questions about the aims and missions of Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) and a return to locality to gather and strengthen their organisation: The priority on neighbourhoods was underlined. Since Taksim Solidarity having a claim for public and central spaces, Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) must continue its mission on localities. However, in this respect, the idea that organisation as a mass movement and broad solidarity at the local would form and feed the platforms which were being formed. The characteristics and ways of effectively working in and getting into contact with neighbourhoods with the help of –collectively- writing and later broadening

the common declaration about Law on Transformation of Areas Under Disaster Risk—which reveals the problems of current urbanisation practices, were some of the main themes in May 2012. In June 2012, with the meetings of İMECE, discussions of information about the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk were made. In June, “(Interactive) Mapping” was proposed again to be included the agenda. With the help of activists from Urban Movements, the association in Kanarya neighbourhood was founded. In July 2012, the necessity of a continuity in information sharing for instance via blogs, and in meetings of Urban Movements mainly in neighbourhoods of the contact with groups and neighbourhoods from different views and types of organizations. In August 2012, trees in the Gezi Park became a discussion theme and one activist sent a petition to be informed about why the trees were cut down, almost one year earlier than the Gezi Park resistance. At the 8th of August, a press release about urban regeneration projects of Fatih Municipality which evict and displace people in front of municipality with Urban Movements initiation. In September and October, the main discussion repeated itself, which is that meetings planned to be made “in” the neighbourhoods were delayed. However, this was also related to the characteristics and conditions of the neighbourhoods. In October, the importance of the main urban oppositional groups and other important political organizations was proposed with International Right to Shelter conference. In this period, some meetings and marches were made in Fener-Balat, Bedrettin and Okmeydanı neighbourhoods. As mentioned above, one of the main issues was –critical-“mapping”, July 2012 and October 2013, which could be evaluated in terms of information, archive and also resistance. Mainly raised points were for whom, which reasons, which functions mapping is proposed to be made. Another aspect was the content of maps and about who will collect necessary, appropriate and accurate information, apart from financing issue. Mapping must be made with a holistic view for Istanbul,

which must reflect interrelations for the transformation of Istanbul such as the relationship between mega projects and urban regeneration projects in different neighbourhoods. In September 2012, the importance of social media was obvious, proposed by some activists and related accounts were open on facebook and twitter. Urban Movements, in an international information and solidarity network due to the activists in relation with other countries sent solidarity letters like the letter sent to the residents in Poland¹³². In October 2012, new activists from different professions were involved in Urban Movements. The demonstration in Fener-Balat-Ayvansaray, the 13th of October, gathered many activists from different groups and neighbourhoods with a limited involvement of local inhabitants against the decision of “urgent expropriation for public purposes – kamulaştırma-“ironically for luxurious houses to be built. In December 2012, another collective memory, the historical patisserie namely İnci is evicted abruptly. Even though this does not stop the demolition, it has created a *public awareness about the enclosures of urban commons* on Istiklal Avenue thanks to some activists always present and active for the Emek Movie Theatre and neighbourhoods as well. This month was the year

¹³² Here is the letter: “None of us is stronger than all of us.” We, Urban Movements, whose aim is to struggle collectively against the neoliberal attacks on our living spaces and cities, support our comrades in Poland, who were evicted by force yet who bravely claim their right to appropriate their living spaces and to fight against the commodification of their city, just as we have done in Sulukule, Ayazma, Dikmen Valley... Even though the geographies are different and the manifestations of this attack could be various, we are totally aware that this is a process solely generated by neo-liberalism encroaching on urban space with different projects and policies determined and redefined according to the needs of global capital while negatively impacting the neighbourhoods all over the world. The struggles of the right to the city for the production and reproduction of our living spaces must be a collective one united against the privatization and violation of the right to housing for profit and rent. We, as the ones whose right to live in just cities is violated every day, make a call to all urban opposition groups to give support and solidarity to the resistance of the seven families who are the “real” residents of Stolarska 2 in Poznań, Poland and who represent actually all of us who are displaced, oppressed and dispossessed. Moreover we are sure that in the future we will be the ones to decide where and how to live and in accordance with our needs and dreams. The right to housing is a human right which can not be violated and privatized by attacks of capitalism! Zero Eviction! We are ending our solidarity letter with the words of our comrades in Poland: “Remember: this could have happened to you too.” In solidarity!”

of panels and meetings in some neighbourhoods. At the beginning of December, the 4th of 2012, after the protest in 24th of November, the Solidarity and urban activists were keeping guard to protest the projects in the Taksim Square and the Gezi Park, which strengthened in time. In January 2013, some neighbourhoods came to address and join in Urban Movements and some discussions on for who the planning is and how it could be realized. The importance of reacting together is emphasized; with the appropriation of different neighbourhoods. Even though a visit to a group of research assistant in the university who had the danger of losing their jobs, this is delayed.

One of the discussion points was related to Taksim Solidarity since there was an appeal from the Solidarity that inhabitants could not appropriate the square, could not appropriate their neighbourhoods. Even though main figures were present in the neighbourhoods, there was a claim that there was no banner of Taksim Solidarity including Taksim Platform there with the lack of a real solidarity by criticizing other urban opposition groups. These discussions were in a milieu where there was a fear of “politics” and “being political”. Taksim Platform was mainly critical of not being involved in issues related to public spaces of Istanbul and rural areas. After the resistance, neighbourhoods started to interact between themselves did organize on urban regeneration issue under the name of “Istanbul Urban Working Groups between Istanbul Forums”. Some actors were critical about “right seeking” but not confronting with governments with the fear of being “political”. Another discussion point was the claim from Taksim Solidarity about the fact that nobody could defend their neighborhood without defending Taksim. On the other hand, there was an idea that Taksim Solidarity was absent in the neighbourhoods. Another confusion point was about the platform and solidarity that will be mentioned again. One of the main problems was new projects in different neighbourhoods, which make the coordination and information quite difficult. However, this led to newly

formed neighborhood associations and their contact with Urban Movements. Even though leading actors were not attending the meetings anymore, new people have begun to come and work actively. One of the visits to neighbourhoods was to Sarıyer Maden neighbourhood with the help of panels made there. Urban Movements was considered to find its main role and mission and to be together with/in the neighbourhoods and to bring them together and make a common field of struggle. This was also the period for the formation of new neighbourhood associations. The idea of resistance must be based both on individual and collective basis. In this process, there is a need to be informed about our international (human rights) and constitutional rights, which would be a part of our strategies. According to these rights, the most vulnerable must be protected first. In this respect, the right to the city is discussed as an abstract right, beyond all these rights. I must add that the right to the city, being beyond all these rights, is a strongly concrete concept, while gathering different struggles in the urban. As I stated, in this meeting, like the other ones, there was a focus on the ways of alliance all over the country and worlds, by forming resistance strategies and housing rights organizations. Another important aspect was the fear and apprehension that were reigning all over the neighbourhoods.

The main issues at that time were mapping, meetings which must be made in the neighbourhoods, seminars of education and information. Some neighbourhoods were forming their associations and Urban Movements were visiting to inform about the process of forming an association as well as urban regeneration. 1st of May was planning to celebrate by walking together to the Taksim Square, while there were some connections with more than twenty neighbourhoods. However, still the representation and organization at the grassroots level was an important issue. Some commissions were planned including legal support, education and other commissions (about campaigning such as “No to the Olympics!”)

In July, the awareness about types of resistance and different struggle ways in the neighbourhoods were one of the main discussion points. During the first days of Gezi uprising, Urban Movements sent international calls/letters¹³³ to inform international public opinion. The Third Bridge, the

¹³³Here is the first call: The International Human Rights Organizations and Dear Friends, Comrades, Press Members from all over the world; This is an urgent call from human rights defenders, activists, NGOs, professional chambers, grassroots, neighbourhood associations and Istanbulites. Since the 27th of May, Istanbulites from all social and political backgrounds and ages and from all over the city had been continuing a peaceful resistance in Gezi Park, the city's largest public park, soon to be demolished due to a renewal project. According to the project, decades old trees in the park will be cut down and a big mall in the replica of the once Ottoman Artillery Barracks (Topçu Kışlası) will be erected: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RgBRGl341ZA>, <http://www.bianet.org/english/english/147016-demonstrators-plant-trees-against-destruction-in-taksim-gezi-park> The police intervened in the park 3 times, each more violent than the other: The first intervention was in the morning of May 28th, a crowd of about 50 protestors were tear gassed directly on their faces: <http://stream.aljazeera.com/story/201305302148-0022796> To give solidarity to the protestors, hundreds arrived in the evening and the occupation movement got larger. Right afterwards, the second intervention came early in the morning of May 30th at 5 am, the riot police set fire to the tents and tear gas and pepper sprays were used incessantly, causing serious injuries: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=suEVcTIpzxA&list=UUNwGZGYteEB64ywTGCn0w2g&index=2>

<http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/protester-to-undergo-surgery-after-morning-police-intervention-at-taksim-park---.aspx?pageID=238&nID=47878&NewsCatID=341>

Against this inhumanity and extreme violence, the reaction was the occupation of the park, this time by thousands. And this morning proved to be the culmination of violence and barbarism that no words can describe, with an excessive use of force. The exit of the park was blocked, the group was thus locked in the park and was taken under the crossfire of tear gas and pepper bombs, choked to death. The only way was by breaking the walls and many were wounded: <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/protester-to-undergo-surgery-after-morning-police-intervention-at-taksim-park---.aspx?pageID=238&nID=47878&NewsCatID=341>.

At the moment brutal interventions against protestors continue, after the press call, while the group was leaving, it was pepper sprayed and tear gassed once more! At the moment, some of the group is in Divan Hotel at Elmadağ. Literally, almost all parts of Taksim (where Gezi Park is) is tear gassed and pepper gas sprayed especially the streets around Taksim are under clouds of gas. Dear friends, we need nothing else to add, the scenes talk themselves. The resistance for democracy and human rights will not be terminated; we are determined to continue our struggle against a government determined to crush each and every opposition, a government that can not tolerate even a peaceful opposition for saving trees. The Turkish government, has violated all international human rights conventions and mechanisms it is a party to. Your valuable support and solidarity will indeed fortify our determination and resistance. Please share it, name it and shame it and blame it so that this insanity and brutality practiced against human rights defenders can be terminated through international pressure.

CALL TO THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

This is also a call to the IOC to take Turkey out of its list of 2020. If Olympics means friendship, if Olympic Games mean peace and companionship, these videos are enough proof of how the government violates the ideals of Olympics. Having Istanbul on the list will be tantamount to pepper gassing these ideals.

In the name of solidarity and friendship Urban Movements Istanbul / Habitat International Coalition

The other letter is the following :

To the World Public and the World Press: A government who seems totally unaware of the concept of conscience and who definitely lacks any proper perception of humanity has been putting on an act of utmost violence in almost all parts of the city since last night. This dark page has unfortunately thus been added to the already known and very much debated human rights record of Turkey. History will certainly not forgive this government; this government with its brutal police, its incompetent governors, its dishonest media and its false jurisdiction! Cruelty beyond comprehension for even war time situations is being systematically applied. While the government has been openly overruling all norms of human rights in front of the whole world, its spokespeople and the governor of Istanbul have chosen to address the national and international public in a reckless manner, creating stories about “marginal groups” and “vandalism”.

Never before have dignity and pride been so brutally vandalized!

Last night, “robocops” programmed to kill without making a distinction between women, children, old people and the sick have attacked the peaceful crowd which had festively gathered all day long at the Gezi Park. Gas bombs have been thrown at hospitals and at houses in which helpless people took refuge. The wounded who were brought into the makeshift infirmary at the nearby Divan Hotel have been re-bombed countless times. Rubber bullets and water cannons have been used in addition to the gas bombs and as the water sprayed by the cannons contained an unknown chemical substance of acidic nature, many people with rashes and itches, skin allergies and open skin lesions have been observed among the wounded. To this moment, the exact composition of the water spray has remained unknown. In short, last night in Istanbul, savageness unequalled even by the atrocities of a war time environment has become the ruler.

We would now like to ask: If this is not vandalism, what is?

We would also like to ask the sovereigns whose mode of ruling comprises of polarizing people, increasing all tensions and forcing everybody to limits; is this what you call “peace”? Can peace only be attained by carrying out whatever the government orders? What kind of a government do you call yourselves if your answer to these questions is “yes”? Is this your understanding of democracy?

This is our call to all the governing and/or opposing members of the parliament who have now become a part of this brutality by remaining silent, to the segment of media that has accepted the language of this cruelty as its own mode of expression and to the members of the police force who, openly violating all rules of human rights, have turned into barbarian “robocops” which think they will not have to account or stand trial for their actions: In the name of humanity, first listen to the voice of your conscience!

We would also like to address the world public and in particular all the international human rights mechanisms Turkey is also a part of with this message and ask them to help us in making our voices heard in our protest of this government which has adapted cruelty and savageness as a mode of approach towards its people. Please hear our voice and take the necessary steps to stop these atrocities!

Spokesperson of URBAN MOVEMENTS ISTANBUL

airport and the mega-project of Kanal Istanbul, the Olympics and related participatory campaigns, changes in the neighbourhoods, the Biennial and its relations with the capital and the formation of the commissions like an “association” were put in the agenda. Especially the Biennial discussion resulted in the questions about “who we are”, “to what we are against”, “what we should do”. In August, the importance on the commoning of the Solidarity of Taksim and its agenda during and after the Gezi Park uprising and the forums all over the city were believed to be a hope for urban struggles. In September, the site of “change.org” is used to open online petition about the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk as well as mapping initiatives. What is critical is that mainly after the Gezi Park resistance, the group People’s House started to act together. The necessity of being active on the net is proposed mainly for sharing information via bulletins. While different platforms and associations were forming solidarities, the plan for education seminars became more meaningful.

The campaign namely “No to the Olympics” was accused by some politicians and columnists. Urban Movements made a statement¹³⁴ about their role in noticing about the consequences in the city and mainly economic burden on society and *demolitions mainly in the neighbourhoods of poor people*. It has an economic burden on the national budgets, which could lead to riots and explosions like happened in Greece and Brazil. This campaign as an alert for the future socio-economic problems must be read as a democratic duty; which was just the opposite of the claims. One of the main issues was after the Gezi Park, state officers have started to be interested and be informed about the groups.

However, Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements), from the beginning of its formation was aiming to be a grassroots platform and an inclusive forum.

¹³⁴ <http://www.bianet.org/bianet/toplum/149337-kent-hareketlerinden-egemen-bagis-a-olimpiyat-yaniti>

Like the attempts of Taksim Solidarity, their appeals and cries were ignored so their presence. They stated that: “We have different neighbourhoods from different political views are in our network, as a member of Habitat International Coalition in UN.” by adding that the campaign launched for the visit of Milon Kohtari from UN. With this opportunity, they underlined that their main aim was to stay put in the neighbourhoods. It is related to the meaning of neighbourhood as the life itself with neighbourhood relations, social networks, solidarity and unique culture. In 2010, for a human and just city, it is formed by representatives of professional groups, artistic organizations, platforms, initiatives and supporters of housing rights from various beliefs, ideology, political views with the symbol of umbrella. However, I must add that this has stayed mainly on the paper apart from some protests, campaigns and petitions. Moreover, there was an intention about this forum to be of directly affected people by the initiatives from outside neighbourhoods. Recently, after the Gezi Park resistance, another campaign for the cancellation of the so-called the “Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risk” (dated 16 May 2012) is launched from change.org with a protest in front of *İstanbul Çevre ve Şehircilik İl Müdürlüğü*. They defend that it is violating the right to housing as a constitutional right and a basic human right free from property as well as public good, while urban regeneration projects are forced from above without considering social needs and claims. It also destroys neighbourhood culture especially of lower and working class neighbourhoods. These projects became that of dispossession, deprivation and impoverishment due to forced evictions, socio-spatial segregated cities and psychological traumas; so these projects must be done without any forced eviction. I would like to add that this is one of the main controversial points within oppositions groups since it is an approval of the urban regeneration projects.

In October, the main discussion points were to focus more on (campaigning) the Law on Transformation of Areas Under Disaster Risk, to open stands in

different neighbourhoods all over the city including upper classes (due to some people from upper class neighbourhoods addressing for information and help), to push the self-organization of the neighbourhoods for this campaigning process against legal enforcement of displacement and eviction as well as against urban regeneration projects, to re-organize education workshops. The education workshops mainly on urban regeneration projects and the legislations were open to everyone including people who would like to contribute. Via email, everybody wrote his/her will to be apart of urban groups, and platforms. Another issue, which is discussed for a long period, “mapping” special was another decision aspect. This mapping activity is also open to everyone, which would create a process of togetherness by working and thinking together. Due to engagement of the same actors and their past experiences and relations, *all the attempts led to vicious circles of problems and agendas, which are not accomplished.* Due to multiple characteristic, commoning practice is always a big issue. However, activists and groups recognise that the struggle itself was a real success.

Recently, a new campaign was initiated for the 22nd of December, 2013, namely “City Meeting”, collectively organized campaign and demonstration covering different associations including forums organized after the Gezi Park as well as other groups for instance LGBT groups. *Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) in time turned to be a collective network of solidarity and information as well as motivation. After a moment and criticisms from inside, they worked intensively in different neighbourhoods and gave emphasis on the support and imitation in forming neighbourhood associations.* However, in some protests, inhabitants of the neighbourhoods were not present in the protest which were organised for them with the initiation of their leading figures.

Started as an alliance of all the urban opposition groups, the alignment remains to be based on meetings a formation of an open and non-hierarchical affinity group, valid for groups outside neighbourhoods. What I would like to add that all the activists, few in number, are forming a group “rather than differences from being outside and inside neighbourhoods”.

Since from the very beginning, there was a concentration on differences and conflicts mainly between “external groups” and as a result, there were discussions about their ways and methods of this formation. *If there is not a necessary representation of neighbourhoods based on some few activists from and outside the neighbourhoods, the meaning of platforms, alliances or coalitions must be reconsidered by questioning as an objective and necessity for still weak urban oppositions.* It was frequently argued that there was a necessity on a clarification on concepts, practices of action. The danger of losing characteristics, principles, and differences was one of the main problems of “external groups”. Obviously, what was important was to find points to be commonized to be the base of a common action practically and conceptually. This does not mean that initiatives will leave their particular characteristics and continue to their struggles in their own ways. Consequently, it is stated that there is a necessity to go over past experiences and struggles emphasizing on problems of initiatives. If we evaluate this on-going attempt of Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) of three years-period, I realise that this initiated a common ground which is still being formed for urban commons. They, practically, beyond conventional politics, became a network of support and mutual information including international groups, which motivated mainly neighbourhoods in terms of self-organisation. Since this period is marked by uncertainties and lack of information about the process of planning, which led to “professionalization” in terms of knowledge of ordinary residents on urban and “technical planning” and legislative language due to the contact with activists. It is a process of mutual learning process between activists: active

inhabitants from neighbourhoods convey information also about neighbourhoods to outside. Even though it has resulted in distances, *this has created a period of external groups* (mainly composed of urban planners with different ways of resistance) to criticise each others and to evaluate themselves as well. This open, flexible and multiple commoning became both an alliance and also a split before and after the ESF while discussing tensions and conflicting points in urban opposition and between them. *In three-years-period of commoning, these following themes created togetherness: critical mapping, international campaigns-even though the necessity and meaning are controversial- and self-organisation.* Active inhabitants from neighbourhoods began to claim the city as a whole, as urban commons. However, the potential of this period has been lost because of the fact that these routine meetings could not meet with main ends. The themes that created fragmentations are: the types of resistance methods, working, organising in central locations rather than meeting in neighbourhoods. This led to the priority of “central issues”: to exemplify, different activists meet in the room of a professional chamber located in Taksim, related insufficiency in initiating/informing about organisation activities in neighbourhoods, unfulfilled projects and common themes, so loss of motivations at the beginning. At the end, one of the main problems was proposed to organize meetings at the centre of the city. Apart from delaying workshops and visits to neighbourhoods, there are many spatial/transportation and financial difficulties for activists to go to city centre every week. *To continue with the main obstacles against urban commoning: Material and mental fatigue due to engagements of same activists,* different involvements of the activists (every day, a meeting of a group), so the fragmentation of groups and related politics (same people in issue/theme oriented groups), the attempts of “unification” –mainly wit the help of campaigns- without local-grassroots organisation, transformation of campaigns (which supposed to be organised to be heard) and protests into

“aims”, the difference of language between different groups due to intellectual, usage of professional and technical knowledge, difference of experience between activists, priority of urgent solutions about housing of different people. It is likely that even though there are differences and fragmentations, active inhabitants think about the reasons of opposition for the urban and reevaluate themselves with their priorities by discussing the reasons and limitations to form alliances.

5.2. Turning Moments of the Forum: Protests and International Campaigns

In this part, it will be concentrated on the protests and campaigns, which have created the moments of togetherness and cooperation initiated by the activists of Urban Movements. Firstly, we have to concentrate on the processes of campaigns as well as the togetherness after the protests. However, it is necessary to be aware the limitations and traps of space in the struggle. It is undeniable that the necessity and even rush for launching campaigns and organizing protests, led to some splits and disappointments in the opposition. As we know, the main question of the urban activists was like the attempts to be a collectivity or a coalitions in 2006-2007 (mainly organized in November, December 2007), namely Istanbul Neighborhood Association Platform -neighbourhoods like Gülsuyu-Gülensu, Başibüyük, Sarıyer Maden, Sarıyer Derbent, Fatih Sultan Mehmet Mahallesi Baltalimanı, Reşitpaşa, Karanfilköy, Kuzguncuk, Küçükçekmece-Ayazma were some of the neighbourhoods in this platform-, whether or not activists from different neighbourhoods and groups could form “alliance”. During this period, some of the neighbourhoods are demolished like neighborhood namely Ayazma (in November, 2008), which generated a collective resistance and support.

This period is marked by projects aiming to transform also an ancient social housing neighbourhood and historical neighbourhoods whose dwellers have titles and legal papers. This period is not merely new for togetherness of tenants and owners and also different people, from different classes and so different point of views. This is valid not merely within a neighbourhood association but also in terms of possible togetherness between associations. What is important is that these associations do not merely have concerns with their own neighbourhoods but also with other neighbourhoods and even Istanbul as a whole. They came together not only for their neighbourhoods, but also for other neighbourhoods, while organizing new meetings with the pioneering of some groups, actors and neighbourhood associations. It could be said that this resistance is pursued at different fronts, from different groups and associations. It is also re-organized by workshops and with the visit of two international actors. The Social Forum could not be able to create a complete alliance but it led to a rise in consciousness, a new political identity and activism¹³⁵ as well as creating a discussion milieu for different ideas on practices of resistance in the urban struggles in Istanbul. It thus paved the way for exchanging information and experiences and for organizing collective seminars and campaigns. The main aim was to create a broad and effective alliance between activists, intellectuals from different groups having different socio-political histories and views on the commons means and ground of resistance, and neighbourhood associations. It is necessary to underline the importance and the effect of the actors from both inside and outside neighbourhoods on the implementation of the idea with their pioneering roles in the formation of associations, groups and platforms. In terms of community and

¹³⁵This is another activism on “uncommon ground” with unknown ways for social change and for another solidarity between the actors who were not previously “activists”, as Chatterton (2006) conceptualizes, by challenging the mainstream activism and related explanations.

neighbourhood associations' actions, the right to the city could also be considered as a right which could create cracks, fissures and spaces in state governance (Swyngedouw and Moulaert in Moulaert et al. 2010, 231-233) by building networks with others at a distance from the state. Even though this group, mainly composed of intellectuals from within and outside the neighbourhoods, has changed and still changing, it aims to be a non-hierarchical core group open to everyone and every neighbourhood association. It has its own problems, but this permanent yet flexible group of actors succeeded in organizing regular meetings, initiating campaigns, in distributing information to neighbourhoods and in forming personal relationships. Some actors from Istanbul went to other cities such as Ankara for conferences and meetings and to support and meet inhabitants living there. They also welcomed to Istanbul neighbourhood dwellers from other cities making grassroots connections. Even though there are differences in the means of resistance according to each neighbourhood's political and social history and to the timing of the resistance, they formed new neighbourhood associations. In this respect it is important to remember the role and the effect of the local actors from within and outside the neighbourhoods.

Besides the *forum before the European Social Forum* and some initiatives about the collective March of *the 1st of May demonstration* that I elaborated in the related part above, Urban Movements campaigns built international connections mainly from the right to the city and provided a platform for international meetings with neighbourhood dwellers, academics, lawyers, urban planners and architects, artists, and other activists from different groups. This resulted in the involvement of new actors from different urban groups at a local level in terms of the exchange of experiences and strategies before and after. Even though there will be another part for intellectuals and neighbourhoods, there are also intellectual figures "from the neighbourhoods" who are struggling for an appropriate struggle for their

neighbourhoods, like in their neighbourhoods namely Gülsuyu/Gülensu, Fener-Balat and Tozkoparan. The neighbourhoods are different in their historical and social constitution and so their resistance and they also struggle “within their neighbourhoods”. Their affiliations and personal histories are different; however, they are also working for an “alliance” of urban struggles to resist. One intellectual, activist, academician and dweller in Fener-Balat and member of neighbourhood organization FEBAYDER stated that people who are residing in the neighbourhood and living the threat of demolition could have the same feelings, underlining the importance of being from a neighbourhood. This reminds also Kasım Abi, from Ayazma neighbourhood, who said me:”If do not resist, I could not do anything. Thanks for coming; however what is important is my resistance.” They also complain about people who write their thesis and abandon the neighbourhoods after finishing their studies.

Before organizing seminars, there was an idea that it is necessary to attract other neighbourhoods and their associations. It is realized and even they organized some meetings in two-three locations which could be grouped as European and Anatolian sides under pioneering of Çiğdem, Ömer and Erdoğan. Even though it paved a path of self-organization and reunion between local opposition groups, there was a need of a support and organization from outside. However, this period is stopped and İMECE has started to do this which is proposed in the Fourth Year Reunion. During this period, another neighborhood namely Ayvansaray, Tokludedede, gathered some actors around demolitions, the end of summer, 2011.

One of the main discussions of the thesis will be on the significance of global-international associations, group, organizations and actors active in the alliance of urban opposition groups in Istanbul with the presence of international as well as local and other intellectuals. To illustrate the

influence of the campaigns organized mainly by the local actors with the networks/groups, more exactly actors active in the attempts of alliances with new local formations vary from a newly formed neighbourhood association to the involvement and recruitment of new actors. Despite of the fact that the oppositional groups -mainly the actors- have different values and forms of action and organization, the actors are involved together via new campaigns. In this respect, internet and e-mail groups played important roles not merely internationally but also —locally, which will be mentioned later on as re-locality. It is necessary to remind the roles of technology and key actors, intellectuals from and outside the neighbourhoods in these personal, organizational and technological networks, who are active across borders against the global urban competition (for new forms of urban development projects) with internationally/nationally targeted campaigns. These linkages could be evaluated as horizons and opportunities in practical and conceptual ways with the use of right to the city concept.

The international claim became apparent especially when the thesis was questioning whether or not urban resistances would form alliances/a platform to struggle together for an effective opposition in Istanbul against so-called —urban regeneration projects. International linkages have always been an important binding role for the —local in terms of sharing experiences reforming of urban resistances even though these are dependent on fragile and changing to one actor/association to other relations. Even though their goals and framing could be different related to the dynamics of urban struggle in these different sites, in spite of its heterogeneous and conflictual characteristics, fragmentations, tensions between/within different groups in the pretext of different reasons and ways, kinds of protests, there were attempts of dialogues and alliances between different groups, local level activists, organizations in Istanbul. In the framework of urban social movements against —spatial interventions and demolitions realized in the name of urban regeneration and gentrification projects, the study aims to

expose moments created by actors from different locations, neighbourhood associations, different platforms with/for the support of international civil initiatives and groups and alliances mainly IAI¹³⁶, No-Vox, Reclaiming Spaces with UN-Habitat, AGFE. In this respect, by avoiding overestimating the role of the international characteristics, this paper would like to underline in this respect the importance of some local actors from and outside the neighbourhoods (intellectuals who do not reside in these neighbourhoods but activists in this sense) with their international networks and initiations in the process of experiencing and finding the way of an effective struggle. International urban resistance groups and actors, who have formed solidarities with international groups, create important —political moments for some neighbourhoods especially for Sulukule, the Roman neighbourhood that had been demolished as well as for new local oppositions and alliances. It has played inspirational and later on, binding roles for the urban resistances in Istanbul. Sulukule firstly initiated also an international support and as well as national/local organizations, as a turning point for urban activists' own struggle experiences as well as for groups for their later alliances.

The zero eviction campaign with the International Alliance of Inhabitants in January, 28th and 29th 2012 was an important moment with slogans “neighbourhoods come together; Istanbul claims its right to the city”, “to act immediately and together strategically to stop aspects of urban regeneration” and as a “call to have the floor and talk for themselves”. Neighbourhood dwellers, academics, lawyers, urban planners and architects, activists including artists and alternative media build connections between themselves at a local level; at an international level, with the initiation and active presence of the International Alliance of Inhabitants and some key

¹³⁶ To have an idea about the approach and concepts used of IAI, please visit the following link:
http://www.habitants.org/the_urban_way/creating_a_common_global_space_of_solidarity_for_urban_social_movements

activists, the claim and take action on the right to the city were put on the agenda. It was a campaign which could be considered as a moment which focused on the importance of global-international associations, groups, organizations and mainly the actors at the local level of urban opposition groups in Istanbul. With the pioneering of Cihan Uzuncarşılı-Baysal, Cesare Ottolini from IAI also active in the ESF, Yves Cabannes, a professor and AGFE Local Representative who was active mainly for Sulukule were on 28th January 2012. Before this event, there was an open call which is signed by professors, academicians, intellectuals, activists under the name of neighbourhood associations and organizations, platforms, alternative or oppositional professional organizations outside neighbourhoods. The call, initiated by Cihan¹³⁷ in the name of Zero Eviction days in Istanbul of IAI (International Alliance of Inhabitants) was grounded on the opposition against urban conversion / renovation projects, including public with a series of projects rather than for rent, utility, historical and natural riches of our city, destroying not only all the social networks but also lives and relationships of solidarity, which does not leave another option. One of the statements was: “The mere solution is proposed as TOKİ silos with social, cultural and psychological victimization, as the transformation zones. The housing rights of vulnerable groups, the tenant population are violated with the schools, hospitals, parks, green areas, cinema halls, public spheres with social memory. In other words, the right to the city is defined with statements: “we live in the city or cities. We must claim our rights to build the cities with an international solidarity according to our desires, to take, claim our right of transformation, by fighting against the trend of urban regeneration.” With the aim and label of “unifying”, this

¹³⁷Uzuncarşılı Baysal (2010), another urban activist and local consultant of Habitat-AGFE, while supporting Küçükbakkalköy Roman residents, she underlines the importance of human right with a legislative emphasis for forced evictions and emptying homes (2011). While supporting all the neighbourhood, she wrote a new comprehensive declaration open to signature, for Zero Eviction Campaign of International Alliance of Inhabitants (Joint Anti-Evictions Task Force), using “right of living” for World Habitat Days 2011.

campaign led to some acquaintances and temporary togetherness titled as “Urban Movements” are unifying” and “*The stage is yours Istanbul/ Speak up for the right to the city join us.*”The call was:“We, as NGOs, neighbourhood associations, grassroots, urban movements and platforms academicians,activists,architects,planners,legalconsultants,documentarists,artists, labourers, deputies from differing political backgrounds, ideologies, and occupations; We, as the signatories to this call, would like to announce our commitment henceforth to pursue an organized resistance against urban renewal, gentrification and transformation projects, aiming to turn İstanbul into a brand city catering to global capital and property markets but not to the needs of its citizens. Namely; Against mega projects like the Third Bridge and Crazy Project, Canal Istanbul which aim for profit and rent rather than public good, projects which will endanger the natural resources and cultural and historical wealth of the city, projects which, by demolishing our neighbourhoods and causing forced evictions and displacement, not only ruin our living spaces but also our lives and habitats together with the decades old social networks and solidarity bonds we have built through years. Projects which present no alternative to displaced communities other than relocation to dismal mass housing TOKİ blocks in the periphery, to the human disposal silos of TOKİ, giving rise to a myriad of economic, social and cultural human rights violations plus psychological traumas. Projects also violate the housing rights of the most vulnerable groups of transformation areas, namely those of the renters by leaving them to streets. Together with renewal projects, the privatizations of state schools, state hospitals and public spaces for flagship projects of the brand city, make it impossible for us to survive in the city. The gates are shown to us. We will be expelled and excluded forever while public spaces and buildings and also those of common memory, and even open spaces reserved for earthquake emergency tents plus the shores, city parks and historical buildings and even cinemas are either transformed or put on the agenda to

be transformed into five-star hotels, malls, luxurious residences and so forth. This city starting to turn into a brick hell will no longer be able to breath! What is more, this split city with the wealthy in the centre and poor at the peripheries, will no longer be safe and secure. Organized and mobilized under the banner of Urban Movements against all these violations, we henceforth claim our Right to the City, that is, our right to construct and transform the city according to our own desires and needs.”

The protest was held at the Gezi Park where at that moment trees were cut down. After some visits and discussions in neighbourhoods, an open platform was set in Taksim Gezi Park where all the red crossed trees are planned to be cut for the shopping mall project. Even though many neighbourhood activists met with each other, get motivation and stated their words, it was a protest of not more than two hundred people with the participation of the same people. In this respect, it is necessary to evaluate comparatively this campaign and protest in Gezi Park with the Gezi Park Uprising in June 2013. Yves Cabannes and Cesare Ottolini (from IAI) organized a meeting/seminar for neighbourhood activists and urban activists, intellectuals. While giving different examples like BA Villa 31 which used strategically both legal ways and resistance, they underlined the importance of early warning/alert system for zero eviction. The removal against the will is the violation of the international law. For the example of El Astor, Cabannes said that the resistance against the eviction could be by negotiation (which could end in relocation which is not a solution), by legal cases and occupation, resistance and live. For Ottolini, the campaigning could be pursued both locally and internationally; however, a national movement for housing is important. Cabannes explains evictions with global cities (mega projects, mega events), city of the fluxes/spaces, profit on land and weak security of tenure (housing is an obstacle, cleaning) and ideological reasons (cleaning up the city selectively). The examples in the

world show institutionalized violence so forms of resistances could be public protests/direct confrontations, legal avenues and negotiations while resisting for in situ relocation. The reasons why it's worth of resisting are firstly the wide gain which did not remain only as the land or housing. To resist for stronger community and education, health, for remaining in place, avoiding evictions, for changing in legal framework, the image of the community, the policies, legal framework, paradigms to address evictions and protesting with proposals (with the slogan "occupy, resist, live"). The importance of neighbourhoods must be underlined. Cabannes gave strategies from Latin American examples. These strategies have both local and global dimensions: Internal unity with solid organizations even though there are differences, federations of villas (neighbourhoods) with support of different feminist, environmental as well as syndicalist groups, networks for international solidarity but with strong organizations and federations. Change in legal framework could be prepared and proposed by neighbourhood dwellers by resisting. These examples also show the importance of inter alliance between neighbourhoods and even though they are some leaders, they must react non-hierarchically. They underlined that the solidarity must be formed firstly locally but then internationally, by proposing something instead of evictions. So according to the differences between neighbourhoods, resistances and organizations could be different, non-hierarchical by appropriating and defending the city.

In March 2013, with the initiation of the activists from Urban Movements, an international meeting about housing/sheltering right became for neighbourhoods another occasion to discuss, to work together and to form a linkage between Urban Movements and neighbourhood association. However, this led to the question of representativeness for neighbourhoods, which became apparent in terms of division of labour in the organization. It is true that always organizing a protest bring people together. If we return to

the content of the meeting, the responsible people from United Nations Miloon Kothari and Bahram Ghazi came to visit and talk with neighbourhoods not only in Istanbul but also Ankara. A performance and protest before the talk were accomplished, which gave neighbourhood dwellers¹³⁸ the opportunity to talk outside the Chamber of Architects in Karaköy. The banner which is used at that day, the 31st of March, was at the Emek Movie Theatre protest and occupation at the same date and later used in the Gezi Park. That day, as mentioned, was the protest day of the demolition/so-called renovation of Emek Movie Theatre. Neighbourhood dwellers who participated in this meeting had gone there spontaneously after that the talk was finished. However, due to the “unorganized” organization, there were some discussions and grey areas for the type of protest. This period was also critical and intense for the Taksim Solidarity. Another key point was about the engagement of different journalists in the urban struggle, not only for information and news seeking. Çiğdem underlines that this is a condition of imprisonment and mortgage. This is a struggle of life because of the urban regeneration over legislations. All the neighborhood associations stated that they have experienced the importance of organization. There was an emphasis on the changes after the formation/emergence of associations. The new regulations created splits in the buildings/apartment houses. Their perceptions are that where there is resistance, there is a notice of “risky area”. This is a transformation/conversion of property by TOKİ, which is a supra-national structure. Another important idea was that the togetherness must not be only all over the country but internationally. I must add that by returning to my

¹³⁸ The neighbourhoods and associations were namely: Ümraniye 1 Mayıs Mahallesi, Esenyurt, Tozkoparan, Küçük Çekmece Kanarya, Küçük Çekmece İç-Dış Kumsal, Sultangazi Cumhuriyet, Validebağ, Beyoğlu Dernekler Platformu, Ataşehir, Fener-Balat, Tarlabası, Okmeydanı, Sarıyer Barınma Bürosu, Mayısta Yaşam, Gazi Osmanpaşa Sarıgöl, Gaziosmanpaşa Pazariçi, Kasımpaşa Bedrettin, Çiftehavuzlar, Sarıyer Dernekler Platformu (as an observer), Halk Evleri Sheltering Commission.

main questions, the togetherness was the main and common wish shared by different neighborhood associations. Not only that day but all over the process, many people from different countries came, visited, and gave many speeches. However, these people, experts, activists, or intellectuals underlined that they could do nothing, or give a receipt, but only the neighbourhood dwellers could do by themselves, firstly by organizing. These people could only support them and propose different solidarity possibilities for instance to support another resistance like that of workers as Gülsuyu-Gülensu did for Tekel resistance. The struggles are global so the alliances must be formed globally. Another idea was that we must appropriate the parks (before the Gezi Resistance) as the common users. They underlined that it is necessary to be aware of the similar processes of the struggles in neighbourhoods. The inhabitants are people who have only their labour force. If neighbourhoods do not support others, UN or professional chambers could not be a remedy. It is true that there could be different characteristics of neighbourhoods; however, they are all similar with those who struggle in rural areas. They have all the right to struggle.

Even though there are differences, fragmentations and conflicts, it is necessary to underline is that *local resistances have the main importance and priority for the activists*. Without overemphasizing or considering as an aim, international intellectuals and their initiatives and organised campaigns could supply different types of support including institutional support, and exchange of experiences. International students' workshops-even though it is sometimes interpreted as a tourism- sometimes initiated by urban activists having international connections, exhibitions, biennials, workshops had mainly positive impacts in neighbourhoods. Some neighbourhoods, because of the intellectuals living in these neighbourhoods, or the characteristics (like historical neighbourhoods) are included much more easily into these networks. International meetings led to mobilizations, sharing experiences

and gaining new ones with the involvement of new actors in the local. Other impacts could be cited as motivation, feeling to be heard, to learn to do something together, to be informed about other neighbourhoods and the world. As it is stated in the part about literature on forums, apart from the campaigns which are initiated by local and international actors in Istanbul - The World Zero Eviction Days which would planned to be in October-, even though there was an invitation for The Urban Social Forum by the International Alliance of Inhabitants like in Naples, September 2012, nobody from Urban Movements as well as from neighbourhood association could participate. This could be related to what is discussed by Leontidou and Souza in the part on Social Forums. *The “local” with/ vs. “global”* is one of the main issues of discussion. What was discussed mostly is that these could emerge “urban movements” if all dwellers support and involved in even for other issues not directly concerning their neighborhood. In the pretext of being “artificial”, a protest is not organized. During ESF, the meetings about city were on the right of housing and zero eviction and right to the city and urban social movements. These two are in a sense meet in the last session, assembly of the urban struggles. These alliances are still in the process of formation within ongoing forms of struggle and resistance to processes of urban restructuring in Istanbul, with forums, meetings or demonstrations in the streets. The thesis questioned whether there will be an alliance between groups of residents and non-residents intellectuals; according to activists’ point of views, there will be strategic alliances; because of differences of political approaches, the characteristic of aims, the characteristics of social change and differences in ways of resistances. The thesis aims to another possibility not the impossibility for urban space. The common march of urban activists together, was including international groups like No-Vox, Reclaiming Spaces, and the Alliance of Inhabitants in the general march at the end of the Forum. The main problematic was proposed as the tension between negotiation and street struggle in the Forum

before the ESF and in other meetings, which reflects some differences between the groups from Sulukule times. Some petitions for evictions in France and in South Africa –whose activists were present in ESF–, are sent via internet. The last meetings are much more concentrated on seminar workshops for “constructing ourselves”, “being together” –instead of “artificial protest”–and the Third Bridge.

GÜLDAM, Gülsuyu Gülsuyu Life and Solidarity Centre, as a “new” type of neighbourhood association is opened after that period, in 28 May, 2011, in a neighbourhood namely Gülsuyu-Gülsuyu having a historically leftist heritage is one that experienced all types of struggle from the beginning of urban regeneration project and having connections with international actors and groups. It’s aimed to gather all the neighbourhood dwellers, associations from different political views, ethnicities and types as an upper platform for urban issues. Since the association was a need because of the old association’s changing characteristic as a radical leftist organization, hindering in a sense the voice and the decision of all of dwellers in the neighbourhood. They started with the slogan: “We’ll appropriate our own living spaces”, to be a real grassroots organization, emerged from neighbourhood, locality aiming to cover general issues. Their another pioneering characteristic which is relevant with the subject is that one association used for the first time “the right to the city” as principle in their rules, differentiating themselves and their claims from other radical non-representative groups. In their journal, they’ve made reference to David Harvey and they made a quotation from him, referring to the right to the city to define their attempt to gather all the people in the neighbourhoods, representing grassroots and their claim starting from urban to struggle in solidarity in the neighbourhoods, gathering every ordinary people, ethnic and religious leaders, associations, head of the neighbourhoods, ateliers/intellectuals outside the neighbourhood. What is critical is that they have been a part of the International Alliance of Inhabitants. *After the ESF*,

the right to the city is elaborated in discussions with attempts of using both discursively and strategically to form alliances but more exactly walking together on a way of debate of different ideas and practices of resistance, exchange of information and experiences. The right to the city was one of the main controversial concepts in the meetings in the pretext of being far from concrete demands and issues and at the end, accepting usefulness and importance of the concept; it's decided to take a distance. However, for actors, the right to the city carries an importance covering all the claims related from urban to broader issues in time. Especially in academic levels and writings, it is also seen as the main opening for an "allied" struggle and an appropriate claim from the authorities as well. This concept also challenges the "right of sheltering" which is criticized mainly to defend right of property, in other words, exchange value of housing and urban land. The right to the city is discussed within the struggle "theoretically" and it will have a definition within the struggle practically. Even though the Social Forum could not change or could not create a permanent alliance, it leads to raise public consciousness and an alliance and discussion milieu for different groups and activists in the urban struggle in Istanbul. Groups were represented individually and some of them were absent. However, general two urban sessions-one of them including Reclaiming Spaces and No-Vox were really comprehensive and created a great discussion milieu. Even though in terms of urban movements, there was a divided picture like the complained picture of the forum, the ESF created a possibility of meeting and of a discussion milieu.

International networks and organizations contributed in the dynamics of alliances, discussions as well as formations of new local neighbourhood associations. However, stuckness and stagnancy in terms of accomplishing some decisions and objectives which are common for a long period of time and insistence on controversial themes resulted in splits and detachments of some actors. *About the reasons why international support is determining*

turning moments of urban oppositions in Istanbul, Çiğdem argued: “The international support is not only for the success, it is important...people in the world discuss historical disappearance must be known and discussed. ...the process in Turkey is important for the world. ...we are sharing the same world. ...like I wish to appropriate a worker in China, someone in the world will appropriate another one whose house is demolished. ...the problems and deprivations must be internationalized.” For Deniz Özgür, *the priority of groups and mobilisation must not be international groups*: “it is important to form strategically a common struggle with international groups. However, our priority is not these groups. We have to describe our inner relations and question the necessity of “partnerships”. Since some political priorities could be lost like “self-management””. Kumru from the experience of Sulukule and about *intervention of UN vis-à-vis independence and interdependence* stated: “We saw in Sulukule that international support was very important. Due to its character as a historical side, the ultimatums and ideas of UNESCO were important. It did not work but there are some regulations that bind us. There are legislations and acts. These acts are international so they have some enforcement on us. Consequently they have positions to threat. However, some works which are related to money and funding. DA and Bir Umut attach importance to institutions that funding come from. For instance, we don’t choose UN. We don’t want their support. It is obvious what they are doing. ..I have to look at the past of this support firstly. Later how I could explain (their works in abroad) this to the locality. There is no meaning of this support. It is not reliable and sincere. We question this. I believe that it is necessary to question the intention. For me, for the struggle in the local, there must not anything related to money. It is valid for us and also for abroad. For instance, the monetary support for an association. Money could be a means to facilitate but why UN sends us money? They could remind the own responsibility of government to act according to the acts that we are belonging to. This would be enough. For

instance the wish of Harvey to come to neighbourhoods was very important but this did not happen so since he could not even say one word with neighbourhood inhabitants. If they come and visit a neighbourhood will be a gecekondü tourism, which we are criticizing. There is no meaning if they don't let him talk with dwellers. *These groups could be important to convey the voice, to raise the voice and to make apparent but it is important who these persons are. This is valid for groups who came for the workshops.*"

Cihan underlined: "IAI initiated an alarm system, which I find very important...The international linkages are important especially in terms of sharing experiences. If you google the right to the city, you will see many articles and struggles. We have to form a translation group to convey the message and information throughout neighbourhoods. We tried to do this in İMECE but it is a very hard process. It is necessary to feed them academically. For instance Yves and Cesare came and explained the struggles. People stated that they are the only ones who live this. It opens new horizons. It goes outside of neighbourhoods. If it will go beyond the shelter to the city, it will be like that. You transform this from housing to the city."

About international support and effects in Turkey, Yaşar argued: "It is true that support and relations are important. Since what is going on is not peculiar to Turkey. These are reflections of globalization of capital in space. I am a person who is involved in struggles in other countries. I am aware of the fact that they have commonalities. But I do not think that is meaningful to form the whole struggle on international support. However, they do not care about control mechanisms. It has effects on human rights and environment struggles. *But in Turkey, this does not work. We could be in the news or part of agendas and reports. It is important to be together and feed each other. However, it is not essential.* On the other hand, we think that all we live is only in Istanbul. Nobody in the world live this. ...We have to

overcome this blindness. We have to see what is going on in the world.” Hatice underlined the exaggerated role of international groups: “International support must be done since it is lived everywhere. But we have to not to exaggerate. If we think like in the neighbourhood Turkey as a local, what will be done will be done here. There could give some examples to see what is going in other parts of the world, to compare and to analyse. It is important that struggles support each other, it gives motivation. Even though they do not conform to each other, the models could be compared with each other. It is important not to something based on abroad. *It is important to carry on our own struggles.*”

It is necessary to be aware of the *distance between locality and international groups*. Arif argued: “Time to time, neighbourhoods could serve of international support and linkages. However, we must be aware of two following points: It is necessary not to allow that supporting groups dictate, enforce something and orient movement to some ways. If the supportive institution does not give a guarantee about that, it is necessary to give up taking this support. Secondly, what is crucial is the support of people and components if we compare with neighbourhood and urban opposition. To ensure or not to lose this, one of the main principles is “transparency” mainly on the characteristic and use of international support.

Deniz Özgür referring to *incoherence and fear of intellectuals in mobilisation and its relation to support from intellectuals from abroad*: “Intellectuals, academic-activists from outside could not show the spark and idea from that people mobilise...They do not aim to produce an alternative and they do not use academic knowledge to oppose...They could not even appropriate their own university buildings...I could not accept this approach to be objective. If it is not, I can assume that they use of poor people to produce knowledge. You use the presence of ignore people’s existence...They could not play their role in urban opposition. Or they have

little information about organisation. For this reason, international issues gain importance.” For him, *the protest and campaigns where people came together are organised due to their visits*: “However, the solidarity is limited and symbolic. It does not have meaning. For instance when Yves Cabannes came and we went there for not breaking heart of our friend.” Referring to the protest, Deniz stated: “The protest in the Gezi Park was not *meaningful. It seems to be organised or it could be a motive but it became a photo* that Yves Cabannes showed this in other places that they had organised a protest and there is an international support. They will use this. We have some actors in the international organisation. They have good intentions. *But it is a photograph*. It could not pass beyond this. It must not be a departure point. It seems to be international but even though some groups came together, they are not meaningful. They don’t have any permanency and could not create mobilisation.” Deniz Özgür referred to *new and meaningful forms of internationalism*: “However, we must think about new forms of internationalism, like we saw in Greece and Arab Spring, people support from where they are and raising their support and make references to their resistances. It is the real internationalism. International support does not mean to go to some places but to support from the locality where people are. We have to mobilise from where we are. We are organising meeting to do this, for IAI. We have to discuss Social Forums too. We could participate without being enforced or not attributing any meaning of organisation. They would not go beyond being some protests. In the meetings, I do not agree with the idea that there are some urban experts to transfer information. *I do attach importance to people who struggle for instance from Africa and came to explain us. I do believe that to be in the streets to have some photos and to make an effort for this, it is totally a loss of energy*. We could do some more easy works, video screening,...to show photos and explain...There are some few people from

neighbourhoods and even these people did not come. These are used as tools but they became objectives.”

About *reciprocal learning* activity, İmre Azem argued: “I think international support will be more and more important. If we struggle/criticize (against) the system, the system exists everywhere. I think we have something for sure something to learn from the struggles from there. They have something to learn from us too. The solidarity starts with this knowledge sharing. If people do not see the benefit of this in short term, in the long term, I think it is important for the struggle.” For international support, Erdoğan put in the other way, *the support and inspiration that we will create*: “If we compare with other countries, we have a potential in our cities. If we could form an allied urban opposition, there would be a source of inspiration for our comrades in all over the world....for instance for IAI in Italy. I do not think that they will add something to us. We have a more developed form of opposition. Istanbul could think more internationally.”

It is necessary to think about *before and after the protests and campaigning as a long run process*. Different people having different political and social backgrounds and activism experience came together on urban issues. Most of the activists stated here broadened their opposition from their housing right to other peoples’ rights and even environmental issues which were considered related to middle classes and intellectual milieus. I would like to emphasize the importance of the mainly local actors in these urban oppositions in campaigns which are organized mainly with the help of local actors and networks/groups. It has resulted in alliances with new local formations such as a newly formed neighbourhood association, involvement, and recruitment of new actors. Despite of the fact that the oppositional groups -mainly the actors- have different values and forms of action and organizing, the actors who are involved had become together via

new campaigns. It is necessary to remind the roles of technology and key actors, intellectuals from and outside the neighbourhoods in these personal, organizational and technological networks, who are active across borders against the global urban competition (for new forms of urban development projects) with internationally/nationally targeted campaigns. These linkages could be evaluated as horizons and opportunities practically and conceptually with the use of right to the city concept. International linkages do play important binding roles in terms of sharing experiences reforming of urban resistances even though these are dependent on fragile and changing to one actor/association to other relations. I would like to assert that international urban resistance groups and actors, who have formed solidarities with international groups, create important —political moments for some neighbourhoods especially for Sulukule, the Roman neighbourhood that had been demolished as well as for new local oppositions and alliances. It has played inspirational and later on, binding roles for the urban resistances in Istanbul. Sulukule firstly initiated also an international support and as well as national/local organizations, as a turning point for urban activists' own struggle experiences as well as for groups for their later alliances.

Ultimately, if the priority is made on international campaigns and visits rather than the process and local contribution, this does not meet with its aims and even obstruct its positive effects. It is true that the campaigning before the organised event created a togetherness which continue in some sense and level after. Moreover, it gives the feeling to raise the voice and a motivation to continue. However, the protests could be considered as artificial and even waste of energy. As it is quoted above, it became a “photograph” of “togetherness” and support. It is a reciprocal process to be informed but also to inform and influence international audience(s) via these connections and contacts with intellectuals and groups. Some

neighbourhoods attract attention more than the others supported by false interpretations. In institutional terms, the emphasis of activists is independence of urban opposition (groups in Istanbul) that must be preserved. On the other hand, the effect of international pressure groups is so weak in Turkey due to its political mechanisms. The expectations of inhabitants could be high, which results in disappointment after their visits. However, people from abroad underline that they could only inform them and be informed to write reports and it is up to inhabitants to be self-organised to create changes. The role of international groups and effects must not also be exaggerated by organising groups, which results in different fragmentations illustrated above. Here, new forms of support and internationalism from where the activists are and are doing. It is necessary to add that Urban Movements created a sense that almost all over the world there are these projects and evictions and inhabitants of the city must support by writing, signing letters.

5.3. Activists Speak on “Urban Movements” (Kent Hareketleri): Success, Failure or a Real Necessity

There are different realities and priorities for every group which could be to defend houses and the related rights and/or to struggle “in an ideal and appropriate” position could lead to a new world. These realities could necessitate or lead to some negotiations. Differences in ways varying between *direct intervention*, supporting in distance, orienting, auto-organization of neighbourhoods/negotiations lead to some discussions and obstacles against coalitions and more exactly urban oppositions. The meaning of support could change in time for one group. Moreover, the actors could give different information and use their various abilities. In the meetings, the main issue is that the groups underline that the problems which are lived are quite normal since they have from the beginning

different approaches, different political views, and so different ways of protest -for instance barricade or alternative plans or reactivity or proactivity-, different affiliations. However, for some groups, there is not any “political stance” –against the system- and difference between these different groups fighting for the same issues.

Çiğdem made a remark: “We are sharing the same problem, being in connection for sharing information for instance Tarlabası and Yalı neighbourhoods. However, I had a big mission being in Urban Movements and being in its directing committee. I am trying to go where there is a need for help. I feel responsible for this. Kanarya, Kartal, Avcılar, Okmeydanı, not selecting any neighborhood. We go there and then send people who could go there. Lawyers so people who could be useful and who needs, we bring together. To provide coordination.” For Çiğdem, *urban struggles have another meaning nowadays; it is a struggle against the system*. She argued: “*The city is where anti-capitalist struggle arises*. The urban opposition must cover all the sides, local and general must be together. The local, neighbourhood associations and dwellers and as well as the right to the city and preservation of the public spaces such as Haydarpaşa and Taksim and other urban disappearance of urban values. Haydarpaşa is a struggle field by itself. Emek and Beyoğlu, the Platform against the Third Bridge are struggles by themselves. All these struggles which are specialized on the issues and neighbourhoods in the local which are together could be successful. For this reason, we have formed Urban Movements which aims the togetherness between all these oppositions. We are in this process and hope we will be more successful. Urban opposition must not aim to one area. To save Emek or Haydarpaşa or to oppose against the privatization of the schools do not mean to save Istanbul and are not sufficient by themselves. We have to accept this as an ideological attack and a problem of the system and the urban struggle has to have a total approach. It has to have an ideological stance too. Not one by one project, but they must oppose

against neoliberal urban politics and the mentality which produce and aimed capital accumulation, so they must oppose against the forces which do regulations.”

About the aim of Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements), Ömer stated: “We are forming by ourselves the groups which struggle. We are trying to do something with neighbourhood associations and deprived people...In order not to develop struggle ways, statements, activities, internet, letters, and protests in order not to be non-legal and in the framework of legal entity. It is necessary to question in time and change tactics according to conditions...Urban Movements, and neighbourhood associations feel at some point fear. The practice passes from struggles of neighbourhood associations by being together. There is a mosaic forming due to the fact that various groups form an alliance. It is an important variety. All the groups, parties and trade unions must support. The struggle is a totality. All of the groups, members of trade unions, everybody will be affected. When there would be a meeting related to city, people who are in the kitchen must organise...Neighborhood associations must be locomotive...You have your own formation aims and way of struggle. You can only support these struggles. Urban Movements is a support to neighbourhood from outside...My conscious also has been changed in time. Before, green and water areas were not my concerns. Academicians and intellectuals do play important roles...It is an advantage to meet people who have knowledge... I could not know urban regeneration better than an engineer. They know the legislation, they know my rights better. If they point out some points by foreseeing, I can know. These people, doctorate students, various institutions and people with an oppositional stance are very important. Their contributions are very important to cry our voice, to oppose in a country where social rights, basic human rights are ignored, where people do not believe in law. International institutions are important in this respect. We tried to force this not as a neighbourhood but via Urban Movements like we

did in 2010 the European Social Forum. Due to this occasion, people came to visit us engaged inhabitants' interests. They had spent a whole day together and watched film.”

Kumru reminded the forming principles of Kent Hareketleri: “When we were forming Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements) together, we were recognising that groups which oppose in the city ... have political views appropriated, with their own methods. Why don't they gather under a big roof to be effective and to reduce the labour/responsibility in the struggle process? They must not enforce their own methods. These approaches are consistent in themselves but they don't have to dominate. But we could not have achieved this. The problem became the main impasse in the left movement in Turkey. ... We have lived a separation. We could not be together. We remained as a point to criticize each other when the day comes. *We broke our hearts and it did not get better.* I could not get over hurts, unfair accusations, and misguidance from critiques coming from Urban Movements (Kent Hareketleri) and other urban movements. Nobody did not knock on my door, neither my group. I don't believe that I broke somebody's heart. Intentionally and willingly. *We could do unintentionally. Nobody stated us that we broke their hearts so we did not ask the reasons why. We stated our feelings (hurts) many times.* Other people's hurts could be only that we left them alone and they mentioned many times this. However, this hurt is not simple as theirs. These were aspersions, we all witnessed this. Some people in our group are targeted. We all are walking together this way together. It was unfair to target these people. We could not over these hurts and for this reason we could not move together. We have very busy days and have other responsibilities in their fields. There is a meeting of Urban Movements (Kent Hareketleri) at the same date (same day) in neighbourhood, because in every meeting of Urban Movements, there was no result. I emphasize again that it is necessary. If we will do

something, we have to do together. Now people from neighbourhoods have started to come together.” And Kumru added: “Before, the nucleus of Urban Movements must go to the neighbourhoods. If they don’t go there, it could not be expected that they come to these meetings. Any group and neighbourhood association whose door is not knocked would rely on their intentions. It is necessary to go there/them firstly and for this reason, we do this. We don’t expect them to come. We go next to them. We have a place in Taksim. Our time and dates of meetings are determined. We could have waited for them and opened our door. People could come. People who come could come and go back. We did not do this. We went to their place, if they did come to our place, we stated: yes we could meet here this time, but next time, we’ll go to your place. It is “locality”, “being at that place, “to touch the locality”. If we would like to form a local struggle, we have to do this at the local place. You have to support from neighbourhoods. You could not do this from a meeting room in Taksim. Everybody could not afford to come to Taksim. We think about this too. Think about ten people coming to Taksim. It’s a cost. They are coming from their work. They have their houses, wives and children. Nobody has the luxury to come next to us. If we are struggling for them, we have to go next to them. We are struggling for them, “come next to me!”. It could not be like this. We have to be aware of these sensibilities. The mistakes come also from this point. If there is no touch with a neighbourhood and if you go there for some reasons, you can lose reliability and sincerity. The mistakes come from the points too. We have to take lessons from these mistakes and take motivation to start over from zero. We have to start over. Still it is not late. I can give support from my part if this happens. What I heard in the meeting that I participated are the things that I beware of. There is no rationality to be there personally or as DA. If you realize that if DA participates, it does not take the floor. Only if there is addressed to it, it uses the right to reply and replies to this point. Anytime it does not say that we could do this and that. He/she goes there as

an observer but not in the sense that what is going there, he/she goes there as a participant observer, it situates itself accordingly since returned and share with the group. If it is necessary to do something, it does. Of there is criticism and it does not correspond to our method, there is nothing as mutual enforcement of method. The sensibilities inner groups are also important. If we come together there and forget about the locality, we can close off and leave all. We must not knock neighbourhoods' doors for a signature of a text and ask support for a protest, we do mistake. If it is possible, these neighbourhoods must not come to these. If there are knocking on their door for this reason. If something is being done only for this reason, pursuing a struggle without their advice is meaningless. So there would be a focus on what we would like to do."Yaşar emphasized: "It is a process. We must not abstract what is going on in the city from other struggle areas. Urban Movements has a possibility to assemble, to gather. We could see in the examples all over the world, which groups came together."

Hatice stated: "I find Urban Movements positive. All local people know each other and transfer experiences. These are important. For this reason, it became so important. New neighbourhoods are coming, and they are active. What we were trying to do by running between neighbourhoods, now, it's happening without us." But she remarked: "Togetherness must not be something enforced. Not related to Urban Movements but generally in the left. Being powerful and standing together are important; however, there could be some conditions that you could not be together due to political line and ways of working. So it is not necessary to work together. We think there is but it is a hollow thing. You realize that this does not exist. So it enforces the struggle. We do not have to enforce. We discuss a lot about togetherness and standing together. And we are still discussing. We always that we have to be together on the actions/protests. They don't have to work together every time. About an issue for instance. To gain a discipline to work

together and to know each other. Later on to be together. It is necessary not to hurry up so these are fragile relations –in the left-. It could melt into air. I don't agree with being together in a big platform and solve our problems. It is a centralist idea. If you have a power, ok, you could be perhaps centralist. We don't. I don't think that it is democratic. There are different ways of working, different principles, ideas and ways of organizations, of groups, parties and politics. To centralize all these is false and we don't know each other yet. We have a serious way then it could happen something. The platforms could be very effective in some cases. We have to remember that these are platforms organized around some issues. To focus and to solve these issues are important and in the colloquium we criticized all these platforms with a general evaluation, there are so many platforms but there are the same groups in all these ones. It is a huge power division. Every day, same people go to some meetings and discuss different issues. It is so problematic condition. What we could do. We have to think to see it as a problem.”

Deniz Özgür, active in the meeting of Urban Movements from the very beginning argued: “The focus of urban regeneration was mainly neighbourhoods which are weak or ignored. For this reason, Urban Movements is on our focus of critique since the *group became focused on public space and city centre. The protests and meetings were being held in the city centre, which do not have an effect on neighbourhoods. We could not carry anything from the city centre to neighbourhoods. However groups which have gains from the city centre, will have effects in neighbourhoods.* They are always in the city centre and must return to their neighbourhoods. We had talked this with some actors from neighbourhoods. Some actors returned to neighbourhoods. It is not related to work from neighbourhoods is easy. Since neighbourhoods are complicated.” In this respect, we could ask *whether or not it is a division of missions/roles between groups or we have to limit urban struggle and “city centre” only for neighbourhoods.*

Cihan refers to the future function and meaning of Kent Hareketleri: “I do not think that we must not insist on the same banner in the 1st of May protest. When we will kill Kent Hareketleri, I will say that the right to the city won. Our concern here is not that everyone will be under our platform. Our concern is to provide togetherness based on the principle of the right to shelter and to city. If we accomplish this, I do not think that we must be in front. We will only be the catalyser by giving support. We could organise alternative symposiums to that of universities which support these projects. Other people will continue to do after us. We must form the agenda and leave. It is not to put another flag in the urban opposition. I do not insist on it. However, Kent Hareketleri could be an organizer, to call the press. It could be an institution and observation institution. All the groups could come and work there. There could be archives, theses, journals to give information. It could be alike a step further. However, this is not a direct togetherness. What is important is to organize at the neighbourhood. There will be massive demolitions, so they must be together against. The government must go a step back with the resistance.”

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUDING REMARKS ABOUT POSSIBLE IMPOSSIBILITIES: TOWARDS NEW URBAN COMMONS BEYOND ISTANBUL

Utopia today is the possible of tomorrow (Lefebvre 2009 in Brenner and Elden (Eds.), 39).

We can see the potential for many rebellions here, both large and small; but not just rebellions in the city, but also against the city...struggles which are subversive and oppositional, but also transformative and prefigurative of possible, as yet unknown, urban worlds. (Chatterton 2010b, 628).

This production of space is determined by instrumental rationality and commodification as the abstract space (Lefebvre 1991, 2000) of homogeneity (Lefebvre 1991, Lefebvre 2000, 48), fragmentation (Lefebvre 2000, 48, 188) and hierarchization (Lefebvre 2000, 48) via urban regeneration projects. It is so hard to finish my (more-than-a) research due to many reasons. In the “unfinished story of the right to the city” (Chatterton 2010a, 235), “it is just the beginning, the struggle continues.”

It was the most important period of time for me, that I learnt a lot personally and academically. I believe that my findings as an insider will challenge general representations of urban resistances and pave a horizon in

theoretical and practical terms to change the world without taking power as Holloway (2002) argued.

6.1. Concluding Notes and Arguments

Being a participatory and solidarity action research about urban social activism, the study aims to expose reasons, ways, and strategies of urban oppositions from and outside neighbourhoods in Istanbul in the framework of their “urban commoning attempts” to illustrate the commonalities, as well as tactics and new ideas for the effectiveness of the urban opposition. The study has rejected the externalization of the “real” subjects and their thoughts, and emotions which represent one of the main obstacles against a better analysis of social movement research. The study conceptualized urban oppositions from but beyond space by discussing the different and common reasons behind, the main agents of these oppositions, roles of grassroots by analysing related problems and potentialities. The study underlined the necessity for a comprehensive elaboration, which is particular from fragmentary and neighbourhood based studies. The thesis is based upon the idea that the resistance is a geographical activity, from local to global, of resistant subjects in affinity group who is taking action and resist as Chatterton and Heynen argued. On the other hand, the research underlines the spatial trap (see Purcell 2006, Routledge 2010) and limitations of urban resistance for theoretical and practical reasons. As Purcell (2006) underlined, the locality does not mean directly a real democratization; we must evaluate local-national and global in inner relations and totality. The study holds the right to the city as a radical claim and process for transformed and renewed right to urban life, a collective right to be seized as stated by Harvey (2008, 2013) for another production of urban space, but also a self-determination process as asserted by Lefebvre (1972). The study as a reply to on-going discussions about old and new social movements and the city and in terms of not only theoretical but also

methodological reasons, proposes new conceptualizations by getting different theories from urban sociology, urban geography -more exactly radical and for the first time autonomous geographies in Turkey-, social movements and urban social movements together. To exemplify, the study will be one of the first examples which uses “urban commons” in Turkey. The thesis investigates whether or not there are any urban movements in Istanbul, while asking whether or not there is any possibility of claiming urban commons of different activists, by discussing the possibility of expanding reactionary oppositions merely against urban regeneration.

“Autogestion” is proposed as the contrary of a tamed and hollowed participation. For instance, in Turkey, in terms of political claims, autogestion is considered as (partial-) independence which is discussed in the context of Kurdish separatism from the nation-state. However, in the thesis, it would be elaborated as a critique of the so-called participation, which necessitates the active inhabitants. Until the 2000s, the mainstream approach was to elaborate “civil society’s and middle-classes” appropriation of the city based on “love and responsibility for their city” as “urban movements”/associations with the following concepts such as “identity of the city dweller”, “responsibility of the citizen”, “democratic” protest characteristic, “quality of life” of middle classes while gecekondu people/resistances are stigmatized as “criminal”, “deviant”, “violent”. On the other hand, there were some studies which elaborate gecekondu and their resistances by romanticizing under the influence of old resistances in 1970s, talking instead of the residents, homogenizing all the neighbourhoods and their dwellers, defining ordinary grassroots as “political”, “revolutionary” in “unified”, “homogeneous” resistances in working class neighbourhoods. This was resulting in a mystification of urban resistances as labour movement of “revolutionary heroes”. They fail to explain the dynamics of urban resistances in Istanbul, are composed of various actors, mainly activists in attempts to form new platforms,

neighbourhood association in a non-hierarchical, horizontal and flexibly organized way.

It is required to reconsider the complexity and the articulation of heterogeneous groups and urban actors. In this respect, I make a contribution by mentioning changing according to classes and different groups and various emotions and affect¹³⁹ within personal, professional and political networks. As Clough (2012, 1668) stated, this plays an important role for organizing as he conceptualized for anarchist groups, as “affective structure of anarchist organizing”. However, in general, it does not work as it is in anarchist imaginary, a mode of connecting affective emotions to movement effectiveness. This remains as an obstacle or formation of organization with some people but not with others, apart from involvement in the opposition and support the others’. For Clough (2012), to preserve affinity and organizational capacity by developing new cultural practices, this could be used as a “substantive model for pushing back the control of the state”. Embodied and emotional geographies thus micro-scale of bodies, perceptions and feelings are important to comprehend larger political praxis according to Clough (2012, 1670).

By not overemphasizing, the study confirms the significance of some pioneering intellectuals from different political views, technical and intellectual languages and social classes. The research exposes the role of

¹³⁹For Clough (2012, 1669), emotion refers to consciously experience and feelings such as love, fear, exhilaration and affect coming together by increasing their capacity to act through interconnection, strength of collective action. This is much more important in a milieu where emotions and affect are manipulated by state, capital, and other systems of power. In this respect, he refers to a concept that I had explained in the thesis, to Routledge’s “convergence spaces” as spaces where activists meet and build connections horizontally across and within movements.

As elaborated in the thesis, Clough (2012) reminds Chatterton who stated that social change depends on the creation of a space for emotional connections of empowerment including teaching activity in order to foster the emotions of feelings and defiance of young activists (1670-1671).

ordinary people and their relations vis-à-vis intellectuals and other actors. The study asks in this respect whose oppositions are by focusing on “ordinary people” and the “process of formation of urban commons” beyond and independent of existing political organization (Castells 1983). However, it is necessary to question this “non-political” characteristic. This is a formation of an (un)common ground (Chatterton 2006) by challenging “being activist” as well as leftist. The study challenges conventional explanations by revealing ignored aspects of the key concepts such as the right to the city. For instance, the right to the city became a political ideal, as a claim of different groups and people, who are excluded and segregated, for the self-realization and self-determination.

The research is aimed to be a self-reflexive process, while learning from the process of struggle, and resisting actors. As a reflexive and participatory/solidarity action research, the study does not speak for the subjects but explains what is experienced, learnt and said raised by people with my personal experience instead of “observations in a limited time”. One of the main motives behind this study was the interrogation of researcher’s position as the *authority* who produces knowledge about the marginalized other considered as the *object* and the challenge of the dichotomy between researcher and who is researched by including *researched as intellectual collaborators*. With an aim to be discussed and collectivized by the actors in urban oppositions, the study aims also to expose common reasons and similarities in ways of urban opposition(s).

There is a necessity for a comprehensive elaboration of urban oppositions in Istanbul and their objectives in terms of different forms of change that they aim, which is different from fragmentary and neighbourhood based ones. In this respect, in time, it is realized that in fact, activists and key people do play crucial roles mainly in forming these initiatives. Different people from different political and life approaches came together in, for Istanbul and

include new common people, which is I think the main potential and uniqueness of urban activism. This opposition, so —beyond the urban space creates another consciousness. As a social and lived entity, the space also refers to solidarity before and after the resistances, being appropriated by different people across classes and even creating new consciousnesses and language. It is necessary not to ignore differences within neighbourhoods and underline the importance of the actors who are mainly active. For active dwellers and intellectuals, there are two trends: Some of them, they had or still have political affiliations. However, in this respect, I must remark that the political affiliations and views are very diverse. On the other hand, many people, considered as “ordinary” have started to claim their rights to the city and involved in protests, campaigns for the first times. I would like to argue that the encountering with different people is the main success of urban opposition in Istanbul. This is where another political culture and togetherness engendered. The process is now on the way to enable information and so organization within neighbourhoods and later starting from the near locality of the neighbourhoods, to form new alliances of neighbourhood organizations with the most representative characteristic leading to global aspirations. *They, even though they are not aware of, challenged “traditional leftist” way of doing politics, including the distance between “ordinary people”.* It is necessary to be aware of the limitations of “urban activism”. Since when there is a focus on a neighbourhood, we could fall into the trap of considering the neighbourhood as one homogenous resistant group. However, even for neighbourhoods that have a political past, a core group of inhabitants is active. Even though there are many political groups in the neighbourhood, they do not include and even exclude “common people of neighbourhood.” There is a necessity of another conceptualization and practice in terms of rights, state and urban struggles which must target a radical democratization and change. Various groups which formed their politics on the exclusion of difference and the others

have started to open up at the locality and with other groups. Moreover, there were mainly in earlier times also tensions between neighbourhoods due to differences related to their characteristics (historical, gecekondü) and different experiences.

More than roughly being groups and associations, the actors and intellectuals and their affinity groups with emotional and solidarity relations must be elaborated in the framework of –changing- multiple agents of urban learning (McFarlane 2011b). They must also be questioned in terms of “real grassroots opposition”, organization and representation. In this respect organic intellectual figures play crucial roles in overcoming these impasses and they contribute in shaping the discourse, forming another language. It is necessary to recognize the *importance of the intellectuals* in both urban oppositions and their alignments. However, one of the main issues is the inclusion/exclusion, emotions (see Goodwin and Jasper 2009), and mutual expectations between groups, must be considered to understand the dynamics and to think about the effectiveness of urban oppositions. Few people which constituted the associations could change their “flexible” affiliations and leave their groups. On the other hand, new people could come and join them. Lived experiences and perceptions of the activists lead to sometimes tensions between affiliated groups. *One of the main cleavages emanates from tensions between groups of academicians, intellectuals, as well as with neighbourhood associations (like alternative planning considered as the negotiation and acceptance contradicting with resistance in the streets to resist against demolition).*

On the other hand, urban activism challenges traditional modes of organisation, recruitment and affiliation, in the form of multitude (Hardt and Negri 2009). The study considers urban oppositions as a continuous process of struggling, as well as mutual learning and self-organizing, self-management, including ordinary people. The study has an aim to display the

reinvention of oppositions (Souza 2010a), the importance and the potential of urban oppositions for urban issues characterised by non-hierarchical, decentralized, networked and horizontal forms of organizing and struggling and new types of grassroots neighborhood organizations. The emergence of new type of (self-) grassroots extra-institutional groups in an attempt of new ways of doing and being political as well as continuity and differences of already existing groups and relations must create new collectivities and urban commoning practices. As Lefebvre pointed out in the *Urban Revolution* (2003), the urban opposition is not a matter of “life style”, but of urban life. It is a continuous form or more exactly a process. The situation in Istanbul and in other parts of the world raises hopes about the possibilities for new types of non-hierarchical, horizontal ways of organizing social and political action, and for new relations between local and global types of struggle aiming at social change. As Pérouse (2011) notes, we will see to what extent these struggles will be a permanent social movement developed on a local base and having a meaning for public opinion, beyond being individual and reactionary. Even though the idea of forming new types of association with real representation at grassroots level, I can argue, there are some affinity groups of key actors who are learning to claim urban commons.

In terms of possibilities of extending meanings (with multitude affiliations and fluidity, see Gusfield 1994, identities in motion see Melucci 1995 and Calhoun 1994) and related oppositions (for example scaling-up from the exchange-value of the space to the meaning of home, staying put in the neighbourhood, as well as connecting the issue with other neighbourhoods, the city and the system), another question was about the sporadic and reactionary characteristic of urban oppositions to go beyond “Istanbul” as reactions to spatial interventions. Urban oppositions have a risk to stay fixed to local and spatial issues and to be an obstacle for a broader claim and political project. In time, activists began to question these characteristics

with spatial limitations in terms of their claims sometimes from public areas of the city to neighbourhoods and vice versa. People learn, criticize, discuss to find and collectively produce new horizons of their struggle. Many of people, even from neighbourhoods, were underlining that while the process being important, the struggle is a lifelong journey. Reclaiming and appropriating public space were mainly elaborated of “civil society consciousness”. In the process of struggling, public spaces as squares and historical and monumental spaces are appropriated as commons, which gather different people including who are struggling for the housing rights of themselves or other inhabitants. Apart from urban regeneration in the neighbourhoods affecting directly the houses and violating the basic right of sheltering, the enclosures of public spaces (squares, schools) and its services gathered many people including inhabitants of different neighbourhoods. The meaning and the limits of urban struggles are open to discussion mainly from the emphasis on urban space or elaboration as class struggle, with positioning vis-a-vis –policies of- state and the capitalist system.

Urban struggles must be defined from both-and-beyond old and new social movements. Most of the inhabitants in Kent Hareketleri in Istanbul are becoming active for public spaces in Istanbul and their housing right in the neighbourhoods where the projects tend to demolish houses and displace people. It is, especially for activists from these neighbourhoods a story of transition from the property value of houses return to their neighbourhoods and city: In struggle, they met other people and broadened their opposition from the property rights determined by the exchange value of space to right to shelter and dwelling (beyond housing) with an emphasis on the use-value of their house and meaning of the neighbourhood. Activists from outside neighbourhoods struggled to find ways both to struggle for neighbourhoods and city as a totality, not only public spaces but make neighbourhoods as urban commons. Activists-independent from neighbourhoods and

sometimes groups/determining the struggle- also claimed to manage their life; tried to find a common ground for environmental issues and other agendas of politically affiliated people, and other organisations. This period is the on-going process of commoning between different actors. Almost all of the groups and activists think that there is a necessity to concentrate on ecological issues. However, for different actors, ecological issues and struggles in rural areas are both inspirational and crucial for urban and togetherness of struggles, or more exactly for commoning. This refers to grassroots struggles and their self-organizations with a high level of representation of different classes and social groups beyond the fragmentations of the left and of localities support from outside as well as problems of doing and participating in politics with the importance of city as a field of different struggles. On the other hand, in practical and theoretical sense, the ecology remains as an idea which could not find its meaning such as low impact development. However, it is necessary to elaborate in the continuity and togetherness of the urban and rural and ecological struggles from the scholars of Bookchin, Souza, and Chatterton.

For some inhabitants, being from outside/inside the neighbourhoods does matter in terms of involvement degree. Moreover, there is a changing relationship between groups, actors from neighbourhoods and outside. While neighbourhoods expecting support and guidance for their oppositions, some of the actors prefer that especially neighbourhood resistance find their ways and organize self-sufficiently. On the other hand, there is a need and desire for the support from intellectuals and academicians outside the neighbourhoods. Urban oppositions groups and activists organize in a non-hierarchical way and form new grassroots associations, criticized existing ones and search for alternative solutions. The technical and academic positions and knowledge related social distance between actors from neighbourhoods and outside neighbourhoods is both reduced and increased while struggling. People and groups supporting from outside diverge in

terms of the characteristic of the support and their approach to the meaning of resistance. Even though groups outside the neighbourhoods could not come together and form coalitions –even strategically-, activists always underlined that the togetherness of local groups and activists is more than crucial but necessary. Differences in terms of political and strategic points of view (for instance alternative/advocacy planning versus struggle in the streets for Istanbul case) do matter. Neighbourhoods in general contacted and worked together with different groups and tried their methods. Some of them have chosen to be near to some and not the others. This is valid for groups outside the neighbourhoods. Even some groups started to act and mobilise with other groups that are formed by the same activists such as Solidarity Studio with Bir Umut, İMECE and Müştereklerimiz. Until the Gezi Park Uprising, there were always same people who take responsibilities and active in urban and other oppositions; they have a meeting every day.

They prefer to work in groups that they feel near socially and politically, so the weak opposition is always fragmented. Many people learn and experience politicization and action. Since urban opposition is a new and blurred area, people even affiliated with political groups could be creative or think and question movements and politics. However, what I would like to argue that neighbourhoods have worked and are supported by different groups of intellectuals, urban activists outside neighbourhoods: The common aspects, to walk and for them are some of their common characteristics. *In time, the difference between external and internal actors referring to neighbourhoods lost its meaning.* To illustrate: Some groups outside neighbourhoods act together with neighbourhood associations. For instance, Ayazma and Sarıyer Mahalle Dernekleri Platformu act together with Solidarity Studio and Bir Umut Association. *It is true that there are differences between being from and outside neighbourhoods. Rather than the general view about the fragmentation between groups outside and from*

neighbourhoods, I do argue, due to emotional, past experiences, as well as political splits, there are changing relations between “actors, activists outside the neighbourhoods act with people, activists from neighbourhoods”. The fragmentation matters in this respect: For instance, Sariyer neighbourhoods mobilize together with Solidarity Studio. We must revise the external-internal dichotomy from what is living.

Some dwellers were thinking that some academicians are excluding some leftist activists due to their “politics”. Critical professional or academic groups became both *initiating and hindering (f)actors* because of their fragmentations based on *differences and tensions*. They sometimes declare that they have their “own principles for urban issues,” “political approaches that they would not relinquish”, sometimes labelling and homogenising neighbourhood resistances as “working classes’ ” resistances or sometimes radicalizing and alienating them, by choosing/appropriating some of them so creating camps. Local activists from some neighbourhoods and in some moments consider actors and intellectuals outside the neighbourhoods as people who could not understand their situation or “academic people” who are in the neighbourhoods for the academic purposes and will leave some day soon. The organisation of meetings and conferences including neighborhood dwellers in some respects (in terms of openness, speaker or just a participant) resulted in the commoning and use of “academic” and “technical” language. Cultural collective activities such as film screenings in open areas gathered many people and resulted in a critical thought. There are various groups with different priorities and ways of resistance, different platforms trying to form alliances in disparate platforms, including personal activists or being together while opposing against some projects. Examining both alliances and tensions and contradictions, urban social movements in Istanbul is examined also in terms of conflicting and intersecting appropriations of spatial issues varying from one issue / local struggles – from demolition of housing, removal of people to an appropriation to the

city to being against the possible construction of the Third Bridge. In other words, the study started from the question whether or not there is a possibility for an alliance and in which terms there are conflicts, tensions as well as alliance, what are the reasons behind formation and breaking ups of the alliances, whether there are tensions between groups, what are the points creating differences and alliances between neighbourhood/beautification associations, what are the characteristics of the relationship of the neighbourhood associations and supportive groups considering changes in time. Even though different meetings including different groups and actors are made for possible alliance –but not a collective identity-, most of the groups especially which are not neighbourhood organizations like alternative professional or academic groups became both initiating and hindering (f)actors. They sometimes declare that they have their “own principles for urban issues,” “political approaches that they would not relinquish”. The main actors defined urban regeneration projects as the “common” enemy. The main point must be to underline that urban regeneration project is the reason why the neighbourhood associations are formed in a former social housing neighbourhood, a gecekondur neighbourhood and a historical neighbourhood in the historical peninsula of Istanbul.

Every group supporting neighbourhoods are not homogeneous. *It is necessary to revise the proposed solutions regarding the results like Solidarity Studio did for STOP 2 process, the second part of solidarity planning practice for Sulukule. However, these critiques must not be limited within the groups but as it is tried before the European Social Forum, it must be open to all of the activists. In this respect, the limits of the groups in the neighbourhood must be open to a broad discussion: the role in organisation, the orientation to some issues for Solidarity Studio or the academic language and their presence-distance vis-à-vis neighbourhoods for İMECE. However, I must underline that the roles of Solidarity Studio in*

the neighbourhoods and the roles and open presence outside but with neighbourhoods of İMECE seem to find their comfortable positions. To overcome these tensions, we must be aware of the fact that people try to propose (or not propose) the method that they find best and practice what they believe in and could do. However, it is necessary not to insist in practicing a method, a campaign, an approach that did not create the result aimed for. It is necessary to find the common ground and agenda.

We must be aware of the importance of the local and their (self-) organisations from neighbourhoods to Istanbul. By paying due attention to the importance of the activists as subjects and differences of neighbourhoods in terms of urban regeneration processes and their political characteristics, the study recognizes the role of ordinary people, their changing activism and their relations with intellectuals/actors from neighbourhoods while assuming that urban space created another consciousness, a new political identity on (un) common ground and that urban activism challenges also “being activist” in stereotypical sense. Urban activism challenges “activist” in stereotypical sense.

Some of the new and old active actors are involved and made important contributions in forming neighbourhood associations, in claiming right to the city, in building up networks (see Nicholls 2008 in terms of “urban insurgent network”) throughout the city and internationally. There are different moments of togetherness like protests and campaigns concerning common urban spaces (the Third Bridge construction, Emek Movie Theatre, schools -Don’t Touch My School campaigns and demonstrations-). The construction of Third Bridge and the demolition of Emek Movie Theatre, for the actors in Urban Movements created *togetherness before for the former example, before and after for the latter example*. Even though the ideal objective, an Urban Movements Alliance is not attained, or some splits are lived, some meetings and forums created *before and after* some

togetherness with *forums, discussions and meetings* like in the European Social Forum.

Is togetherness necessary? How could it be realised? Almost all the actors underlined that togetherness (changing from coalitions to other types) does not mean the erasure of differences but a way composed of a minimum of commons to struggle effectively and to stand stronger since there are always some and few people who struggle. Every group and activist would like to preserve its own principles and “differences”. What is crucial is the self-organisation and self-management of neighbourhoods and of the multitude in order to continue the practices of urban commoning in, for and beyond Istanbul.

The meaning of protests also is another controversial aspect. Even though activists are in general present in the demonstrations and in some moments, it resulted in togetherness, they point out that these could remain artificial. While struggling, people know each other and could choose their comrades and groups according to many factors such as political, professional, and emotional. Experiences, emotional factors (friendship, anger), personal, professional and political networks, personal and collective turning points (Neighbourhoods, city, groups) do matter in the framework of involvement, togetherness as well as cleavages. Activism both at individual and collective levels depends on the intersection of personal life conditions and experiences with implementation of projects. Urban oppositions created new acquaintances and solidarities.

That period is marked by strategic and temporary alliances, collective oppositions struggling for -“their”- neighbourhood as well as other neighbourhoods or for “the city” Istanbul, against the construction of the Third Bridge on Bosphorus, the demolition of the city’s cultural centre, a historical cinema hall and selling of public school buildings. Seminars as

common gatherings, common discussions, forums, meetings, new groups and politics included from different localities to form new “alliances of neighbourhood organizations” with the most representative characteristic mostly remain as moments of alliances, which did not last as long as aimed and imagined. In fact, when we talk about the platforms, associations and groups, we talk about some activists.

Even though there are associations, groups and platforms, it can be asserted that there are few activists from and outside neighbourhoods who struggle *in terms of affinity groups*; this is even valid for gecekondu neighbourhood with leftist characteristics. Although there are many leftist groups in these neighbourhoods which are standing against demolition; urban struggles are not their main politics. Their politics lead to problems of representation, exclusion of common people and grassroots from their own resistance and obstacles against a broad organization covering many people and approaches. Forming a coalition between groups was one of the main discussion aspects with positive and negative outcomes. It was also both a claimed, desired and necessary solution and an avoided issue. These struggles must be evaluated on the way for “urban commons” of different people from different neighbourhoods, across different classes, academicians and intellectuals, critical planners who come together on urban issues concerning them from different aspects and claim the rights to the city, which is on its way of realisation from urban commons. This “commoning” as a *process* of uncommon politics could cover many neighbourhoods as well as other urban struggles over public spaces and issues (health, work), resulted in a new socio-political consciousness.

There are tensions could counteract strong collaborations and cooperation, if discouragements could be overcome. However, there are many hostilities and fragmentations. To be together in conjectural terms or in the protests

finish in impasses. Meetings and seminars before protests could lead to new involvements and information as well as acquaintances. However, people/groups return to their politics after the protests as events. It is necessary to accept and underline multiple characteristic in terms of actors, groups and their politics of urban oppositions in Istanbul. Due to flexible affiliation to groups, activists are more than their groups that they form and even they can leave.

The study questions what the dynamics of forming alliances of different groups (e.g. neighbourhood organizations, civil initiatives as urban oppositional groups) are and how they relate to changing unequal power relations, what their aims, changing repertoires of contention, ways of protest, differences as well as tensions, conflicts but more crucially commonalities are. Even though their goals and framing of groups and associations, more exactly activists could be different with contradictions and heterogeneous characteristics within dynamics of urban struggles, there were always attempts to make alliances to struggle collectively for another production of urban space activists in Istanbul. New legislations affecting many neighbourhoods lead to moments of togetherness, but as strong and broad as it is claimed and supposed to be. This period is marked by uncertainties and lack of information, apart from the total rejection of participatory decision making processes. However, this process led to technical professionalization in terms of knowledge of ordinary residents on urban planning projects and legislations.

The study exposed continuous process of struggling, learning and self-organizing to intervene in and take action on *the right to the city* by focusing on new types of organizations and the importance of the activists. The right to the city is not only a theory for the “space” but for the “production and use of urban space” in relation with the state. This concept challenged the

“right of housing” which is criticized because of defending the right of property, in other words, exchange value of housing. What is important for the study is to point out the importance of urban regeneration but to go beyond spatial problems, and related reactive mobilizations. Urban opposition from urban space challenged property relations, power-capital, and democracy and state. In the thesis, I tried to expose what is lived and aimed to explain by new -but old- conceptualizations and critical discussions. Most of actors active in the struggles appropriate not merely their house as a shelter but as a home with their right to dwelling, their neighbourhoods as lived spaces i.e. space of users and inhabitants (Lefebvre 1991), as well as other neighbourhoods, and Istanbul and rural issues. On the way of consideration of urban struggle as a totality, they tried to form different solidarities from and beyond Istanbul and even some also broaden their urban demands, from homes to other issues like environmental, sanitary, transportation sometimes with their alliance with other groups and political parties, including renters, from their locality to Istanbul, and international alliances (in the dialectical understanding of local and global as Koehler and Wissen (2003)) whatever neighbourhoods’ histories are. What I do emphasize is that these were claims for the rights to life for their human dignities. I think as underlined by many scholars, we have to be aware of different levels but considering as urban commons. To illustrate, activists from and outside neighbourhoods struggling for the right to housing, neighbourhoods as common spaces, to centrality against all forms of enclosures of commons-including body, dignified life-.Every actor has his/her own right to the city as/beyond a slogan. They often underline *the necessity of collectivity* in terms of struggle and everyday life. However, a radical change idea is still so uncommon and difficult to think about for the actors. The right to the city was also the main controversial issue in the meetings of Urban Movements and at the end, accepting usefulness and importance of the concept, it is decided also to take a distance by the

activists. Especially in academic writings, it is also seen as the main hope and opening for an “allied” struggle and for an appropriate claim from the authorities. It also remains for some critics, at a theoretical level, being far from concrete demands and issues. The right to the city is discussed within the struggle “theoretically” and the study claims that it will have a definition within the struggle practically of different groups, activists from and outside neighbourhoods, for neighbourhoods or for the city Istanbul. It is obvious that this means a lot for some activists while they are struggling in fact defining the right. However, as a concept, it remained restricted in some milieus. On the other hand, even though it is not “used”, it is inherent in every urban claim. It is in fact a collective and self-“reclaim for the life” in different respects.

The right to the city beyond being a mere slogan should be considered in the framework of *challenging the right to housing based on property, as a horizon for the right to oeuvre and appropriation, the right to participation, “autogestion” and to the priority of the use value over the exchange value*. In the construction of transformed and renewed urban life, the right to the city paves another way for defining another type of citizen. The words of the academicians- in general activist-academicians working and struggling with and on neighbourhoods- were effective in terms of mutual production from the field. The concept by some people and in some moments is used in the practice for the use and claim of the inhabitants of the city.

The right to the city by *few active inhabitants* from and outside the neighbourhoods is claimed to be realised as *the right to centrality*. Actors from neighbourhoods, *struggling mainly from and for the centrality “in spatial terms, by meeting in Taksim and concentrating on central urban spaces rather than self-organization in the neighborhood”* are criticized, which leads to new splits. On the other hand, the centrality was important in terms of the claim for direct participation in the production of space. *I must*

add that organisation in the neighbourhood is a very hard task and we could not limit intellectuals from neighbourhoods, organic intellectuals within the borders of their neighbourhood. However, there is a nuance here: The priority for different activists must be revisited and evaluated in their conditions. The right to the city challenged from the “right of sheltering”, “the right to housing” which is criticized mainly to defend the right of property, in other words, the exchange value of housing. However, the right to the city concept also remains for some critics, at a theoretical level, being far from concrete demands and issues. The right to the city is discussed within the struggle “theoretically” and it will have “collective” definitions in the struggles practically. However, it is tamed both in theoretical and practical terms with its careless and limited elaborations with spatial connotations and relations with international organisations and their definitions.

Key local actors are in relation with other actors at *international level*. According to lived experiences and statements in the meetings and interviews, it is underlined that *without a grassroots organisation at the local level (which could be a neighbourhood as well as the city), international campaigns and city-wide or national coalitions do not mean anything*. Without overemphasizing, it is explained that globally intellectual and institutional support/ exchange of experiences, international student workshops-even though it is sometimes interpreted as a tourism- and campaigns initiated by urban activists having international connections, exhibitions, biennials, workshops, so international connections had their effects on locality. International groups, associations, intellectuals, forums, workshops do play important roles both in togetherness, information and empowerment. Some neighbourhoods, because of the intellectuals living in these neighbourhoods, or because of the characteristics of the neighbourhoods (like historical neighbourhoods) are included much more easily into these networks. International meetings led to mobilizations,

sharing experiences and gaining new ones with the involvement of new actors in the local. Still these supportive and informing interactions do have the power of creating global urban commons, for a better and more just city. Even though there could be some supports, temporal coalitions or mutual references, mainly for the actors outside the neighbourhoods, these campaigns and protest must not be imposed as the main objectives. International campaigns and related support resulted in some motivations and short term togetherness in and between neighbourhoods. It is true that some neighbourhoods with political heritage have mobilized their neighbourhoods as well as others. However, there are many groups in one neighbourhoods, whose political approaches may vary even in these ones. On the other hand, some neighbourhoods whose inhabitants are considered to be more conservative like Başbüyük not active at all like Sulukule have created an impact on resistances. However, in this process, many neighbourhoods' associations have lived splits and tensions like in Gaziosmanpaşa, Fener-Balat. On the other hand, in neighbourhoods like Gülsuyu-Gülensu, a new association is formed for the togetherness of different groups, aiming inclusion so appropriation of grassroots. The mobilisation of the actors for urban issues varies according to their political and personal history as well as with the political past and demolition process of the neighbourhood. Some neighbourhoods' resistances represent common turning point for different actors.

6.2. Prefigurations on Istanbul

What I call for is a radical appetite for change to inform our work. Like an Alice in Wonderland who has found herself in the city, we need to dream six impossible cities before breakfast. (Chatterton 2010a, 235).

Apart from concluding thoughts on the urban oppositions in Istanbul by mentioning the Gezi Park uprising, the thesis aimed to push new imaginations and prefigurations for the actors and the future readers, which are dispelled in the pretext that they could not be real asks the key activists about their prefigurations as suggestion, or imaginations in order to reveal the obstacles such as political, resource mobilization, spatial and local framing behind the radical claims to make them “possible-impossibles”¹⁴⁰. *The main aim behind was to draw the way for prefigurative politics towards an anti-capitalist urban commoning* such as *Müştereklerimiz (Our Commons)*, another attempt which gains importance after the Gezi Park resistance since one of the main questions of the research has the potential and necessity to go beyond a spatial resistance. In this respect, the real commoning which have started with the Gezi Park uprising against all forms of enclosures carries the potential not only for urban struggle but it also carries a broad political characteristic. People by struggling from and beyond urban space, develop, redefine and appropriate the meaning and necessity of some “theoretical concepts” such as the right to the city or self-management and “commoning”. However, it is necessary to remark that this study is not the outcome of a deduction of ideas but rather a result of longitudinal solidarity participation. It is obvious that it would be difficult to tell about another city’s possibility to some people arguing that utopia time has passed as argued by Souza (2010). I think that it is influential and necessary to expose what is (must) be imagined for the city and the society. As Darby (2011) elaborated in her whole dissertation, the prefiguration is all the attempts of horizontality, starting new ways of working –that we can

¹⁴⁰ The Free Association started their –type of- manifesto with a quote from “Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland”: “Alice laughed. “There’s no use trying,” she said. “One can’t believe impossible things.” “I dare say you haven’t had much practice,” said the queen. “When I was your age, I always did it for half an hour a day. Why, sometimes I’ve believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast.” (The Free Association 2010, 1019). This is critical in an era when social movements could start from antagonistic demands and the concepts are losing their meanings or becoming “clichés” (The Free Association 2010, 1023).

include resistance and life- including politics of everyday. As it is asserted, prefigurative politics do mean that there is no model for social change but it starts like the famous quote of Ghandi, from us, the everyday, from the journey rather than the “aimed utopia” (Chatterton et al. in Darby 2011, 11) and the present, the process rather than fixed ends and aims.

The thesis pushed to the necessity of urban oppositions for radical transformation, i.e. to discuss possibilities of radical change for another city in another society. To contribute in this broader idea, the study aims to propose new definitions and to reveal ignored dimensions from the conceptualizations of the activists and to illustrate possible-impossible(s), urban imaginations and emancipatory ideas from various moments and actors on the path for new urban commons. The thesis asks the activists what are their prefiguration behind the radical claims (as representation, suggestion, or imaginations in advance in order to reveal the obstacles such as political, resource mobilization, spatial and local framing) to make them “possible-impossibles”. It is influential and necessary to expose what is to be imagined for the city and the society. It is important to propose “a much more wider political imaginary for the intervention in the unfolding story of the city and engage in the building of an equalizing participatory democracy for the realization of radically different urban futures and values” (Chatterton 2010a, 235). Some new ideas and radical propositions for the city in the seminars are dispelled in the pretext that they could not be realized and attainable. In this respect, I invited activists for “dreaming six impossible cities before breakfast” (Chatterton 2010a), that will be presented. We must remember at this point that one of the key concepts of the thesis, the right to the city which is far beyond being just a demand, is a claim, a redefinition for another city in the future, from the possible to the impossible (2010a), As Chatterton discussed (2010a), the impossible today will become possible tomorrow in a horizon of “possible-impossible” (Lefebvre 2000, 164, 181).

Çiğdem underlined that the city must be of everyone: “I am against the class division. This system arranges the city according to one prior class and give it them. The city must not belong to anyone; the city must belong to everyone. The city must be for people who live there. Istanbul is the city of all Turkey. ...Is the Topkapı Palace belongs only to people who are native or live in Istanbul? The city is for everyone, belong to everyone. I am against all the property relations, appropriations. Firstly people who live there are the first responsible for the city...The culture and historical cultural values are international...a part of world accumulation.”

For Erdoğan, we have to think about prefigurations about new ways of resistance and asserted: “We could do this easily since with this type of protest and mobilization, we could not stop the projects. We need different protest pratiques. We have all political views. For another political prefiguration we are involved in this. I believe that urban opposition from urban regeneration is part of this imagination. Our concern was to transform the right claiming and obtaining about housing into appropriation of the city...Not as a limited view into “socialism” and revolution but to form new relations beyond urban regeneration.” Kumru¹⁴¹, about “possible impossibles”, commented: “If we make urban opposition, with strategies, methods proposed long before, we could abolish what we call the “impossible”. Sure, I have many things what I consider as impossible in the

¹⁴¹ Kumru added: “I had a very condensed experience process for six years. It will continue. Still I learn something from everyone, from the local. It is a learning process, experiencing and gaining experiences. After engaged in this struggle, we have started to live social relations from this way. Our point of view to everything is alike. Our life in DA is before Erbay and after Erbay. Form the point that I stand our way of struggle and our method, functioning, I think it is very appropriate and right. For other, its own way could be so. We were struggling before that we learnt this way but after I learnt this, my belief in this increased. What we formulated for our position with neighbourhoods; I try to reflect this in my everyday life. For LGBTs, for people who have political views independent from mine, different from me, I could not change my perception about the state and security forces. All these struggles have served to this. I was not like that. I had a more status-quo ideas but I broke all these ones with these struggles. I broke this with the presence of brothers and sisters in this struggle. I was not that open and flexible for every idea before. I will continue on this way...”

processes that I live. Even going from some place to another is impossible. There are impossibilities present that we live every day. This would last for some time. But I don't believe that we could not get over these. We could do. If we are together, we could get over. So we could make possible everything. My imagination is a city where people are happy with the living space that they used to live, in way what they wish for, who could have a word and possibility to talk for every process that interest them, they could participate in so they could orient. That they could something obtained as a result of their struggle, never regretting of this struggle. We have to be more organized and be in solidarity. After this struggle and solidarity, we won't lose our social relations. Nobody would be victims due to their class differences. We abolish the classes if it is possible. Everybody has a dream of revolution but I think that before we could make an urban revolution. It is not impossible if the local finds itself we could abolish all the mistakes in the city and everybody could live where they wish for in their way, not as individual but collective property, with public spaces for all where nobody will tell that you could not be there. Nobody is enforced to be imprisoned in small box type of houses. Nobody will be searched for his/her bag while entering in some places. Distrust was not felt at this level. Not shopping malls with this number with the rape lived in terms of public space. Governments not consider themselves as dominant who believe the only people who could shape the space and not use all its economic force to the spatial transformation. Accordingly with as everyone think. For this reason we must struggle in local and with the local. If we do so by asking what they want, everything will find its way. What is impossible is the belief that we could not do something. What is impossible is that we could not do something. We could do something".

Istanbul, for Çavuşoğlu, *must be the city of all, mainly of its users*. For the question "Alice in Wonderland, Alice finds herself in the city while thinking six impossible-possible things for the city", he cites "Freedom, Justice,

Solidarity, liveability, the value of use, the right to the City” as his key concepts. For İmre Azem: “The city, Istanbul could be either a global city or a city for the inhabitants of Istanbul. They could not be both. It could be a global city shaped by the capital, to attract capital to city so a money (-oriented) city or human being centred, so the city of inhabitants of Istanbul. The separation is here. The vision of making Istanbul as a global city excludes the inhabitants of Istanbul. These could not be together. I am against Istanbul as a global city. If London, Hong Kong are global cities, I don’t think that Istanbul could be a city alike. I don’t think it must be. I don’t want that it happens. The city must be designed for disable people, children, and elderly people. There must be spaces where the poor and the rich are present together. Their life intersects, not only in working life but living areas must intersect. They could co-exist. Different economic classes could come together in public spaces. A city where the car number decreases day by day, where as a pedestrian, you can go everywhere. You don’t have to pass through highway between two neighbourhoods. By using public transport, it could be possible to go from every part of the city. It is valid for every city. Everyone have to have equal right to health and education. Your study will make possible to understand our mutual expectations from struggles. It would be a road map for us.”

Pointing out the importance of ecology, Besime proposed: “The main principle is the ecology. Ecological city is against the war. This city which forms the relation with the nature directly. It rejects the rivalry of capitalism...Another one is woman. Not racist. ... Ecology and racism are intersected. ... It is against the human nature. The woman represents the nature. It must accept its nature. If you accept the nature, you could not be racist. ...but only be collective. ... While reforming the world, if we think about the level of what is for me to make in the method bare for everyone. ...To think in a totality, with the world...I think that I could not exist in this city, being free and a woman. I could not realize myself. It turned to be a

highly class and fragmented city. We could not even see classes. I am unhappy in this city. I love to live in big cities but I see that I live by suffocating. Everything is forced. The simplicity is lost. *For some people, they could not live in the city, not being a creature and a subject. Istanbul must be of people who work hard on it with his/her labour.*”

Hatice claimed small cities where we could live equally: “What are possible things that I work on, and discuss also as the others want; *the collective life is possible* that we wish for and is possible too we know. I want a collective and egalitarian life that we produce together not only in terms of decision making. The city must be like that. *To live humanly in little lives with little aims and small, limited cities is possible.* A togetherness of city and rural is possible. Or it must be alike. Instead of a consuming machine and a rural which always tries to feed it, they could co-exist. We could live both. Everyone could be equal. *This life could be possible.*”

Yaşar proposed: “Not only for Istanbul, but we must ask how other cities could be. As Harvey mentioned it is uneven development...We do ignore other pillars outside Istanbul. We do not have politics and visions about that...Different classes have different imaginations for Istanbul...Istanbul will be the city of its inhabitants, not those who pass over. For instance the building where I live transformed into a hotel and we are evicted...They want to attract people who are the audience of the luxurious projects. There is an imagination for people who work in finance and service economy...I imagine a city whose public and green areas are not privatized. The coast and Bosphorus are open and not separated from walls. Without consuming and being in a shopping centre, a city that you can use and sit at the sea side and catch fish. Spaces open to public are not sold to the investors but planned for people who live there and are used for them. *A city, Istanbul which takes the right to shelter as a principle. A city where people decide on their living areas and sanitization according to earthquake. Istanbul which*

is shaped with, by people. A city which is accessed with affordable public transportation. Istanbul of the disabled people. All the infrastructure and housing are accessible. A city that is not separated according to zones. A city where different aspects of life could be lived.”

Cihan proposed: “Urban struggle is a tough struggle. Since while creating another city, you have another view on the world. This is the struggle of system and class. It is not only for the shelter. Like the occupy movement claiming for the %99. This is the world that they were searching for through the struggle against capitalism.” Erdoğan, for the impossible possibles, started from his practices and experiences mainly in his neighbourhood: “*An urban agriculture is important. When we have first met with Metin Yeğin, he told about experiences in Latin America. He stated that people there reacted not only because that they demolish their houses, but life spaces. We formed a market. We could do the same by saying: “You are demolishing our life!”...Gülsuyu is appropriate for this. One nightmare Metin Yeğin called us and brought various vegetable and fruit seeds...We did this in seven gardens. We had very healthy big tomatoes. However, we could not continue to do this...We could do this here, organic urban gardens and agriculture. If we did this, it would be a strong line beyond barricades like Sem Terra workers use with barter methods instead of monetary ones. It would build a bridge between urban and rural struggles. We could do this as the first possible impossible of Alice. This is another dimension of resistance and barricades if we realise this.* We have everywhere forests in the neighbourhood. We could organise festivals where people sing and cook for a long period of time so that they share. It is a feasible thing. It is a self-critique. Until now, these festivals were under the coordination of left groups and dominated by leftist artists. But what we think is to address and include local inhabitants and their culture. For instance, we could organise festivals from their dances, cuisines from their city of origins where they can share their cultures and meals: *A week of life and solidarity.* We have

here a forest, green areas and neighbourhood culture that we will appropriate and we won't leave this to urban rent. All these were at the local level."Deniz Özgür for the future (im)possibilities, argued: "However, we have to have prefiguration to make it possible. I have an anti-authoritarian, anti-hierarchical and human based political view. I am against metropolises. I am against the central place of these cities. We have to get rid of this centrality. We are struggling for labourers. In the Istanbul commune where we will live, there won't be any centrality. For instance, we could divide in regions. We will be in a classless society. We will have everybody from different classes. These people will say their words, with their autonomy; they will call into being by themselves. The organisation from the locality is crucial too. Beyond the right to the city, it is a part of the struggle of class. The city is a part of this. I could not appropriate the right to the city."

6.3. Claiming Urban Commons?

Even though the analysis of the Gezi Uprising is out of the scope of the thesis, it did confirm many arguments and future prospects in the study by mobilizing different groups and represented in this respect a real turning point, with a collective repertoire within collectively produced new types of opposition and so new political language(s) engendered, still being produced in the streets. Various motivations met uncommon commons ground (for the concept, please read Chatterton 2006) while creating new vocabularies, imaginations and strategies of action on this way for a radically different and just city of the future (Chatterton 2010a, 235). The struggle for the right to the city, as a slogan, as an idea and as a horizon, creates cracks in capitalism as Holloway conceptualized (2002, 2010) and as Erdoğan stated: "This actually a process that we came from, that we live by assembling more and more. These are the cracks in the capitalism so we

don't wait for the revolution...However, every struggle and every action that we pursued from today creates in fact a nucleus of being a founder again. Thus every form of struggle that we establish today must be part of the social order to be found. Otherwise, ...this order will be collapsed today and tomorrow another order will be found. We have to quit this strategy and form another thing which could create cracks today.”

As Harvey stated, we have remade ourselves by claiming our right to the city. In addition to accumulation by dispossession, we could state “freedom, consciousness and self-realization by dispossession”. In the interview made by The Occupied Times as a reply to the question that Occupied Times asked was: “Civil unrest is becoming a more recurrent feature of urban life in London, as it is for cities around the world, among them Athens, Madrid, Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Bogotá, Rio de Janeiro and, most recently, Stockholm. Are riots (not just protests and organised social movements) now part of a toolkit to reclaim the right to the city? What can those here in the financial capital of the world learn from these struggles in other cities?”, Harvey stated: “Since inviting me to comment on these questions we have Istanbul. When you look at the global situation you sense there is a volcanic situation bubbling beneath the surface of society and you never know when and where it is going to explode next (who would have thought Istanbul, even though it was plain to me on my earlier visit there that there were a lot of discontents). I think we need to prepare ourselves for such eruptions and build as far as we can infrastructures and organisational forms capable of supporting and developing them into sustainable movements.”

Istanbul and especially the centres of the city are changing according to urban regeneration plans, mega- projects and neighbourhood renewal and regeneration plans for many years. In this respect, the Prime Minister was extremely interested in urban projects and active in first and last person in

decision making process, which was also valid for the Gezi Park. What was critical in decision making processes is that planning is proposed to be realized in totally unparticipatory processes. Apart from urban (spatial but socio-economic) decisions, discourses and legislations were targeting the control of private lives mainly of women, making it as a state and public subject; on the other hand, making private the public sphere. In more than two years period, there were many protests and meetings about Taksim Square and in Gezi Park against the demolitions in neighbourhoods. The Gezi Park uprising¹⁴² created another turning moment both for a massive

¹⁴²Gökarıksel (2013) stated the forums held in the public parks all over Turkey offered the “needed space to speak, discuss, criticize and also organize cultural events in order to build a common political vocabulary –a new political language- with the sense of solidarity”, to “spread the word” everywhere and to develop counter-strategies (Gökarıksel, 2013). This was also a challenge to the mainstream patriarchal and homophobic discourse, while screaming together “This is just the beginning, we keep struggling”. Gökarıksel (2013) asked the questions of people, for systemic changes for him, and also about political strategy and organization, about the transformation of this popular uprising into a lasting movement with revolutionary effects. Referring to Lefebvre, he reminds the statements about “words”, the proliferation of words that had never spoken before. Gökarıksel stated that due to these words, this uprising lead to a “moment of joyful creativity”, for “thinking the unthinkable” while dealing with the “problem of communication” over conflicts and divisions between familial political lines such as “Muslim vs. secular”, “Kurdish vs. Turkish”, which are defined as “çapulcu” and “marginals”. The forums for Gökarıksel (2013) are attempts of self-management by forming collectivities and groups such as “Our Commons” (Müştereklerimiz).

Ozan Karaman (2013) referred to commoning against discipline (starting from disciplining of the streets) besides displacement, dispossession, and forced marketization with a precarious urban poor and working class emphasis. It is the commoning of Taksim, the “enclosure” against the state, with the collective production of space so a different kind of urban life. What Karaman proposed is quite important: “The Gezi struggle was not simply about the conservation of existing commons, but the defence-through production- of a future urban commons, ...The occupants of Gezi Park;...were also actively discovering other ways of co-producing space.” And he added as I always try to underline that this open-endedness of this experience could contribute to a common repertoire of strategies in expanding the fight for future commons.

For Meyda Yeğenoğlu (2013), the effect of regulation of various institutions based on religiously inspired discursive regulation and its legal introduction on the bodies, activities, and habits of people -to be unified, homogenized, and reinscribed by the authoritarian and top-down micro-management of the social order- has an important role in this unique upheaval, which could be understood from Foucault’s biopower. Dalakoglou and Vradis (2011) mentioned historical change in urban mobs: from pre-political of Medieval Cities in Hobsbawm to moral economy of crowds of 18th century, in Thompson. They give another date, as a turning point for revolutionary potential, between the French Revolution of 1789 and the Paris Commune of 1871. They remind that this period is marked by the social

control via urban planning, named as Haussmanization of Paris. Till this time, from 1968, to 2000, many metropolises all over the world have witnessed many riots. They have referred to Castells and urban social movements. From the right to the city lenses, they have interpreted as the right to occupy and re-use of spaces for the organizational basis of revolt. Individuals and collectivities could be considered as claim to right to the city, for a radical restructuring of social, political and economic relations in the city and beyond, as Lefebvre proposed (Dalakoglou and Vradis 2011, 84). They refer to the definition of Purcell, the right to the city as the right to appropriation, i.e. inhabitants' right to physically access, occupy, and use urban space. They used this terminology to make clear differences between Navarinou Park and Ayios Panteleimonas Square occupied by the Nazis. Lastly, they make clear their position: The case of Navarinou Park is about rights, not about cities. If it is so, they do not exclude each others. On the other hand, the conception of "rights" is problematic. If we understand rights as fragmented and narrowly, the Nazi's claim of square and playground could be sufficient. However, the Park example was close to the radical conceptualisations, for a collective human right. Moreover, it's a reply to the so-called human right which do not challenge hegemonic liberal and neoliberal market logic, dominant modes of legality and state action as Harvey stated (Dalakoglou and Vradis 2011, 87).

For Kuymulu (2013) it was a peaceful, occupy style resistance against the destruction of a public park, an urban commons for the benefit of a few capitalists. Especially, the first days, it was a resistance against an urbanism shaped through capitalism, neoliberalism in an authoritarian way over the ordinary inhabitants of Istanbul for the use value against exchange then a turning into a wider resistance at national and international levels for civil rights, individual ("micro-managements" related to alcohol consumption vs. Religious youth, abortion, the Kurdish civilians murdered in Roboski) and collective freedoms with the authoritarian reflexes of government and the police brutality. Kuymulu mentioned the breaking point, the morning, the 30th of May as an operation dawn by the police raiding the park and then continuing with spontaneous demonstrations and civic mobilization including people who are in the streets for the first time in their lives, organized through media (Kuymulu 2013, 275). So, Kuymulu stated: "Pandora box was now open." (275) Kuymulu declared that for a lasting social transformation, Kurdish and labour movement should catch up with the decidedly leaderless, spontaneous and collective protesting people from direct democracy and solidarity on the ground (277).

Jay Cassano (2013) emphasizes that no party could claim ownership of the Gezi Uprising and the last May Day protest is abolished from the square due to continuing works in the Square in a "rapid process of gentrification" including historic neighbourhoods populated by Roman, poor or Kurdish people, or immigrants. What Cassano states is that it is an uprising of people thus far is about "a conflict between ruling elites and people who live, work, play in the city". Cassano reminds us the 2009's uprising against the International Monetary Bank and World Bank under the name of "Resistanbul", like in "direngeziparkı". For future prospects, Cassano shows two ways indeed implicitly: The first one, a Right to the City movement with anti-government sentiments and the other one with the meaning related to the physical space of Taksim Square. For Ahmet Tonak (2013), to define the resisting subjects is quite difficult since they could not be explained by one of two elements of the most widely-recognized social uprising subjects. They could not be defined within the middle-class, whose definition must be challenged. Ahmet Tonak, for this point, discussed middle-class and new middle classes in Turkey and middle classes in formation as Keyder proposed for the June uprising. This resistance for Tonak must be considered as a revolt to the representative democracy since people are feeling, struggling and working for alternatives to the current system in different forms.

In Brazil, it was not only bus fares (Free fare Movement) like in Turkey, the issue was not only two or three trees. As Bringel (2013) stated in Global Dialogue, the indignation in Brazil is “extremely diffuse and increasingly polarized” with “diverse and contradictory arguments, actions and demonstrations”. These revolts represent “a new form of viral and diffuse politics” too. In this respect, the main question for Bringel must be: “How do we channel the indignation into a transformative social movement?” (Bringel 2013). The reply could be found in the transformation of cities into agoras. Gutierrez (2013), in his article namely “O que tem as revoltas de 2013 tem em comum” on *Outra Política*, questions the common aspects and mutual influences of revolts in Brazil, Turkey, Bulgaria and Peru. A claim for a participative democracy could be common for four cases, he suggests. In Brazil and Turkey, for Gutierrez, no classical social collective was the main influence. It was valid also for Peru in the sense that there was no leadership. Both in Brazil and Turkey, the police violence was ignored in the mainstream media and for both cases, a transparent democracy was the main motivation behind the resistance of “hybrid anatomies” as conceptualized by Toret. Another commonality was about describing protesters as “vandalos” in Brazil and chapullers in Turkey. They have both appropriated this description and named their “alternative information channels” with these names. Another discussion was related to middle classes with the precariat classes who are in the protests.

In his article, the 3rd of July 2013 (namely “Gezi hareketinin ortak paydaları ve yeni örgütlülük biçimleri”), Tuğal made a great analysis of the pros and cons and also put forward a strategy for the future of urban resistances. Tuğal stated in this analysis that every day the resistance is changing and the exam still continues, defined every day with its advantages and risks. Mainly gaining its pace from environmentalist point and police violence, it became also a desire for democracy and appropriation of common spaces. We must make a remark about this “common spaces”. These spaces which are so-called public are re-claimed as “commons”, which must be for Tuğal, to be established on a historical ground. Tuğal puts the commons of Gezi as the participatory democracy and the appropriation of common spaces. On the other hand, it is necessary to change the (our) language if we wish to create the cracks in the %50, which is pretend to be the other half who does not support/involve in the Gezi Park resistance. Being aware of the fact that the attack on the commons are not experiences only for the last ten years, the resistance could go further from urban claims of Gezi to rural ones by targeting a public right defence. This framework is necessary to break the general understanding of Gezi Park as an middle-class identity movement, to be much more comprehensive for instance in terms to include workers’ neighbourhoods. This also means that the camps are not %50-%50 as stated by Erdoğan but as %99-%1 as defended in Occupy Wall Street movement, to make the workers and informal proletariat the real agents of the resistance. On the other hand, this does not mean that the exclusion of upper and middle classes and middle-aged activists; on the contrary, the attack on the commons is also their issue. However, in this respect, Tuğal claimed that to rely on the upper middle-classes, subjects of aggressive and possessive individuality theoretically and practically, for the defence of the public rights, would be a mistake, as its proved in 1980s. Another significant observation is that the Gezi park resistance is not against exploitation and proletarianization, but against marketization and commodification, which is also an obstacle against a possible revolution. The other statement is crucially critical and “real”: For Tuğal, the discussions, meeting could have different meaning for different groups and activists. Moreover, it could easily disruptive for working classes who wait for concrete results and demands. One of my main concepts – from the field study- of the thesis was anarchism/autonomy, which is referred as “anarchism spirit” to define the Gezi park resistance. Tuğal argued that this spirit could be found in the flexible and individual recruitment, not to get orders from anybody, the distrust in organizations –but the presence of Taksim Solidarity-, joyful activism and politics, the emphasis on prefiguration and performativity of many groups other than anarchist and

autonomist groups. However, unlike the Zucotti Park, there was an absence of a stance without any desire for demands and negotiation. On the other hand, there are strategically and practical difficulties of participatory democracy, with both presence and denial of any leader. Tuğal concluded that another type of leadership but leadership was necessary in these undeniable “anarchisan period” all over the world to defend commons spaces or “commons” and to be on the way for another future.

Tuğal criticized all the mainly liberal interpretations which consider these uprisings as cultural but not political. The point from which Tuğal opens the discussion is very critical: Two trees could be the limit of commodification in the world. If we claim that the issue is not two or three trees, it would be the imprisonment of Gezi Park resistance into a narrow frame by reducing the global bankrupt of liberalism into a regime crisis in Turkey. The Gezi resistance became the example for destructive characteristics in spite of the “apparent success of liberalism” and authoritarian -with democratic support project- and conservative liberal hegemony. Young people of middle classes from banks, plazas, ivory towers rebelled against free marketization and the police state behind. What Tuğal stated is that these young people appropriated their commons spaces which are cruelly sold, commodified and looted like in Brazil, it is stated: “Love is over! Everywhere is Turkey!” It is time to form the alternatives-alternative tactics and mechanisms, for an alternative economy-, said Tuğal. However what is claimed is still blurred for Tuğal (2013). It is necessary to be neat politically: people’s self-organization, revolutionary leadership, provision of the base for alternative institutions so leader. Tuğal supports the line of Taksim Solidarity and its feasible goals, mainly spatial ones such as the Third Bridge instead of being against the ruling party. In this respect, we have to ask: is it a trap, limitation? The resistance against the Third Bridge was there but mainly of a political group. After the resistance, urban regeneration and the resistance against the Third Bridge does not gather necessary people together. What Tuğal stated is very significant: Almost for the first time, one scholar recognizes resistances of neighbourhoods against urban regeneration even though the ruling party did manage to split up and marginalized them by creating and going through existing tensions. On the other hand, Tuğal mentioned the prevailing impression that like intellectuals and artists struggling for a patisserie and a movie theatre in Taksim and related resistances will be another separated chain in addition to that in gecekondu neighbourhoods until the violent police intervention in the Gezi Park. One of the related problems is that people under threat of urban regeneration are disconnected due to the cultural, economic, local reasons and it is hard to spread and carry on this resistance since they do not know each others. We could add that people started to know each others years ago and the platforms aimed this as a main strategy. Another important aspect that Tuğal underlined is the attempt of the separation between “innocent environmentalists” and “looters/marginals”. To claim the rights such as the right to “urban space” as a basic right is only possible by the permanent coalition of middle and working classes starting from the commodification of everyday life, the temporary alliances between political groups for the elections and the Gezi Park riot could be an appropriate beginning not only in Turkey –for the type of organization such as the Taksim Solidarity whose aim is not to gain or to lose- but for all the movements.

Amy Austin Holmes (2013) made an emphasis on the encampment in the park, which became soon a utopian community and its everyday praxis. The Gezi Park became a radical space with realistic demands. The encampment was important since it was an occupation apart from the demonstrations. It was different also from Tahrir Square, while being free of oppressive practices and also the use of money. What was critical in Holmes’ text is her attention on the lack of radical demands especially in the Taksim Solidarity main five goals (preservation of the park, ending police brutality, halting the sale of public spaces, freedom of expression and the media) and their position towards the Prime Minister, the

Government and the state despite the related slogans and claims. She elaborated the standing man, with other people replaced him, as a strategy, an anti-occupation. This is a significant statement since referring to Alinsky, Holmes stated that “protesters went outside the experience of their enemy”, by just standing subverting the police brutality, did occupy the public space without occupying. Police could not find the way of responding. The standing man was also the figure in the protests in Tiananmen and Occupy Wall Street.

Foti Benlisoy (2013), referring to “interesting times” of Hobsbawm, argued that the uprising was not only of leftist and socialist groups but a spontaneously developed, sudden a new type of social uprising by challenging existing organizational structures and routines and a street politics different than existing organisational forms. This was like all the revolutions, a real break and a leap over all the accepted. He traces back all the events that prepared this revolt; for instance, the 1st of May and the struggle against the demolition of Emek Movie Theatre, which is not a petit bourgeois obsession. Referring to Bensaid, Benlisoy stated that these were small notches/fissures and small holes in the fragile hegemony. I could refer here to Holloway and his concepts about cracks in capitalism. This is also turning point for socialist movements if forums became a key mechanism to give energy to social movements and struggles, ecologist, right to the city struggles; however, they must consider the future and the outcomes of this uprising. This must create “DIY reformism” spreading from neighbourhoods to every sphere of life. It is necessary to accept that the Gezi Park won’t happen again and for this reason, to insist upon forms of action and to fetishize ways and methods of struggle would be a mistake. Benlisoy stated that it was a resistance against urban regeneration politics and ecological demolishment with the commodification of common areas. It turns to be anti-governmental party politics of different encounters of young people –which is another challenge for the Left- from different classes, neighbourhoods and football team fans more than leftist groups against anti-authoritarianism. These must form alliances centred from social opposition determinant structures, trade unions such as DİSK, KESK, and professional chambers instead of a hollowed democracy discourse without any anti-capitalist and class emphasis, which has its dangers as it has in history. Every group has to recognize differences but it is necessary to keep the movement as a class one by (“daring”) taking necessary initiatives and intervening agendas which tries to shape this, and propose new slogans. However, it is not the time to lose by discussing tactics but to construct this as a collective resistance castle and to create permanent changes in political consciousness of great masses. It is necessary to take initiative about developing a common language for the unorganized part and mechanisms for connections with young people hostile against people who does politics (over there). The discussion on academicians and so-called abstract academic discussion and we must make a collective discussion on the definition of conditions, power equilibrium and what we have to do with this “revolutionary spirit” in a proactive way. The Gezi Park became a space where the state does not exist. Everybody, even though they do not know each others are organised and conscious. They have already get over fear limit and silence trap; we have gained many things such as belief in collective action capacity and to grasp back our fate under our control and self-confidence, according to Benlisoy. On the other hand, there are tragic moments that do not represent and even erase various groups in the resistance. Another idea which is very crucial is that ecological issues which will be radicalised in this period, are not middle-class issues but anti-capitalistic and a major political issue. Another necessity is to form direct democratic forms and for instance to transform Taksim Solidarity into a dynamic and more representative structure and to attach more importance to forums which could an inclusive discussion possible. On the way from resistance to movement, against the myth of being a middle-class uprising, this was the resistance of insecurely employed white-collar unemployed people and the forums must be the core of a radical, democratic but local urban movement. As a reply to Tuğal (2013), Benlisoy (2013) stated that uprising occur without people’s self-organization, without revolutionary

reaction for different issues and agendas together. It has brought together people from urban and different oppositions including ordinary people mainly after the violent intervention so gains another common meaning. With a new language, a new spirit with humour, the Gezi Uprising broke the fear of people of being in the streets for their rights. We have to reveal the importance of life spaces with different rights and right seeking starting from a local issue but situated in the city centre. After the Gezi Uprising, with a new awareness, a process of proactive resistance has started including ordinary people from different age groups beyond groups on a common ground by *struggling*. The Gezi uprising led to continuation of urban oppositions, to new alliances, acquaintances, emotional as well as strategic rapprochements, and move on a common ground with different agendas. What was critical about the Gezi Park urban commoning process, apart from the absence and the silence of the media, the alternative media became the milieu of news, information as well as an open semi-academic but practical discussion ground. Many academics, including that were uninterested in/absent ones, have written many articles on these alternative media websites. Alternative media channels turns to be the main information channel in the country; the power, ideological and capital relations in the media became explicitly visible. Besides, there were some

leadership and without the base of alternative institutions just because of present social and political power relations and all the elements with self-emancipation will emerge from the struggle not outside or on behalf of them. One of the major aspects must be the permanency as alliance or frequent meetings of different groups' encounters. In this respect, organizing in old terms still does matter. This is vital to take initiative with a leftist agenda. Benlisoy stated that the Gezi uprising is a part of an international struggle wave in June days. It is a leak of an international movement against the privatization, the base of neo-liberal capitalism as the commodification and "enclosures" of our commons, our common areas which belong to us, like the Diggers, –so which must be an anti-capitalist/not an abstract approach-, which could not be represented with the central and appropriated slogan: "The government, resign!" and a NGO politics. These words lead to the appropriation of some groups and the creation of the dichotomies. Against these enclosures, we have to form commons action bases to share experiences and to make self-organization possible for instance via forums of lower classes from below, rather than togetherness, platforms, umbrellas for press releases, protests. It is a part of seeking another and a real democracy: This commons spirit must turn into a commons resistance for a practical internationalism by challenging and reconstructing the Socialist movement.

channels (*Çapul TV*) and networks, with the zines (*Common Ground Post - Hemzemin Postası- of Müştereklerimiz-Our Commons-*) during and after the resistance were formed. The Gezi Park led to forums in neighbourhoods, which are held in occupying parks in the neighbourhoods. This could be interpreted as the direct action in open spaces. The discussions were not only about “spatial issues” but also could cover other agendas. In this respect, Taksim Solidarity became the main leading and accredited group both for the coordination of protest and conveying the words/messages, which is in fact composed of more than 124 component organizations. However, violent intervention of police and an issue related to space such as Middle East Technical University or other cities could have led directly a protest in the neighbourhoods. In this respect, we could underline the variety of neighbourhoods.

These two periods, firstly during and secondly after Gezi Uprising created another language, consciousness, and politics. The meetings before Gezi were limited to neighbourhoods directly affected by demolitions and urban regeneration, different (intellectual) groups working for neighbourhoods and some political groups mainly People’s Houses. After the Gezi Park uprising, many people from different classes even who are not interested or involved directly in an urban struggle, “common” people are mobilized. Moreover, they organized their own meeting around their solidarity and forums in the neighbourhoods, have contacted with others and even occupy/or witness an occupation of a vacant building. Müştereklerimiz (Our Commons), a new platform which is being organized recently, has started to be one of the main actors in Gezi Park resistance. An important aspect that we have to think about is changing agendas between social/urban justice, repressions and urban space; which we could name “*enclosures*”. After the Gezi Park uprising(s) all over Turkey including other countries, discussions and platforms which are aimed to be organized started to emerge by themselves such as for the possible construction of the Third Bridge with bicycles.

Moreover, new campaigns are launched for urban issues which were already started (Yedikule Orchards, the privatization of Beşiktaş –then reopened– and Sarıyer/Büyükdere Port). New forums (with ecological issues, grassroots...) are being organized in Sivriada apart from parks all over the city and the cities and a collective consciousness for new commons including issues concerning the Professional chambers are being raised in the forums and public discussions. The urban struggles have gained its pace after the Gezi Uprising throughout different forums and solidarities and recently squatting houses as social centres formed in and after the Gezi Park uprising process. Even two abandoned houses are *squatted to be transformed in social centres* at the Anatolian Side of Istanbul, near Kadıköy; which are the first examples in urban opposition history in Istanbul. As an explicit claim for commons, this also show the possibility of different organisation, management and social relations possible, while creating inner-discussions on meaning and practice of squatting. As Chatterton (2002) stated: “In this climate of lack of accountability from the local state and the banality of schemes being imposed upon cities, squatting and reclaiming parts of the city are eminently sensible and increasingly widespread options. When most developments in the contemporary city point toward sterility and sameness, squatting ... diversity and disruption and represents a desire for serendipity, unpredictability and openness...celebrates the power of the local...It illuminates a collective and creative use of urban space that sketches out possibilities for radical social change.” (Chatterton 2002, 6). As Chatterton (2008) defined the social centres as an “urban commons” and a direct action –against gentrification– in itself across generations. They are self-managed, independent via experimental organising, open to all as politically plural spaces, and emotionally rebuilt social collective “outside the activists ghetto” (see the part namely Autonomous Geographies). In the framework of autonomous politics against the enclosures and alienation of everyday life in the

“corporate” neoliberal city, the social centres are attempts to re-make citizenship by constructing horizontality, self-production and constructing the social commons (Hodkinson & Chatterton, 2006). Hodkinson and Chatterton (2006) emphasized that these radical and self-organized politics “in and against society” have their challenges and tensions in terms of implication of values namely anti-authority, solidarity and its limits to openness, legalization and co-optation. In future, in different cities, they can form a network of “autonomous nodes”. And we will see in the future what their characteristics -mainly inclusiveness of “common people”- and roles will be. The Gezi Park uprising was a reply to all the academics and politics who does not form any linkage between urban opposition groups as well as a hopeful but spontaneous turning point for urban activists. There were always same few people who were interested in what is going on in the park as well as in the neighbourhoods before. Many writers and commenter on this issue were underlining that this is a beginning of a new process, a democratic and civil struggle (Morgül, 2013). Kent Hareketleri (Urban Movements –Forum-) have organised new campaigns pioneering the recent Urban Meeting/Protest, and new people have started to participate in their meetings and there are on the way new seminars of education. Even though there are frequent visits to different neighbourhoods, due to many reasons, meetings are still being organized in Taksim. We could argue that grassroots have found its way by struggling with the Gezi Park Uprising. However, the statements of leaderless common banner of Taksim Solidarity *being a common and inclusive agenda remained limited and ambiguous*. Still, current political agenda determines which people from different groups and forums react against it rather than being a driving force for social change. This was carrying a potential for “commoning” but also the trap of over-emphasis on space. However, urban renewal/regeneration plans are scarcely discussed and neighbourhoods under the risk of demolition as well as resisting during many years. This commoning was not an “anti-capitalist”

one; but in time, with anti-capitalist experiences and different groups naming and acting as “anti-capitalist” (including *Anti-capitalist Muslims*), other people have gained an acquaintance with practices and also theories. We could argue that people arrived at a point of discussing and thinking about different management ways such as direct participation for their neighbourhoods and the city. Even though there is a growing urban commoning, the main questions must be focused on the changing meaning of spatial concerns, collective consumption vis-a-vis commoning of agendas. There is no only one urban Spirit: *The growing multiple of spirits is haunting over our cities all over the world and our minds to re-appropriate our commons.*

REFERENCES

Adanalı, Y. A. (2012). Dünyadan Kent Hakkı İçin Kentsel Mücadele Örnekleri: Hindistan, Dominik Cumhuriyeti, Brezilya, Venezüella ve ABD. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum*, 9(36), 14-30.

Ahıska, M. & Kosova, E. (2011). Interview with Erbay Yucak about Bir Umut Association. *Red Thread* 3. http://www.red-thread.org/dosyalar/site_resim/dergi/pdf/4080237.pdf.

Albet, A. (2011). Spatial justice: Where/when it all comes together. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(1), 69-72.

Alkan, A., & Duru, B. (2007). Türkiye’de Kent Çalışmalarının İzinden Giderken ‘Toplumsal Adalet, Eşitsizlik ve İktidar’ Nereye Düşer?. *Ruşen Keleş’e Armağan, Kent ve Politika*.

Akgün, G. and Türkmen, H. (2009). Kentsel Toplumsal Hareketler ve Emek Muhalefeti, *Birikim, Aylık Sosyalist Kültür Dergisi*, 47, 94-105.

De Angelis, M. (2003). Reflections on alternatives, commons and communities. *The Commoner*, 6, 1-14.

De Angelis, M. (2005). How?!?! An Essay on John Holloway's Change the World Without Taking Power. *Historical Materialism*, 13(4), 233.

Askins, K. (2009) ‘That's just what I do’: Placing emotion in academic activism. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2(1), 4-13.

Aslan, Ş. (2004). *I Mayıs mahallesi: 1980 öncesi toplumsal mücadeleler ve kent. İletişim*.

Aslan, Ş., & Şen, B. (2011). Politik kimliğin temsil edici mekanları: Çayan Mahallesi. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 120, 109-132.

Assies, W. (1994). Urban social movements in Brazil: a debate and its dynamics. *Latin American Perspectives*, 21(2), 81-105.

Attoh, K. A. (2011). What kind of right is the right to the city?. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(5), 669-685.

Ayata, S. (1989).Toplumsal çevre olarak gecekondü ve apartman. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 46(47), 101-127.

Barker, C., & Dale, G. (1998). Protest waves in western Europe: A critique of" New Social Movement" theory. *Critical sociology*, 24(1-2), 65-104.

Barker, C., Cox, L., Krinsky, J., & Nilsen, A. G. (2013). *Marxism and Social Movements: An Introduction*. Brill.

Baysal Uzunçarşılı, C. (2010). 5366 Cinayeti karşısında kent hakkını inşa etmek.Radikal Gazetesi, (06.11. 2010).

Baysal Uzunçarşılı, C. (2011a). Barınma Hakkından ne haber?. Radikal Gazetesi,(12.07.2011)

Baysal Uzunçarşılı, C. (2011b).Zorla tahliyeler vakti. Radikal Gazetesi, (21.08.2011).

Baysal Uzunçarşılı, C. (2012). Kent Hakkı Yeniden Hayat Bulurken. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum*, 9(36), 31-55.

Beja-Horta, A.P. (2006). Places of resistance: Power, spatial discourses and migrant grass-roots organizing in the periphery of Lisbon. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 10 (3), 269-285.

Benach, N. (2011). The spatial perspective in action. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(1), 66-68.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual review of sociology*, 611-639.

Benlisoy, F. (2013). *Gezi Direnişi: Türkiye'nin Enteresan Başlangıcı*. Agora Kitaplığı.

Bennett, L. (1997). Urban redevelopment and grassroots action in Chicago and Sheffield: themes, variations and uncertain legacies. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 21(4), 664-676.

Blomley, N. (1994). Activism and the academy. *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space*, 12, 383–85.

Blomley, N. K. (2008). Activism and the academy. *Critical Geographies: A Collection of Readings*, 28-32.

Boer, R. W. J., & De Vries, J. (2009). The Right to the City as a Tool for Urban Social Movements: The Case of Barceloneta. In The 4th International Conference of the International Forum on Urbanism (IFoU), Amsterdam/Delft.

Bookchin, M. (1982). *The ecology of freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy*. Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books.

Bookchin, M. (1986). *The limits of the city*. New York: Harper & Row.

Bookchin, M. (1992). "Libertarian Municipalism: An Overview." *Green Perspectives*.

http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/gp/perspectives24.html.

Bookchin, M. (1995). *From urbanization to cities: Toward a new politics of citizenship*. Cassell.

Bourdieu, P. (Ed.). (1999). *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society*. Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2003). Participant Objectivation. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9(2), 281-294.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (Eds.). (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago Press. [Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. D. (2003). *Düşünümsel Bir Antropoloji İçin Cevaplar*, Translated by Nazlı Ökten. *İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları*.]

Breitbart, M. M. (2012). Looking Backward/Acting Forward. *Antipode*, 44(5), 1579-1590.

Brenner, N. (2000). The urban question: reflections on Henri Lefebvre, urban theory and the politics of scale. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 24(2), 361-378.

Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of “actually existing neoliberalism”. *Antipode*, 34(3), 349-379.

Brenner, N., Marcuse, P., & Mayer, M. (2009). Cities for people, not for profit. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 13(2-3), 176-184.

Bringel, B. (2013). Brazil within the Geopolitics of Global Outrage. *Global Dialogue*, July 1, 2013

Brown, L. A., & Strega, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*. Canadian Scholars' Press.

Buechler, S. M. (2000). *Social movements in advanced capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burawoy, M. (1998). The extended case method. *Sociological theory*, 16(1), 4-33.

Burawoy, M. (2005). For public sociology. *American sociological review*, 70(1), 4-28.

Butler, C. (2012). *Henri Lefebvre: Spatial politics, everyday life and the right to the city*. Routledge.

Cabannes, Y. (2013). Urban movements and NGOs: So near, so far. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 17(4), 560-566.

Caffentzis, G. (2004). A tale of two conferences: Globalization, the crisis of neoliberalism and question of the commons. Centre for Global Justice.

Caffentzis, G. (2010). The Future of 'The Commons': Neoliberalism's Plan B or the Original Disaccumulation of Capital?. *New Formations*, 69(1), 23-41.

Caldeira, T. P. (1996). Building up walls: the new pattern of spatial segregation in São Paulo. *International social science journal*, 48(147), 55-66.

Calhoun, C. (1994). *Social theory and the politics of identity*. Blackwell.

Carpio, G., Irazabal, C., & Pulido, L. (2011). Right to the suburb? Rethinking Lefebvre and immigrant activism. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 33(2), 185-208.

Carrasco, S. (2010). 'The Right to the City: Shaping the City that Makes Us.', *ZNEt A community of people committed to social change*.

Carson, T. (1990). What kind of knowing is critical action research?. *Theory into Practice*, 29(3), 167-173.

Cassano, J. (2013). The Right to the City Movement and the Turkish Summer. *Jadaliyya*.

Castells, M. (1977). *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach*, MIT Press.

Castells, M. (1978). *City, Class and Power*, St. Martin's Press.

Castells, M. (1983). *The City and the Grassroots*, University of California Press.

Castree, N. (2006). Geography's new public intellectuals?. *Antipode*, 38(2), 396-412.

Castoriadis, C. (1991). *Philosophy, politics, autonomy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Castoriadis, C. (1998). *The imaginary institution of society*. The MIT Press.
- Chatterton, P. (2002). "Squatting is still legal, necessary and free": a brief intervention in the corporate city. *Antipode*, 34(1), 1-7.
- Chatterton, P. (2005). Making autonomous geographies: Argentina's popular uprising and the 'Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados' (Unemployed Workers Movement). *Geoforum*, 36(5), 545-561.
- Chatterton, P. (2006). "Give up activism" and change the world in unknown ways: Or, learning to walk with others on uncommon ground. *Antipode*, 38(2), 259-281.
- Chatterton, P. (2008a). Autonomous spaces and social centres, *Shift*, 7-11.
- Chatterton, P. (2008b). Demand the Possible: Journeys in Changing our World as a Public Activist-Scholar. *Antipode*, 40(3), 421-427.
- Chatterton, P. (2010a). The Urban Impossible: A Eulogy for the Unfinished City. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 14 (3): 234-244.
- Chatterton, P. (2010b). Seeking the urban common: Furthering the debate on spatial justice. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 14(6), 625-628.
- Chatterton, P. (2010c). So What Does It Mean to be Anti-capitalist? Conversations with Activists from Urban Social Centres. *Urban Studies*, 47(6), 1205-1224.
- Chatterton, P., Fuller, D., & Routledge, P. (2007). Relating action to activism: Theoretical and methodological reflections. Kindon S, Pain R, Kesby M, eds. *Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods: Connecting People, Participation and Place*. Routledge Studies in Human Geography. London: Routledge.
- Chatterton, P., Hodkinson, S., & Pickerill, J. (2010). Beyond Scholar Activism: Making Strategic Interventions Inside and Outside the Neoliberal University. *Acme: An international e-journal for critical geographies*, 9(2).

Chatterton, P., & Heynen, N. (2011) Resistance (s) and Collective Social Action. *A Companion to Social Geography*.

Cinalli, M. (2003). Socio-politically polarized contexts, urban mobilization and the environmental movement: a comparative study of two campaigns of protest in Northern Ireland. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(1), 158-177.

Clark, J. P. (1984). *The anarchist moment: Reflections on culture, nature, and power*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Clough, N. L. (2012). Emotion at the center of radical politics: On the affective structures of rebellion and control. *Antipode*, 44(5), 1667-1686.

Cohen, J. L. & Arato, A. (1994). *Civil society and political theory*. The MIT Press.

Cook, I.G. & Norcup, J. (2012). Geographies and urban space in R. Kinna (Ed.), *The continuum companion to anarchism*. London, UK and New York.

Couch, C., Fraser, C., & Percy, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Urban regeneration in Europe*. Blackwell.

Crossley, N. (2002). *Making sense of social movements*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Cunningham, D. (2010). Rights, politics and strategy: A response to Seeking Spatial Justice. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 14(6), 604-606.

Cushman, E. (1999). The public intellectual, service learning, and activist research. *College English*, 61(3), 328-336.

Çavdar, A. and Tan, P. (2013). *Müstesna Şehrin İstisna Hali*, Sel Yayıncılık.

Çavuşoğlu, E., & Yalçın, M. C. (2010). Kentte Olagelene Birarada Muhalefet İhtimali ve Kent Hakkı Kavramını Olgunlaştırmak Üzerine. *Birgün gazetesi*, 8.10.2010.

Çavuşoğlu, E. (2011). Kentsel Muhalefetin Akademik ve Aydın Aktörlerinin Değerleri ve Kapasite Sorunları.
<http://www.planlama.org/index.php/haberler/59-planlamaorg-yazlar/erbatur-cavuolu/2693-kentsel-muhalefetin-akademik-ve-aydn-aktoerlerinin-deerleri-ve-kapasite-sorunlar>.

Çavuşoğlu, E., Çılın, K. & Strutz, J. (2011). Kentsel Dönüşüm Baskısı Altındaki Mahallelerdeki Güç İlişkilerinin Bourdieucu Bir Okuması. Paper presented at the 7th Urbanism Congress, YTÜ, İstanbul,
http://www.academia.edu/6265664/Kentsel_Donusum_Baskisi_Altindaki_Mahallelerdeki_Guc_Iliskilerinin_Bourdieucu_Bir_Okumasi.

Dalakoglou, D., & Vradis, A. (2011). Spatial legacies of December and the right to the city. *Revolt and Crisis in Greece*.

Darby, S. (2011). *Subverting the Big Society? A case study of a community group engaging and resisting neoliberal co-optation*, Dissertation supervised by Dr. Paul Chatterton, the University of Leeds, MA in Activism and Social Change.

Day, R. J. (2004). From hegemony to affinity: The political logic of the newest social movements. *Cultural Studies*, 18(5), 716-748.

Della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (1999). *Social Movements: An Introduction*, Blackwell Publishing.

Diani, M. (2002). Network analysis. Methods of social movement research, in Klandermans, B., & Staggenborg, S. (Eds.), University of Minnesota Press.

Dikeç, M. (2001). Justice and the spatial imagination. *Environment and Planning A*, 33(10), 1785-1806.

Dikeç, M. (2002). Police, politics, and the right to the city. *GeoJournal*, 58(2-3), 91-98.

Dikeç, M. (2007). Revolting geographies: Urban unrest in france. *Geography Compass*, 1(5), 1190-1206.

Doğan, A. E. (2011). Kent Hakkı ve Siyaset. *Ekmek ve Özgürlük*, 14, 32-33.

Duben, A. (2006). *Kent, Aile, Tarih*, İletişim Yayınları.

Eder, K. (1995). Does social class matter in the study of social movements? A theory of middle-class radicalism. *Social Movements and Social Classes: The Future of Collective Action*, Sage.

Eder, K. (1996). *The new politics of class: Social movements and cultural dynamics in advanced societies*. Sage.

Elden, S. (2004). *Understanding Henri Lefebvre*. Continuum.

Erder, S. (1997). *Kentsel gerilim: enformel ilişki ağları alan araştırması*. umag.

Erder, S. (2000). Nerelisin Hemşerim? *İstanbul Küresel İle Yerel Arasında, Çağlar Keyder, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları*.

Erder, S. (2001). Yoksulluğun Düzenlenmesinden, Zenginliğin Düzenlenmesine Kentleşme ve Kentsel Kurumlar. *21. Yüzyıl Karsısında Kent ve İnsan*, Gümüšoğlu, F. (ed.), Bağlam Yayınları.

Ergin, N. B. (2006). *Grassroots Resistance Against Urban Renewal: The Case of Güzeltepe, Istanbul*, under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç, Master Thesis, Middle East Technical University, The Department of Sociology.

Erman, T. (2001). The politics of squatter (gecekondu) studies in Turkey: the changing representations of rural migrants in the academic discourse. *Urban Studies*, 38(7), 983-1002.

Erman, T. (2004). Gecekondu Çalışmalarında ‘Öteki’ Olarak Gecekondu Kurguları. *European Journal of Turkish Studies, Thematic Issue Gecekondu (1)*, <http://ejts.revues.org/85>.

Erman, T., & Eken, A. (2004). The “Other of the Other” and “unregulated territories” in the urban periphery:”gecekondu” violence in the 2000s with a focus on the Esenler case, Istanbul. *Cities*, 21(1), 57-68.

Erman, T., & Coşkun-Yıldar, M. (2007). Emergent local initiative and the city: the case of neighbourhood associations of the better-off classes in post-1990 urban Turkey. *Urban Studies*, 44(13), 2547-2566.

Fainstein, S. S. (2010). *The just city*. Cornell University Press.

Fainstein, Susan and Hirst, C. (2010) “Urban social movements” in D. Judge, G. Stoker et al., *Theories of urban politics*, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Federici, S. (2004). *Caliban and the Witch*. Autonomedia.

Fernandes, E. (2007). Implementing the urban reform agenda in Brazil. *Environment and Urbanization*, 19(1), 177-189.

Fernandez, L. A. (2009). Being there: thoughts on anarchism and participatory observation in Amster, R., DeLeon, A., Fernandez, L., Nocella, A. J., & Shannon, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Contemporary anarchist studies: an introductory anthology of anarchy in the academy*. Routledge.

Fırat, B. Ö. (2011). Ve Madem ki Sokaklar Kimsenin Değil: Talan, Dolandırıcılık ve Hırsızlığa Karşı Kentsel Müşterekler Yaratmak. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum*, 9(36), 96-116.

Fırat, B. Ö. (2012). Devrimci-Halkçı Yerel Yönetimler Sempozyumu. Praksis, Yeniden Gramsci: Hegemonya, Devlet ve Pasif Devrim Sorunu, 27.

Fırat, B. Ö. (2013). Kentsel Çitlemeye Karşı Müşterekleştirme Pratikleri. *İktisat Dergisi, Maliye “Müşterekler”den Bakmak*, 522, 26-32.

The Free Association. (2010). Antagonism, neo-liberalism and movements: Six impossible things before breakfast. *Antipode*, 42(4), 1019-1033.

Fuentes, M., & Frank, A. G. (1989). Ten theses on social movements. *World Development*, 17(2), 179-191.

Fuller, Duncan, and Rob Kitchin. (2004). Radical theory/critical praxis: academic geography beyond the academy?. *Praxis (e)Press*, http://www.praxis-eypress.org/rtcp/RTCP_Whole.pdf.

Fuller, Duncan. (2008). Public geographies: taking stock. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(6), 834-844.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006). *A postcapitalist politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gilbert, L., & Dikeç, M. (2008). Right to the city: politics of citizenship. *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*.

Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. Francesca Polletta, eds. (2001). *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements*. London: Blackwell Publishing.

Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. (Eds.). (2009). *The social movements reader: cases and concepts*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gordon, U. (2012). Anarchist Geographies and Revolutionary Strategies. *Antipode*, 44(5), 1742-1751.

Gottdiener, M. (1994). *The social production of urban space*. University of Texas Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.

Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watts, M., & Whatmore, S. (Eds.). (2009). *The dictionary of human geography*. Wiley.

Gökarıksel, S. (2013). Speaking of Resistance, The Gezi Park Forums Have Spread Across Turkey, <http://www.occupy.com/article/speaking-resistance-gezi-park-forums-have-spread-across-turkey>.

Gutierrez, B. (2013). O que tem as revoltas de 2013 tem em comum. *Outra Politica*, 07.10.2013.

Gusfield, J. R. (1994). The reflexivity of social movements: Collective behavior and mass society theory revisited. In Gusfield, J. R., Laraña, E., & Johnston, H. (Eds.). *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Temple University Press.

Gusfield, J. R., Laraña, E., & Johnston, H. (Eds.). (1994). *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Temple University Press.

Gündoğdu, İ. (2010). Sosyalist-Sol Yerel Strateji?: Yerellikler, Kent Planlama ve Sulukule Atölyesi in Şen, B. & Doğan, A. E. (eds.) Tarih, Sınıflar ve Kent, dipnot Yayınları, Ankara.

Günlü, R. (2002). Türkiye’de Kentsel Değişimler ve Siyasal Bilinç. *Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği: Kentleşme, Göç ve Yoksulluk*.

Hale, C. R. (2001). What is activist research. *Items and Issues: Social Science Research Council*, 2(1-2), 13-15.

Hamel, P., Lustiger-Thaler, H., & Mayer, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Urban movements in a globalising world*. Routledge.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2009). *Commonwealth*. Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2012). *Declaration*. Melanie Jackson Agency, LLC.

Harloe, M. (1977). *Captive cities: studies in the political economy of cities and regions*. John Wiley & Sons.

Harloe, M., Pickvance, C. G., & Urry, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Place, Policy and Politics: Do Localities Matter?*. Routledge.

Harvey, D. (1987). Flexible accumulation through urbanization: reflections on 'post-modernism' in the American city. *Antipode*, 19(3), 260-286.

Harvey, D. (1996). On architects, bees, and possible urban worlds. *Anywise*, 216-227.

Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B. Human Geography*, 3-17.

Harvey, D. (2003). Debates and Developments: The right to the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939-941.

Harvey, David. (2008). "The Right to the City.", *New Left Review*, 53, 23-40.

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: from the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso Books.

Heater, D. (2004). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Hodkinson, S. (2012). The new urban enclosures. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 16(5), 500-518.

Hodkinson, S., & Chatterton, P. (2006). Autonomy in the city? Reflections on the social centres movement in the UK. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 10(3), 305-315.

Holloway, J. (2002a). Changing the world without taking power: The meaning of revolution today. London: Pluto Press.

Holloway, J. (2002b). Twelve theses on changing the world without taking power. *The Commoner*, 4, 1-6.

Holloway, J. (2010). Cracks and the Crisis of Abstract Labour. *Antipode*, 42(4), 909-923.

Holmes, A. (2013). The Crackdown on the Commons. Everywhere is Taksim. Counterpunch. 26.06.2013.

Holston, J. (2011). Contesting privilege with right: the transformation of differentiated citizenship in Brazil. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(3-4), 335-352.

Horton, M., & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Temple University Press.

Ince, A. (Forthcoming 2014). Black flag mapping: emerging themes in anarchist geography. in Levy C and Newman S (eds.) *The Anarchist Imagination: Anarchism Encounters the Humanities and Social Sciences*. London: Routledge.

Isin, E. (2002). City, democracy and citizenship: historical images, contemporary practices. in Isin, E. And Turner, B. (ed.) *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, London: Sage Publications.

Işık, O., & Pınarcıoğlu, M. M. (2001). *Nöbetleşe yoksulluk: Gecekondulaşma ve kent yoksulları: Sultanbeyli örneği*. İletişim.

Iveson, K. (2011). Social or spatial justice? Marcuse and Soja on the right to the city. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(2), 250-259.

Jasper, J. M. (2011). Emotions and social movements: Twenty years of theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37, 285-303.

Karaman, O. (2013). Defending Future Commons: The Gezi Experience
<http://antipodefoundation.org/2013/08/27/intervention-defending-future-commons-the-gezi-experience-by-ozan-karaman-2/>

Kavoulakos, K. I. (2006). The emergence, development and limits of the alternative strategy of the urban movements in Germany. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 10(3), 343-354.

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: New York University Press.

Keskinok, Ç. (2007). Kentsel Toplumsal Hareketler Üzerine Tartışma. *"Yerellik ve Politika 4: Küreselleşme Sürecinde Yerel Demokrasi"*, İmge Kitabevi.

Kıray, M. (1998). *Kentleşme Yazıları*. Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.

Kıray, M. (1999). *Toplumsal yapı, toplumsal değişme*. Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.

Kimpson, S. A. (2005). Stepping off the road: A narrative (of) inquiry. In Brown, L. A., & Strega, S. (Eds.) *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*. Canadian Scholars' Press, 73-96.

Kiriş, Ömer. 2011. "Bu yasanın tek amacı yıkmak." 25.05.2012. <http://www.emekdunyasi.net/ed/guncel/18208-bu-yasanin-tek-amaci-yikmak>.

Kitchin, R. M., & Hubbard, P. J. (1999). Research, action and 'critical' geographies. *Area*, 31(3), 195-198.

Köhler, B., & Wissen, M. (2003). Globalizing protest: urban conflicts and the global social movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 942-951.

Kofman, E., & Lebas, E. (2000). *Writings on cities: Henri Lefebvre*. Blackwell.

Koopmans, R. (2004). Protest in time and space: The evolution of waves of contention. *The Blackwell companion to social movements*, in *The Social Movements Reader: cases and concepts*, The Blackwell Reader in Sociology, Malden, MA: The Blackwell Publishing.

Kriesi, H., Koopmans, R., & Duyvendak, J. M. Giugni (1995). *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*.

Kutlu, T. & Tonak, A. (2012). David Harvey'in değeri, Sendika.org.8 Ağustos 2012.

Kuymulu, M. B. (2013). Reclaiming the right to the city: Reflections on the urban uprisings in Turkey. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 17(3), 274-278.

Kuyucu, T., & Ünsal, Ö. (2010a). 'Urban transformation' as state-led property transfer: An analysis of two cases of urban renewal in Istanbul. *Urban Studies*, 47(7), 1479-1499.

Kuyucu, T., & Ünsal, Ö. (2010b). Challenging the neoliberal urban regime: Regeneration and resistance in Başlıbüyük and Tarlaşı. *Orienteering Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, 51-70.

Laclau, E. (1979). *Politics and Marxist Theory: capitalism, fascism, populism*. Verso.

Laclau, E. (1996). *Emancipation (s)*. Verso.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. Verso.

Laraña, E., Johnston, H., & Gusfield, J. R. (Eds.). (1994). *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Temple University Press.

Legard, S. (2013) Has Harvey Become a Libertarian Municipalist?.*New Compass*, 10.04.2013

Lefebvre, H. (1972). *Le droit à la ville suivi de Espace et politique*. Éditions anthropos.

Lefebvre, H. (1976). The survival of capitalism: reproduction of the relations of production. London: Allison & Busby.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (2000). *Writing on Cities* in eds. Kofman, E., & Lebas, E. London:Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (2003). *The urban revolution*.University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. , Elden, S. And Lebas, E. (2006). *Key Writings*. Continuum.

Lefebvre, H. (2009). *State, Space, World Selected Essays*, in Brenner, N., Elden, S. (Eds.). Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Leontidou, L. (2006). Urban social movements: from the ‘right to the city’ to transnational spatialities and flaneur activists: Introduction. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 10(3), 259-268.

Leontidou, L. (2010). Urban social movements in ‘weak’ civil societies: the right to the city and cosmopolitan activism in Southern Europe. *Urban Studies*, 47(6), 1179-1203.

Lojkin, J. (1976). Contribution to a Marxist theory of capitalist urbanization.*Urban sociology: critical essays*, 119-146.

Lovering, J., & Türkmen, H. (2011). Bulldozer neo-liberalism in Istanbul: The state-led construction of property markets, and the displacement of the urban poor. *International Planning Studies*, 16(1), 73-96.

Lowe, S. (1986). *Urban social movements: The city after Castells*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Marcos, S. (2001). *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*/Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos. Seven Stories Press.

Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 13(2-3), 185-197.

Mason, K. (2013). Academics and Social Movements: Knowing Our Place, Making Our Space. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 12(1), 23-43.

Mathivet, C. (2010). The right to the city: Keys to understanding the proposal for “another city is possible”. *Cities for All*, 21.

Mayer, M. (2006). Manuel Castells’ the city and the grassroots. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(1), 202-206.

Mayer, M. (2009). The ‘Right to the City’ in the context of shifting mottos of urban social movements. *City*, 13(2-3), 362-374.

Mayer, M. (2013). First world urban activism: Beyond austerity urbanism and creative city politics. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 17(1), 5-19.

McAdam, D., Tarrow, S. & Tilly, C. (2001). *Dynamics of Contention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCann, E. J. (2002). Space, citizenship, and the right to the city: A brief overview. *GeoJournal*, 58(2), 77-79.

McFarlane, C. (2011). Assemblage and critical urbanism. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(2), 204-224.

McFarlane, C. (2011a). The city as assemblage: dwelling and urban space. *Environment and Planning- D*, 29(4), 649.

McFarlane, C. (2011b). *Learning the city: Knowledge and translocal assemblage*. John Wiley & Sons.

Melucci, A. (1994). A Strange Kind of Newness: What is New in New Social Movements? in Larana, E., Johnston, H., & Gusfield, J. R. (Eds). *New Social Movements From Ideology to Identity*, Temple University Press.

Melucci, A. (1995). The process of collective identity. *Social movements and culture*, 4, 41-63.

Mengi, A. (2007). Yerellik ve Politika-Küreselleşme Sürecinde Yerel Demokrasi, Ruşen Keleş'e Armağan. İmge Yayınları.

Merrifield, A. (2011). *Magical Marxism: Subversive politics and the imagination*. Pluto Press.

Merrifield, A. & Swyngedouw, E. (1997). *The Urbanization of Injustice*, New York University Press.

Meyer, D. S., Whittier, N., & Robnett, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Social movements: identity, culture and the state*. Oxford University Press.

Mingione, E. (1981). *Social conflict and the city*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mitchell, D. (2003). *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. Guilford Press.

Mitchell, D., & Heynen, N. (2009). The geography of survival and the right to the city: Speculations on surveillance, legal innovation, and the criminalization of intervention. *Urban Geography*, 30(6), 611-632.

Mouffe, C. (2005). *The return of the political*. Verso.

Narotzky, S. (2013) What kind of commons are the urban commons? *Focaal-Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, 66, 122-124.

Nicholls, W. J. (2008). The urban question revisited: the importance of cities for social movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(4), 841-859.

Offe, C. (1985). New social movements: challenging the boundaries of institutional politics. *Social research*, 817-868.

Olesen, T. (2004). Globalising the Zapatistas: from Third World solidarity to global solidarity?. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(1), 255-267.

Olives, José (1976) The struggle against urban renewal in the 'Cité d'aliarte', in Chris G. Pickvance (ed.) *Urban Sociology: Critical Essays*, Tavistock Publications.

Ozanne, J. L., & Saatcioglu, B. (2008). Participatory action research. *Journal of consumer research*, 35(3), 423-439.

Pain, R. (2003). Social geography: on action-orientated research. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(5), 649-658.

Pain, R., & Francis, P. (2003). Reflections on participatory research. *Area*, 35(1), 46-54.

Pattaroni, L. (2007). La ville plurielle. Quand les squatters ébranlent l'ordre urbain. *Bassand M., Kaufman V., Joye D., Enjeux de la sociologie urbaine, Lausanne, PPUR*, 283-314.

Peet, R. (1977). The development of radical geography in the United States. *Progress in Human Geography*, 1(2), 240-263.

Peet, R. (2000). Celebrating thirty years of radical geography. *Environment and Planning A*, 32(6), 951-953.

Pérouse, J. F. (2004). Les tribulations du terme gecekondu (1947-2004): une lente perte de substance. Pour une clarification terminologique. *European Journal of Turkish Studies. Social Sciences on Contemporary Turkey*, 1. <http://ejts.revues.org/117>.

Pérouse, J. F. (2006). Kentsel Dönüşüm Halleri Olarak Birkaç Saptama: Aman, İstanbul Miami olmasın. İstanbul(lular)a rağmen Kentsel Dönüşüm, *İstanbul Dergisi*, 57, 28-32.

P rouse, J. F. (2009). Deconstructing the Gecekondu, *European Journal of Turkish Studies.Social Sciences on Contemporary Turkey*, (1).

P rouse, J. F. (2011). İstanbul'la y zleşme denemeleri:  eperler, hareketlilik ve kentsel bellek. İletişim.

P rouse, J.F. (2013).Kentsel d n ş m uygulamalarında belirleyici bir rol  stlenen Toplu Konut İdaresi'nin (TOKİ) belirsiz kimlięi  zerinde birkaç saptama in  avdar, A. and Tan, P. (Eds.) *M stesna Şehr n İstisna Hali*, Sel Yayıncılık.

Pichardo, N. A. (1997). New social movements: A critical review. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 411-430.

Pickerill, J., & Chatterton, P. (2006). Notes towards autonomous geographies: creation, resistance and self-management as survival tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(6), 730-746.

Pickerill, J., & Krinsky, J. (2012). Why Does Occupy Matter?. *Social Movement Studies*, 11(3-4), 279-287.

Pickvance, C. G. (1975). On the Study of Urban Social Movements.*The sociological review*, 23(1), 29-49.

Pickvance, C. (2003). From urban social movements to urban movements: a review and introduction to a symposium on urban movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(1), 102-109.

Pindell, N. (2006). Finding a right to the city: Exploring property and community in Brazil and in the United States.Vand. J. Transnat'l L., 39, 435.

Pithouse, R. (2008). A Politics of the Poor Shack Dwellers' Struggles in Durban.*Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 43(1), 63-94.

Portaliou, E. (2007). Anti-global movements reclaim the city. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 11(2), 165-175.

Potts, K. and Brown, L. (2005). Becoming an anti-oppressive researcher. In L. Brown and S. Strega (Eds.), *Research is resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Pruijt, H. D. (2007). Urban movements. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia*.

Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *GeoJournal*, 58(2-3), 99-108.

Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and the right to the global city: reimagining the capitalist world order. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 27(3), 564-590.

Purcell, M. (2006). Urban democracy and the local trap, *Urban Studies*, 43(11), 1921-1941.

Purcell, M. (2008). *Recapturing Democracy Neoliberalization and the Struggle for Alternative Urban Futures*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Purcell, M. (2009). Le droit à la ville et les mouvements urbains contemporains, *Rue Descartes* 1, 63, 40-50.

Purcell, M. (2013). Seeking Democracy, *Society and Space Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*.
<http://societyandspace.com/material/discussion-forum/forum-on-turkey/purcell/>

Purcell, M. (2013a). Possible Worlds: Henri Lefebvre and the Right to the City. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 36(1), 141-154.

Purcell, M. (2013b). *The Down-Deep Delight of Democracy*. John Wiley & Sons.

Purcell, M. (2013c). A New Land: Deleuze and Guattari and Planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 14(1), 20-38.

Pusey, A. (2012). Cities of Struggle. *Red Pepper*.
<http://www.redpepper.org.uk/cities-of-struggle/>.

Rankin, K. N. (2009). Critical development studies and the praxis of planning. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 13(2-3), 219-229.

Ricketts, A. (2012). *The activists' handbook: a step-by-step guide to participatory democracy*. Zed Books.

Ritzer, G. (Ed.).(2007). *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*. Blackwell Publications.

Roth, R. (2000). New social movements, poor people's movements and the struggle for social citizenship. *Urban movements in a globalising world*, 25.

Routledge, P. (2003). Convergence space: process geographies of grassroots globalization networks. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28(3), 333-349.

Routledge, P. (2007). Transnational political movements. *The Sage Handbook of Political Geography*. Sage.

Routledge P. (2009). Transnational resistance: Global justice networks and spaces of convergence. *Geography Compass* 3, 1881-1901.

Rucht, D. (1999). The transnationalization of social movements: Trends, causes, problems. *Social movements in a globalizing world*, 206-222.

Russell, B., Pusey, A. & Chatterton, P. (2011). What can an assemblage do?. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(5), 577-583.

Samara, T. R. (2007). Development, social justice and global governance: challenges to implementing restorative and criminal justice reform in South Africa. *Acta Juridica*, 113.

Sandercock, L. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities Of The Twenty First Century*. London: Continuum.

Sassen, S. (2004). Local actors in global politics. *Current Sociology*, 52(4), 649-670.

Shields, R. (1998). *Lefebvre, love and struggle: Spatial dialectics*. Routledge.

Shin, H. B. (2013). The right to the city and critical reflections on China's property rights activism. *Antipode*, 45 (5), 1167-1189.

Simmel, G. (2002). The metropolis and mental life in Bridge, G., & Watson, S. (Eds.) *A Companion to the City*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sitrin, M. (Ed.). (2006). *Horizontalism*. AK Press.

Smith, N. (1996). *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*. Routledge.

Smith, N. (2002). New globalism, new urbanism: gentrification as global urban strategy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 427-450.

Smith, A. M. (2002a). *Laclau and Mouffe: The radical democratic imaginary*. Routledge.

Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A., & Kriesi, H. (2004). Mapping the terrain. *The Blackwell companion to social movements*. Blackwell Publishing.

Soja, E. (1980). The socio-spatial dialectic. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 70(2), 207-225.

Soja, E. (2010a). *Seeking Spatial Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Soja, E. (2010b). Spatializing the urban, Part I. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 14(6), 629-635.

Soja, E. (2011a). Spatializing justice—Part II. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(1), 96-102.

Soja, E. (2011b). Response to Kurt Iveson: 'Social or Spatial Justice? Marcuse and Soja on the Right to the City'. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(2), 260-262.

Solmaz, Y. (2013). *Kentsel Dönüşüm Uygulamalarına Karşı Gelişen Kent Hareketlerinin Geleceği*, I. Türkiye Lisansüstü Çalışmaları Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı. İstanbul. 23-32.

de Souza, M. L. (2000). Urban Development on the Basis of Autonomy: a Politico-philosophical and Ethical Framework for Urban Planning and Management. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, 3 (2), 187-201.

de Souza, M. L. (2001). The Brazilian Way of Conquering the "Right to the City" Successes and Obstacles in the Long Stride towards an "Urban Reform". *disP-The Planning Review*, 37(147), 25-31.

de Souza, M. L. (2006). Together with the state, despite the state, against the state Social Movements as 'critical urban planning' agents. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 10 (3): 327-342.

de Souza, M. L. (2008). Some Introductory Remarks about a New City For a New Society. *Life After Capitalism Essays*. <http://www.zcommunications.org/some-introductory-remarks-about-a-new-city-for-a-new-society-by-marcelo-lopes-de-souza>.

de Souza, M. L. (2010a). Which right to which city? In defence of political-strategic clarity. *Interface*, 2(1), 315-333.

de Souza, M. L. (2010 b) Two world urban forums. What happened in Rio? Where does it lead? A discussion in Atkinson, A., Lipietz, B., Lopes de Souza, M., & Suri, S. N. (2010). *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 14(5), 566-585.

de Souza, M. L. (2011). The words and the things. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(1), 73-77.

de Souza, M. L. (2012a). The city in libertarian thought: From Élisée Reclus to Murray Bookchin—and beyond. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 16(1-2), 4-33.

de Souza, M. L. (2012b). Marxists, libertarians and the city: A necessary debate. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 16(3), 315-331.

de Souza, M. L. (2012c). Panem et circenses versus the right to the city (centre) in Rio de Janeiro: A short report. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 16(5), 563-572.

de Souza, M. L. (2013). NGOs and social movements: Convergences and divergences. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 17(2), 258-261.

Speed, S. (2006). At the crossroads of human rights and anthropology: Toward a critically engaged activist research. *American Anthropologist*, 108(1), 66-76.

Springer, S. (2012). Anarchism! What geography still ought to be. *Antipode*, 44(5), 1605-1624.

Springer, S. (2013). Anarchism and Geography: A Brief Genealogy of Anarchist Geographies. *Geography Compass*, 7(1), 46-60.

Springer, S., Ince, A., Pickerill, J., Brown, G., & Barker, A. J. (2012). Reanimating anarchist geographies: A new burst of colour. *Antipode*, 44(5), 1591-1604.

Stahre, U. (2004). City in change: Globalization, local politics and urban movements in contemporary Stockholm. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(1), 68-85.

Strutz, J., & Çavuşoğlu, E. (2012). Enformelliğin Sınırları Değişirken Kent Hakkı. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum*, 9(36), 56-73.

Swyngedouw, E., & Moulaert, F. (2010). Socially innovative projects, governance dynamics and urban change. *Can Neighbourhoods Save the City?: Community Development and Social Innovation*, Moulaert, F. Swyngedouw, E., Martinelli, F. and Gonzalez, S. (Eds.). Routledge.

Susman, G. I., & Evered, R. D. (1978). An assessment of the scientific merits of action research. *Administrative science quarterly*, 582-603.

Susser, I., & Tonnelat, S. (2013). Transformative cities: The three urban commons. *Focaal*, 2013(66), 105-132.

Sutherland, N. (2013). Book Review: Social movements and activist ethnography. *Organization*, 20(4), 627-635.

Şahin, Çiğdem. 2012. "Fener-Balat-Ayvansaray Yıkımı da İptal.", interview of Nilay Vardar. <http://bianet.org/bianet/toplum/139203-fener-balat-ayvansaray-yikimi-da-iptal>.

Şanlı, L. (2003). Türkiye’de Toplumsal Hareketler”. *Toplumsal Hareketler Konuşuyor*, (Haz: Leyla Şanlı), Alan Yayınları.

Şen, B.(2010). Kentsel Dönüşüm ve “Kaybetmeden Mücadele Etme Arayışı” Gülsuyu-Gülensu ve Başbüyük Deneyimleri. *Tarih, Sınıflar ve Kent*, Dipnot Yayınları.

Şengül, H. T. (2009). *Kentsel çelişki ve siyaset: kapitalist kentleşme süreçlerinin eleştirisi*. İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.

Şenyapılı, T. (2004). Charting the ‘Voyage’ of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial ‘Quadruped’. *European journal of Turkish studies*, <http://ejts.revues.org/index142.html>.

Tarrow, S. (1993). Cycles of collective action: Between moments of madness and the repertoire of contention. *Social Science History*, 17(2), 281-307.

Tarrow, S. (1994). Power in movement: Social movements, collective action and mass politics in the modern state.

Tekeli, İ. (2001). *Modernite Aşılırken Kent Planlaması*. İmge Kitabevi.

Thörn, H. (2012). In between social engineering and gentrification: Urban restructuring, social movements, and the place politics of open space. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 34(2), 153-168.

Tilly, C. (2004). *Social Movements, 1768–2004*, Boulder, CO, Paradigm Publishers.

Tonak, A. (2013). *Kent Hakkı'ndan İsyan'a*. Agora Kitaplığı.

Tonkiss, F. (2011). Spatial causes, social effects: A response to Soja. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 15(1), 85-86.

Touraine, A. (1981). *The voice and the eye: An analysis of social movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Touraine, A. (1985). An introduction to the study of social movements. *Social research*, 749-787.

The Trapeze Collective. (2007). *Do it yourself: a handbook for changing our world*. Pluto Press.

Tuğal, C. (2013). *Gezi'nin Yükselişi, Liberalizmin Düşüşü*. Agora Kitaplığı.

Türkmen, H. (2011). Debates on Right to the City in Istanbul, paper presented at the International RC21 Conference, August.

Türkün, A. (2011). Urban Regeneration and Hegemonic Power Relationships. *International Planning Studies*, 16(1), 61-72.

Uitermark, J., Nicholls, W., & Loopmans, M. (2012). Cities and social movements: theorizing beyond the right to the city. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(11), 2546-2554.

Uysal, Y. (1994). Sultanbeyli'nin engellenemez yükselişi: Çarpık kentleşmenin İllegal Yüzü. *İstanbul Dergisi, Yasadışı İstanbul*, 11, Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Uysal, Ü. E. (2012). An urban social movement challenging urban regeneration: The case of Sulukule, Istanbul. *Cities*, 29(1), 12-22.

Uzun, N. (2003). The impact of urban renewal and gentrification on urban fabric: three cases in Turkey. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 94(3), 363-375.

Wacquant, L. (2008). Relocating gentrification: the working class, science and the state in recent urban research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(1), 198-205.

Walton, J. (1998). Urban conflict and social movements in poor countries: Theory and evidence of collective action. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22(3), 460-481.

Ward, K. (2006). Geography and public policy: towards public geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 30(4), 495-503.

Ward, K. (2007). Public intellectuals', geography, its representations and its publics. *Geoforum* 38, 1058-1064.

Wasserfall, R. (1993). Reflexivity, feminism and difference. *Qualitative Sociology*, 16(1), 23-41.

Weinstein, L., & Ren, X. (2009). The changing right to the city: urban renewal and housing rights in globalizing Shanghai and Mumbai. *City & Community*, 8(4), 407-432.

Yalçintan, M. C. (2009). "Kentsel Muhalefetin Halleri ve Halsizlikleri", Planlama.org, <http://www.planlama.org/index.php/planlamaorg-yazlar6/planlamaorg-yazlar/57-planlamaorg-yazlar/murat-cemal-yalcintan/489-kentsel-muhalefetin-halleri-ve-halsizlikleri>.

Yalçintan, M. C. & Çavuşoğlu, E. (2013). Kentsel Dönüşümü ve Kentsel Muhalefeti Kent Hakkı Üzerinden Düşünmek. Kentsel Dönüşüm ve İnsan Hakları. Çınar, B. (ed.), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Yeğenoğlu, M. (2013). Smells like Gezi spirit-Democratic sensibilities and carnivalesque. *Radical Philosophy*, 182, Nov/Dec 2013.

Yıldırım, Y. (2013). Avrupa Sosyal Forumu yolun sonunda mı?: İstanbul 2010 ve sonrası. *Interface*, 5 (2), 121-142.

Yıldız, E. (2008). Kentsel Dönüşüm. <http://www.redfotograf.com/kentsel-donusum-hazirlayan-erdogan-yildiz/>.

Yücel, H. (2013) Türkiye’de Kentsel Kimlikler ve Hareketler, Kentsel Dönüşüme Muhalefet, <http://hakanyucelgsu.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/kentsel-dc3b6nc3bcc59fc3bcm-muhalif-gruplar.pdf>.

Yücel, H., & Aksüner, G. (2011). Kentsel Dönüşüme Karşı Kent Hakkı Mücadelesi: Kazım Karabekir Mahallesinde Mekansal Kimlik ve Dayanışma Örüntüleri. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum*, 9(36), 117-139.

Zukin, S. (1995). Whose culture? Whose city?. *The urban sociology reader*.

APPENDIX A.

TURKISH SUMMARY

Bugün kentsel mücadeleleri düşünmek oldukça zor ama aynı zamanda umut verici. Tüm dünyada kentler, Henri Lefebvre'in tanımıyla “kentsel” olanın önünü açmaktadır; bu şu şekilde açıklanmalıdır: Sosyal ve politik farklı gruplar ve onların çıkarları, talepleri ve amaçlarının mekansal yüzleşmesiyle gitgide daha çok sosyo-politik bir mücadele alanı hale gelmektedir. Eleştirel ve radikal kentsel ve toplumsal muhalefet teorileri ve analizleri sayesinde, bu çalışma öncelikle İstanbul'da dönüşüm projelerine karşı olarak ortaya çıkan bazı mahallelilerin kurduğu yeni oluşum ve dernekler ve mahalle ve dışından Purcell'in vurgusuyla “aktif sakinleri”, farklı sınıf, grup ve oluşumları kesen, tüm kesimlerden insanlar, aktivist-akademisyenler ve onların oluşumları, kent muhalefetine dahi olmayı ve öncelik vermeyi seçen bireyler gibi farklı aktörlerden oluşmakta olan kentsel muhalefeti analiz etmeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu muhalefetin kaygan zemininde birliktelikler aynı zamanda ayrışma ve farklılaşmaları da sürekli tetiklemekte, bu mevcut durumu anlamayı ve analiz etmeyi zorlaştırmaktadır.

Tezde mevcutta tartışılmakta olan kentsel toplumsal hareketler ve kent hakkı literatürünü ele alarak eleştirel ve radikal coğrafyacıların getirdiği öneriler ve açıklamalar temel alınmıştır. Yine buradan yola çıkarak yapılan toplumsal mücadele analizini katılımcı ve dayanışmacı eylem araştırma metodolojisi uygulanmaya çalışılmıştır. Tez, hem toplumsal hareketler teorisini ve kent hakkı teorilerini, bununla birlikte çalışma yaklaşımını radikal coğrafya teorilerinden tekrar ele alınması gerektiğini savunmaktadır.

Araştırma, 2010 yılında Avrupa Sosyal Forumu hazırlık süreciyle başlayan dönemi kapsamaktadır. Tek bir kentsel dönüşüm projesi ve kentin bir ya da birkaç semtinde ilgili muhalefete odaklanmak yerine, son derece parçalanmış olan İstanbul'un genelindeki kentsel muhalefetin desen ve

dinamikleri üzerinde durulmuştur. Bu bağlamda tez, “aktif sakinler”, aydınlar ve akademik - aktivist farklı grupların öncülüğündeki farklı muhalefet ve bunların beraberlik girişimleri, yapısal faktörler ve siyasi dahil çatışmaların dinamikleri analizini özellikle de duygusal faktörleri göz önüne alarak açıklamayı amaçlamıştır. Çalışmada, kent hakkı, autogestion (autogestation) gibi kavramlar üzerinde yoğunlaşarak kentsel müşterekleşme –ve bunun sosyal pratikleri- bir süreç olarak ele alınmaktadır.

Tezin başında araştırmanın temel sorusu esas aktörlerin de temel sorusu olan bir ittifak kurulup, kurulamayacağıydı; fakat zaman içinde bu çalışma ortaklaşmanın uygulamaları ve kentsel direnişin bir analizi halini aldı. Bu sayede yine kentsel muhalefetin aktörlerinin ele aldığı sorular olan çelişkili ve ortak yönler, nedenler, potansiyeller ve engelleri anlamak için bir çabaya dönüştü. Böylece yine Lefebvre’den yola çıkarak kentsel mekanın üretiminin kentsel karşıtlıklardaki temel rolü ve toplumsal dönüşümleri oluşturmak için bir potansiyele sahip olduğunu iddia edilmektedir. 2000’lerin ortalarından itibaren kentsel muhalefet kentsel dönüşüm projelerine karşı oluşurken, zamanla yeni örgütlenme şekilleri de almıştır. Dolayısıyla, kentsel muhalefet zaman zaman ve özellikle son zamanlarda kentsel müşterekler ve kent hakkı için çoğul talepleriyle siyaset yapma şekil ve amaçlarını değiştirmiş ve “kent içinde ve kent için” halktan çeşitli kişileri aktif sakinler kılmıştır. Siyasi parti tabanlı örgütlerin yerine kentsel mekandan yola çıkan yeni yerel teşebbüsler ve çeşitli kişilerin çabaları ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu çalışma bunların özelliklerini değerlendirerek, kentsel muhalefet dinamikleri, oluşmakta ve halen zayıf olan yerel ve özel önem atfedilen uluslararası boyutları, kentsel mekandan yola çıkan muhalefetin sınırlamaları ve ötesine geçmedeki engelleri, kentsel ittifaklar oluşturma neden ve gereklilikleri ve bunun yapay/zorlama karakterini, mahalleden olma veya olmamanın benzerlik, farklılıkları ve dış aktörlerin destekleri ve bunun sınırlamalarını tartışmıştır.

Kent hakkı kavramı çalışmada da referanslarıyla belirtildiği şekliyle ancak (yeni) kentsel müşterekler ve autogestion kavramlarıyla hem teori hem de pratikte bir değişimle sonuçlanır. Bu noktada, özellikle İstanbul örneği için bireyler, gruplar ya da ağlar ve ittifak çabalarının ardındaki mahallelerden ve mahalle dışından aydınların gibi çoklu etkenlerin öncelikli rolü vurgulanmalıdır. Çalışma, bu aktörlerin duygusal olarak yüklenmiş ve sabit değil ve fakat zaman zaman kendiliğinden, değişen, akışkan duygu ağlarında yer almasının önemli özellikler olduğunu savunmaktadır. Yerel düzeyde ve bunun ötesine gitmek için bir potansiyel olmasına rağmen, birçok aktörün fikrine, toplantı, tartışma ve yaşananlara dayanarak direnişin gerçek anlamının yerel düzeyde öz-örgütlenme olduğunun altı çizilmiştir.

Bu muhalefet, farklı sınıflar ve politik görüşlerden kentsel sorunlar için mücadele edenlerin farklı bir siyasi kimlik oluşturmaya ve yeni dayanışmalara yol açtı. Bu tabii ki yeni deneyimlenen, farklılıkların birlikteliğinden de kaynaklı zor bir süreç olmuştur Lefebvre'in öne sürdüğü gibi sosyal bir varlık olarak kentsel mekan, direniş öncesi ve sonrasında dayanışma duygusu ve ortak üretilen bir yaşamın sahip çıkılması demektir. İstanbul'da Lefebvre'in belirttiği gibi (1976, 1991, 2003) sermayenin ikincil döngüsüne işaret eden mekanın toplumsal üretiminin mekanın değişim değeri üzerinden kapitalizmin büyüme ve hayatta kalmasını sağlamak için kullanılır. Araçsal akılcılık ve metalaşması ile belirlenen bu üretim mekanın kentsel dönüşüm projeleri yoluyla homojenleştirilmesine (Lefebvre 1991, 2000, 48), parçalanmasına (Lefebvre 2000, 48, 188) yol açar. Sonuç olarak , bazı sakinler kent hakkı taleplerini öncelikle barınma ve bazen de sorun yaratan ve dışarıdan destekçilerin eleştirisine yol açan/en çok üzerinde durulan/dışarıdan destekçiler arasında ayrılık yaratan konu olan mülkiyet hakkından başlayarak yeniden iddia etmişlerdir. -Bu noktada Türkçe özetle kullanılan fiillerin önemli olduğunu belirtmek gerekir. İngilizce yazımda kullanılan fiilin Türkçe'ye çevrilmesi iddia etmek ve talep etmek şeklindedir; Türkçe özetle bazı noktalarda talep, bazı yerlerde de iddia etmek olarak kullanılacaktır.-Bu çalışmada daha çok barınma hakkı ve diğer

mahalle ve kentin tümüne dair bir mücadele içinde olan kişilerin izleği takip edilmiştir.

Bu arada sosyo- mekansal müdahaleler tarafından silinmekte olan sadece toplumsal mekanın, değerler, anlamlar, algılar, pratikler ve gündelik deneyimlere (Lefebvre 1991, 2000) dayalı mahalleler değil aynı zamanda park, meydanlar, sinema veya kültür merkezlerinin yıkım ya da dönüşümü gibi kentsel müşterekler (Chatterton 2010b, Hodgkinson 2012) de tehdit altına girmiştir. Bu projeler az, değişken de olsa öncelikle gecekondutabandan dirençlerin ve muhalefetlerin ortaya çıkmasına ve bununla birlikte zamanla hiyerarşik olmayan ve esnek farklı aktörlerin gruplarına ve İstanbul'un farklı semtlerinde mahallelerin yeni tip ve kapsayıcı oluşumları için başlıca bir dönüm noktası olmuştur. Hem mahalle hem de şehrin genelinde sadece şimdi değil özellikle 1990'lardan beri devam eden özel mülkiyetten ortak alanların "çitlemenmesine" karşı 2000'lerde başlayan kent-sel'in mücadele edenler için ortak olmayan ortaklıklar yaratması sayesinde aktif sakinler olarak değişen farklı yöntemler üretmekte olması dikkat edilmesi gereken en önemli husustur. Farklılık arz eden ve sayı olarak çok da olmayan bu aktörlerin neden kentsel muhalefete ön ayak oldukları, dahil oldukları, ne istedikleri, -"ölçek" konusu teorik ve pratik olarak tartışılrsa da- farklı ölçeklerdeki taleplerinin yanında, aralarındaki gerilim, birliktelik şekilleri ve yine vurgulamak istediğim duygular temel ele alınan başlıklar olmuştur. Bu noktada, kentsel mekanın kullanım ve değişim değerine meydan okuyarak "kent hakkı" iddia eden mahallelerde mahalle içi ve dışından olan aydınların etkisinin de tekrar altı çizilmelidir. Bu noktada karşılıklı bilgi akışı, bunun kullanılışı ve süreçte farklılaşması da tez boyunca tartışılan temel meselelerden biri olmuştur. Özellikle mahalle dışı aktörlerin arasında farklılık ve çatışma yaratan bu bilgiye ulaşma, kullanışı ve sonraki aşamalarda üretilen yeni bilgidir.

Çalışmanın ana savunusu olan İstanbul'daki kentsel muhalefet son derece parçalanmıştır ve buna bağlı farklı desen ve muhalefet ve ittifaklar

dinamikleri olduğunu belirtmek gerekir. Kentsel mücadelelerinin ana zorlukları mekanın mücadeledeki çelişkili yeri yanında, temelde ortak kentsel alanlar konusu ve mücadelelerin ortaklaşmasındadır: Kentsel dönüşüme uğrayan mahalle ve kamusal ya da diğer kültürel/kente mal olmuş alanların “müşterekler” kapsamına alınması ve buna bağlı olarak, benzer alanlarda mücadele edenlerin mücadele alan ve güçlerini müşterekleştirme ve kapsadıkları alan ve aktör bakımından ortaklaştırmalarıdır. Bu noktada asıl soru, yeni mağduriyetler ve mülksüzleştirmeler yaşatan ve özellikle mahallelerdeki var olan ekonomik ve sosyal eşitsizlikleri derinleştiren değişik kentsel dönüşüm projelerinin kimler için önerildiğini sorgulamak olmalıdır. Kentsel dönüşüm ve soylulaştırma projelerinin adına gerçekleştirilen mekansal müdahaleler ve yıkımlara karşı kentsel toplumsal hareketlerin çerçevesinde, bu tez, direniş yollarını ve farklı aktivistlerin, çoklu ve sürekli değişken aktörlerin deneyimlerini açıklamayı amaçlamakta ve farklı mahallelerde ve farklı platformlarda aktif sakinlerin mücadele nedenleri, ortak ve ayrılan noktaları, deneyim ve tabii ki talepleri hem farklı yollar açmakta hem de her gün değişen ve ön görülemeyen zorluklar yaratmaktadır. İşte tam da bu kentselin farkı, önemi ve gücüdür. Özellikle şehir merkezlerinden, tarihi semtlerinden, sosyal konut alanlarından ve gecekondu mahallelerinden sakinleri yerinden katılım, tartışma ve danışma olmadan bir gecede geçirilen yeni yasal düzenlemeler ve buna bağlı uygulamalara karşı az sayıda ve yine az katılımcıyla sınırlı ve aynı kişiler tarafından kişiler tarafından organize edilen protestolar yapılmaktaydı. Buna bağlı olarak çalışma kentsel mekanın rolü ve önemini vurgulayarak, kentsel muhalefetin taşıdığı potansiyeller ve çıkmazlar üzerinde yoğunlaşmıştır. Bu açıdan, araştırma olası beraberlikler kurma çabaları, bunun gerekliliği, bir amaç olarak ortaya konması ve buna karşı olan görüşleri bunun farklı yönlerinden yola çıkarak İstanbul'da/için ve ötesinde kent hakkından yola çıkarak bir “kentsel müşterekleşme süreci” olarak ele alıp, tartışmaya çalışmıştır. Harvey'den (2012) de yola çıkarak kentsel ortaklaşma mekanları ve konuları kesen ve özel ve kamusalın ötesinde kentsel olanı yeniden tanımlayan yeni dayanışmalar kurarak oluşan

ortak uygulamaların süreci olarak açıklanabilir. Tezin başlığı olan İstanbul’da, için ve ötesinde vurgusu için Chatterton’ın (2010a, 2010b) sözlerine ve çalışmalarına başvurmak ve referans vermek gereklidir: Chatterton (2010a , 236) kentsel imkansızın mevcut kentsel durumda, buna karşı ve içinde aynı anda oluştuğunu savunmuştur. Bu şunu kastetmektedir: Kentte isyanlar sadece kentte değil aynı zamanda kent için ve kente karşı olduğunu öne sürmüştür (Chatterton 2010b, 628). Bunlar yalnızca yıkıcı ve muhalif değil, dönüştürücü ve tahayyüle dayalı imkanlı fakat bilinmeyen kentsel dünyalar için geleceğe dair potansiyel taşırlar; çünkü toplumsal dönüşüm yaratacak müşterek olanın politikalarını üretme potansiyelinin alanlarıdır. Bu konuda doğru bir yaklaşım için düşünürlerin (Souza 2010) gibi yönelttiği şu temel soruyu sormalıyız: Kimin kentleri? Temel barınma hakkımız bir metaya dönüşürken, kentler artarak ayrışıp, dışlayıcı hale gelmektedir. Kentsel toplumsal hareketleri ya da daha doğrusu mücadeleyi farklı anları ile İstanbul’da kentsel ortaklaşmanın süreci olarak kabul edilmelidir. Zamanla araştırma değişen koşullara ve mevcut güç ilişkileri, gerilimler, örtüşen ve kesişen çatışma ve dönüm anlarına yoğunlaşarak bu grupların heterojen ve çatışmalı yönlerinin ve dinamiklerinin özellikleri üzerinde duruldu. Harvey ve Holloway’dan yola çıkarak, kapitalizmde kentsel çatlaklar yaratarak kentsel müşterekleşmenin toplumsal pratiklerinin süreci olarak ele alınmıştır. Chatterton (2010b , 626) kentsel müşterek kavramını “ortak dayanışmanın, sosyal ve mekansal pratikleri ve ilişkileri ve direniş repertuarların yeni sözlükler oluşturarak direnç üretken anlar olarak açıklamıştır. Kentin kendisi kentsel yaşam metalaştırma dışında ortaklaşmaya dayalı sosyal ilişkiler kurma gücü vardır. Önemli olan bu gücün farkına varmak ve bu kentsel ortaklaşma pratiklerini hayatın her alanında yatay dayanışma örgütleri ve deneyimleriyle ortak alanlar olarak öncelikle mahallelerde harekete geçirmektir.

Farklı mahallelerde bazı mahallelilerin girişimiyle ve destek veren grupların daha doğrusu kentsel mücadelenin oluşmasında temel rol oynayan grupların birlikte oluşturulan başka bir şehir ve toplum için değişim olanakları taşıyıp

taşımadığının pratikten teorik ve yeniden teorik sorgulamasını yapmaktadır. Bu fikre katkıda bulunmak için, tezin kavramların tartışılmayan ve üstünde durulmayan yönlerini, ilk tartışmasından bu döneme kadar izlediği düşünsel yolu ve kullanımını ortaya çıkarmak ve sorgulamak gibi bir hedefi vardır. Bu yüzden öncelikle yukarıdan aşağıya şekillenen ve uygulanan kentsel projeler ve mevzuatla gelen yıkım, tahliye ve barınma hakları ihlallerine karşı tepkilerin kentsel mücadeledeki yeri üzerinde duruldu. Buna bağlı olarak aktörlerin amaçları, talepleri, stratejileri, mesajları, eylemleri, hedefleri ve karşılaştıkları zorluklar sorgulanarak, kendilerinin de bu konu hakkında tekrar düşünmesi ve başarıların ve geline noktanın ortaya çıkartılması hedeflendi. Bunun ardındaki esas amaç ise mekandan yola çıkarak bunun ötesinde hareket etmeyi düşündürmektir. Parçalamanın, homojenleştirmenin ve odaklanmanın yerine araştırma aktörlerin benzerlik ve farklılıkları, temel hareket noktaları, soru ve sorunlarının üzerine yoğunlaşmayı tercih etti. Buradan yola çıkarak, bir katılımcı ve dayanışmacı eylem araştırması olma çabasındaki çalışma Avrupa Sosyal Forumu öncesi 2010 yılında birkaç aktörün çabasıyla başlatılan hala oluşmakta, şekil değiştirmekte olan İstanbul Kent Hareketleri Forum örneğini ve bu müşterekleş(e)me(me) sürecini de tüm bu soruları anlamaya yardım ettiği için ele alınmıştır. Müşterekleşme aslında tezde tam da bu noktadan hareketle, grupların kentte sahip çıktıkları alanları karşılıklı anlamaları, birbirlerini tanımaları ve aslında kesin bir yapı oluşturmadan-bunun gerekliliği ve mevcut ve kurulmakta olanlara da referans verilerek- beraber durmaya çalışma süreci olarak ele alınmıştır. Bunun yanında uluslararası düzenlenen kampanya ve protestoların anlamı sorgulanmış, bunun yanında tabandan, açık, hiyerarşik olmayan yeni örgütlenme ve mücadele şekilleri tartışılmıştır. Tüm tartışmalar aslında özellikle akademik-aktivistlerin sorun ve farklılık olarak gördüğü alanlara işaret ettiği için ayrıca önem taşımaktadır. Tezde, var olan gerçek durumun altını çizerek aslında bu süreçte iki elin parmakları kadar olan “aktif sakinlerin” ve grupların, esnek organizasyon ve karar alma/uygulama süreçlerinin önemini tanıyarak, kentsel muhalefetin ortaklaşmasında önde gelen eylemciler, aydınlar,

aktivist – akademisyenlerin duygularının rolünün altını çizerek, fikir ve deneyimlerden çıkan karşıtlıkların yanı sıra ittifaklar, ortak eylem ve kampanyalar düzenleme, farklı mücadele yolları arama ve zaman içinde değişen yaygın ve çelişkili rollerinin üzerinde durulmuştur. Tez birlikteliklerin ise “yakınlık grup”ları olduğunu öner sürer.

Bu anlamda çalışmanın süreç içinde değişen deneyimler odaklı olduğunun altını çizmek gerekir. Bireyselleştirerek ve rollerini fazla vurgulayarak değil ama aydın aktivistlerden oluşan bahsedildiği gibi duygusal ilişkilerin önemli olduğu bir çekirdek gruptan bahsedilebilir. İstanbul'da mahalle sakinleri öncelikle mülkiyet ve değişim değerine dayalı önermelerle ya da bunların sonrasında bir barınak olarak ev hakkını iddia etti. Zamanla, farklı mahalle ve gruplardan insanlarla tanışarak evleri ve mahalleyi, diğer mahallelerle yaşanan bir mekan olarak savundu. Çalışma özellikle 2010 yılından itibaren buradan yola çıkarak uygulama pratikte ve teoride kent hak(lar)ını sorguladı. Araştırma, farklı anlamları ve çağrışımları ile kent sorunları için harekete geçenlerin nedenlerini vurgulamak ve mücadele şekillerine dikkat çekmeyi hedeflemiştir. Bunu yaparak, benzerliklerin ve farklılıkların altını çizilmiş, ittifaklar, gerilimler ve çelişkiler incelenmiştir. İstanbul'da 2010 Temmuz ayında düzenlenen Avrupa Sosyal Forumu öncesi toplantı ve hazırlık forum sırasında, ağırlıklı olarak dayatılan kentsel projelerin neden olduğu tahliyelere karşı “sıfır tahliye” sloganıyla “kent hakkı” kentsel mekanın homojenleşmesine karşı çeşitli birçok kentsel muhalif gruplar tarafından kullanılan birleştirici bir slogan olarak önerilmiştir. İstanbul'un kentsel ve kırsal alanlarının metalaştırılması aslında yeni bir bilgi ve dayanışma ağının oluşumuna dair bir dönemi başlatmıştır. Aslında örneğin “Kent Hareketleri” ismiyle oluşturulan birliktelik aynı zamanda mücadele içinde tartışılan ve itiraz da edilen bir konu olmuştur. Tam da bu noktada eklenmelidir ki tez çalışması kasıtlı olarak bir homojen birim olmayan bir mahallede çalışmak yerine İstanbul'daki kentsel muhalefetin özünü oluşturan az sayıda olsa da mücadele eden ve sürekli yeni olasılıklar üretmeye çalışan aktörleri ve bunların birbiriyle bağlantılarını, karşıtlıklar

ve deneyimlerini takip etmeyi seçmiştir. Farklılıklar, gerginlikler, zorluklardan ve engellerin yanında, çalışmanın hedeflerinden biri ortaklıklara odaklanmak Chatterton (2006) tarafından önerildiği gibi “eylemci” kategorizasyonunun ötesinde öncelikle kentsel dönüşüm yüzünden sorun yaşayan mahallelerden bazı sakinler ve özellikle akademiden kent üzerinden düşünmeyi ve hareket etmeyi seçenlerin oluşturduğu homojen olmayan grubu –farklı grupları- incelemek gereklidir. Bu bağlamda, James Jasper’ın çalışmalarının genelinde vurguladığı ve Chatterton’ın (2006) altını çizdiği mesleki ve bunun yanında siyasi duruşların ve buna bağlı yaklaşım ve uygulamalar yanında duygusal faktörler, dostluk ve kişisel ilişkiler önemli rol oynamaktadır: Ortak olmayan zeminde duygu ve ilişkiselliklerle karşılaşmalar ve ortaklıkların melez bir diyalogu kurulmalıdır.

Tezin genelinde vurgulanmak istenen diğer bir nokta ise aktörlerin kendi ve birlikte mücadeleleri sonucunda kendi öz – dönüşüm/değişimleridir. Dışarıdan destek alan, ilgi gören ve yön bulan mücadelelerin yararlanan yerel anlamı, yerel öz - örgütlenme ve temsiliyeti de sorgulanmıştır. Öte yandan, hareketteki mekan, kent ve kentsel mekan vurgusunun, zamanla mekan ve konu açısından ölçek artışı ve buna bağlı değişik mücadelelerin eklenmesiyle özellikleri sorgulanmıştır. Bu noktada mülkiyet hakkı talepleri, radikal iddianın arkasındaki engeller ama yine de kent ve toplum için “imkanlı – imkansızlıklar” (Lefebvre 1972, Purcell 2009, Elden 2004, Chatterton 2010, Souza 2010a , Routledge 2010) temel tartışma noktaları olmuşlardır. Bunu da daha önce bahsedildiği üzere “Kent Hareketleri”ni oluşturma süreci içinde akademisyen, aydın, mahalle içi ve dışından gelen aktör, grup ve derneklerinin fikirleri şekillendirmiştir. Belki de imkansız olan “kalıcı ittifak” amacı yerine zaman içinde mahalleden başlayarak yeni yeni kurulan veya şekil değiştiren yerel ve uluslararası anlamlarıyla grupların dinamiklerini kalıcı “anlar” ya da gerçek “beraberlik” dayanışma süreçleri haline dönüşen kampanya faaliyetleri ve buna bağlı sorunlar ele alınmıştır. Çalışma ve konunun sınırlamalarını göz önüne alarak bu

çalışmada kavramsal ve pratik katkılar sunmayı umut ediyorum. Tam da bu yüzden alanın ve şehrin gerçeklerini ön planda tutarak var olanları anlatmaya ve analiz etmeye çalıştım. Chatterton'ın kavramsallaştırmasından ve çalışmalarından ilhamla İstanbul ötesinde / (karşı) için / içinde kentsel muhalefetin etkinliğini değerlendiren bir katılımcı ve dayanışma çalışma şeklinde müdahale ve harekete odaklı etnografik bir çalışma olan araştırma kentsel muhalefetin gerçek konuları, anlatıların ve ifadeleri, deneyimleri derinlemesine görüşmeler ile desteklenen protesto ve toplantılardan benim kişisel yüzleşmemin bir analizini yapmaktadır. Bu süreç sürekli devam eden ve edecek bir karşılaşma ve mücadele sürecidir. Tez boyunca, yolumu bulmak için ilham aldıklarım Lefebvre, Chatterton, Souza, Holloway, Harvey, Purcell, Marcuse, Dikeç ve Elden, Hardt ve Negri, Caffentzis, Federici, de Angelis, McFarlane gibi eleştirel ve radikal coğrafyacılar ve bilim insanlarının çalışmaları oldu. Çalışmanın temel amacı aslında kavram, teori ve mücadeleler arasındaki diyalektik ilişkiyi ortaya çıkarmak ve yaşanan ve deneyimlerden kavramları tekrar sorgulamaktır. Alandaki katılımcı metotla yapılan çalışmanın sonucunda seçilen kavramlar var olan sınıflandırma ve genel geçer açıklamalar dışında kentsel muhalefet süreci ve aktörler tarafından çalışmada tekrar tanımlanmıştır.

Tezde kentsel toplumsal hareketler ne yalnızca sınıf, ne de yaşam tarzı ve kültürel unsurlar, çevre, kimlik hareketleri şeklinde yanlış bir yeni sosyal hareket olarak ele alınmaktadır. Temel olarak, kentsel sosyal hareketler sosyal karşıtlıklar ve kentsel müşterekleşme potansiyeli taşıyan kentsel mekandan başlayan mücadeleler olarak tanımlanır. Günümüzün hareketlerinin tümünün genel geçer tanımları oldukça tartışmaya açık olan “yeni toplumsal hareketler” olarak tanımlanmasında kentsel mücadeleler dönüm noktası oluşturmaktadır. Tek konu hareketi ya da özellikle kentsel sorunlar üzerinde yoğunlaşarak ya da belirli mahallelerde odaklanan olmanın ikilemleriyle çalışma eski ve yeni toplumsal hareket ile kentsel toplumsal hareketler literatürü sorgulamaya amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma mahalle örgütlenmelerinin zaman, koşullar ve farklılıkların şekillendirdiği

birliktelikleri anlatmaya ve tartışmaya açmaktadır. Alandan beslenen angaje bir tutumla üretilen akademik kavram ve tanımlamaları temel alan çalışma temel olarak muhalefetin gerçek nedenleri, alandan gelen tanımlamalar ve ifadeleri anlama ve aktarma kaygısını taşımıştır. Tam da bu noktada, kimin kenti sorusunun yanında kimin direnişi ve neden mücadele edildiği temel sorularını da farklılık, gerginlik ve güç ilişkileri kapsamında sürekli olarak sorgulamıştır. Tez yerel boyuta bu süreçte ortaya çıkan yeni örgütlenme biçimlerini de incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu noktada farklı önceliği olan grup ve aktörlerin kentsel konularda ortaklıklarının değişen şekil ve anlayışlarının Holloway’ın bahsettiği gibi (2002) “güç sahibi olmayı hedeflemeden dünyayı değiştirmeyi” amaçlama hedefinde yol aldığı söylenebilir. Lefebvre’in kent hakkı (Lefebvre 2000, 158), bir yakarış ve taleptir. Bu ancak dönüştürülmüş ve yenilenmiş “kentsel”e bir haktır: Sahiplenmeye ve insanın kendini kontrol ve yönetim mücadelesine dayanır (Lefebvre 2000, 158). Mekan dönüşürken ve üretilirken, insan da dönüşür. Souza (2010a, 2012a) kent hakkı üzerine tüm çalışmalarında özgürleştiren adil ve özgür bir toplum için gerçek bir kent hakkı, siyasi partiler, sivil toplum kuruluşları, akademisyen ve orta sınıf aktivistler yerine halkın özne olduğu hareketlerle mümkün olabilir. Iveson’a göre ortak bir dava ve birleştiren bir yapıştırıcı görevi görse de (2011), Souza’ya göre yukarıdaki noktalara dikkat edilmezse, kent hakkı sözde katılımı perdelenmiş politik olarak zayıf ve sınırlı bir talep olmaktan öteye geçemez.

Lefebvre’in perspektifinden baktığımızda, kentsel mekanın kullanım değeri değişim değerine dönüşürken, ekonomik çıkarlar ve bunun arkasındaki “güç” ve “bilgi”nin mekanı olan, araçsal rasyonellik, homojenleştirme, parçalama ve metalaşmayla belirlenen ve kapitalizmin varlığını sürdürmesi için mekan, daha çok eşitsizlik üreten eşitsizliğin bir parçası haline gelmektedir. Soja (2010) ve Dikeç (2002)’in vurguladığı eşitsizliğin mekansallığı ve bir süreç olarak mekansallığın eşitsizliği diyalektiğinde/ilişkiselliğinde eşitsizliğin mekansallığına ek olarak mekan da eşitsizliğin yaratıldığı ve tekrar yaratıldığı başka bir etken olmuştur; ve

işte bu eşitsizlikten, kent hakkı ve direniş hakkı kavramları öne çıkmaktadır (Dikeç, 2002). Souza'nın (2010a) vurguladığı gibi Lefebvre'in kent hakkı özellikle kapitalist kent çerçevesinde daha iyi bir barınma hakkına indirgenemez; indirgenmemelidir. Bununla bağlantılı olarak yetersiz ve sözde katılıma karşı özellikle Lefebvre'den yola çıkarak Souza'nın (2010a) altını çizdiği “autogestion” savunulması ve ortaya çıkarılması gereken bir kavram ve pratikte bir yoldur. Teoride moda bir ifade olmak yerine ve eylemlilikte şemsiye olmanın ötesinde radikal anlam ve potansiyeli öne çıkarılmalıdır. Bu açıdan bir yaklaşımla, Souza (2010a, 2012c) ve Chatterton (2010) hakim kapitalist sistemin eşitsiz ve sömürücü doğasını reddederek bir bütünlük içinde tamamen farklı bir şehre ve topluma işaret etmişlerdir. Peter Marcuse (2009) ve sonrasında Marcelo Lopes de Lopes (2010) soruları sorar: “Kimin hakkı?”, “Hangi şehir”, “Hangi hak?”. Çalışma bu soruların önemini vurgulayıp, Chatterton'ın altını çizdiği (2005) öz-örgütlenme, karşılıklı dayanışma ve kolektif deneyim ve dayanışma arzusuyla ancak “gerçek bir kent hakkı” mücadelesi verilebileceğini savunmaktadır.

Tez, “kentsel müşterekleşme süreci”ni aslında başından günümüze kadar kırılma, birliktelik, ayrışma noktalarıyla ele almıştır. Chatterton'un (2006) “ortak olmayan zeminden ortak yerlere diyalogu genişletme” çabası ve potansiyelini ve bununla birlikte Lefebvre'in vurguladığı ve sonrasında Elden, Purcell, Chatterton ve Souza'nın vurguladığı imkansızlıkların temeli alınmıştır.

Çalışmada kent hareketleri teorileri, toplumsal hareketler, kent hakkı teorileri ve sosyal forum hakkındaki çalışmalarla desteklenerek ele alınmıştır. Toplumsal hareketler teorilerinde ise özellikle kaynak mobilizasyonu, ağ ve repertuar oluşumu ve değişimi hakkındaki çalışmalara özel önem verilmiştir. Thörn'ün (2012) de savunduğu gibi kent hareketleri toplumsal hareket teorileriyle ilişkili ele alınmalıdır. Dayanışmacı ve katılımcı eylem araştırma metodolojisiyle desteklenen, adanmış/mücadeleci

coğrafya, radikal ve özerk coğrafyalar literatürü de ilk defa özellikle Dr. Paul Chatterton'ın etkisiyle Türkiye'deki bir çalışmada ele alınmıştır. Umarım ki bu çalışmalar hem kent literatürü ve çalışmalarına hem de araştırma metotlarına yeni bir yol açacaktır. Bununla birlikte İstanbul'daki yeni organize olma ve direnme yol ve şekilleri, kent mücadelesinin mikro gruplardan oluşan ve temelde birbirini dışlayan ama birliktelik çabasıyla da hızla kendilerinin değiştirdiği ve bunun dışında yeni stratejiler ürettiği süreç içinde incelenmiştir.

Her hafta toplantılara katılarak kentsel müsterekleşme sürecinde az sayıda ve farklı özelliklerde aktivistlerin bu özellik, özgüllük ve özgürlüklerini koruyarak kurmaya çalıştıkları kentsel mücadelenin pratiklerini, kentsel dönüşümün zamanla değişen anlamı ve farklı grupları ve kesimleri etkilemesi, karşı tavır ve bunda izlenilen yolda ortaklaşan ve ayrışan yönler anlaşılmaya çalışılmıştır. Özellikle bu yollardaki farklılıklar temel politik farklılıklar olarak ele alınmış, bunun yarattığı ayrışmalar ise deneyim ve duygularla derinleşmiştir. Aktörler tarafından bu ayrışma çoğu zaman bir sorun, bir açıdan da olması gereken ve olacak temel nokta olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Chatterton'ın (2006) vurguladığı yakalanması gereken ortaklıktaki (örneğin tahliye ve diğer mağduriyetler konusunda) diyalog tam tersi yönde ortak olmayan noktaya gel-gitler şeklinde devam etmiştir. Kent hakkı da tam bu noktada literatür ve bununla etkileşim içinde olan ve hatta örtüşen mücadele pratiklerinde bu ortak diyaloga katkısı çerçevesinde, sınırlılıkları ve sunduğu ufuk tartışılarak ele alınmıştır. Bu süreçte kent hakkı Avrupa Sosyal Forumu sırasında farklı aktörler tarafından kullanılmış, sorgulanmış ve birleştirici yönü ön plana çıkartılmıştır. Bu sırada tezde de bahsedildiği gibi kapsayıcı ve temsiliyeti yüksek mahalle derneği kurma çabasında derneğin tüzüğünde yer almıştır.

Chatterton'dan ilhamla, İstanbul'da, İstanbul için ve bunun ötesinde geçecek muhalefetten birliktelik ve aynı anda ayrışma noktaları, bunda duyguların önemi ve Marcuse'dan (2009) yola çıkarak buradan mağdur ve

yabancılaşanların, farklı ölçeklerdeki yerelliklerden başlayarak mekanın yarattığı ve yaratacağı potansiyeller ve müşterekleşme önündeki engeller İstanbul özelinde incelenmiştir. Ortaklaşırken ayrışan bu mücadele zemini yeni yol, yöntem ve ilişkiler de üretmiştir. Çalışma, çokluk olarak tanımlayabileceğimiz mahallelerden ve dışından temel birkaç aktörden oluşan ve zamanla esnek dahil olma süreçleriyle yeni kişilerin katıldığı muhalefetin farklılaştıran, ayrıştıran amaç, taktik, söylemleri incelemiş ve politik farklılıklara işaret ettiği noktaları anlatarak ortaklıklar bulma ve kurmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu noktada mahalle dışı grupların esas ayrışma noktalarını oluşturduğunu söylemek yanlış olmayacaktır. Bu ayrışmalar, tanışıklıklar, deneyimler ve yaşanmışlıklar değişen bir süreç ve zemin olarak ele alınmıştır. Mahalleden ve dışından aktörler arası teknik ve duygusal bir bağ kurulmakta, bu sürekli değişmektedir. Hemen hemen her aktörün bu noktada altını çizdiği husus ise her grubun, aktörün kendi konu ve yereline sahip çıkması ve mücadeleye bu noktadan başlamasıdır. Fakat çalışma mahalle dediğimiz “ölçek” in de her zaman birliktelik anlamına gelmediğidir. Farklılıklardan oluşan mahalledeki herkes aynı duyarlılık, bilinç ve çalışmayı sürdürmemektedir. Başlangıç noktası da anlaşılacağı üzere kendilerini ilgilendiren bireysel olarak değerlendirilebilecek konulardan olmaktadır. Fakat bu bir başlangıç olarak ele alınmalıdır. Buradan yola çıkarak diğer mahalleliler, tüm mahalle ve kent için bir mücadele hattı kurulabildiği de görülmektedir. Bu hat ise hep altı çizildiği gibi kırılgan ve değişkendir ve temelde birkaç aktörün sürekli mücadelesine dayanmaktadır. Aslında çalışma, mahalle içi ya da yereldeki gerçek bir mücadelenin en zor hedef olduğunu ve mahalle dışında mahalleden bile olmayan aktörlerle birliktelikler kurulmakta olduğunu göstermiştir. Fakat bununla birlikte bu süreçte eğer mahallede ve en geniş temsiliyetle birliktelik kurulmaz ise kurulan ve kurulmaya çalışılan tüm mücadelenin kırılganlığı daha da artmıştır. Temelde kurulamayan birliktelik bunu farklı gruplara ve kentin tümüne yayılmasını engellemiştir. Bu çerçevede yerelde iyi örnek ve hedefleri de görünür kılan çalışma, bir iki kişiden oluşan grup ve platformların sorunlarını da ortaya koymuş ve mahallelerin ve kentin

ortak sorunlarına yoğunlaşmıştır. Farklı durumlardaki mahalleli, dışarıdan kentin tümüyle ilgilenen aktör ve mahallelerin farklılıkların bu ortaklığın önünde engel olduğunu vurgulamıştır. Farklılıklar teslim edilerek, yaklaşım ve politika farklarını ortak sorunlar karşısında farklı stratejiler geliştirme zorunluluğu vurgulanmıştır. Mahalle içi ise dışarıdan grupların varlığı ile öncü kampanya ve çalışmalar yürütülmüş (örneğin iş güvenliği), kentsel mekan konusunda olmasa da bu gibi temel konular üzerinden ortaklıklar kurulmuştur.

Çalışma tüm zorluk, sorun ve çıkmazlarına rağmen bir kentsel mücadele varsa bunu kuran ve ayakta tutan aktörleri anlamaya çalışarak kimlerin neler yaptığını, yaşadığını, düşündüğünü, hedeflediğini, kimlere destek olduğunu, temel başlık, soru ve sorunlarını, ilkelerini anlamayı, ve buna bağlı olarak aktörlerin yoğunlaştığı sorunlar dışında ortaklık ve benzerlikleri ortaya çıkarmıştır. Önemli metin, açıklama ve dönüm noktaları incelenmiş, bunların farklı aktörler için ne ifade ettiği, mücadele yolları ve bunlarda yola çıkarak nasıl bir yol izlenmesi gerektiği gibi konulardaki fikirler sunulmuştur. Bir süreç analizi vurgusuyla değişim ve dönüşümlerin altı çizilmiş, aktörler arası değişen yakınlık ve uzaklıklar anlaşılmaya çalışılmıştır. Bahsedilen sorunlar, potansiyeller ve önemli noktaların ortaklıklar oluşturulabileceği vurgulanmıştır. Birlikteliğin gerekliliği ve nasıl olması gerektiği tartışılmış ve yakınlık gruplarının öneminden bahsedilmiştir. Farklı ve benzer nedenlere bağlı olarak kentsel mekanın bu noktada da özgünlüğü ve parti politikalarından –parti politikalarının kapsamına girmemesiyle de desteklenerek- özgürlüğü mücadeleyi eşitleyen, birleştiren ve bölen, yaratan ve sorun yaratan yönleri tüm çalışmada aktörlerin kendi sözleriyle tartışılmıştır.

Lefebvre'in altını çizdiği kapitalist gelişmenin olmazsa olmazı mekanın üretimine karşı birleşilen, farklılaşan noktalar ve destek veren ve katkı sunan farklı meslek ve siyasi, uluslararası ve diğer gruplar bu hızlanan yıkım, yer değiştirme, tasfiye halinde kentsel dönüşüm uygulamaları ile

kentsel kaynakların eşitsiz dağıtılması, varolan eşitsizliklerin derinleşmesine neden olmaktadır. Mekanda eşitsizlikler açıkça ortaya çıkmakta ve ortak mücadele ihtiyacıyla yeni birliktelikler oluşmaktadır. Lefebvre (2000)'in tüm toplumun, sistemin dönüşümünü amaçlayarak önerdiği ve sonrasında Harvey (2008) dahil birçok düşünürün dünyada ve Türkiye’de (Doğan 2011, Baysal 2010, Çavuşoğlu ve Yalçın 2010) tartıştığı ve savunduğu kent hakkı, barınma hakkı mücadelesiyle kentin genelinde, yeni dernekler, birlikteliklerin kurulduğu, hatta kendi mahallesinin yanında diğer mahalleler için ve kente sahip çıkarak, daha geniş hak arayışlarıyla destek veren diğer politik ve farklı akademisyen ve muhalif meslek gruplarıyla bir araya gelerek bütünsel, ortaklaştırılmış ve bir o kadar da çatışan mücadele arayışları ortaya çıkmaktadır. Mekan, daha çok eşitsizlik üreten eşitsizliğin bir parçasıyken, mülkiyet ilişkilerini sorgular; güç-sermaye ilişkilerini ve çıkar gruplarını apaçık ortaya koyar. Dayanışma ilişkileri, birlikte kurulan bir geçmiş, ortak bir yaşam ve bellek kaybolma tehdidi altındadır. Mahalleliler, kendi mahalleleri hakkında, ve aslında kendileri hakkında karar verme hakkına sahip olamadan onlara rağmen üretilen kararlara maruz kalmaktadır. İstanbul tartışılırken ve uluslararası bağlantı kurulmaya çalışılırken diğer şehirler ve farklı gruplarla bir iletişim ve dayanışma ağının kurulmasının önemi vurgulanmıştır. Pérouse’un (2011) çalışmasında vurguladığı gibi kentsel toplumsal muhalefetin, bireysel, noktasal, tepkisel bir tezaruhatın ötesinde yerelde gelişen, kamuoyuna hitap edebilen, kalıcı bir sosyal hareket olup, olmayacağını zaman gösterecektir. Kent hakkı mücadelesi nasıl bir kent ve toplum sorgulamalarını beraberinde getirmektedir. Bununla birlikte tüm bu dayanışma ve ağ çok katmanlı güç ilişkileriyle -örneğin yerel ve akademiyle olan- kesişmekte ve bunlar tarafından belirlenmektedir. Bu noktada yerel, mahalle ve dayanışma ağlarının araçsallaştırılmaması gerektiği vurgulanmıştır. Fikir ve uygulamaların farklılığına rağmen ortak sorun ve düşmanlara karşı –farklı şekillerde kurulan ve farklı anlamlara işaret eden- birliktelikler, bunun bilinen ve bulunacak yolları, farklı anlamları ve olasılıkları ve birlikte mücadele etmenin önemi temelde ifade edilen konu olmuştur. Başarıların

farklı anlamları, mücadelenin sürekliliği ise tartışılan diğer başlıklardır. Aslında zamanla kentsel mekana müdahalenin, emek alanı ve kırdaki yaşam dahil yaşam alanları ve yaşamın tümüne müdahale olduğu görülmüştür. Bu çerçevede dışarıdan desteğin sınırları kabul edilerek, müşterek olanın kabulü ve genişlemesinin ana mücadele noktası olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Zamanla kentsel çitlemeye karşı kentsel müşterekleri savunan farklı gruplar kentsel sorunlarla yıllarca mücadele eden mahalle derneklerine ve kent muhalefeti gruplarına katıldı. “Sıradan halk” zamanla kazanılan bir ruh ve ortaklaşan duygularla kent hakkını yani şehir merkezine ulaşabilme ve kullanabilme hakkı, kamusal alana dair karar verme süreçlerine dahil olma hakkı ve kendini gerçekleştirebilme hakkı için mücadele etmişlerdir.

Karşılaşmalar ve kırılğan birliktelikler arasına sıkışan birlikteliğin yapaylığı ve gerçekliği, gerekliliği ya da abartılmış bir amaç olup olmadığı de aktörler sayesinde ana tartışma başlığı olarak sunulmuştur. Bu noktada, birliktelik ve kırılma noktalarındaki kentsel mekan ve konular sadece eylemlilikte birliktelik ve var olan politika yapma yollarını değiştiren yönleriyle tartışılmıştır. Çalışma çoklu aktörlerin toplumsal cinsiyet, sınıf ve pozisyonlarına bağlı oluşan farklı deneyim, biyografi ve duygularını da dahil eden imkanı-imkansız tahayyülleri, umutla umutsuzluk, kazanma kaybetme arasında kentten başlayan muhalefetin önemi, yerelin iç dinamikleri, yaşam ve mekanın, devamlı mücadelenin önemiyle tartışılmıştır. Kentsel mekanın bilinen siyasetin ötesinde gizlenen mekansal adaletsizlikleri ortaya çıkarma gücü vardır. Farklı dönemleri ve buna bağlı değişimleri açıklayan çalışma, yeni fark edilen, tartışılan ve yaşanan kentsel müştereklerin toplumsal pratikleri toplumsal gerçeklikte ve literatürde yeni bir ufuk sunmakta olduğunu savunmaktadır.

APPENDIX B.

CURICULUM VITAE

NEZİHE BAŞAK ERGİN

e-mail:

nbasakergin@gmail.com

Personal Information

Name: Nezihe Başak Ergin

Date/Place of Birth: 12 October 1979/Istanbul-TURKEY

Education

February 2014	Ph.D., Department of Sociology
February 2012-February 2013	Visiting Researcher, University of Leeds, the School of Geography
2009 December	Approval of the Research Proposal of Ph.D. Thesis
2009 May	Ph.D. Qualifying Exam is passed
2007-	Middle East Technical University, Ph.D., Department of Sociology
2003-2006	Middle East Technical University, Scientific Preparation and M.A., Department of Sociology
	University of Victor Segalen Bordeaux 2, M.A., Erasmus Student, Department of Sociology
2002-2003	Middle East Technical University Continuing Education Center English Language Certificate Program
1998-2002	Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts, Department of City and Regional Planning
1990-1998	Saint Benoit High School, Turkey

1985-1990

Özel Şişli Terakki Primary School

Languages

Turkish (native), French (advanced), English (advanced), Portuguese (intermediate), Italian (preliminary)

Papers Presented

August 2013: “Music as a Social and Cultural Interaction: The Case of Arabesk”, the 11th European Sociological Association Conference with Zeynep Baykal.

June 2013: “Academic-activism(s) in urban resistance: Pioneers or obstacles for a common ground.” Protests as Events / Events as Protests: A one day symposium for academics and activists. International Centre for Research in Events, Tourism and Hospitality (ICRETH) Leeds Metropolitan University.

April 2013: “[Hetero]-[U]-[Eco]topias and the Urban Space”, the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers with Federico Venturini.

August 2012: “Struggling for new urban futures: Right(s) to a transformed city, to another society”, The Second International Sociological Association Forum of Sociology, Social Justice and Democratization.

August 2012: “Urban movements in Istanbul: From local to global, from global to local”, The Second International Sociological Association Forum of Sociology, Social Justice and Democratization.

September 2011: “The Right to the City: Right(s) to possible-impossible vs. a mere slogan in practice?”, the 10th European Sociological Association Conference with Assoc. Prof.Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç.

July 2010: “Counter-Projects against Urban Renewal in the Cultural Capital Istanbul”, International Sociological Association World Congress of Sociology.

October 2009: “Kentsel Yenilemeye Karşı Taban Direnişi” at the 6th National Sociology Congress with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç.

September 2009 : “Urban social movements in/against European Capital of Culture Istanbul” at the 9th European Sociological Association Conference with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç.

September 2008: “Squatting as a Strategy or as Resistance to Planning” at the 1st International Sociological Association Forum with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç.

September 2007: “Grassroots Resistance Against Urban Renewal: The Case of Güzeltepe, Istanbul”, RS 19: Urban Sociology and Cities at the 8th European Sociological Association Conference with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç.

Published Works and Theses

November 2013: “The Art of Resistance” with Baykal, Zeynep in Global Dialogue (3.5) of the International Sociological Association.

2009: “Kentsel Yenilemeye Karşı Taban Direnişleri: İstanbul, Güzeltepe Örneği” with Assoc. Prof.Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç, Sosyoloji Derneği VI. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Kitabı.

December 2006: Master Thesis: “Grassroots Resistance Against Urban Renewal, The Case of Güzeltepe, Istanbul”, Middle East Technical University, The Department of Sociology.

June 2002: License Thesis: “Sosyal Yapı Farklılaşmasının Kentsel Mekana Yansıması ve Planlama: Adana Örneği”, Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts, The Department of Urban and Regional Planning.

Work Experience

December 2009-Present: Research Assistant in The Department of Sociology, Giresun University

August 2010 – June 2014: Research and Teaching Assistant in The Department of Sociology at Middle East Technical University

November 2009 – June 2014: Research Assistant in The Graduate School of Social Sciences at Middle East Technical University

October- November 2008: Researcher in Return Migration Project of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç

May- June 2007: Researcher in Improvement of Crime Estimation Models and Precaution Policies based on Spatial Analyses Methods for Urban Crimes / DPT and Middle East Technical University

April 2007: Researcher in The Socio-Cultural Investigation of Hopa, Artvin as a Border City, Middle East Technical University

July- August 2001: City Planner Intern, the Office of City Planning of the Kadıköy Municipality, Kadıköy-Istanbul

July- August 2000: City Planner Intern, Atelye Mim, Kadıköy-Istanbul

July-August 1999: City Planner Intern, the Office of City Planning of the Kadıköy Municipality, Kadıköy- Istanbul

Teaching Assistantship Experience

2009-2014: Urban Theory and Policy (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç), Middle East Technical University, Department of Sociology

2009-2014: Social Movements and Civic Action (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç), Middle East Technical University, Department of Sociology

2009-2014: Urban Sociology (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç), Middle East Technical University, Department of Sociology

Awards

Granted with ÖYP, the Scholarship Program of the State.

The 1st degree student of the Faculty in Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts, The Department of Urban and Regional Planning.

The 1st degree of Science Program and the 2nd degree of Saint Benoit High School, Turkey.

Academic Interests and Research Area

Urban sociology, critical/radical geography, social practices of urban commoning, movements/urban social movements, qualitative methodology, participatory and emancipatory research and teaching, emotions and protests, art and resistance, academia and academic-activism.

APPENDIX C.

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı :
Adı :
Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: