A GARDEN AND ATELIER IN COMMON:
PRACTICES OF COMMONING IN THE 100. YIL NEIGHBORHOOD, ANKARA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

YAĞMUR KOÇAK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE GRADUATE PROGRAM OF SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

FEBRUARY 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

———————————————
Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

———————————————
Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu
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 Master of Science.

———————————————
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Besim Can Zırh
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

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

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Besim Can Zırh   (METU, SOC)   ———————————————

Asst. Prof. Dr. Katharina Bodirsky (Uni. Konstanz, 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: Yağmur, Koçak

Signature:

ABSTRACT

A GARDEN AND ATELIER IN COMMON:
PRACTICES OF COMMONING IN 100. YIL NEIGHBORHOOD, ANKARA

Yağmur Koçak

MS., Social Anthropology Graduate Program

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Besim Can Zırh

February 2019, 117 Pages

This thesis aims to discuss the transformative and emancipatory possibilities of urban commons and practices of commoning in societies where people experience social, economic and political enclosures. Through an exploration of the common urban spaces as processes composed of ongoing practices and relationships of commoning, it explores the ways people compete with social, economic and political crises in their daily lives. For this purpose, it applies to a two-year-long practice of participant observation in the collective neighborhood atelier and garden (*bostan*) in 100. Yıl Neighborhood in Ankara. It argues these spaces carry both possibilities and limitations in the processes of creating emancipatory urban encounters and the formulation of transformative collective habits.

Keywords: Practices of Commoning, Urban Common Space, Collective Gardening, Neighborhood Atelier, Ankara

ÖZ

ORTAK BİR BOSTAN VE ATÖLYE:
ANKARA, 100. YIL MAHALLESİ'NDE MÜŞTEREKLEŞTİRME PRATİKLERİ

Yağmur Koçak
Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Antropoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı
Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Gör. Besim Can Zırh

Şubat 2019, 117 Sayfa

Bu tez, insanların sosyal, ekonomik ve politik kapatmalar deneyimlediği bir toplumda, kent müştereklerinin ve müşterekleştirme pratiklerinin dönüştürücü ve özgürleştirici ihtimallerini tartışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Süregiden müşterekleştirme pratikleri ve ilişkilerinden ortaya çıkan mekanlar olarak incelediği müşterek kent mekanları üzerinden, insanların mevcut sosyal, ekonomik ve politik krizlerle gündelik hayatlarında nasıl mücadele ettiklerini tartışır. Bu amaçla, Ankara'daki 100. Yıl Mahallesi'nde müşterek mekanlar olan mahalle atölyesi ve bostanında gerçekleştirilen iki senelik katılımcı gözlem pratiğine başvurur. Bu mekanların kentte özgürleştirici karşılaşmalar yaratma ve dönüştürücü kolektif alışkanlıkların oluşmasına olanak sağlama süreçlerinde hem ihtimaller hem de sınırlar taşıdığını öne sürer.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Müşterekleştirme Pratikleri, Müşterek Kent Mekanı, Kolektif Bostancılık, Mahalle Atölyesi, Ankara

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Neighborhood Atelier and Bostan, Where Hopes, Webs and Herbs Grow

Summer months pass hot and dry in Ankara, but it always gets cooler as the sun goes down. It's the evening of 14th of July 2018, and the weather is perfect for an open-air film screening. We are going to watch *Muhsin Bey*, a 1987 Turkish classic film. As a neighborhood initiative in *100. Yıl İşçi Blokları* Neighborhood, we are planning to show a series of films that revolve around an urban-related theme this summer, in our neighborhood's small but centrally located park, *İlhan Erdost*. Muhsin Bey, with its background story of rural to urban migration and transformation of 80's İstanbul is a good opening. We pick up camp and yoga mats to sit on, our tea-urn and projection equipment from our place, where we use for our regular assemblies and events, that we call the Neighborhood Atelier, and walk to the İlhan Erdost park, which is just behind the apartment block the Neighborhood Atelier settles. There are almost twenty people in the park, who saw the Facebook event for the screening that invites all to bring their friends, neighbors, blankets and join us. Some are there with their camping chairs, others with some drinks and snacks. The kids leave the playground, run to us to ask questions about the film as we start to set things up. When it gets dark, and the brew is ready, we pour tea for everyone then start the screening. We always try to select films that would fit and attract possibly everyone in the neighborhood. Particularly for the open-air screenings in the summer months we only select Turkish films to be able to reach "non-English speaking" or "too-old to read subtitles" inhabitants of the neighborhood. As a neighborhood initiative that wants and claims to be open and accessible to everyone, 100. Yıl Initiative needs and attempts to provide the conditions of that openness and accessibility.

1

We carry a mike with us for the discussions after the film screenings. This time, Deniz[1], a middle-aged woman from the core group of the Initiative takes the mike, says that she wants to express some of her feelings. She seems moved. First, I think that it is the film. Later on, she starts to tell that she had her birthday last month, right before Turkey had the last general elections about the new Constitutional amendment, and moved to the presidential system of government with the approval of 51%. She says, "I was going to celebrate after the election, but it was not possible due to the results. Today, seeing a crowd, gathered together in the public space where we had our first neighborhood forums[2] as 100. Yıl Initiative during the Gezi Resistance, makes me feel hopeful. We are in a dark tunnel for a long time now, but still, these small things help me to see the light". Our hearts feel heavy, and it is possible to hear that in the silence. To change the mood, her daughter Ekin who is in her early thirties, also from the Initiative, takes the mike and says, "We were planning to talk about the film but after this intimate talk (she laughs) let me say a few words about what we do as a neighborhood initiative, for the ones who don't know". I actually have not seen her much in the Neighborhood Atelier, at least as much as her mother, since I have become a part of the Initiative. She does not regularly come to the weekly assemblies of the Initiative, where we discuss the agenda of the neighborhood and the country. People in the 100. Yıl Initiative prioritize and take part in its different fields of action. Some people find creating a garden in the middle of the city significant in the processes of collectively creating counter landscapes. Others find it important to have regular meetings and discussions on the ongoing agenda, produce or repair things together in a collectively owned space. Some others feel the longing to the more classical repertoires of political action like street marches or public announcements which become almost impossible due to the increasing political enclosures.

---

[1] All names used are pseudonyms.

[2] 100. Yıl Initiative's origin date back to a well-attended neighborhood forum on 19th July in 2013. Along with the protests, there were many neighborhood forums where people gathered to discuss

In Ekin's case, she is always there for the meetings for or at the bostan[3], the urban garden collectively cultivated by people associated with the Initiative. She finds it really important to be able to make the bostan green again every year. Seeing growing tomatoes, peppers, aubergines, cabbages and even wild herbs give her a sense of joy. It is a joy, she expressed once, which comes from *creating a visible change* in our public environments. She has great communication skills with kids and old people from the neighborhood, and bostan is where we most likely have that chance of encountering the inhabitants from various backgrounds. While she is describing the 100. Yıl Initiative, she raises her left arm to show the direction for the bostan, which is also two apartment blocks away from the park, and raises her right arm to point the apartment where the Neighborhood Atelier is, since these places are the two main sites that emerged from 100. Yıl Initiative for different purposes. I catch her saying, "Bostan is something that we produce, not something that we are". I look at the small crowd and wonder how many of them do not already know about the bostan and neighborhood atelier. How many of them know these places and do not come because they do not want to involve in politics? How many of them do not come because they think these places are not political at all, just some people who come together to grow vegetables in the bostan and learn how to sew in the Neighborhood Atelier? By those words, she expresses that bostan (and it is applicable for the Neighborhood Atelier as well) do not hold a fixed and singular position that represents or belongs to a closed community, but rather it is an open, ongoing process of creating urban commons.

Both the Neighborhood Atelier and bostan are common urban spaces produced through practices and relationships of commoning. There is not even a bicycle lock at bostan's weather-beaten fence gate. It grows on an abandoned piece of land in between the apartment blocks. A short text on its water tank explains it belongs to all

---

[3] The word bostan literally translates as vegetable garden. However in the case of this thesis, it refers to an urban garden which is collectively cultivated. For further discussion on how the bostan in the 100. Yıl Neighborhood differs from others, see the sub-chapter on related studies and sites.

of us in the neighborhood. It is open to whoever wants to join, put his/her labor, cultivate, know and water the plants, remove the couchgrass and crop the harvest with us, from early March on till the end of October. The Neighborhood Atelier is located in an apartment, which's rent is collectively paid by monthly donations of participants of the 100. Yıl Initiative and whoever stands in solidarity. It regularly opens its doors for three times a week; for the film screenings during the Winter, for the weekly assemblies which take place in the form of dinner forums, and for the Open Saturdays when everyone is invited to produce or do whatever they want by using the sewing machines, repair atelier, kitchen or library in the Neighborhood Atelier. Apart from all these, people get in touch with the Initiative in various ways (through friend circles, other initiatives, e-mail groups or social media) in order to organize events, workshops, short and long-term courses, exhibitions, reading clubs, and meetings in the Neighborhood Atelier. It is an open, common space for everyone to come together, produce, and share practical skills and knowledge. There is a small, black donation box hanged on the wall of the Neighborhood Atelier. An online excel sheet is open to the ones who are in the e-mail group, sharing transparently the incoming money, expenses and a bank account number for whoever is able to support. Since 2016, there are five people who regularly attend and take responsibilities in all fields, bostan, atelier and food community, of the 100 Yıl Initiative. Among these people one is a doctor in her fifties, another one is an engineer in his thirties. One has her background in industrial design, one in psychology, and another one in political science. All of the last three are at the end of their twenties, they either work or are graduate students or both. Some of them, are part of the Initiative right from the beginning, others joined at another point in time in the last five years. Apart from this core group, there is another group of six who regularly attend only to the bostan or to the assemblies, events of the Neighborhood Atelier. There are fourteen households in the food community. We give orders in every two weeks by filling an online excel sheet, which has a list of food products from local, small producers, farm collectives and ecovillages. There is a coordination group (also composed of the members of the food community) responsible for forwarding these orders to the local producers by phone. A week later

when the orders arrive, their transfer to the Neighborhood Atelier is also shared by the members of the food community. The distribution takes place in the Neighborhood Atelier. Food community is an important part of the 100. Yıl Initiative because it formulates a great web of relations. It brings different people, who share similar concerns regarding the justice and security of their food, together. Even though the food community is not the main focus of this research, it is the main character of the story of how I met with the Neighborhood Atelier and bostan.

1.2. Background and Statement of the Research Idea

In early November 2016, while I was heading to the food court of the University's Social Sciences Building, I encountered a poster on the wall. The green raised fist among flying vegetables caught my attention. I got closer to read the text below the heading "Food Freedom, Right Now!". It was a call for the first meeting of 100. Yıl Food Community (*100. Yıl Gıda Topluluğu*). The poster was inviting everyone who is aware of the fact that local food producers do not receive the worth of their work in return. "We are coming together to build another food system" was the ending line. There were initiatives like an urban permaculture farming project[4] and a food cooperative[5] that I was in touch with when I was living in İstanbul a year ago, but nothing in Ankara apart from the urban garden[6] that is in the campus of the university. I remember thinking, the beginning of something new might be a good moment to involve in. The indicated location of the meeting was 100. Yıl Neighborhood Atelier (*100. Yıl Mahalle Atölyesi*). So, I saved the date and address to my agenda.

---

[4] Webpage of urban farming project EK-BİÇ-YE-İÇ: http://www.ekbicyeic.com/en/ek-bic-2/

[5] Webpage of Boğaziçi University's Consumer Cooperative's (BÜKOOP): http://bukoop.org/

[6] Social media page of ODTÜ Bostan: https://www.facebook.com/odtubostani/

The establishment meeting of the 100. Yıl Food Community took place in 100. Yıl Neighborhood Atelier on 9th of November 2016. The Neighborhood Atelier is located on the first floor of one of the apartment blocks in 100. Yıl Neighborhood, where also I live like many other students from the Middle East Technical University[7]. This part of the neighborhood is often mentioned as the ones with five floors (*beş katlılar*) and these five-floored apartment blocks are composed of flats with almost the same interior structure. Visiting a flat is always like entering into another version of your house, only the colors, furniture, parquet, and people change. So, when I first entered the Neighborhood Atelier I took my shoes off, to quickly realize everyone else still has them on. It was a Wednesday evening and everyone in the flat seemed to be like friends already. Apart from the two relatively older women from the neighborhood, there were familiar faces from the university who are mostly graduated now. Some were smoking in the balcony some others were chatting around the table or in the kitchen. When we all gathered around the table, which is in the middle of the largest, central room in the flat, one took out a notebook, cleared his throat and said: "Okay, let's open the forum". Then they started to talk about the agenda of the neighborhood as well as the country. The initial reason behind my presence there was to attend the newly emerging Food Community's first meeting but all of a sudden, I found myself participating in the weekly assembly of the 100. Yıl Initiative. Soon I realized the Neighborhood Atelier, bostan and the food community are all the fruits of the Initiative, which is formed by the people who continued to come together after one of the neighborhood forums of Gezi Movement[8]. The organic link in between these different fields first showed itself in this opening meeting.

---

[7] Further details on the neighborhood and atelier are given in the chapter titled as "The Research Site and the Significance of the Research".

[8] Gezi movement, Gezi Park protests, July resistance, uprising, or from the opposition Gezi crisis, are commonly used words to describe the social movement that began on 28th of May 2013 in İstanbul, in a public park called Gezi and spread to different cities in Turkey within the next two weeks. Different people from various backgrounds and ideological viewpoints protested the neoliberal policies of the current government. I will refer to that period as Gezi movement throughout the thesis.

After the weekly assembly of the Initiative and the Neighborhood Atelier, we discussed what we understand, expect and can do with a food community.

It would not be an exaggeration if I would say that the first meeting of the 100. Yıl Food Community changed my life in Ankara. My everyday life practices, the circle of friends and ideas on what I would like to put the effort in researching have changed throughout my participation in 100. Yıl Initiative's different fields of action, namely the Neighborhood Atelier, bostan and food community. The Neighborhood Atelier as a place left a feeling that resembles what I have experienced in the squatted social centers of Athens earlier that year[9]. Over there, I was impressed by the time and effort people put into proving that there are other ways of living our lives and relating with our environments, both in spatial and social terms than what state-market duo offers. Instead of waiting for the great salvation or as David Graeber (2011: 103) puts it, for a great change in the revolutionary *Future*, turning into everyday life practices, moments of rupture or, in other words, into our present time, started to seem as a strong way to deal with the political hopelessness[10] in the Turkish context as well. After my arrival in Turkey in September 2016, I was left alone with the question of "How we are dealing with the hope that we lost, our social, political and economic crises in our everyday lives"? With that question in mind, I decided to stay around these people who already seemed to have some answers. Then neighborhood atelier and bostan became two important localities in the map of my everyday life.

---

[9] While I was participating in the summer school titled Visual Anthropology of Cityscapes in Athens, I had the chance to observe how crises and people's ways of resistances unfold in the cityscape. I was impressed to see how widespread the common spaces that run as social centers, refugee accommodation and solidarity spaces, pharmacies or cafes are all around Greece.

[10] Here, by political hopelessness, I refer to losing trust from the politics at the governmental level, due to the increasing authoritarianism, the new understanding of democracy the current government has drawn, repeating election frauds, corruption scandals, crony capitalism, anti-academic attitude of the ruling power and imprisonment of the politicians in opposition.

Since the 2000s, the Justice and Development Party's (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*)[11] adopted economic development strategy puts a great emphasis on the construction sector in Turkey. As a consequence, studies state, reconstruction becomes a fundamental element of the AKP's hegemony as well as the repertoires of oppositional movements (Bartu Candan & Özbay, 2014; Logie & Morvan, 2017; Genç, 2018). Re-thinking the methods, scope, and scale of urban politics is essential to understand, how the opposition to the marketization of everyday life organizes today. The rise in discussing urban common spaces and practices of commoning is also related to the intensification of privatization and exclusion processes together with the understanding of neoliberal urbanism. Collectively rented or cultivated places and their organization through practices and relations of commoning are, to a degree, oppositions to the reification of the city space and everyday life. They are straightforward ways to show how another way of living our lives, relating to our surroundings is possible. This thesis approaches the neighborhood atelier and bostan as spaces that are in production through relationships and practices of commoning. Through the lens of literature on urban commons and practices of commoning, it aims to discuss how such spaces gain different socio-political meanings and possibilities under neoliberal authoritarian governments.

Before the discussion goes further, I would like to explain what I mean by different political meanings and possibilities. And clarify from which perspective I see a link between the recent series of urban social movements and the increasing re-significance given to the discussion of urban commons. Here, as the sphere and subject of the political, I am considering the urban rather than the state. I am not stressing this out to indicate a cultural or an urban turn like the so-called new social movements literature adopts (Castells, 1983). I argue neither neighborhood atelier nor bostan is solely (if not at all) about identity struggles, relations of consumption, concerns regarding the lifestyle or even place-based politics. Rather, they are spaces that emerge out of the will to discuss inherently political agendas and make public

---

[11] Justice and Development Party is the conservative political party in power in Turkey since 2002. I will use its abbreviation, AKP, throughout the thesis.

claims. People make such public claims through acting and relating in a way that they think an equal, free and just city and society would organize. Even though people seem to be fighting with the capital's conflicts that lay in the social spheres of life, they are aware that it is not possible to separate these conflicts from larger political and economic systems. Even if the practices are local, claims and formed relationships are not. Still, these attempts might not immediately give answers to the structural questions. Then what kind of a possibility of a socio-political change is at stake here?

What participants of the Neighborhood Atelier and bostan, or in both cases the space itself, do is to provide a way to encounter, start getting to know each other, possibly understand and find what they have in common. In an interview David Graeber states, social movements are the moments when with a combination of tactics, people try to create prefigurative models of a democratic society as a way of organizing against an undemocratic structure of governance (Wolfe, 2012). Stavros Stavrides (2010: 12) also expresses his approach in line: during the time of the struggles people experience fragments of a possibly different life. He adds, only when collective habits of people start to change according to this possibly different life, or in Graeber's terms according to these prefigurative models, the urban encounters become emancipatory. In both views, social movements are not "irrational effervesance" that does not represent the majority of the public (Graeber, 2011: 59), which will dissolve away after the street protests settle. So, it is not possible to talk about a complete defeat of a social movement. This is very critical because the opposite argument is neoliberalism's main source in the production of hopelessness. Graeber puts forward a strong argument on how hopelessness needs to be produced and maintained, essentially to make people believe social movements cannot grow, take different forms of everyday communism and changing the world is just an idle fantasy (2011: 31-36). The defeat, marginalization, and criminalization of social movements serve to prove the idea that there is no other viable alternative. But while there are some people who nourish by ignoring the crises of neoliberalism, there are others who recognize and suffer from the very same crises.

In the times of crises, people who suffer start to produce living spaces to survive, out of their political, economic and social needs. The times of crises constitute cracks in the logic of the state-market duo. In those cracks people begin to try out possibly different ways of living. Critical urban studies claim, trying to reveal the uneven relations in the city makes it possible to challenge and change the normalized, universalized, seemingly inevitable forms and processes of the urban (Kaika, 2005; McFarlane, 2011). In light of this, this research aims to explore and discuss the processes and possibilities of commoning practices that produce spaces of the commons. To be able to do that, it applies to the theoretical framework critical urban studies and urban commons provide. And an engaged, committed ethnographic research practice conducted in two common urban spaces, namely the Neighborhood Atelier and bostan in 100. Yıl Neighborhood in Ankara composes the empirical part of the thesis, which provides the field to look for answers to the research question and problems raised in the following chapter.

1.3. The Research Question and Problems

How the urban commons and practices of commoning organize, and to what extent have transformative and emancipatory potentials, in a society where people experience social, economic and political enclosures in their daily lives? Here I introduce the primary sites of the research the Neighborhood Atelier and bostan as urban commons. And explain urban commons as processes made by practices of commoning. More precisely, they are places, which are in collective creation and share through (and also for) the production, reproduction and interaction activities of people from potentially different social, economic and political backgrounds. I argue the wider socio-political framework in Turkey widens the role and meanings of these local initiatives, open places and gardening practices based in a small neighborhood in Ankara. This argument brings along three different sub-questions or problematics to this research that I will briefly present here. Then I will come up with possible answers in Chapter 4, in which I discuss the research findings in more detail.

What is the role of the spatial elements of these common urban spaces' potential in socio-political change? How can the place itself have an impact on the potentially different social and economic relations that people are trying to formulate? This emerges as an important question because of two main issues. Firstly, different spatial elements; like being in a squatted, public-looking garden and being in a collectively rented, private-looking atelier create a difference in the processes of commoning, especially in the issue of the participation of strangers. Secondly, spatial accumulation of experiences, of possibility of a different way of acting and relating in daily life, once tried out during social movements, become very critical, according to the participants of the Initiative. Through these places, it becomes possible to appropriate what Stavrides (2010) explains as new collective habits that would bring an emancipatory transformation. In that way, they become important elements in the continuity of the struggle for social change in everyday life.

The second important note to be made is on the question, challenge or the problem of scale. The major and global condition of the crises, problems, and destructions of neoliberal capitalism provides a ground for a common critique; how these local attempts can have meaningful impacts on the larger scale? How these neighborhood initiatives, collective urban gardens or food communities create a change in policies or governmental structures and *fix* issues like climate change? With this question in mind, this research follows the people who engage in such communal activities and their ways of answering to such critiques through their ways of organization, daily practices, and relationships they aim to formulate. David Harvey argues, this scale problem is about jumping scales, rather than the inefficiency of the struggles. He indicates that possibilities for managing a small common property do not carry over to bigger problems; resolving problems at one scale do not hold at another (2012: 69). This is an important point to stress out, because, throughout my participation in bostan and food community, this critique was the most common one that we have faced. Therefore, it is possible to say that it is one the most common doubts that keep people away from such small-scale initiatives. While Harvey explains this as a

misleading consequence of shifting scales, people's ways of giving answers in practice are also crucial. Common urban spaces born out and lead to practices and relationships of commoning. Their chances of spreading, or having an impact at larger scales (both in the manner of public space and sphere) depend on their capability to communicate and formulate webs of relationships across individuals and groups of people from different social, economic, and political backgrounds.

The third issue is intimately related to the first and second question sets; understanding the different ways of the social and economic organization in common urban spaces. What kinds of responsibilities, and roles do people in initiatives take? Who are the ones that actually come together; what is the commonality that brings them together? What are the differences between common and public spaces based on their organization models? How practices and relationships in such spaces lead to the politicization of everyday life? This last framework of questions intends to figure out the processes behind, both the organization of places the first question refers to and the communication network that second question addresses.

1.4. The Research Site and the Significance of the Research

The general site of the research, with its long name, 100. Yıl Workers Blocks Neighborhood (*100. Yıl, İşçi Blokları Mahallesi*) is located in the Çankaya district of Ankara. The neighborhood was built as a cooperative project established by the Confederation of Turkish Trade Union in between the years of 1973 - 1988 in order to provide housing for its members (Kose, 2013). It is surrounded by Konya Yolu (Mevlana Boulevard), Eskişehir Yolu (Dumlupınar Boulevard), Çukurambar Neighborhood, Çiğdem Neighborhood and Middle East Technical University. Malazgirt Boulevard, which crosses through the territory of Middle East Technical University, 100. Yıl and Çiğdem neighborhood also became a critical reference point in our collective memory after its controversial construction in the fall of 2013[12].

---

[12] In the late summer of 2013 students, graduates of METU, residents of 100. Yıl and Çiğdemim Neighborhoods, chamber of city planners and people from different parts

Today, students of Middle East Technical University constitute a considerable amount of the neighborhood residents. Aforementioned geographical and historical features make 100. Yıl Neighborhood a critical region for the urban political ecology of Ankara. The social, economic and ecological transformation of the neighborhood is taking place in a slow but steady manner. Even in the last three years that I have lived in, noticeable changes took place in the social and economic fabric of the neighborhood. The revival of the rumors of urban transformation can be dated back to the establishment of Malazgirt Boulevard. The construction of the Boulevard back then caused social unrest, protests, and public debate because of its expected negative impact on the social, physical and ecological fabric of both Middle East Technical University's woodland and 100. Yıl Neighborhood. Malazgirt Boulevard project is discussed as a part of a greater economic and political project which is connected to the construction of other road opening works and urban transformation projects. So it is possible to argue, the protests were a continuation of the Gezi Movement, which was also primarily connected to the neoliberalisation processes of the city. Therefore, people in the 100. Yıl Initiative remember this period as an important time in their history of coming together.

The construction of the cooperative houses in 100. Yıl Neighborhood dates back to the 1970's. Therefore, housing blocks in the neighborhood are old and mainly have poor physical conditions. This situation provides a ground for the construction sector to make claims and generate a discourse on the neighborhood's disaster risk. The various scenarios of urban transformation, renewal or re-generation in İstanbul show that applying to the Law on Disaster Prevention (*Afet Yasası*) is one of the primary sources of legitimization of urban transformation (Adanalı, 2013; Karaman, 2014). Even though there are not clear predictions or news on how the transformation would take place in 100. Yıl Neighborhood, newly constructed residences or smart buildings give a hint on the tendency. How that transformation would take place and

---

of the country protested the construction of Malazgirt Boulevard (back then METU Road). Protestors were against the destruction of the natural protected areas in the territory of the University and the other urban transformation projects that would come along with the road.

how different social actors would be affected in these processes are other major questions. I would like to focus on a different aspect of the neighborhood that is inherently related to these political economic processes.

What exactly determines our perception of places; what makes a neighborhood more neighborhood-like than other? 100. Yıl Neighborhood has unique social and architectural characteristics and it is one of those places in the city where a neighborhood culture (*mahalle kültürü*) still exists. What I refer here as the culture of the neighborhood is defined by both social and material conditions. Bilge Köse argues that Workers Blocks holds an important place in our collective memory with its block types, green spaces, common marketplace (*üçgen çarşı*) and the social environment these material conditions provide (2013). It is very important to explore how these material conditions or the physical space is used in order to create what actually constitutes the neighborhood culture, which gives Workers Blocks an important place in our collective memory. There has been a strong solidarity network that works among the neighborhood inhabitants in various areas for many years. I asked about how the neighborhood was in the past to one of the participants of the Initiative who was living in the neighborhood when there were some blocks that were still in construction. She answered that when she first came in the 90's: "There were not any supermarkets or grocery stores. There was only a cooperative market in the place of *üçgen çarşı* (common marketplace) now, and the apartment blocks, nothing else. We were figuring things out with staying in solidarity with our neighbors". So one of the reasons behind the solidarity network that goes back many years is the isolation. Another possible reason is that it was a cooperative housing project. That is why it was more likely that already politically active people were constituting the majority of the neighborhood inhabitants. That has changed today. Still, it is possible to see the resonations in today's 100. Yıl neighborhood culture.

The solidarity networks of today date back to early 2000s. It first starts through e-mail groups then evolve into social media groups and pages. These groups which are firstly initiated by METU students are used by other inhabitants as well. Besides

14

these online networks, there are three important physical sites in the neighborhood. First two are the already mentioned sites of this research, the Neighborhood Atelier and the bostan. The third one is also unique and worth to mention. Şimdilik Association (*Şimdilik Derneği*) organizes long-term courses for children of the neighborhood, given by volunteers in various sub-fields of science, arts and philosophy. These spaces that can be considered as "common spaces with emancipatory potential" (Stavrides, 2010) are the fruits of the above-mentioned complex social and material conditions of the neighborhood and at the same time, they are the sites that re-create that complexity.

There are two particular physical sites of this research: the 100. Yıl Neighborhood Atelier and the 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan. In 2014, 100. Yıl Initiative turns an abandoned, empty land into a collective urban garden. Because of the recent loss of Berkin Elvan, who was a fifteen-year-old hit by a tear-gas canister fired by a police officer while he was out to buy bread in İstanbul at the time of the Gezi Movement, the garden takes its name after him. They say we wanted to commemorate him and keep his name alive. The Neighborhood Atelier settles in one of the first floors of Workers Blocks buildings. There is an embroidered piece of fabric hanged on its front windows, and it is written Atelier (*Atölye*) on it. With its tie-dyed, colorful curtains and the fabric hanged on the front window, it is possible to separate it from the other houses in that block. Yet one needs to be careful or attentive enough to discover it.

> After the Gezi Park protests were put to an end in the summer of 2013, people started to get together in local neighborhood parks and founded so-called neighborhood "forums." Some protesters wished to maintain the often-mentioned "Gezi spirit": They wanted to keep discussing political demands or ways of organizing amongst themselves (Künhert & Patscheider, 2015: 9).

Above Künhert and Patscheider refer to the motivations and processes of neighborhood initiatives that emerged after the Gezi movement. There are many neighborhood initiatives and (collective) bostans all around Turkey. I do not claim that all local mobilizations emerge after the Gezi Movement. However, the ones that did, carry some similar characteristics. 100. Yıl Initiative comes into existence out of

the above-referred neighborhood forums. Afterward, it produces the bostan in 2014, the Neighborhood Atelier in 2015 and the food community in 2016. 100. Yıl Initiative, as well as the other neighborhood initiatives, seek ways of coming together with different social actors, to discuss and act in various ways against the ongoing social, political, economic and ecological injustices.

Therefore, it is important to differentiate the collective urban gardening practices that are taking place in 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan from the case of any other urban hobby garden or historical bostan. Along the same line, the Neighborhood Atelier is different from the other social centers in the neighborhood. It is not a place designed by the municipal authorities for public use. Or it is not a co-working space; a freelancer habitat designed with stylish furniture. It is continuously in production through the ideas, relations, and practices of the participants of the 100. Yıl Initiative. The neighborhood atelier has a repairing workshop, sewing room, kitchen and a room for the exchange of second-hand clothes and staff. 100. Yıl Initiative comes together one day in a week to make a dinner forum to discuss the local and national agendas. There is a day for film screenings where people outside the Initiative also attend. Every Saturday afternoon there are open atelier sessions, where everyone can join to do whatever production, discussion, interaction they are imagining.

These places compose particularly relevant and rich sources for the questions of this research because they give a chance to observe the political meanings of the social and economic organization of a collective in the urban space. They, or rather the practices and relations that compose those spaces, hold the links between the possibly different life and today. Through these places, it becomes possible to observe and discuss how different ways of practicing politics by producing different urban meanings and values in everyday life become necessary under authoritarian neoliberal governments.

1.5. Related Studies and Sites

To be able to discuss how bostan and atelier in the 100. Yıl Neighborhood are
different from other urban gardens and associations, this sub-chapter, first of all,
explores the related literature on urban gardens and refers to site visits to other urban
gardens to make comparisons and look out for contrasts. Then moves to the related
studies on independent, open, common urban spaces and concludes with examples of
places that it might be possible to compare with the Neighborhood Atelier.

Urban gardening scholarship around the world mostly concentrates on issues such as
urban poverty, community building, gentrification and resistance to the urban
capitalist growth (Marche, 2015: 2). "Community gardens grow in the fertile
intersections between food politics and agri-food studies, environmentalism, and
urban social movements, policy and planning, social work and social action" (Nette,
2014: 3). Indeed, there have been various social, political, economic and ecological
reasons, motivations and factors behind the act of urban gardening. It gains different
meanings throughout the world and history. Susan Parham states that the history of
urban food growing is a long one, varying from one city to another and commonly
associated with 'food security' (2015: 158). She overviews the various forms of
urban gardens; from allotments to victory gardens, and that shows how the
relationships between land and people can have different meanings under different
social, economic and political contexts (2015).

Only in particular contexts and in particular forms, it becomes possible to argue the
practice of urban gardening is about taking a position in opposition to the socio-
ecological crises of capitalism. According to Nette (2014), this political dimension of
the practice is far less investigated than others. However, there is an ongoing interest
in producing and discussing urban gardens as spaces that carry possibilities of
politics of collective action against the market or state-led enclosures. Studies that
create a conversation between urban community gardens and commons literature
focus on various struggles, with economic crises, austerity, racial segregation, etc.
Efrat Eizenberg's study on New York's community gardens (2011: 765) consider

producing the commons, as counter-hegemonic struggles against neoliberal urbanism. In Franklin Ginn and Eduardo Ascensao's study on Lisbon's collective gardening spaces, the gardening practice is a way of performing practices of belonging for post-colonial migrants (2018: 947). Esra Erdem's analysis of Prinzessinnengarten in Berlin as a heterotopic space argues the urban garden becomes an experimental space that combines political action and recreation through daily activities which become reflections of critical positions (2012: 73). Here I argue the 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan is one of those cases where the garden becomes urban commons because of the continuous practices and relationships that accumulate and grow a critical perspective there. Recent studies from Turkey tend to attribute a resistant dynamic to the gardening. Elçin Turan in her thesis that takes Yedikule Bostans[13] as a case argues that in Turkey urban agriculture takes the form of everyday life resistances (Turan, 2015: 3). She explains how historically urban agriculture was a part of the daily life of Istanbul (2015: 50) and how during and after Gezi protests, bostans become spaces of appropriation (2015: 56), spaces of demanding and producing possibly different urban meanings for different actors.

Yedikule and Kuzguncuk Bostans are both urban gardens located in İstanbul and have a long history. Even though all, Yedikule, Kuzguncuk and 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan, are called bostan in Turkish, these particular translations help to distinguish them better: Yedikule Bostans are historical market gardens, Kuzguncuk Bostan operates as an urban community garden and 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan is a collective urban garden. Yedikule Bostans are the market gardens that surround the historical Yedikule city-walls that were enclosing the Byzantine Constantinople in the fifth century. Chantel White, Aleksandar Shopov and Marta Ostovich state, until the mid 20th century, there were hundreds of market gardens in İstanbul. Today the Yedikule bostans are the only market-garden complex that remains in İstanbul, which is under the great pressure and threat of the rapid urban development (2014: 30-31). In mid-June, I had participated in a summer school titled Political Ecology

---

[13] Historical market-gardens named Yedikule in the Fatih district of İstanbul that I elaborate later in this sub-chapter.

on the Roads of İstanbul organized by the Center for Spatial Justice. As a part of the 'on the road' section of the summer school, we had field visits together with the researchers, locals or activists who are working in those sites. In Yedikule Bostans, Suna Kafadar, who is researching the lettuce of Yedikule and engaged in the resistance processes of the gardeners, showed us around. In the case of Yedikule bostans, the destruction of the gardens means the displacement of the working-class gardener families whose means of subsistence is the bostan itself. According to White, Shopov, and Ostovich and Kafadar, gardens of İstanbul have always been operated by immigrants. İstanbul has been receiving migrants both from Balkans and Anatolia in the late 17th and 18th centuries. Migration brought more labor force and increased the demand for food (2014: 33) which led people to grow more market-gardens. Today Yedikule Bostans are mainly operated by internal migrants from the Black Sea region. However, operating a market-garden in the city is not as attractive and profitable as it was then, according to the gardeners who start to sell flowers as well. They say, "Although the products pass the tests, people approach with suspicion to the fruits and vegetables that grow in a polluted city like İstanbul". The products of Yedikule Bostans are usually more expensive than the supermarket prices, other district bazaars, and wholesale markets.

While we were there, walking from one plot to another, I saw gardeners, mostly families or men with a helper, working on the land. I have noticed that they were using pesticides and found it strange since it was a practice that was out of the framework of urban gardening that I am used to. Probably Suna Kafadar, our lead, realized that it took our attention and explained on our next stop how it does not make sense to think that these people will do "permaculture" here, how they are hardly earning their keep. The rules of permaculture that are accepted by everyone as facts today are not the methods they adopt. They still use the old watering system, and the value of this site comes from transferring those methods to the future. For the sustainability of the market-gardens, there is a need for local support. There is not a single city center of İstanbul anymore, everywhere is far away from each other. And there is one store of the cheap supermarket chains in every neighborhood. The

19

historical and cultural value of Yedikule Bostans is not appraised enough by the municipality of Fatih or the inhabitants of the neighborhood. The area including the Yedikule neighborhood and bostans is subject to gentrification; the project plans to build a green park area instead of the bostans. One remaining gardener states[14], only after the struggle against urban gentrification, they could unite, but it was already too late for some of them to avoid the destruction of their plot. In short, the case of Yedikule Bostans has significant yet different political meanings compared to the collective gardens. In the case of Yedikule Bostans, the right to be claimed is a cry[15].

Our second visit was to the Kuzguncuk neighborhood and the community garden of the neighborhood (*Kuzguncuk Bostanı*). Kuzguncuk is one of the oldest neighborhoods of İstanbul with strong community ties. The Kuzguncuk Bostan has a 700 years-long history, like in the case of Yedikule Bostans, the first owners of the bostan was a Rûm family. First, the General Directorate for Foundations of Turkey takes the garden from the family, and after that, there are periodically emerging contestations on the use of the space. It re-vitalizes during the Gezi Movement as a collective garden like many other examples of that time. According to a local that we had a chance to meet and have a chat about those times of the bostan while we were there: after a year, the municipality steps in and takes the responsibility and also the control of the space. After 'cleaning and giving an order to nature', municipality begins to annually distribute the parcels of land by lot to the neighborhood inhabitants. The local we met in a tea house close to the bostan said, "Many of them stopped going there after the municipality took control. The aim of the intervention was to avoid political formations". After the municipality, people start to get parcels of land by lot. The ones who get the land parcel for a year comes to the bostan only to take care of their plot, which is often enclosed by fences and warning signs like "do not touch!". As a result, many of the parcels look abandoned or neglected. So, the attempt of the municipality, which at first seems well-intentioned or supportive,

---

[14] In a video-interview conducted by Center for Spatial Justice, available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xWtDn8uVToA&t=103s

[15] See Peter Marcuse's (2009: 190-191) further discussions on cry and demand to the city in *From Critical Urban Theory to the Right to the City*.

takes the garden from the hands of the people. That changes the actors, the practices and the garden itself. Some inhabitants, like the President of Kuzguncuk Association who showed us the bostan, consider the intervention of the municipality as a service and some others see it as a form of control mechanism. The contrast in their approach comes from the inhabitant's varying social, economic or political backgrounds and motivations.

What makes the case of 100. Yıl Neighborhood significant for the discussion of commoning practices? Discussing the different contexts of urban gardening makes it possible to distinguish the practices and relations in the 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan. It is not possible to consider Yedikule or Kuzguncuk Bostan as places that emerge from practices of commoning in their current state. Yedikule Bostans are private gardens in the public space. I would even have second thoughts to enter if I was there on my own because it does not look like a public space at all. Immigrant families practice gardening for their means of survival; they produce and then sell in the markets. On the other hand, in the case of 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan, harvesting is open to everyone. During the summer, bostan organizes common breakfasts announced through social media or posters in the neighborhood. Of course, participants of the bostan prefer people who collect the vegetables to contribute to the cultivation processes as well. Still, more importantly, what 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan seeks is formulating possibly different practices and relationships, while in Yedikule Bostans there is a straightforward exchange relation. Even though in both cases there is a struggle against the processes of neoliberal urbanism, they take place in different forms and processes. Kuzguncuk Bostan is a space that is *made* public with "weakly participatory forms" and becomes a "new form of state planning" (Brenner, Marcuse, Mayer, 2009: 180) or a form of "middle-class environmentalism" (Gin and Ascensao, 2018: 931). So, the tendency of privatization, which is more visible in Yedikule exists in Kuzguncuk as well. Even though it had a similar spatial meaning and organization during the Gezi Movement, today it works as a community garden, where the participants of the community do not interact or even see each other. It might even be possible to argue Kuzguncuk

21

Bostan carries the danger of becoming a tool of the gentrification processes in Kuzguncuk. Therefore, it is critical to differentiate the contexts of urban gardening before attributing emancipatory, revolutionary or characteristics as such. What matters is the relations and practices that shape the garden as well as the participants themselves.

During the neoliberal urban re-structuring processes, the increasing rents, property booms, and intense commercialization of the city make it impossible to access urban space for any form of activity which does not generate profit (Bresnihan & Byrne, 2015). In these "wounded cities of neoliberal era" (Scneider & Susser, 2003) studies begin to focus on liminal (Stavrides, 2010), common (Harvey, 2012), other, heterotopic (Erdem, 2014), open, independent (Bresnihan & Byrne, 2015) spaces where encounters, collective experiences, practices and relationships create possible chances of social, political and economic reproduction and transformations. Increasing privatization of public spaces all around the world limits people's chances of social interaction and access to urban life. When we think of such spaces, one of the first things that comes into mind is urban squatting movement. Due to the high rents and increasing housing problems in cities like Amsterdam, Dublin, or Berlin squatting practices become an important part of discussing urban commons in relation to space. However, the resistance to social, economic, and political enclosures in Turkey, more likely take the forms of "alternative markets, labor practices, communal ownership constellations, sites of nonmarket transaction" (Erdem, 2014: 66). The Neighborhood Atelier is not a squat but a collectively rented space. Still it carries the characteristics related studies use to interpret these common spaces of Athens (Stavrides, 2010) independent spaces of Dublin (Bresnihan & Byrne, 2015). There have been various neighborhood initiatives as well as food cooperatives in Turkey, but it is possible to say their numbers have increased in the last five years. There might be several reasons behind, from the increasing crises to the spread of the networks of solidarity. They organize in various forms and subjects, like kitchens, cafes, centers, or associations. Fırat Genç argues that these movements broaden the scope of urban politics and resistance in the Turkish context. While it

was common to discuss the collective struggles in *gecekondu* (built overnight) neighborhoods, today the variety of actors, practices, and subjects of the urban politics widens the scope of the resistance (2018: 13). These practices and spaces that Genç also refers to as urban commons need further analysis to make possible contributions to the paths they try to create to overcome the crises. This study aims to contribute both to the existing literature and the movements, by attempting to understand the processes behind urban commons examples in Ankara.

1.6. The Methodological Approach

It is important to clarify what I understand and mean by ethnography, fieldwork and participant observation before entering into the methodology section of the research subject to this thesis because these discussions shaped the way I have conducted the research. Tim Ingold initiates critical discussions on the issue of common use and abuse of the term ethnography and its distinctions from anthropology, in several articles that are titled as *Anthropology is not Ethnography* (2008), *That's Enough about Ethnography!* (2014) and *Anthropology contra ethnography* (2017). He states, the term ethnography has become commonplace in social sciences beyond the shores of anthropology. The loose use of the term causes a procedure, in which ethnographic appears to be a substitute for qualitative and that offends every principle of proper, rigorous anthropological inquiry (2014: 384). Ethnography literally means writing about the people. In its dictionary definitions it is explained as, "a scientific description of the culture of a society by someone who has lived in it[16]", or "the systematic study and description of peoples, societies and cultures[17]". Ingold argues that dictionary definitions of ethnography are hopelessly anachronistic; they refer to a scientific act of cataloging habits and customs rather than referring to practicing an art of *thick description* (2014: 385). And these definitions are of course not capable of actually distinguishing what ethnography is and not. John Comaroff in

---

[16] Cambridge Dic.: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/ethnography

[17] Oxford Dic.:
http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/64809?redirectedFrom=ethnography#eid

The End of Anthropology, Again: On the Future of an In/Discipline, discusses the symptom-arguments that lead us to the prediction of the end of anthropology. The first crisis symptom he refers to is the fact that anthropology lost its 'brand' or signature method, namely ethnography. He states, these days sociologists, political scientists, social psychologists, humanists and even economists claim 'to do ethnography' (2010: 525) and asks, what holds anthropology from dissolving into other social sciences (2010: 533)?

Graeber and Da Col argue that the auto-critique of anthropology in 80's served a purpose which it was never intended. After the great debates on the dark, colonial history of anthropology, anthropological knowledge became something that could be easily dismissed because it is accepted as Eurocentric, racist, and therefore not knowledge at all. The situation in the first half of the twentieth century was different; most of the major European thinkers used anthropological concepts lifted from ethnographic work, like mana, potlatch or taboo but nowadays anthropologists take their concepts from European philosophy. And Graeber and Da Col state, no one outside anthropology really cares what we, anthropologists, have to say about concepts like deterritorialization or governmentality (2011). What Graeber and Da Col highlight is not a simple argument that suggests ethnography is the one and the only thing that marks out an anthropological inquiry and justifies its existence as a distinctive discipline. They argue, like Comaroff and Ingold, that anthropological ways of working in different themes and geographies, grounded in the practices of everyday life and the critical engagement of the discipline of anthropology need more attention in order to make anthropology relevant again beyond its borders.

The critiques that Ingold raises on the definition of ethnography, which I further elaborate below, are important for the discussions of this thesis because they connect with the methodological questions I have been keeping in mind throughout the research. The major question that shapes these discussions is; for whom and why we are conducting research? What is the purpose of the discipline of anthropology? The reason why Ingold repeatedly criticizes the collapse of anthropology into an

accumulation of ethnographic case studies or seeing ethnography as a means to anthropological generalizations comes from the desire to defend anthropology's role of contributing to debates on the great questions of our time:

> By general consent, the organizations of production, distribution, governance, and knowledge that have dominated the modern era have brought the world to the brink of catastrophe. In finding ways to carry on, we need all the help we can get. But no specialist science, no indigenous group, no doctrine or philosophy already holds the key to the future if only we could find it. We have to make that future together, for ourselves, and this can only be done through dialogue. Anthropology exists to expand the scope of this dialogue: to make a conversation of human life itself (Ingold, 2017: 22).

In that way, Ingold argues, anthropological education does more than teaching us about the world, people, and societies; it changes our perception of the world by opening up our eyes and minds to other conditions and possibilities of being (2007: 82). And the way ethnography is understood and popularly used "is doing great harm to anthropology (…) preventing our discipline from having the kind of impact in the world that it deserves and that the world so desperately needs" (Ingold, 2014: 383).

How to realize the above-mentioned role of anthropology? The ways in which the research is conducted carry a great importance in this process. The question of for whom and why we are conducting research cannot be thought separate from the questions on methodology. What kind of a dialogue or conversation is in need, in order to be able to attribute such a role to anthropology? Ingold states, anthropology has the means to show how knowledge grows from the crucible lives lived with other; "this knowledge, as we are well aware, consists not in propositions about the world but in the skills of perception and capacities of judgment that develop in the course of direct, practical, and sensuous engagements with our surroundings" (2014: 387). This definition, takes us back to participant observation, the discipline of anthropology's principal way of working. Ingold (2014: 392) claims that 'doing ethnography' instead of 'participant observation' shifts the priority "from engagement to reportage from correspondence to description, from the co-imagining of possible futures to the characterization of what is already past". What are the

values Ingold attributes to participant observation? He (2014; 2017) highlights the difference between to observe and to objectify. To observe, he states, "is to attend to persons and things, to learn from them and to follow in precept and practice. Indeed there can be no observation without participation – that is without intimate coupling, in perception and action, of observer and observed" (2014: 387). That continuous coupling of waiting, perceiving, attending and acting is the process in which participant observation of anthropology differs from what people do all the time. Waiting for correspondences is the way that theory and world of everyday life set into a dialogue or a conversation. Then, what we live in the research site should not be treated as empirical data or finished ethnographies that will be used to test theoretical generalizations. The process of knowledge generation should be in constant making through correspondences. "Participant observation, in short, is not a technique of data gathering but an ontological commitment. And that commitment is fundamental to the discipline of anthropology" (Ingold, 2017: 23).

In order to have a public voice, a voice that can possibly be heard or have an impact outside of the academy as well, we need to re-think the ways in which we fill the terms we use for researching and writing. The primary aim of this thesis is to understand and engage with the socio-economic organization of life in particular urban sites, the collective garden and the neighborhood atelier in the 100. Yıl Neighborhood. Then opening an ongoing discussion on the political possibilities and limitations of practices and relationships of commoning that produce and sustain sites as such. It is critical to pay attention to the qualities Ingold attributes to the anthropological research; to be able to understand and engage with the organization processes in these sites rather than only describing or reporting what has already happened. Therefore, participant observation is the primary way of working of the research subject to this thesis. I have a long-term and open-ended commitment to the research topic and companions and hold an attentive and active position in the research site and community. Since the emphasis is on the practices and relationships that produce the common urban spaces, it is necessary to immerse in the sites of the research. The political possibilities and limitations appear in the processes of acting

and relating. Observing and participating make it possible to understand them as processes in themselves. While other qualitative approaches[18] might be better-fits to figure out specific characteristics of communities, participant observation provides the possibility to recognize a community as *a process composed of actions and relationships*. Jeniffer Mason in 1996 was arguing that despite its diversities within and its wide range of methods, ethnography was an approach, or a strategy, grounded in a particular ontology (1996: 55). In 2017, Tim Ingold argues that participant observation is an "ontological commitment" (2017: 23) to differentiate it from doing ethnography. The point to be taken seems to be that, the particular context of the research and the way the researcher approaches the site; thinks about, looks at, and engages with it, actively shape the methodology. Today, under the current social, economic, ecological crises, anthropology must be ethically and politically grounded. That ground for this research topic is shaped in the process of the research through the co-production of knowledge together with the participants of the 100. Yıl Initiative, common places and other species inhabiting the research sites.

> Greek ethnos or rather ethnikos, used for the heathen, that is, one who was neither Christian nor Jew. What is more, the term was used by the heathens for themselves. So, ethnography should have been a heathen science and a science from the inside. However, the Judeo-Christian millennium and an ironic turn not unknown in the history of language saw the name transferred from those who used it to describe themselves to those who were meant to be distinct from it. Not surprisingly then, as ethnikos became an 'external' term, the fate of ethnography suddenly changed. The name that should have meant 'writing for us' had become instead the 'writing of them' (Mitra, n.d.)

Wrick Mitra's linguistic explorations of the term ethnography demonstrates how even at its roots, ethnography was a self-reflexive practice. It was the practice of writing done by someone within the culture that person is writing for. In *Critical*

---

[18] Jennifer Mason (1996) refers to some of the most influential qualitative research approaches while indicating that the research is an active process rather than an alignment with a position or a doctrine. The main strategies she names are: ethnographic approaches, interpretivist approaches, psychoanalytic approaches, biographical, life history and humanist approaches, and conversation analysis and discourse analysis.

Ethnography: The Reflexive Turn, Douglas Foley states that from the early 1900s through the 1950s, social scientific research was founded upon logical positivism that took root in the United States. By the 1970s, various critiques, as well as responses, emerged within the discipline of anthropology and we can place the reflexive turn in the discipline there (Foley, 2002: 473). The reflexive turn in 70's, came along with the major 'crisis of representation'. *Writing Culture*, edited by James Clifford and George Marcus in 1986 holds a key position in this process because of the debate scene it opened for the *poetics and politics of ethnography*. These debates led to an overall rethinking of the discipline of anthropology; it's history, researcher's position in the research field - site, subjectivity - objectivity, geographies of the research, forms of representation, etc. The question of 'what anthropology is for?' re-gained importance in this context and various meaningful theoretical and methodological responses and attempts of experimentation emerged. The approaches like public (Lassiter, 2008), militant (Scheper-Hughes, 1995; Juris, 2007), engaged anthropology (Low, 2010), or partisan participation (Urla & Helepololei, 2014) are meaningful in explaining the position I attempt to take in this research. The next sub-chapter explains how I gain that position and how the methodological approach drawn in this sub-chapter impacts the research sites and materials.

1.7. Overview of the Research and Research Calendar

In this overview chapter, I will briefly refer to what motivated me to conduct this research, how I met with the sites of this research and how that encounter shaped my research interests. Then, I will refer to the calendar of the research and generated research materials.

I was not in Turkey whenever a major event that settled in our collective memory took place. I was an Erasmus student in Germany in the spring of 2013 when the Gezi Movement took place. I was attending a summer school in Greece on the 15th of July when the "coup attempt" event happened in 2016. I always found the

remains, traces, and changes when I came back, tried to understand how those collective experiences have changed the feelings, people and places. It is possible to consider this research also as an attempt to observe and engage in those living traces. I moved to the 100. Yıl Neighborhood in the summer of 2015. However, my first encounter with the neighborhood Initiative took place when I saw the poster of the food community in November 2016. As I already told the story, my first visit to the Neighborhood Atelier was the food community's first meeting. Through the food community, I got the chance to meet with the Initiative, atelier and bostan in our neighborhood. Even though I have heard about it a lot in the weekly dinner forums, my first visit to the bostan was in the spring of 2017 because there was nothing in the field at early November in 2016. The fall that I met with the Initiative, my interaction was mostly limited to the meetings of the food community, which was an evening in a week and a Sunday twice a week. However, together with the beginning of meetings at the bostan on weekends, I started to feel like a part of the collective. While working on the land, I had the chance to formulate better relations with the former participants of the Initiative. I even conducted interviews in break times in the bostan in the Spring of 2017. These interviews were mostly about the history of the Initiative (years 2013, 2014, 2015) and the 100. Yıl Neighborhood. I was recording videos and photographs in the bostan with the thought of sharing them with the Initiative. I was trying to find my place in the Initiative. Today I know it is almost only possible to engage new people in the Initiative, bostan or atelier by asking them to do something. It is not only important because of the responsibility one has to take to get access. Becoming a part of work-flow helps to feel like a part of the collective. In the end, that ongoing process itself is the Initiative. That realization shaped my research interests and methodological approach. I have become interested in the processes that make it possible to discuss these spaces as urban commons. Therefore, my main method of researching was participant observation, including informal conversations, active role-taking in the organization and coordination processes, experiencing and feeling the possibilities and limitations.

I can date the beginning of the research back to the Spring of 2017. While it is easy to set a beginning date to the research, it is difficult to put an exact end date to it because of my close connection to the Initiative, which continues today, even denser than the first years that we spent together. I found myself participating in 100. Yıl Initiative's all three different fields of organization. Throughout the past two years, I became active in all the three different fields of action that born out of the 100. Yıl Initiative; 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan, 100. Yıl Neighborhood Atelier, and 100. Yıl Food Community. Taking more duties and responsibilities provide more access and understanding. It is almost impossible to grasp what it means; what are the possibilities and limitations of being a collective and producing common urban spaces without becoming an actual part of the process. Throughout my participation, I saw two different researchers who came to the bostan and the neighborhood atelier to conduct interviews. They asked about the history of the Initiative and what we do. But what I was interested was not something that I could ask as an interview question to the people in the Neighborhood Atelier or bostan. My interview attempts yielded to more informal conversations, where people started to direct the same questions to me. After I a while I have started to find answers to my research questions related with the organization of urban commons in Initiative's relationships with the other inhabitants of the neighborhood, surrounding space and even other species. Also in the in-group discussions of the weekly dinner forums, in the organization of workshops, alternative markets, in the coordination of the food community; the possible answers were in the overall rhythms of the atelier and garden. I observed and kept diaries about these webs of relationships and practices. These observations and encounters are what started to change my priorities in everyday life and shifted my research interests. If we consider the research as a dialogical process, in which the researcher, questions, and subject are in transformation through mutual actions and relations, it is possible to argue that both my experiences in the research site and theoretical readings fed each other. In time, to be a part of the initiative became both an actual and intellectual process.

It took some time for me to feel a part of the Initiative and some more to feel confident enough to talk or write about our experiences. As I have discussed in the previous chapter the question of "why and for whom the research is conducted" determines the method of this study. Today in our current, destructive political, social, and ecological condition, we need to re-think our ways of relating to our surroundings. That includes our ways of conducting research. I profoundly felt that throughout the research period. Therefore, the questions I have asked in the research were in line with the ongoing agenda, everyday life and problems of the Initiative. My primary purpose throughout the research was to think, raise questions on and give possible answers to the subjects that concern the Initiative that I am participating. I observed the practices and relationships that build the sites of this research. And I participated in the processes of creating possibilities and overcoming limitations they encounter. So, it is possible to argue, throughout the research period as well as the thesis writing process, I have carried similar questions and concerns with other participants of the Initiative. Our conversations and discussions on these issues contributed to my research ideas, interests and questions. The various documents and the notebooks; from analog research materials, like the research diaries, drawings that I have kept and the collectively held assembly notebook, and garden log-book as well as the collectively produced sources in the digital sphere; videos, photographs, social media accounts, pages, posts, and e-mail groups, constitute the research materials of this research. I wanted to contribute to the main agendas of the Initiative with any intellectual or artistic forms of production I have done throughout the research period. That was only possible after understanding what motivates or concerns others in the initiative. In that way, my thoughts and concerns started to develop and reflect on my actions and relationships. Being a participant of the initiative, or immersing in it, does not necessarily mean holding an insider's perspective since there is not a single, harmonious one. It more likely refers to being a part of the web of relations that you also shape with your practices. Comprehending that dynamic web of acting and relating leads to an understanding of the potentials of common urban spaces.

Assembly notebook, which is kept during the weekly dinner forums by someone from the Initiative and my research diary are the two-main text-based sources of data, gathered for this research. The assembly notebook mainly includes the current agenda of that time and meeting, clause by clause. It works for keeping the track of the discussions, organizing future plans and dividing responsibilities. On the other hand, the research diary includes my emerging thoughts, observations, self-reflexive notes, and questions. The very first thing that comes out of the notebooks are the months that we meet more often, which also shapes the calendar of the research. Even though the participants of the Initiative are not students but rather graduates or middle-aged people from the neighborhood, the life-cycle of the Initiative seems to be going in line with the calendar of the academic year. It is possible to claim the 100. Yıl Neighborhood is like an extension of the campus because they are just next to each other. But at the same time, it is possible to argue the self-sufficient structure of the campus-life creates a closed community. Therefore, the regular participants of the Initiative, producers and users of the Neighborhood Atelier, and bostan are not students. Still there are two main reasons why the calendar is scheduled as such, first of all, it shows that the Initiative comes together to organize events and it aims to attract more people, and in the case of 100. Yıl Neighborhood it means attracting more students who return to the neighborhood after the summer holiday. Since students compose a major part of the 100. Yıl Neighborhood. Also, other neighborhood residents leave Ankara the summer holidays or visits to their home towns. That is the reason why the beginning of most of the long-term courses or projects are at the beginning of the fall. Other small meetings, weekly dinner forums and film screenings continue throughout the year. The second busy period is the spring-time. This time, it gets busy not right after the semester break ends, but the meetings get more frequent towards March and April because of the preparation of the bostan. So, the calendar of the bostan has a significant impact on the calendar of the research.

"It is common to hear people talk about 'writing up' a research. Implicit in the phrase is the sense that writing is a stage that occurs principally when the research

has finished and is a straightforward process of telling what was done" (Newbury, 2001). Or it is often said, a distance from the field is necessary before starting to write about it. In fact, why's and how's of the research carries an important role in our approach to the process of writing. In the case of this study, the data was occurring through the formulation processes of relationships and practices, rather than being an already existing set waiting to be explored or brought into the surface. The textual bases of this research, the research diaries and the assembly notebook provide a chronological order of these processes. I will discuss the research materials in a conceptual framework to be able to put the empirical material into conversation with the theoretical framework.

CHAPTER 2

CONTEXTUALIZATION OF THE RESEARCH

2.1. Spatio-temporal Framework: When, Where and Why?

This sub-chapter introduces the spatiotemporal context of the research. By drawing a framework of the recent social, economic and political changes in the urban context of Turkey, I aim to express the relevance and importance of discussing the urban commons and practices of commoning, here and now.

"In 1800 the world's population was around 1 billion. At that time only one in forty people lived in towns and cities (…) Two centuries later, the world population had reached 6 billion. The proportion living in cities was close to half" (Hann and Hart, 2011:101). Wendell Cox states, today, %55.4 percent of the world's population live in urban areas according to the United Nations, even though it does not necessarily mean that they live in megacities (2018). Increasing population creates density and more urbanized areas both in developed and developing countries. Processes of capitalist urbanization have tangible, observable, and perceivable destructive impacts on all living species and Earth itself all around the world. As Harvey states, "capitalist urbanization perpetually tends to destroy the city as a social, political and livable commons" (2012: 80). Even though urbanization takes place in both developed and developing countries, some of the associated problems like environmental degradation, unregulated industrialization, unplanned urbanization, poverty, high population growth, poor sanitary conditions, gentrification of slums are more visible in developing countries. Turkey always stands on a thin line between developed and developing countries.

It is not possible to mark the 2000s as the beginning of the urban conflicts in Turkey. Even though neoliberalization and urbanization processes date back to 80's, it is possible to claim, in 2000s Turkey began to experience profound social, political and economic shifts. After the economic crisis of November 2000 and February 2001, the AKP gained power with populist discourses on claiming to be an anti-IMF and anti-liberal reactionary movement. Shortly after the AKP adopted neo-liberal policies under the discourse of 'strong government' (Yeldan and Ünüvar, 2016: 1-2). The construction sector holds a significant role in the Turkish economy. Various models of urban transformation, megaprojects, and construction of energy plants gained rapid growth under the AKP rule regardless of their social, ecological impacts. Moreover, the AKP strengthens its hegemony and power over society through these projects on the urban landscape by holding on to the discourse of modernization. Fikret Adaman and Murat Arsel state, the project of modernization remained at the core of ruling governments in Turkey since the early republican era. The modern Turkish politics has its roots in the early days of modernization, which considered economic development as the key indicator of societal progress (2005: 5). The urbanization rates of the megacities of Turkey, like İstanbul or Ankara, are high due to the high population growth and rural immigration. The growth is seen or posed as the solution, while it is the problem itself. "The unquestioned commitment to rapid and continued economic growth has been at the heart of many societal tensions in modern Turkey (…) because of the tendency of policy-makers to propose increased economic growth as a cure to social problems" (Adaman and Arsel, 2005: 1). The impacts of the neoliberal policies are already affecting and will continue to affect everyone regardless of their social and economic backgrounds in the long run. However, as usual, the destruction begins and always more vital on the side of disadvantaged ones.

Government benefits from the megaprojects, either economically or politically. These megaprojects have harsh consequences in economic, political and social terms. The growing economic crisis, increasing societal polarization, and less and less reliable state politics are making people with different social, political and economic

visions desperate and hopeless. The authoritarian neoliberal government of the new Turkey and it's social, economic and political crises lead to new forms of im/migrations. In 2016 while the number of people arriving İstanbul was 369.582, 440.889 left (Verda, 2018). According to a newspaper article, the Turkish Statistical Institute's (TUİK) annual reports state İstanbul moves to the category of immigrant-sending from immigrant receiving for the first time in the years between 2015-2016 ("İstanbul Modern Tarihinde İlk Kez Göç Verdi", 2017, October 03). Some of these are reverse migrations; people move back to the rural parts of Turkey because of various discontents and motivations. Besides, there is an increasing number of people who are willing or have to migrate to Western European countries, U.S. or Canada. The lack of freedom of expression, law enforcement that dictates the government's ideology, and the unemployment rates; basically anxiety, anger, and sadness that surrounds all the social, political and economic spheres of life motivate some people to leave. The question of where we would like to live is directly related to the questions of what kind of social, economic and political relations we would like to formulate with our surroundings, how do we imagine our everyday lives in the city, and initially what kind of people we would like to be. Therefore, some of the people who are also struggling with the same conditions but have to or choose to stay in Turkey try to formulate living spaces in the city where they can claim their own words and imaginings as in the case of the 100. Yıl Initiative.

Particular forms of organizational interactions occur in specific contexts. The common urban spaces subject to this research and the social relations that produce those spaces emerge in today's urban context of Turkey. Those spaces are like the light in the dark tunnel, as one of the members of the neighborhood initiative said; they still make it possible to come together and be hopeful. How that hope arises? Practices of commoning and the different uses of space transform the urban life, at least in particular sites. Those sites carry the possibility to become open, common spaces that different socio-economic actors communicate. Even though emerging claims on urban life are different from each other, through the practices of commoning, like collective urban gardening, the ground for communication

develops. Here, I do not refer to a communication ground where every difference disappears. The communication ground I refer to makes the different actors visible to the other through her practices in a common urban space. Even this is a significant step in providing communication between diverse social actors, in countries governed by imagined others and enemies.

2.2. The Hopelessness that Comes with the Idea of There is No Alternative

This sub-chapter elaborates the socio-political context, the way of governing, that makes it critical for this research to put an emphasis on the encounter, interaction, communication and relationships between actors of the society from different social, economic and political backgrounds. I emphasize the necessity of these relationships and question to what extent common urban spaces provide an answer.

It is possible to argue that throughout the history, the approach of "there is no other alternative" is used as a common framework for states to gain legitimacy and hegemony. Murat Güney in the concluding chapter *of Türkiye'de İktidarı Yeniden Düşünmek*, critically investigates the back then the only seven-year-long rule of the AKP government. Güney argues that creating a sense of having no alternative constitutes one of the main strategies of Turkish Government under the AKP rule (2009: 362). In fact, this logic of governing is internal to neoconservatism, which is a term popularly used to describe the political scene in the United States under the administration of George W. Bush. Conservative liberalism, the movement the AKP identifies itself with, shows very similar tendencies to neoconservatism. Therefore, it might be explanatory to refer to Stuart Elden's points on the subject in the introductory chapter of *Terror and Territory* where he explains how neoliberal geopolitics operate in the context of United States. There are several notes that he makes on neoconservatism that resonates the political, social and economic climate of Turkey under the rule of the current government. Elden explains neoconservatism as the political and military support of neoliberalism. He claims that it imposes a particular political and economic system that constructs a kind of neocolonialism of democracy promotion and freedom. In that way, states make the world safe for

capitalism while they are promoting their actions as "wars against terror" (2009: xix). There is a tendency of modern states to frame their greatest projects in terms of some sort of unwinnable war (Graeber, 2018: 399). States constitute geographies of threat and fear through imagined enemies without any location (ibid: xvii). In the context of U. S., with these narratives, the government covers itself while implementing the former ideas of imperialism and colonialism. In the case of Turkey, especially in the last four years, state shows an increasingly less amount of effort to cover its hidden agenda. This particular kind of hegemony construction in Turkey is worth to explore further to be able to discuss and draw the environment that counter-movements spring.

It is difficult to follow the ongoing political agenda of Turkey let alone theorizing it, mainly because of the rapidly changing discourses, strategies and even policies and legislation. Katharina Bodirsky (2016) makes an insightful and thought-provoking analysis of how hegemony building strategies show a change in the recent history of Turkey by referring to Philip Abrams' notions of "state-idea" and "politically organized subjection". Bodirsky states that Abrams coined the expression of "politically organized subjection" but did not elaborate it and it is possible to interpret it "as the capacity to ensure cohesion of an unequal and antagonistic society through the stabilization of inequalities and the suppression of alternative political projects" (2016: 123). The state politics in Turkey, with its scandals of corruption, endless state of exception, cases of injustice and inequality, physical and psychological state violence and the state of war, composes an obvious example of a "successful unmasked state" with "politically organized subjection". Bodirsky argues, governments as such, instead of claiming to encompass and represent most of the population, including groups with different interests, seem to adopt strategies that promote polarization in society when they are faced with alternative political projects (2016: 124). Besides consolidating the tense climate in the country and empowering the government, the extreme polarization in the society shape the qualities, values, strategies, and forms of the counter-movements, both at the governmental level and grassroots movements. As the use of polarization as a strategy by the Turkish

government increases, the counter movements put an emphasis, more than ever, on the question of how to stand together and communicate with the ones who do not necessarily share the same political stances, ethnic or religious backgrounds. The case of the 100. Yıl Initiative also follows a similar path: one of the most important objective of the bostan is to create encounters in the public sphere. The process of seeing, getting know the marginalized groups[19] while they are gardening breaks the criminal image the government draws based on other acts of contestation experienced during protests; like street clashes, damage to the public property, etc.[20] To what extent the attempts of the 100. Yıl Initiative become successful in practice is a remaining question yet at least they open paths for communication in times of hatred and polarization.

2.3. Here and Now: Re-thinking the Urban Meaning of the Neighborhood Atelier and Bostan

100. Yıl Neighborhood is still not exactly at the city center, even though the city is expanding for a long while and the highways surround the neighborhood and push the periphery further. The neighborhood does not carry the characteristics of the dense, inner-city settlements. Mainly the students and the middle-class families compose the neighborhood profile. However, it is not possible to collect their everyday life practices, habits, and relations under these two general groups. The neighborhood does not emerge as a closed ghetto community composed of people with very similar concerns and everyday life practices. It is possible to argue that this hybrid character is what provides a ground for common urban spaces. Spaces where

---

[19] Here from the marginalized groups, I mean the participants of the 100. Yıl Initiative because the state and mainstream media's narrative shows a tendency to marginalize the groups that are in opposition, to turn them into examples of anomie to be cured or normalized.

[20] I am not trying to advocate a kind of peaceful protest and legitimize the criminalization of street clashes. I am just trying to indicate how different practices like gardening carry the chance of providing a safe ground for communication between different actors.

social confrontation takes place are referred as thresholds[21] (Stavrides, 2010).
Stavrides explains such threshold spaces as "passages towards otherness (ibid., 2010:
14). These threshold spaces are where different social, political, economic actors
encounter through "a rich network of practices" (ibid., 2010: 16).

> Existing only to be crossed, actually or virtually, the threshold is not a
> defining border that keeps out a hostile otherness, but a complicated social
> artifact that produces, through differently defined acts of crossing, different
> relations between sameness and otherness (ibid., 2010: 17).

In Stavrides's terms, the encounter or the communication between social actors,
among the same or with the other, do not refer to eliminating borders but flexing
them or creating meeting points. Then, even it is not possible to completely
overcome polarization, in spaces defined as such, it possible to see how encounters,
meetings take place. At first it seems like the sites of this research are the
productions of a community rather than the outcomes of the claims of diverse range
of actors. To an extent it is right that there are mostly like-minded people behind the
processes, who would like to communicate with a diverse range of actors. However,
when the encounter takes place through practices and relations, the transformation of
the space itself and different selves constitute the here argued political meaning and
potential.

"Many of today's activists have rejected 'a politics which appeals to governments to
modify their behavior, in favour of physical intervention against state power in a
form that itself prefigures an alternative" (Graeber in Day, 2004: 730). This forced-
rejection, or preference in direct action, in the case of Turkey, takes slightly different
forms than what Graeber implies. It is not possible to squat buildings, organize street
marches, make public announcements; most of the repertoires of struggle and

---

[21] Threshold or, in Latin liminal, space is used by various social, political and post-
colonial theorists (Victor Turner (1977), Arnold Van Gennepp (1960), Homi K.
Bhabha (1994)) to describe transitory, in between, third, hybrid spaces where a
potential for change lies. Here I use the term threshold in a way that Stavros
Stavrides (2010) has put into theory; because of its emphasis on urban space, it is
more relevant for the case of this research.

resistance are limited today due to the ways of governance I have tried to discuss in the last two sub-chapters. Increasing and continuing despair and destruction let people's hopes from the governmental politics down, but do not lead to discouragement from imagining different ways of prefiguring alternatives. What I argue is that under these conditions, common urban spaces like the neighborhood atelier and bostan become the realm of politics, to raise voices and practices against not just economic but also social and political enclosures.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. From the Commons to the Practices of Commoning

"Commons might simultaneously refer to a shared resources, a discourse, a new/old property framework, social processes, an ethic, a set of policies or, in other words, to a paradigm of a pragmatic new social vision beyond the dominant capitalist system" (Kostakis & Buwens, 2014: 38). Discussions around commons and different definitions of the term in various disciplines including anthropology, economics, geography, history and political science, take us to the very fundamental debates on enclosures, property debates, the dichotomy between capitalist and non-capitalist orders, logics and relocating the social and the ecological into the economic relations. Here, I will briefly refer to the classical and new understandings of the commons and discuss how seeing commons as a process made by practices and relationships is relevant for the sites and discussion of this thesis.

A considerable amount of literature on the commons is driving from Elinor Ostrom's (1990) understanding of the term, the sustainable management of the environmental pool resources. David Harvey (2012), Derek Wall (2014) praise Ostrom's work as a critical reference that challenges the notion of the famous *tragedy of the commons* by Garret Hardin. Hardin (1968) argues that in a scenario in which everyone had open and free access to a common grassland, it would eventually lead to a resource depletion because of the self-interested nature of humans. The stereotype or the myth of homo economicus claims that humankind is composed of individuals who are self-interested and continuously attempt to maximize their profit while minimizing costs. Within this perspective, market logic is the only rational behavior. However, neither non-capitalist orders nor most of today's urban common spaces fit into that

framework. Karl Polanyi states, what differentiates and specifies his day's capitalist (economic and social) relations as, the important role that *gain and profit* plays on exchange relations. He states, "…previously to our time no economy has ever existed that, even in principle, was controlled by markets" (2001: 45). Recent social movements initially oppose this human condition within the market logic through imagining and practicing possibly different repertoires and activities of contestation. I argue practices of commoning and the urban spaces they accumulate are a part of those repertoires.

It is possible to argue, the practices and relationships that compose the sites of this research, the neighborhood atelier and bostan, are also oppositions to the imposed market logic and regimes of capital accumulation, enclosures, privatization, gentrification, and marketization. Essentially, they are about imagining a society beyond capitalism. Therefore it is important to make a distinction here, with the use of the term urban commons, as governing natural common resource pools in the urban context and urban spaces that are in always in the making by the processes of commoning. So, even though Ostrom's work composes a strong opposition to the top-down created commons and theoretical economic models on rational human nature and puts emphasis on self-governance, mutual responsibility, collectivity, and co-operation (Wall, 2014: 87), it is still about how to manage or govern the commons. But to think on the main questions of this research and discuss the relationship flows in the neighborhood atelier and bostan it is necessary to apply to the critical literature on the urban commons, practices and relationships of commoning, production of urban space and creating a set of common values. Only in that way, the neighborhood atelier and bostan also become urban commons. Therefore, first I elaborate the recent discussions on the differences between the commons and the practices of commoning, by referring to the conditions that cause these discussions to regain a significance and its relevance to the subject matter of this thesis. Secondly, I focus on the spatiality of the commons and explore to what extent the open urban space can be produced and owned in common, again by referring to the spatial elements of the bostan and atelier.

3.1.1. Thinking the Commons as Processes in/outside the Capitalist Structures

In this first sub-chapter, I discuss the commons as processes of producing urban space, creating different sets of values and responsibilities that exist inside the capitalist structure but think at the outside of it. By applying to the critical approach in the commons discussions, I emphasize the state of being always in the making. I argue common urban spaces are productions of people who are motivated to draw possibly different paths within or outside the market relations. The discussions on re-embedding social relations into the economic sphere, formulating possibly different everyday life practices, habits, set of values and selves are primarily necessary to understand the organization of different fields of action of the 100. Yıl Initiative; the neighborhood atelier, bostan and also the food community.

> The modern state promotes and imposes itself as the stable centre -definitively- of (national) societies and spaces. As both the end and the meaning of history - just as Hegel had forecast- it flattens the social and 'cultural' spheres. It enforces a logic that puts an end to conflicts and contradictions. It neutralizes whatever resists it by castration or crushing. Is this social entropy? Or is it a monstrous excrescence transformed into normality? Whatever the answer, the results lay before us (Lefebvre, 1996: 23).

Economic anthropology, or "an anthropology of the political economy of world systems" (Clammer, 2016: 4), provides a ground to discuss how, despite the results that Lefebvre indicates above, the capitalist system is in a never-ending growth and development. The literature of economic anthropology, ethnographies from different geographies, draw a framework of neoliberalized subjects, precarious lives, and damaged socio-economic relations. However, these do not necessarily lead to despair in the face of neoliberal capitalism's invincibility. On the contrary, understanding the modes and relations of the neoliberal capitalist system is important because it at the same time means understanding how *outsides* of that system can be formulated or elaborated in the present time. As Gibson and Graham argue, *starting where you are* and creating landscapes of diverse economies, through different kinds of production, labor and transactions processes would bring a change in the collective action,

so "the project of history making is never a distant one, but always right here, on the borders of our sensing, thinking, feeling, moving bodies" (2006: xvi).

In the sites, the crises of capitalism lay, we see both the problems; outcomes of the increasing privatization, impacts of the debt system, exploitative conditions of work, uneven development in different geographies and also the ideas and models in which people are trying to formulate possibly different social and economic relations out of the framework of values capitalist system offers. Massimo De Angelis argues that there is always a 'non capitalism' part of our lives, we do not live in one 'ism' but we live at the "crossroads of many real or potential isms" (2007: 34). It is important to underline that he argues that non-capitalist possibility exists *within* our lives. De Angelis states, there is an abundant literature in anthropology, theorizes and documents non-capitalist orders where commons and gifts are the primary sources of value creation instead of commodity and money (2007: 35). Applying to the early anthropological research in order to find non-capitalist orders might have two distinct outcomes. First of all, it clearly demonstrates that there are other possible value practices outside the capitalist value systems. Also, it challenges the logic of 'human nature' in economic theory.

David Graeber, by applying to Karl Polanyi's work, *The Great Transformation*, dives into the historical origins of 'the market'. Graeber opposes to the argument that market relations are based on freedom and the market emerged as a direct result of what Adam Smith once called 'man's natural propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another'. He states that the state and its coercive powers created and maintained what we know as 'the market' and their mutual relation always remained so. More critically, he argues, the assumptions economists make about human market behavior, the self-interested, rationally profit-maximizing individual, would be impossible without police (2001: 10). So, it is possible to argue historical analysis strengthens the claim on the possibility of non-capitalist orders. But at the same time, seeing the non-capitalist only in the past, far away, savage or

45

exotic land, creates a problematic dichotomy. It proposes a certain kind of relation between capitalism and outside of it. "Some of this literature has explored the connection and articulation between the capitalist and non-capitalist fields, sometimes to highlight how the former has intervened in the latter in order to colonize it and exploit it" (De Angelis, 2007: 35). Instead of placing the capitalist into the present time and non-capitalist into the past or the other, we need to turn into what De Angelis stresses out as different real and potential isms existing simultaneously in the present. In order to understand these potentials, we need to discuss further how value, its relations, and practices are created by actually exploring sites and collectives like the subject of this thesis. How the neighborhood atelier and bostan exist both in and outside of the capitalist structure and challenge the capitalist logic? I will take that upon and discuss it further in the following Chapter 4 under the heading of The Economy of the Atelier.

How value(s) comes to exist? Is it something out there that everyone organizes their life accordingly? Is it something that created out of labor? Questions of value are taken into consideration by anthropologists, sociologists, and economists in very different manners. David Graeber begins to the *Towards an Anthropological Theory of Value*, by undertaking a difficult task of making an introduction to the existing approaches towards value in the discipline of anthropology. It is a difficult task mainly because it is possible to argue, the values of the groups of people have always been what anthropologists trying to figure out. The question of "what being human has meant in different times and places (and hence, perhaps of human possibilities?)" (2001: 21) is not separate from the question where value arises from, what are the principle values of human beings in life. Franz Boas[22] (1895) was looking at the potlatch ceremony among Kwakiutl in Northwest Coast, in order to understand their way of social organization through exchange relations. Bronislaw Malinowski[23] (1922) was interested in Kula-ring network in Trobriand Islands in order to understand how people transact things, produce exchange systems. Later in 1925,

---

[22] The Social Organization and the Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians

[23] Argonauts of the Western Pacific

Marcel Mauss coined the term *gift economies* or *system of total services* to describe these economic relations in the Maori, the Kwakiutl or the Trobriand Islanders:

> In the economic and legal systems that have preceded our own, one hardly ever finds a simple exchange of goods, wealth, and products in transactions concluded by individuals (…) what they exchange is not solely property and wealth, movable and immovable goods, and things economically useful. In particular, such exchanges are acts of politeness: banquets, rituals, military services, women, children, dances, festivals, and fairs, in which economic transaction is only one element, and in which the passing on of wealth is only one feature of a much more general and enduring contract. Finally, these total services and counter-services are committed to in a somewhat voluntary form by presents and gifts, although in the final analysis they are strictly compulsory, on pain of private or public warfare. We propose to call all this the *system of total services* (Mauss, 1990: 6-7).

The distinction between gift and commodity has always been a way for anthropologists to attempt to distinguish different economic and social systems. Non-capitalist orders show that there are possibly different descriptions of the economy that integrate relations other than the exchange of commodities. Different formulations of the notions of reciprocity and exchange are born out of different kinds of social relationships and organizations. What Marcel Mauss calls system of total services in Polynesia can be referred to as an economic model where the exchange is not only done through properties, wealth or goods but also the social attitudes, rituals, and relationships. In these systems, economic exchanges become only one element of more general contract of social relations (1990: 7). Therefore they become not transactions between individuals but rather transactions in between collectivities; families, clans or tribes (1990: 6-7). Collective production and redistribution bring a particular kind of order and way of acting, which attributes moral obligations and responsibility to the people in the communities. There are always a set of rules that people position themselves in relation to one another. "Anthropologists contrast gifts and commodities as icons of different systems for making value (…) The value in a commodity system is in things for use and exchange. The value in a gift system is in social obligations, connections and gaps" (Tsing, 2013: 22). Even though there are many others who oppose to this distinction

with rightful reasons, it is important to understand the exchange relations, in which the economic transactions is only one element, in order to re-embed the social relations into the economic sphere. Because only in the contemporary economic politics economy emerges as a bounded sphere "whose internal mechanisms and exchanges separate it from other social processes" (Mitchell in Gibson and Graham, 2006: xi).

What re-embedding social relations into economic relations mean and how the neighborhood atelier, bostan and food community attempt to accomplish that? What kind of value and responsibility sets and exchange relations like reciprocity, gift economy emerge in the process of creating commons? Graeber states that it is not about mapping values as power, prestige, moral purity or status, as one would do in a traditional sociological sense and define them as on some fundamental level similar to economic values (2001: 8). In this case, it is rather about understanding where the value of objects arises when they are not exchanged with their economic or other kinds of equivalences? That task makes it possible to think outside of the logic of economic theory that explains only a certain type of human behavior that is called "economizing" (2001: 11). If we turn back to the argument of De Angelis, he claims that "a variety of alternatives to capitalism also comprise the whole, and among these the systems of relations we are able to posit and constitute based on different value practices" (2007: 37). These alternatives are the ones that consist of value practices outside the value systems that economists envision for human beings. How then, possibly different value practices, both existing and imaginable, can be formulated? While the term value system is defined by McMurty (1999) as a system of values as a totality that is a given structure of signification and meanings, by value practices De Angelis refers to actions, processes and webs of relations that are both predicated on that value system and in turn (re)produce it. Therefore, De Angelis states, "to talk about value practices is not only to talk about social form, organizational reach, mode of doing, modes of co-producing and relating, but about the processes giving rise to this form" (2007: 29). Thus, it is possible to claim that; understanding the processes that possibly different value practices emerge is more important than

understanding what those values are. "The politics of alternative is ultimately a politics of value, a politics to establish what the value practices are, that is those social practices and correspondent relations that articulate individual bodies and the wholes of social bodies" (De Angelis, 2007: 25). What De Angelis stresses out is that a politics of value emerges in the processes of establishment of those values, by changing the ways we relate to our surroundings. This is very critical for the argument I make here: activities like urban gardening and spaces such as neighborhood atelier gain new values and meanings, by practicing those different values and meanings. I elaborate this in the Chaper 4, under the heading of Encounters, Relationships and Practices that Produce the Urban Common Spaces**.**

The articulation between the parts of the society that are pursuing potentially different value practices become meaningful when they produce different types of wholes and create their dimension outside of the capitalism. Those outsides do not necessarily refer to physical spaces but to processes and webs of co-production. "Our outside(s) is a process of becoming other than capital (…) our outside is the realm of the production of commons" (De Angelis, 2007: 229). What De Angelis attributes to the process of the production of commons turns into a process of producing counter value practices to the value systems of capitalism. He states the importance of the processes of actions, webs of relations and the present time by stating; "capital generates itself through enclosures while subjects in struggle generate themselves through commons. Hence 'revolution' is not struggling *for* commons but *through* commons" (2007: 239). The critical approach deviates from the classical understanding of commoners who constitute a closed community composed of people with the same social, economic backgrounds and political positions who trust each other, cooperate, and reciprocate only in between. In this perspective, commons emerge as processes of creating different value sets and practices and relationships of commoning rather than sharing common resources. Katharina Bodirsky indicates that critical scholarship on the commons, "identifies commoning with open, inclusive, horizontalist sharing relations across difference" (2018: 124). It is important to situate the urban commons I refer here, either as spaces or practices and

relationships, to this approach to the commons. This is because when we think of it as sharing of natural, common resources in the city, it carries the danger of referring to "a new form of enclosure, [of] the commons being constructed on the basis of the homogeneity of its members" (Caffentzis and Federici in Bodirsky, 2018: 124). However, as Bodirsky states, in critical scholarship, commoning is "understood as a "relational process" that concerns the production of "a life in common"" (Velicu and García-López, 2018: 5)" (2018: 124). "Sustaining the earth's commons is not a mere technical management of resources (in space) but a struggle to perform common livable relations (in time) (Velicu and García-López, 2018: 3).

The discussion on the production of the commons and possibly different value sets, practices open a sphere to think about the potential and real outsides. It gets complicated when we think these 'outsides' as physical spaces. Since "commons may well resist the privatisation of everyday life and resources, but are nonetheless still tied to broader processes of enclosure. In urban areas many commons are areas of low land value" (Turner in Gin and Ascensao, 2018: 932). This point helps not to romanticize commoning practices as complete rejections of the system, or make hollow claims that common urban spaces provide a safe ground outside the capitalist structure and relations. There is always the danger of co-optation and the necessity to act in relation to actors and spaces of the state and the market. "Most commons therefore subsist as hybrid forms of individual, state or market property claims; more a dialectic of enclosure-commons than a pure oppositional form (Jeffrey et al. in Gin and Ascensao, 2018: 933). In fact, these interactions might be transformative, as well as they carry the danger of co-optation. It is important to note what Velicu and García-López underline, the danger of developing a dualist assumption by attributing ideal and homogenous qualities to the commons, commoning and having the same expectations about the 'another world' they would create. Looking at practices and relationships directs our gaze to the processes rather than outcomes. "Lately, focus has shifted from an emphasis on the commons as an institutionalised resource management regime to the practices of commoning as a "struggle for alternative futures" that refuse to treat life instrumentally (Kirwan et al. in Gin and Ascensao,

2018: 931). This shift emphasizes the possibly different social relationships state of being always-in-the-making among non-homogenous communities within the capitalist system. Practices of commoning hold the potential to transform the existing relations between different social actors and their surroundings, through encounters in the processes of making. As Katharina Bodirsky states, the practices of commoning,

> is not only about the production of things needed for physical reproduction; rather, it is about the reproduction of whatever goes into the making of social life. It is about forms of knowledge collectively produced, shared, or withheld; it is about the labor that goes into the making or unmaking of social ties as much as into particular relations to the environment; and it is about the creation of a public life or urban space that can be held—maybe—in common (2018: 126).

The urban has been a particular focus as a space for spectacular resistance against neoliberal enclosure (Harvey in Gin and Ascensao, 2018: 932). However, as stated above, the commons do not necessarily indicate resistance to land ownership but they develop in various hybrid forms of land-use. There is a great discussion on urban squats in the forms of housing commons. However, as Alex Jeffrey, Colin McFarlane, and Alex Vasudevan state, enclosures are not only about displacement and land grab. They also refer to the appropriation of wealth produced in common. Today, affective ties, cooperative care define so called creative industries, communication, collectivity become marketing strategies. This is another critical reason why commons are not just about resources but about the potential of utilizing existing forms of collectivity for more socially and ecologically just purposes (2012: 1249). Here, the emphasis is firstly on the processes (practices and relationships) that produce the common urban spaces and secondly on the critique of the everyday life that neoliberalism imposes, which emerges throughout these processes. In the case of this study, the critique to the social and political enclosures proceed the solely economic ones. Bostan is not there only for the food that it gives in return. The practices and relationships in the atelier try not to re-create or resemble the ones outside.

51

Becoming a part of the Initiative carries the potential to transform the isolated subject that experiences social and political enclosures beside the economic ones.

3.1.2. Spatial and Temporal Dimensions of the Commons

The second sub-chapter discusses the spatial and temporal dimensions of the processes of commoning. This framework provides a background for the later discussion on the social, economic and political possibilities, limitations of and the motivations behind the commoning practices in everyday life in the city.
This framework is necessary to grasp how the spatial elements of the neighborhood atelier and bostan impact their socio-political possibilities. Yet, it is important to underline, what matters is not the physical spaces themselves but the "conditions, qualities and characteristics of space in general (…) Even though we can locate specific forms of spatiality in concrete places, spatiality describes ways to perform space rather than spaces as concrete arrangements of physical elements" (Stavrides, 2016: 190). Therefore, there is also the temporal dimension that we should not overlook; the Lefebvrian understanding of rhythms of everyday life, that reproduces the present free time (2017: 58-59). So commoning practices do not only emerge as a way to change how and where we spend our everyday lives in the city but also a way to change our imaginings.

Interest in the spatial dimensions of culture or the conceptualization of space in social sciences has a long history. In the case of the discipline of anthropology, space was a crucial element of analysis right from the beginning. Setha Low states that earlier anthropological studies included space as descriptions of natural landscape and material conditions of everyday life in order to support the other theoretical arguments in their analyses. However, she argues, later on, anthropologists foregrounded spatial dimensions and space got a new meaning (Law & Lawrence-Zuniga, 2003: 1). What led anthropologists and others to focus on spatial dimensions is an important question that enables us to set social theory into certain historicity. According to Henri Lefebvre, "the correct line of thought is to situate the works and

the theoretical or political propositions within the global movement of the transformation of the modern world" (Brenner & Elden, 2009: 1). The increasing importance given to spatial dimensions and dynamics did not solely arise in the discipline of anthropology. Space became an established concept of analysis over a period of time through the works of political scientists, sociologists, and geographers. Parallel to the history of capitalism, there were great spatial transformations with important social and economic impacts. Therefore space "became a critical analytical tool in the latter half of the 20th century for theorists across disciplines in the social sciences" (Roohi, n.d.). Sanam Roohi argues that spatial transformations observed through the 1960's up until 1980's led thinkers to critically engage with the concept of space, as it seemed to be a crucial element to understand the liberatory potential of space in the processes of capitalism. Her proposal illustrates a Lefebvrian understanding of space that sees it as a social, political and economic construct which carries the capacity to have a social, political and economic impact on the ones who produce it. That is also what Stavros Stavrides underlines; the processes of commoning that produce the common space, continue to shape the subjects and practices of commoning (2016: 245).

Henri Lefebvre, as the pre-eminent philosopher of space, wanted to generate a knowledge of space; a unitary theory of space that is concerned with physical, mental, social, practical and imaginary spaces (1996: 11-12). With this single, unitary theory, he aimed to introduce ideas such as use value of space or production of space in order to create new codes of argumentation in contrast to the what is referred as Euclidean, arithmetic, atomic space (1996: 25-26). Lefebvre emphasizes all human spaces are produced through social processes and also in turn, they shape those processes. According to him, without understanding the production of space through its use value, it would not be possible to understand the political possibilities of everyday life (1996: 357). The importance of space in the organization of societies and everyday lives are widely discussed after the writings on space in 90's. New realms of research in various lines of thought like geography, sociology, anthropology, political science, cultural, literary and post-colonial studies emerged in

the following decades. It might be possible to say that after these major debates, Lefebvrian 'socially, economically and politically produced space' became the 'common sense understanding of space'. Therefore, these discussions lay in the ground for the transition from the commons as land of resources to the commons as social, economic and political meaning and space production processes.

When Henri Lefebvre (1996: 352) describes the movement between production and consumption of space, he argues that in between these flows, space itself becomes something that is reproducible. Repetitions in actions and relations, or rituals of everyday life, constitute these movements and flows. In these processes of acting and relating, spaces gain their meanings and values. For some thinkers in geographic and social thought, the distinction between space and place emerges here. "In the simplest sense, space refers to a location somewhere and place to the occupation of that location" (Agnew, 2005: 82). Still, there are various different definitions of these two terms. John Agnew, in his chapter in the book that deals with the binaries of human geography, gathers the terms associated with space and place. While the former is considered general, abstract, global and modern, the latter is considered particular, lived, local and traditional (2005: 82 – 86). Agnew states, besides all the controversial definitions of the two terms in different lines of thought throughout the years, as long as thinkers are clear on their philosophical and political orientations, the way they use the terms space and place is unproblematic (2005: 84). I find the discussions on the distinction between space and place important because of the question of scale, that I elaborate later under the heading of The Question of Scale in this Chapter and Thinking the Problem of Scale Through the Urban Transformation in the Neighborhood in Chapter 4. I have indicated by now that I follow the thought line that accepts everyday life spaces, not as mere backgrounds, empty vessels (Kogl, 2008) or containers (Lefebvre, 1996; Stavrides, 2010, 2016) to social, political and economic activities but as powerful sites in an ongoing formation through practices and relationships. Therefore, I have not tried to use the term place when I am referring to particular, local spaces that prominently come to the fore with their use

values and socially produced meanings. After stating these, I can address how I approach the distinction between public and common spaces.

3.2. On the Distinction of the Public and Common Space

The plan and design of the cities make room for only certain kinds of activities and relations. The state-market duo shapes the cityscape, divides it into private and public spaces. The counter-argument is, in the processes of production, consumption, and re-production, other agencies get involved in the process of shaping by creating living places. How these place-making processes take place? David Harvey states, there is always a struggle over how the production of and access to public space and public goods is to be regulated, by whom, and in whose interests (2012:73). Today the private hands in in/visible ways cover all around the public space.

> Political and economic shifts taking place in the mid to late twentieth century have accelerated changes in the way cities provide and manage public space (…) Many metropolitan area planning and design strategies are organized around growth promotion, amenity creation, ensuring quality of life and providing safe, sanitary, business friendly downtowns. These strategies often promote visual coherence, spatial order and aesthetic improvements over unmediated social interaction (Schmit and Nemeth, 2010: 454).

These are the main reasons why, recently there is an increasing tendency to describe spaces produced through possibly different relationships, practices and uses as common spaces instead of public ones. "Our so-called "public" spaces are there only for leisure and temporary pleasures permitted by proprietary governments" (Collis, 2011). Of course, to avoid a straightforward shift in the terminology we need to elaborate on the characteristics associated with common urban spaces.

In Rebel Cities, while Harvey discusses how can the diverse struggles in the city be collectivized, makes an argument on common spaces; argues that they are necessary for the accumulation of the ideas, people, practices, and relationships that form the struggle:

> Lefebvre's concept of heterotopia (radically different from that of Foucault) delineates liminal social spaces of possibility where "something different" is not only possible, but foundational for the defining of revolutionary trajectories. This "something different" does not necessarily arise out of a conscious plan, but more simply out of what people do, feel, sense, and come to articulate as they seek meaning in their daily lives. Such practices create heterotopic spaces all over the place. We do not have to wait upon the grand revolution to constitute such spaces. Lefebvre's theory of a revolutionary movement is the other way round: the spontaneous coming together in a moment of "irruption;' when disparate heterotopic groups suddenly see, if only for a fleeting moment, the possibilities of collective action to create something radically different (Harvey, 2012: vii).

Above quote refers to the ongoing processes of creating possibly different relations and spaces. In order to produce living, open, common spaces, there has to be a spontaneous coming together of separate ideas and groups of people acting and relating with each other. To explain this argument better, I will elaborate the dialogue between a social movement and accumulation of experiences in the urban space in the following chapter. Then, apply to the specific stories from the research site in Chapter 4.

3.3. The Dialogue Between a Movement, Urban Space and Different Actors

What changes or remains in the city and its inhabitants, after the waves of urban social movements? Stavros Stavrides states, people, do not only experience space but think and imagine through it. Therefore, spaces do not only represent the already existing social world but also, they shape the potentially different worlds that are capable of inspiring action and collective imagination (2010: 11). The city becomes not just the source of the conflicts but also the source of different possibilities. What are these assumed possibilities was an important question I had in mind while

observing the common spaces of 100. Yıl Neighborhood and the interaction between newcomers, strangers and the regular participants of the 100. Yıl Initiative.

It is important to understand people from different social, economic and political backgrounds inhabiting the 100. Yıl Neighborhood; what do they claim about their neighborhood and everyday life? How their socio-economic background shapes their interaction with the practices of commoning and common spaces? What are the commonalities that bring and keep 100. Yıl Initiative and the neighborhood together? What are the conflicts that keep them apart? As the question, which Don Kalb raises (2017: 72): is the horizontalist commoning practices and the urban commons spaces they lead to are accessible for everyone? To be able to give possible answers to these questions, here I apply to the framework of literature that explains how people from different backgrounds have different expectations from the urban. To what extent urban encounters among different social actors have emancipatory possibilities? By that I mean, is there such a thing like the urban encounter directly realizing the urban revolution? How social movements that are against neoliberal urbanism resonate to different actor/inhabitants? The urban encounters among different social actors do not necessarily create an immediate socio-political transformation. As Katharina Bodirsky states, as well as analyzing the limits of the capital, we need to analyze differences between inhabitants who are also shaped by histories of capital and the state (2017: 674).

Different social actors can claim different rights to the city. Peter Marcuse differentiates the right that comes from *demand* and *cry* in Lefebvre's analysis of the right to the city. Marcuse states that demand comes from the directly oppressed, excluded, in need ones, like the homeless, the hungry, the imprisoned, the persecuted gender, religious, racial groups. The cry, on the other hand, comes from the superficially integrated, alienated ones who are constrained in and dissatisfied with their opportunities for creative activity, social relationships, lives. What is problematic is the remaining gap between these two groups because a combination of both will lead the push for the Right to the City (Marcuse, 2009: 190-191). The new

urban meanings, living spaces that some social groups create might not necessarily appeal to the different ones. However, as Marcuse argues above, the combination of or the communication between different social actors is often seen as the encounter with emancipatory potentials. Therefore, it is necessary to be aware of the heterogeneity of the social actors who live together, claim their rights to the city and make their own living places. The division in between different, contested place makings "cannot be limited to the antagonism between the users and exchangers of urban space" (Bodisrky, 2018: 675). The emphasis on the complexity of the desires and actions of the inhabitants of the city is important, to understand and discuss the limits of the urban social movements or the contested place-making practices.

3.4. The Problem of Scale

In a capitalist world economy, different places are linked to a global economic framework. What Micheal Hardt and Antonio Negri define as Empire is the global network of capitalism that subordinates nearly all of humanity without a determinate place (2000: 43 – 44). Then how to struggle against it from a local place, is the most common question and critique that is raised against the small-scale collaborative solidarity economies, kinds of neighborhood initiatives, food communities or urban gardens. Harvey discusses that when we 'jump scales' the whole nature of the commons problem and the prospects of finding a solution changes; a good way to resolve problems at local scale might not hold at the global scale (2012: 69). How the solutions that are formulated will translate into global solutions is one important question to take out from this discussion. Another important point to stress out is that how misleading is to claim, local struggles are useless because their prospects of change do not translate into global solutions. The problem emerges not in the ways of organization, let's say practices of commoning, but in the process of shifting scales.

The critiques directed at local-struggles are necessary to see the limitations of these processes and go beyond romanticization of their powers at creating social change.

Food communities or urban gardens do not always hold anti-neoliberal stances; they can emerge in many forms like community gardens, urban farms or organic food stores. They can even be a part of the sustainable growth plans. There is the danger of co-optation by turning into a strategy in the market that aims to green and gentrify urban spaces. Guillaume Marche explains how urban community gardens can be used to clean, beautify and regulate, govern the low-income neighborhoods, increase their market value and make them open to gentrification (2015). However, particular cases in different neighborhoods, under different local governments, with different social actors and practices, same-looking urban spaces like gardens might have different meanings and possibilities. In urban gardens where people formulate possibly different practices and relationships, with each other and the land and species, the garden becomes a place of resistance. In twofold ways it becomes a resistance to the market logic and to the neoliberal urbanism. When Stavrides (2010: 190) argues the emancipatory potential of space lies in the conditions, qualities, and characteristics of the space, what he refers to moves beyond the borders of a locality. The envisioned change in the relationships and practices that produce the conditions, qualities, and characteristics of the space, carries the possibility of transformation to a larger scale than a single community or a territory.

Throughout this chapter, I have discussed the urban common spaces as processes made by the practices and relationships of commoning. This framework of literature provides a background to interpret the organizational relationships and everyday life practices in the neighborhood atelier and bostan. To give meaning to those spaces, one needs to understand what kind of practices and relationships organize them as urban commons and how. The next chapter under the framework of urban political ecology elaborates the so-called urban-rural and nature-culture dichotomies. Discussing the political in the urban ecology is necessary particularly to understand the primary site of this research, bostan and also the food community, which is a part of the 100. Yıl Initiative. This framework indicates how these seemingly ecological concerns are inherently political movements and that is an important discussion for the relationships of neighborhood atelier, bostan and the other social actors.

3.5. Urban Political Ecology

Urban political ecology is a field mainly developed in the historical-geographical, radical geography. Its main area of investigation is composed of the processes that make it necessary to add the 'urban' in front of the long tradition of political ecology. The main subjects of discussion are the urbanization of nature as well as the other way around and flows of food, human labor, and infrastructures in the city. That is to say, urban political ecology looks into the complex production processes of the urban condition.

The urban condition is fundamentally a socio-environmental process; urbanization is primarily a socio-ecological change. "Cities are dense networks of interwoven socio-spatial processes that are simultaneously local and global, human and physical, cultural and organic" (Heynen, Kaika & Swyngedouw, 2005: 1). If so, it must be possible to argue that today's urban condition is not inevitable and the change in these processes would change both the physical spaces as well as the relations they produce. That is the main reason why Heynen and Swyngedouw argue that the central message of urban political ecology is a political one. The attention has to be paid to the political in these socio-ecological processes through which particular socio-environmental urban conditions, configurations are made and remade for the sake of different social actors. In other words, they say, urban political ecology is about formulating radically democratic political projects that produce environments for humans and non-humans (2005: 2). Maria Kaika stresses out that by stating urban ecological processes are inherently political ones so it should have been unnecessary to indicate that they are. However, she adds, there are constant attempts and increasing discourse to depoliticize these processes. Therefore, it becomes important to uncover the reified process in the making of urban natures (2016). The framework of urban political ecology underlines the importance of webs of relationships, between different species, and the rural and urban. That is the main reason why it becomes critical for the discussion of the sites of this research. Through this framework, we can discuss, the relationships that food community and bostan

provide are inherently political ones. Understanding the binaries like urban rural or nature culture is important to uncover the relations and flows that produce the urban condition. Social sciences, including social geography, highly criticizes binary thinking because of the destructive effects of it on different species and Earth itself. Binary thinking legitimizes the commodification of resources, living beings and hide the exploitative relations of production. The main research sites of this thesis, bostan presents a strong critique to the binaries of the socio-geographical thought. Following the brief discussion on the production of the urban meaning, I will introduce these binaries to discuss the existing relations, processes, and practices that I argue bostan stands in opposition.

3.5.1. Production of Urban Meaning

Cities are not containers that host different communities but they are *constantly happening relations and activities*. People handle the urban condition in individual and collective ways; both ways of acting and relating lead to different discussions under headings like alienation, individuality, locality, community or so. How growing populations manage to live together, is still one of the remaining questions that shape all these discussions. In the 1980's, geographers and sociologists explored the urban to think about the questions concerning the global political economy. Also, there is an increasing emphasis on the environmental justice. The urban becomes an element of capitalism to survive through the commodification and privatization of land. The market and municipal mechanisms go hand in hand in shaping the urban meaning and geography; it is simultaneously a political, economic and ecological process. Political and economic powers design the city in certain ways that create in/visible layers. Thinking about *urbanism as a way of life* and a cultural form leads us to a more dynamic and dialogical definition of the urban. Urban becomes a space that is determined by the complex social, economic and political relations, actions, and at the same, it becomes an agent that determines the possibilities of these

relations, actions. Different actors play their roles in the formation of the meaning of urban; as Manuel Castells states, cities are socially produced as the outcome of conflicting social interests and values (1983:291).

It is not possible to understand the urban processes, without the plans and regulations of dominant powers. The way cities designed and planned reproduces, as well as hides, the existing, unequal socio-economic relations. People and different living species always have an impact on the processes of making the city by raising and realizing their claims. Therefore, the question of the possibility of the opposition is very much related to the social, economic and spatial relations that produce and shape the city and the urban meaning. Social polarization and conflicts are happening both at local and global levels. These moments of disruption open up states of exception that carries multiple possibilities. "Urbanism becomes the generalized condition in the end through which capital, politics, everyday social relations and environmental politics are simultaneously organized and fought out" (McFarlane, 2011: 206). Through this dialogue, people, their social, ecological, political and economic relations as well as the city-space are re-made.

3.5.2. Problematization of Binary Thinking

The idea of an ideal nature outside the city, separate from human beings is a Western conceptualization. Material and social flows of late capitalism show there is rather a continuum than a dichotomy. Understanding these processes are essential to grasp the urban transformation in twenty-first century (Rademacher, 2015: 142). For the purpose of relieving the processes of urban transformation, urban political ecology problematizes binaries like nature culture or urban rural. Heynen and Swyngedouw, referring to Blaikie and Brookfield (1987) state that political ecology combines the concerns of ecology and broadly defined political economy. This combination encompasses the constantly shifting dialectic between society and land-based resources, and also within classes and groups within society itself (2003: 906). The historical processes of capitalism produce a particular kind of nature that is separate both from the society and the city. In this context, "nature" becomes a commodity in

the forms of a hobby gardening product or a holiday center. Moving away from a definition of nature that encompasses all living species, both urban and rural space and various ecological relations, leads to uneven relations in and development of geography. Then the urban scenery, with its routes, rhythms, and images, begin to represent the unequal relations in the society. Maria Kaika states that nature city dualism is a spatial expression of nature society dualism (2005: 11). Both refer to the uneven development of nature under historical capitalism.

What kind of a re-definition of the relationship between city and nature is in need? They are not distinct entities but hybrids (Kaika, 2015), as David Harvey's famous quote says: "there is nothing unnatural about New York City" (1996). Cities are transformed nature, they are constantly made of labor and investment. Maria Kaika in *City Flows* traces the journey of water in the city. She indicates, in order to understand the flows behind these fundamental elements of our everyday lives, like water or food, we need to look at hidden, invisible networks underneath and outside the city (2015). The flows that our food follows to come to the markets in the city include relationships among various socio-economic actors, spaces, and infrastructures. Following these flows backward reveal the processes behind the food in the market shelves. It is possible to refer to these flows as "metabolisms that maintain urban life" (Heynen & Swyngedouw, 2003). Changing these flows is about changing urban life itself. Thinking the practices of commoning in the 100. Yıl Food Community and 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan through the framework of urban political ecology indicates how commoning provides a spatial organization of the city or re-organization of relationships in the city flow, contribute to particular socio-political change.

In this chapter, through the frameworks of urban commons, practices of commoning and the urban political ecology provide, I have discussed the possibility of sociopolitical change in the commonly market-regulated spheres of everyday urban life. In the following chapter, I will apply to these frameworks to discuss how the research sites of this thesis, the 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan, and 100. Yıl

Neighborhood Atelier, organize as urban commons, and what are the possibilities and limitations that emerge in these processes. To what extent the possibly different relations and practices presented in this chapter can put into practice?

CHAPTER 4

THE DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH SITES

4.1. Thinking the Problem of Scale Through the Bostan, Food Community and Urban Transformation in the Neighborhood

The demographic, geographical and historical characteristics of the 100. Yıl neighborhood plays an important role in the formation of the sites that are subject to this thesis. That is the reason why I have already made an introduction to 100. Yıl Neighborhood in the first chapter. Here I will discuss how these urban transformation[24] processes and 100. Yıl Food Community can provide a way to re-think about the question of scale.

One day in the spring of 2017, when we were working in the bostan, I was asking questions about the neighborhood to one of the core participants of the initiative that many of us call *abla*[25]. When I asked her how was 100. Yıl Neighborhood in 90's, she said, "The boundary between the woodlands of METU and the neighborhood was not really clear, we used to go there to picnic. My kids grow up there". I could easily imagine that because before the Malazgirt Boulevard, there was only a hill in between the neighborhood and the METU. There was literally, an almost untouched pathway to the METU from the neighborhood. It still takes a fifteen-minute walk to reach to the campus, but one needs to use an overpass. Apart from the incredible traffic noise it brought, there is a constant battle between small kiosks and parking

---

[24] There are various terms referring to different processes of urban transformation; like urban development, gentrification, urban renewal, etc. It is important to indicate their differences in order to understand these processes. Here I am using a general heading, the further explanation is in the chapter titled as Urban Political Ecology of Ankara.

[25] Abla literally translates as older sister yet it is often used as a way to addess older women in an informal way.

lot owners to use the smallest empty spaces around the overpass. Urban transformation projects always come with their followers. A lot has changed in the urban space in the last three years that I have been living in 100. Yıl Neighborhood. After the new road, the access to the neighborhood became easier. Numerous new bars and nightclubs have opened. New entertainment industry caused more traffic to come. More cars eventually brought a gas station. The Initiative collected signatures, applied to the court but all initially realized their projects. All these interconnected processes caused a gas station in the middle of the neighborhood, where there used to be an old football field. As the 100. Yıl Initiative, we had different plans for there; we were making jokes and dreaming about opening a çay bahçesi, which translates as a tea garden, before and throughout the construction. Apart from these sweet dreams, there were protests, petitions, trials, and reports against the construction. However, as it happened with the road, all of these transformations took place despite the opposite efforts.

Of course, not being able to succeed at preventing these transformations creates anger, sadness, hopelessness, and despair. These processes of physical and emotional destruction; losing the struggle in the face of the market, not succeeding at avoiding the actual urban transformation, makes people question the effectiveness of the politics of everyday commoning. That is where the scale problem lies. People approach with suspicion to the political effectiveness of urban gardening, a neighborhood atelier or a food community. There are two main reasons behind that. First, they do not see the avoidance of the actual conflicts. Second, most of the detractors are used to the classical repertoires of social movements. Especially the urban garden and the food community are evaluated within the framework of ecological concerns and criticized by people outside the Initiative, as well as some members of the Initiative who are not in the core web of practices and relationships at that moment. The critiques that I refer to here are coming from different accounts[26] of people who know what is going on in the Neighborhood Atelier or

---

[26] Either I had accessed through personal discussions, observed when they rarely visited and joined to the dinner forums or listened from other Initiative members.

66

bostan but do not regularly attend, participate or take responsibilities in their organization processes. The prominent arguments state that these attempts (either in the form of bostan, food community or atelier) do not carry a possibility of political action, because they are locally bounded, only carry ecological concerns, aim to transform only the everyday or individual, rather than focusing on ways to resolve larger structural problems in the future. Two main critiques emerge from these arguments. The first one positions the food-related movements (like bostan or the food community) into the realm of the consumption patterns or health of the *individual* and argues they are far away from being political. The second one argues the small scale and local movements cannot include everyone and bring solutions to problems at larger scales, therefore they are not political projects. These approaches question the effectiveness of the struggle by looking at the 'unsuccessful' results, like not being able to stop the urban transformation that anyhow takes place. Or they consider all food-related movements the same as other existing examples which indeed do not carry concerns regarding equity or justice. When we discuss these critiques with the active participants of the Initiative, they underline that the critiques are coming from people who do not experience the ongoing processes, and state the processes are more important than the results. That is the reason why I argue the problem of scale is one of the most important issues that keep people away from engaging in the bostan or the atelier.

If we remember what Harvey (2012: 69) said on the problem of scale, and the question of how to manage commons at large as opposed to small and local scales, the critiques directed at bostan, the food community and atelier become misleading. Practices of commoning here organize to work at a different scale and in a different way. If they do not work, or translate into a larger project, it is not because of their inefficiency. The aim is not simply growing a garden to reach healthy, organic food in the city. Bostan cultivates possibly different relationships and practices. Lower middle classes' access to food communities is an ongoing, important discussion in the food community. And the resistance to the transformation of the neighborhood can take many different forms. The urban garden can still be directed at or thought in

link with larger problems like urban transformation. It is still possible to argue that an urban garden also carries the danger of attracting new social groups to move by beautifying the neighborhood. And that would then make construction companies think there is demand and naturally the possibility for gentrification. However, the case of 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan is not one of those situations. Despite all the transformations, gentrifications in the neighborhood, it is not possible to compare what is happening, with the overall renewal processes that are taking place in various neighborhoods in İstanbul. Bostan in 100. Yıl neighborhood by no means look like a fancy permaculture garden. It does not aim to attract new, higher socio-economic classes to move there. Instead, it aims to cultivate relationships with the existing ones and show that bottom-up processes of transformation are also possible.

The emphasis the Initiative puts to the processes of formulating relationships rather than creating an outcome is critical in analyzing their approach to the urban commons. The effort of creating change in our lives, relationships, practices, and environments is a continuous everyday struggle. Changing the everyday practices and environments and producing urban commons is a way of showing what kind of change people ask for while they are protesting out on the streets. Beginning to create the change that you ask for, produces webs of relationships and different examples of possibilities. It becomes particularly significant when there are no other means of raising your claims. The bostan provides a ground for communication with the other inhabitants of the neighborhood. Even though not everyone in the food community carries the same motivations and concerns, its way of organization, coordination and the discussions that are taking place in these processes, make it different than an organic food store, which could deserve those critiques. When people enter into these webs of relationships, they begin to understand what kinds of changes and hope come into existence.

4.2. Encounters, Relationships and Practices that Produce the Bostan

Figure 1. Wide angle view of 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan, 2014, Source: 100. Yıl Initiative

This chapter focuses on the encounters, webs of relationships, and commoning practices that turn the main site of this research, the bostan, into urban commons. I begin by exploring the cycles and practices of the bostan, then continue with encounters and relationships, to discuss what goes into the making in the process of producing bostan as urban commons.

The above figure shows how the bostan looked like on its very first year in March 2014. People in the Initiative still remember how difficult it was, to dig the land (even though they were much more crowded) because of all the construction debris. "In the end," someone from the Initiative says, "we had to ask for a bulldozer to clean the soil". Then they all together put meter-high fences around the garden, painted the first sign of the bostan and planted the first vegetables, fruits, berries, greens, and herbs. Since then, every Spring just before the heavy rains of Ankara, we plant the seeds and the seedlings. In the middle of the Summer we start to cook some of our food with the harvest and every fall we pour the compost that we collected through the year onto the soil to feed it during the Winter.

Figure 2. 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan, Transition from Fall 2017 to the Summer 2018

When John Berger talks[27] on the village and peasant life, how it is different from the city, he puts an emphasis on the matter of time. He tells that time in the village is more cyclical; there is an unbroken presence. People adapt to the cycles of the day, seasons, and other species, instead of imposing human –or rather market- regulated rhythms that destroy the present time. Even the small area of the bostan has the chance to open up cracks, fractures for different forms of engagements with our surroundings, with our perception of time and our bodies. In the bostan, everything has its own presence and rhythm, like Lefebvre describes the polyrhythmic time of the garden. Instead of a pile of fixed things, there are beings and bodies that have their own time above the whole, with their own past, present and future (2017: 58).

The struggle with the couchgrass (*ayrık otu*) in the 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan is a wonderful example that demonstrates how a garden has the capability to slow down

---

[27] John Berger, 1985, A Visual Essay On Time, available at:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=USzGCdoLhjQ
A Touch of Grace: Portrait of John Berger, available at:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JzcQUPnm3Z0&t=820s

the speed of the city and force people to move their bodies in ways that they don't usually do. Couchgrass is a type of invasive weed with very strong, horizontally spreading roots that cause many farmers to have difficult times. Without removing all of its roots, it is not possible to get rid of it. If you cut the roots by mistake, it easily pops up and takes over the garden. Weeks and lots of physical power are necessary in order to remove all the couchgrass from the land without using herbicides. It takes almost two weeks, with two hours of work of three to four people in a day, to prepare the land ready for plantation. Preparation of the seedlings takes place in a day in early March, depending on the weather conditions of Ankara. They grow in the houses of different people from the Initiative. In May, a plantation festival is organized that calls everyone in the neighborhood to the bostan to plant the seedlings. And tomatoes turn from green to red almost four months later, in August. It is a very long and difficult process, compared to the time and effort it takes to buy tomatoes from the market. The difference between these two ways of reaching tomatoes provides a room to rethink our relations with our surroundings. The former process; learning different ways to struggle with the couchgrass without herbicides, attempting to understand the companion plant-species and getting to know how a vegetable garden grows, provides a chance to critically approach to the particular kind of nature that historical capitalism offers. The cultivation of bostan turns into a process of producing different collective experiences. These collective experiences, among the participants produce the bostan as urban commons. So here, bostan is not considered as urban commons because it is a piece of land in the city where vegetables grow, like a common pool of resources. It is not like the fruit trees of the 100. Yıl Neighborhood, that are immediately open to everyone. However, the Initiative do claim that, *it is the bostan of the neighborhood, which is open to everyone*. But at the same time, they expect that *everyone* to become a part of these collective experiences. Because when they do, "the lived experiences within the spatial organization of cities transforms social relationships among the inhabitants and can contribute to particular social formations" (Susser & Tonnelat, 2013: 107).

71

4.3. Reciprocity and Value Creation as Ways of Commoning in the Bostan

It is May 2018, because of the monsoon-like rains Ankara had this year, we are meeting every day to work in the bostan (couchgrass spreads so fast when it rains), while we usually only meet at the bostan on the weekends. We get more attention from the neighborhood when we work in the weekdays around the evening time. While people are coming back from the work or the university, while they are out to take their dogs for a walk, or grandparents welcoming their grandchildren from the school… People randomly come to the bostan and get into start chatting with us on the subject of gardening, giving information on plants or through some practical gardening skills. Usually, old women and sometimes old men, come to show how to dig with a spade or how to collect the vegetables or take care of them while they are growing. It is easier to formulate a conversation through an exchange of practical knowledge and show hows. The openness of the bostan and the practice of gardening provides a great chance of formulating relationships with people from various socioeconomic backgrounds.

There are many people in the neighborhood, who migrated from the Black Sea or the Aegean regions of Turkey. They come and talk about their gardens back in their hometowns and give recipes for their local foods. The connection bostan creates between the rural and urban, makes it possible to formulate a connection between people in the neighborhood and the Initiative. Food is always a conversation starter; people often stop by to share recipes with collard green or zucchini blossoms. These are the two top picks of the old women in the neighborhood because both are rare to find in district bazaars and the markets. They usually hesitate to pick them up when the people from the Initiative are there. When we offer, at first they politely reject, then accept with promises to cook for us. They rarely do, but the ones who live in the surrounding apartments say that they watch us from their windows and often bring tea when we work. Some collect the zucchini blossoms and say, "You have to collect them early in the morning when they open up, none of you will get up at that time". When it is the subject of gardening, everyone with a rural background likes to see the

kids who are trying to learn to farm in the small parcel they found in the city. They like to take care of us, either by bringing tea, small snacks or by passing their farming know-how to us. In exchange, they either take the joy that comes from seeing something good is happening in their neighborhood, or one or two cucumbers to add to the salad in the evening. In any case, these processes of knowledge or vegetable exchange, are more than transactions, they are processes of organizing relationships.

Figure 3. Text on the tool house that says: "The neighborhood bostan is for all of us…", 2018

Another common way people apply to start a chat or formulate a relation is to inform the Initiative against the people who sneak in and collect all the vegetables. This, in a way, shows how the neighborhood sees the bostan as the Initiative's property and inform us of the other ones who come and steal from us. At those times, the answer is: "The doors are always open to everyone, but of course one should think of others while collecting for themselves." People from the neighborhood do come and collect the vegetables, the fence gate of the bostan is never locked. The Initiative wants people to feel free to collect but by keeping the others in mind. There are indeed the

ones who secretly collect the vegetables. One of them attented to one of the collective breakfasts the Initiative organized in the bostan. She said that she feels sorry because it is against her religious practice (*haram*[28]). Afterward, she tried to pay for what she took. In such circumstances, the Initiative explains how the bostan is for everyone in the neighborhood, and money-based exchange relations are not what they want to establish there. What is more important for the Initiative is, being able to show to the neighborhood, that it is possible to produce in collective and share the commons. Still, it creates a kind of discontent in the Initiative, at times when people do not leave a thing to anyone else, or when they collect unripe vegetables. However, the discontent does not come from the loss in the outcome but in the process; it is the discontent of not having those people in the collective process of preparation, putting the effort, labor in the bostan as well. It is possible to suggest the desired exchange relation here is a form of reciprocity. The neighborhood inhabitants do not have an obligation to return the monetary value of what they got. However, the Initiative expects them to put their labor in other processes of material flow that would initiate the social relations between them. A set of rules and relationships are in the formulation throughout the labor processes of gardening. What the Initiative really wants is organizing webs of relationships in the neighborhood; to interact and to multiply. So, what they expect in return from the neighborhood inhabitants is to become a part of the processes of formulating the commons. They do not want to own the bostan and distribute food to the neighborhood and get money in return. The same is valid for the food community. Mert from the core group, who usually takes the responsibility of the coordination of finance in the food community once said, "I don't want to feel like I'm running a - organic food- store, (*Dükkan işletiyor gibi hissetmek istemiyorum*)" when he was describing his discontent with the situation. When people use the food community and bostan only to reach safe food and try to offer an immediate monetary return, the formulated exchange relation does not turn into a long-lasting social relationship and therefore do not carry any potential for transforming the existing economic relations.

---

[28] Haram in Arabic literally translates as forbidden. Stealing (in this case, from the garden) is a sinful and forbidden action according to the Quran.

As in Marshall Sahlins' terms "the material side of the transaction is repressed by the social" in this form of desired generalized reciprocity (1972: 194). There is not a clear statement of the obligation to reciprocate. Also, the failure to reciprocate does not cause the Initiative to stop giving, but there is an unstated expectation of return in the long run that would formulate ongoing social relationships between people.

There are often jokes about placing security cameras in the bostan but everyone is on the same page about producing that place as commons, so it never goes beyond a joke. These jokes and the signs show the discontent that comes from not being able to reach a greater part of the neighborhood and formulate possibly different exchange relationships. The Initiative often fails to introduce itself to the neighborhood as desired. There is a common self-critique given on that issue: "It is not the case that we organize lots of events, announce it widely and people don't come (*Biz çok fazla etkinlik düzenleyip, iyi duyurabiliyoruz da insanlar gelmiyor değil*)" Either people in the Initiative do not have the time, or there are not enough people to collaborate or the presence on social media is not enough to reach possible collaborators. Or there is also the possibility of the simple, common fact that people choose not to be a part of the processes of cooperation. Even though "the dominant tendency in human relations was co-operation rather than competition" (Kropotkin in Chatterton, 2004: 547) and as Richard Sennett (2012) argues, people learn to co-operate before realizing they are separate human beings, 'isolated individual' becomes the norm as a result of the historical processes of capitalism. Still, the is an ongoing attempt to explain how bostan or the atelier are common spaces. It is relatively easier to do that in open doors; gardens are already in-between spaces. While the fences somehow create literal enclosures, the always open gate, explanatory signs or short notice texts like in Figure 4 try to express the openness to everyone. They aim to tell how bostan do not belong to the initiative, but it is a common space of the neighborhood.

Figure 4. A sign added to the garden after the warnings of the neighborhood inhabitants: "Pick only to taste, not to be full!", Instagram Post, 2018

There are two critical sentences that I heard from the neighborhood inhabitants who came to inform us about the others who only come to collect. One was from a woman in her sixties: "I warn them, I tell them that kids are putting a lot of effort into this (*onları uyarıyorum, çocuklar buraya çok emek harcıyorlar diyorum*)". While she was complaining, she was sincerely sad. To her, we are kids, even though no one is younger than twenty-five years old and two or three older participants of the Initiative also regularly come to the bostan. Maybe it's childish to her because it is an attempt of growing vegetables in the middle of the city. Or it seems like we are playing the game of gardening rather than cultivating for our means of survival. In fact, performing the practices of commoning and inviting others to join carries an element of play in it. Our other informant was a man, again seems to be in his sixties. He said, "I tell them, if nothing else, you should be ashamed in front of that kid (*hiçbir şeyden utanmıyorsanız, şu çocuktan utanın diyorum onlara*)". While he was saying that, he was showing the portrait of Berkin Elvan on the sign of the bostan, see figure below. It is very important for the Initiative to be able to make Berkin Elvan's name live, to commemorate him every year and associate his name with all the flourishing life in the bostan.

Figure 5. The new sign of 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan, Instagram Post, 2018

Another web of relationships where we can see a form of reciprocity or a possibly different value set at work is the 100. Yıl Food Community and the events, workshops, courses that the Neighborhood Atelier organizes that I will discuss in the following sub-chapters.

4.4. Access and Responsibility: Organizing the Food Community as Urban Commons

Figure 6. Poster of the first meeting of the 100. Yıl Food Community: "Food Freedom, Right Now!", 2016

Figure 6 shows the poster that I have mentioned earlier, that led me to the Neighborhood Atelier to join to the first meeting of the 100. Yıl Food Community, which is a part of the Initiative. There are various forms of communities, cooperatives, collectives or initiatives that are organizing based on their concerns regarding the issues related to food all around the world. The ecological, social and economic costs of the transition to industrial food production are well-known and commonly discussed along health-related and ethical questions. The health aspect of the issue legitimizes governments' implementations of public policies that aim to control the small-scale food production processes and either eliminate them or integrate them into the market. The term food security refers to "the global effort to eliminate hunger and malnutrition (…) through economic policies including trade liberalization, privatization, deregulation of national industry, and the opening of economic markets" (Schanbacher, 2010: vii-viii). Bülent Şık argues that food security is often understood as a technical process associated with security regimes, therefore, it has negative connotations. He stresses out that the technical framework drawn for the food security limits our perception of the real threats to the security of our food (2015). The term food sovereignty is used to critique the food security approach's blindness to the socio-political processes, concerning the actors who take a role in the different processes of food production. "Public policies that have massively liquidated family farming in the last 15 years are not regarded as a problem (…) however *(family farming)* is crucial for ensuring food security in the face of industrial agriculture undergirded by national and international policies" (Şık, 2015). Under these circumstances the number of food communities, cooperatives, and initiatives started to increase in Turkey. The poster above declares the object of the food community in 100. Yıl as: "We, as consumers, are aware that we move away from the production processes (of food). Under the domination of the wholesaling intermediaries and top companies, *the small producers do not get the return of their labor*. We are coming together, to build a new food system". So, the new food system, according to them, comes from changing the relationships both with the small producers and operating as a community where everyone acts according to a set of rules and takes responsibilities in turn. Exactly because of this

framework of relationships and the set of rules; the creation of common values in the process, I suggest the organization of the food community, in this case, is a way of commoning. Particularly because of the way they organize; distribute responsibilities and collaborate (both within the group and with the small producers in the rural areas) the food community turns into urban commons. However, there is an ongoing negotiation in 100. Yıl Food Community, both on the issue of responsibility and also the different socio-economic group's chances of access to the food community.

100. Yıl Food Community operates as a collective where everyone takes a role in the coordination group in turns. Even though the distributions take place in the Neighborhood Atelier, the food community is not composed of the inhabitants of the 100. Yıl Neighborhood, which is the case for most of the time for the bostan or atelier. In that way, the food community makes it possible to physically exceeds the local borders of the neighborhood and introduce the atelier and also bostan to a greater network. A new page in the common excel document, titled as food doodles, circulates in the e-mail group every two weeks. Everyone lists their orders. If the number of requests is enough to meet the shipping costs, the person who is responsible for getting in touch with the producer-farmer forwards the orders. Currently, there are twelve producers who are mainly from other Initiative's lists of producers. Some others are from the district or organic bazaars in Ankara. Some of them are the acquaintances of the people in the Initiative, who left the city to *go back to the rural* and become small producers. Some people in the food community state they prefer these producers among the others, not just based on the taste of the food they produce but because of the needs, socio-economic circumstances of them. In this respect, it is possible to say the food community in the case of 100. Yıl is a small producer oriented organization. Therefore, shopping from organic bazaars, or even being a member of a consumer co-operative and being part of this kind of producer-oriented food community, which is collectively run, is not the same. There is a seek for justice, not for the benefit of the consumers but for the producers. The focus is not -yet- on making healthy food cheap and accessible for everyone (though that is an important topic of discussion). However, that does not directly indicate it is the

79

opposite case, where the emphasis is on the individual interests regarding food safety. Here again, as it is in the case of the bostan, the aim is to build possibly different relationships, among the participants and with the producers. Therefore, members of the food community refer to themselves as *türeticiler* (co-producers or re-producers) instead of consumers. But this is the perspective of the core group which came up with the idea of formulating the food community in the first place. It is not possible to argue everyone in the food community carry the same concerns and motivations.

If we return to the discussion of commons as processes rather than resources (or end results), it becomes possible to argue the food community in this case also is a way of producing urban commons. Even though it does not provide accessible and purchasable food for all, it does try to change the existing economic relations in the processes of food production and consumption. Different motivations and their impact on the attitudes and practices of the participants are in constant negotiation through discussions in e-mail groups or meetings. The food community in this case prioritizes another aspect of food commons through supporting the small producers. In that way, it is possible to say that it also turns into an opposition to the rational, profit seeking individual. By supporting the small producers, the food community supports the idea of producing just food is possible. It is a significant part of the Initiative because it shows another, more indirect form of commoning. Next chapter returns to the boundaries of the neighborhood and explores the everyday practices of commoning taking place in the Neighborhood Atelier.

4.5. Rethinking the Organization of Everyday Practices and Spaces

Figure 7. A social media poster for the weekly dinner forums presented as "Monday Dinners in the Neighborhod Atelier", 2017

The group of people from the Initiative who decided to rent a place to use as an atelier in the neighborhood, state that they wanted a place where everyone would come together, produce and share practical skills and knowledge. For that reason, even though the Neighborhood Atelier is private property, it functions as commons: it is possible for anyone to come up with an idea and use the space to organize workshops, long-term courses or events. The organized workshops are most of the time designed to share practical skills and knowledge; sewing, video editing, soap making, permaculture, etc. Very few of these events contribute to the financial sustainability of the Neighborhood Atelier. It is up to the workshop organizer/lecturer/instructor to ask something in return, both for themselves and for the donation box of the atelier. But there is again an unstated expectation to contribute to the financial needs that born out of the material expenses, like the bills, rent, etc. However, most of the people in the Initiative already have their regular incomes and choose to sustain the place by regular donations as long as there are

people who are interested in these gatherings. The main aim is to create a place for practices of production and communication.

In weekly dinner forums[29] which are also taking place in the Neighborhood Atelier, we usually cook to share what we got from the food community for that week, discuss the ongoing agenda of the neighborhood, and the country and make plans for new events or organizations. The red assembly notebook with Hayır (*No*)[30] stickers on it lies on the table while we eat and chat during the dinner forum. When the tea starts to brew someone takes the assembly notebook and forum begins. According to the logs of the assembly notebook, Bostan comes to the fore as the most commonly discussed subject even in the Winter months. The time invested in bostan re-states its importance for the people in the Initiative. The other important issues that come out of the assembly notebook are the short and long-term workshops that the Neighborhood Atelier organizes or hosts. These are the activities, which produce and socially and economically sustain the Neighborhood Atelier. In return, the Neighborhood Atelier becomes an open place for people who are willing to engage in possibly different everyday practices and relationships in the city.

---

[29] See Figure 7 for the call poster on social media.

[30] On 16 April 2017, a constitutional referendum was held in Turkey to change the parliamentary system of the government into a presidential system. While the large number of Evet (Yes) campaigns were supported by the state and spread on the televisions, billboards and in the form of rallies and events, Hayır (No) campaigns were not supported and even suppressed and prevented. Still, there were small budget attempts in the forms of videos, stickers, posters, etc.

Figure 8. The library and Sewing room in the Neighborhood Atelier, 2018

Two most important events organized by the Initiative are the children's day
organization that takes place around 23rd of April[31] and the Producer and Second-
Hand Markets. The Initiative cares a lot about the children's day organization
because it is one of the rare opportunities to come together with the neighborhood,
communicate and formulate relationships especially with children, and their mothers
or grandparents. The alternative children *bayram* (festival) takes place annually, in
the empty space next to the bostan. Different initiatives that mostly work with
children also attend. There is someone who plays the music, sometimes theatre or
story-telling sessions and dance groups. Kids paint a large canvas that we hang on
the fences of the bostan at the end of the day. The parents of the kids who come from
the neighborhood sometimes bring food to share. Early in the spring-time, kids
passing through the bostan start to ask about the children's day. The Initiative states
the main motive in organizing such a festive event as the hope of showing a way of
celebration, which does not focus on consumption, for today's kids in Turkey who

[31] 23rd of April is the National Sovereignity and Children's Day in Turkey. It is one
of the public holidays.

are used to spend all of their leisure time in shopping malls. The Producer and Second-hand Markets are the other seasonal events that the Initiative organizes. Again, they emerge as a critique of excessive consumption. Almost every fall and spring, the Initiative announces a day to come together, share the production of the Neighborhood Atelier (from the organized workshops throughout the year), or what is not in use anymore (clothes, items that are left to the atelier by others), to spread the values and practices of giving or barter. The crafts produced during the workshops, like cloth bags, sewed pouches, postcards, notebooks, etc. contribute to the financial sustainability of the Neighborhood Atelier. Even though the Initiative organizes such events to spread the values of generalized reciprocity, it is still possible to talk about financial or material limits these attempts face.

The organizers refer to movements like anti-consumerism or solidarity economies when they are describing the events that are taking place in the Neighborhood Atelier; like do-it-yourself home cleaning products workshop, sewing and repairing courses, second-hand markets, and even the alternative children's day. Even though some of these practices resemble individual strategies to cope with the market's domination of our everyday lives, there is a significant effort put into turning these into collective struggles. How to move the discussion and action beyond the isolated subject's illusion of free choices in the realm of consumption? How exactly these practices go beyond taking personal responsibilities and become collective struggles? These questions emerge throughout the interactions between the people from the Initiative and new people who are willing to organize workshops or join to the alternative markets. The Initiative's approach in these negotiations shows how much they care about formulating possibly different relationships while they are transforming the daily practices. The Neighborhood Atelier motivates and provides an open space for various activities of production in a city, where public spaces are under increasing privatization. These processes of rethinking the daily practices and the relationships formulated around these practices, produce the Neighborhood Atelier as urban commons.

The last three sub-chapters aimed to discuss the processes in the different yet related fields of action of the Initiative, bostan, food community and atelier, and how these processes produce urban commons. Based on the organization models, design, interactions, people's descriptions, and negotiations, it is possible to argue, the cultivated relationships and the organization networks are more important than the individual stories of transforming daily practices. The essential processes that make it possible to consider these fields of action as urban commons emerge through the relationships, which organize around a common set of values, responsibilities, and reciprocity. In this way, as Stavros Stavrides argues (2010) the transformation of habits only become emancipatory when they are collective efforts. Of course, there are cases when it is not possible to create a ground for communication for different social, economic and political claims. These are the cases when urban encounters, even though they continuously take place or appropriate in such spaces, do not transform into relationships. Next chapter focuses on such limitations and challenges of urban commons.

4.4. The Limits and Challenges of the Urban Commons

In this sub-chapter, I will discuss the limitations and challenges of the urban commons through the financial processes in the Neighborhood Atelier and challenging experiences in the bostan. As the previous chapter illustrates, the Neighborhood Atelier emerges as a way of reclaiming the public space for the collective use, by creating a non-commodified space. The apartment where the atelier locates is private property. A small group from the Initiative rented the place in 2015 and different people (whoever can) collectively pay its rent and monthly bills since then. The small black box of donation usually hangs on the entrance of the Neighborhood Atelier. There are cloth bags and postcards that people can take away when they donate small amounts. We take it with us if we organize an event outside the Neighborhood Atelier, like the seasonal Producer and Second-Hand Markets, or the film screenings that take place in market-place or public park of the neighborhood. Some percentage of the money that comes from the food community

also goes to the bank account of the Initiative. There are not many regular donations but it is most of the time enough to pay the rent and the bills. E-mails attached with the excel file transparently showing the input/output table and phone reminders circulate when there is a large deficiency. The ambiguity in the status of the Neighborhood Atelier, the fact that it is not an association or a cooperative on paper, makes it difficult to apply for funds or grant programs. Sometimes workshops leave a share to the Neighborhood Atelier if they are money-paid ones like the permaculture workshop. In some other cases, the share of the end products of the workshop or leaving them to the atelier become the in-return gift. However, these are small contributions to the budget, both in direct monetary terms and in the form of products to be used or sold in the future, and do not help the financial situation to become a recurring topic on the agenda. "Those who piece together collective forms of creating and exchanging do so in order to meet concrete needs, and in doing so they confront concrete dynamics of power as they encounter both private (market) and public forces" (Bresnihan & Byrne, 2015: 36). These spaces like the Neighborhood Atelier, where people produce out of their socio-political needs, hopes, and desires face certain economic, material limits. However, in the case of 100. Yıl, after securing the most fundamental financial needs, paying the rent and the bills, there are not any further issues with the economic situation. Noone who is active in the organization and coordination processes expresses that they expect a monetary return for their voluntary labor. Mostly because they already have other steady jobs and income. But it is not possible to say that is the case for everyone who is participating in different processes of bostan or the atelier. There are also people who are looking for collective ways of securing their means of subsistence. It is a newly emerging discussion topic in the assemblies of the Initiative, parallel to the increasing unemployment rates and actually existing economic crisis. How that would challenge (bringing out entrepreneurial characteristics) or contribute to (investment of the full time and energy to these practices rather than considering them as voluntary free time activities) the urban commons is a question to be explored.

86

Though it is an open, squatted space and planted seeds are coming from friends or relative circles of the Initiative participants, the bostan also have some material needs apart from the gardening labor. Bostan in 100. Yıl takes the water it needs from the municipality. However, that is not the common case. Mostly the collective urban gardens (like in the case of Roma Bostan in İstanbul) take their water from their neighbors because of their conflictual relationships with the municipality. The Municipality of Çankaya does not show a positive or negative interest in 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan. This might be either due to the social understanding of the municipality or because people from the Initiative have acquaintances in the municipality[32]. We call the municipal employees whenever the tank is empty. When the capacity of the tank was just two-tons, we had to give a call to the municipality to request for water more often. Since it was not a formal exchange that we pay for it in return, but more of an informal request, that we probably get because of some acquaintances, the exchange system was not working properly. Bostan's main problem in the summer of 2017, was the inefficiency of the water. The two tons water tanks were not enough for the dry and hot summer months of Ankara, it necessitated frequent re-fill, so we started to seek for a solution. We decided that a bigger tank like five-tons would be enough. I have suggested opening a crowdsourcing campaign to raise money for the new tank and to renew the drip pipe system. There were hesitations at first. Starting an online crowdsourcing campaign meant asking for money and it personally disturbed some people in the Initiative. The hesitations were, in a way, right. The brief research on crowdsourcing shows that it demands a lot of online presence to "engage a community". It is generally used for start-ups or entrepreneurial projects. The market logic, which seems to be inherent in the practice made the Initiative doubtful about the applying to the crowdsourcing. However, we discussed and decided to give it a try and succeeded. Thus, the water problem is, to a large extent, solved without having to make compromises with the municipality. But this accomplishment hid another problem related with the share of responsibilities.

---

[32] The difference between the urban condition in İstanbul and Ankara should also be taken into consideration.

It is possible to see the contrast between the first project description video and the thank you video of the campaign[33]. While I was trying to shoot the first video, everyone was reluctant to participate. Perhaps there was a kind of hopelessness and sourness. Everyone including myself had the idea that this would be less problematic if there were more people, who regularly come to the bostan and share the responsibilities. Because the problem is not that the municipality does not provide the water whenever it is needed, it is more the burden of getting in touch with them so often. And the following fact that this duty saddles with the same person, who took it upon herself in the first place. So, if there were more people to share the responsibilities as such or if we could share the responsibilities evenly in between us, then we would not have to sit and record a video answering the crowdsourcing campaign website's question template which sounds quite like we are about to give a pitch presentation. However, it is possible to see in the thank you video, how it makes people in the Initiative happy to see others who still care, support, and be in solidarity with the bostan. After this, I started to think methods like crowdsourcing, which seem to be working only to build start-ups and enterprises, use the very same logic of solidarity economies. These online networks, platforms at heart are not far from classical forms of solidarity or reciprocity. The market logic utilizes digitalization and technology and serves fundamental socio-economic relationships as new business models. This kind of makes people who consider themselves outside the market logic approach with suspicion, but at the same time does not completely avoid them to implement these methods. In a way, it becomes possible to argue, the paths to overcome the financial limits of the commons still lies what can be essentially called commoning. The remaining problem, although it is not a recurring one, comes from not being able to share the responsibilities even. This, states the significance of the set of rules about responsibilities, which produce the commons. Usually, everyone in the Initiative takes upon a share from responsibilities. However, there are cases as such when people can act loose about their responsibility because

---

[33] Campaign page, available at: https://www.fongogo.com/Project/100-yil-berkin-elvan-bostanini-yesertiyoruz#Media

of the voluntary basis of organization. Apart from these economic limits and social challenges, urban commons might face socio-political limitations as well, which I will discuss next through an incident in the bostan.

Figure 9. The blacked-out sign of 100. Yıl Berkin Elvan Bostan, 2017

The Winter of 2017 is about to end. Someone from the Initiative sees that the sign of the bostan and the walls of the tool house are blacked out with offensive words written with a can spray. Since it is the Winter time, we do not go to the bostan regularly. Therefore, no one have seen the ones who did it. However again, some informants from the neighborhood approach to us when we go to the bostan to take the sign out. This time a middle-aged man says that he has seen what happened and who did it: "It was the Syrian kids". While he is criticizing the act of hate directed towards the bostan, he is committing the same to another minority. His accusation also indicates the generality of the false-belief, hatred, and polarization in the society. The continuous "us and them" narrative and the imaginary enemies which are used to strengthen the government, support the ultranationalist feelings of people's and give the courage to reflect these onto their everyday lives. There is already a signature beneath the offensive words, which belongs to the supporters of

the Grey Wolves (*Ülkü Ocakları*[34]). Bostan's name, Berkin Elvan, awakens strong but different emotions in various groups of people in Turkey. Some people embrace the bostan and others attack, because of the very same sign. This incident makes it possible to question the assumed direct emancipatory potential of urban encounters. Not all encounters in the bostan lead to mutual understanding and respect. There are cases where the encounters do not turn into relationships or even conversations. The physical openness of the space does not mean that it is politically all-embracive.

There are observable financial, infrastructural and socio-political limits that emerge in the processes of producing urban commons. But if we approach commons as processes in production rather than under management, the possible path to overcome these limitations again can be found in the commoning practices and the internal set of rules.

---

[34] Ülkü Ocakları is a Turkish ultranationalist, neo-fascist organization.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The term enclosure is often thought to be carrying a similar meaning with the words like privatization or marketization. Within that approach, commoning practices against enclosures seem to be movements with economic concerns. However, in societies (and times) where people experience social and political enclosures as well, the processes and spaces of commoning begin to vary. With that in mind, this thesis attempts to explore how urban commons and practices of commoning organize, where people experience both economic and socio-political enclosures.

The introduction chapter begins by describing the research sites, how the research idea of this thesis has emerged and states the main question, subject and objective of this study. The 100. Yıl İşçi Blokları Neighborhood and particularly the Neighborhood Atelier and bostan are the two main sites of this research. Through participant observation in these spaces and engaging with the practices and relationships that produce them as such, this thesis argues that commoning is not about creating a common wealth but about building possibly different processes of practicing and relating in daily life. In the common sense understanding of the enclosures, urban community gardening, cultivating and sharing food are familiar practices of commoning because they provide common food resources for the economically deprived. The case of the bostan subject to this thesis shows gardens can be urban commons, which are also about formulating relationships to imagine a socio-politically different city. The focus on the Neighborhood Atelier supports this argument by exploring different processes of socio-political reproduction in daily life. The three sub-research questions, following the main one, compose the framework of the research problem of this thesis.

The first question highlights the significance of spatial elements of urban commons for the appropriation of the practices of commoning experienced during social movements. Based on Stavros Stavrides' views, this question aims to explore how the Initiative, (which also has its roots in a social movement) after the protests settle, needs and produces common spaces in the city. How that spatial organization impacts the continuity of the Initiative's struggle?

The bostan reproduces an already empty, open, public space. It gains the characteristics of urban commons in the processes of reproduction. Not because of the vegetables that grow in the garden but mainly because of the relationships that cultivate there. Referring to the organization of the bostan makes it possible to follow the theoretical shift from the classical understanding of the commons as pool resources to the practices of commoning. So, it is not possible to consider the practice of gardening in itself as a critique of the crises of capitalism. Therefore, the next chapter on the significance of the research discusses how the bostan in the 100 Yıl is different from the other community garden projects. Acknowledgment of this and stressing it out also makes room for answering the critiques directed at urban community gardens for being personal strategies or focusing only on ecological issues. The spatial elements have certain impacts on the relationships, both within the Initiative and also with the neighborhood. The cyclical rhythms of the practices in the Bostan space cultivate stronger relationships within the Initiative. The continuous effort put into the processes with the couch grasses, plantation, cultivation, and harvesting processes keep people together around a common cause. Around that commonality, bostan cultivates relationships and creates counter landscapes in the city. The practice of gardening opens conversations with the Initiative participants and the neighborhood inhabitants, it creates a familiarity, but in general, the encounters or small interactions do not turn into long-lasting relationships. Still, it is possible to argue the interactions challenge neighborhood inhabitants existing views on exchange relations. The bostan's always open doors, Initiative's response to the theft of the vegetables, rejection of the offered money, and openness to share

the harvest with everyone, asking for people's labor, and more importantly people's time for communication challenge inhabitant's understanding of exchange relations based on money transaction.

The Neighborhood Atelier, unlike the bostan, is a new and rare example in Turkey as a non-commodified social space. Most of the existing examples of running collective spaces take the form of social cafes. Or there are neighborhood association centers, which also have their roots in the Gezi movement. However, the Neighborhood Atelier in 100. Yıl not just tries to accumulate the already existing relationships but try to build new relationships and possible solidarity networks through practices that are taking place in workshops, courses, and events. Even though there are financial limits the processes of producing the atelier as commons face every once in a while, it becomes possible to observe the core participants of the Initiative do not mind the financial issues as long as there are people who are willing to contribute to the social and political production of the commons.

The second question builds on the common critique directed towards the local, place-based struggles; it asks how these struggles are meaningful in the face of global, structural problems. This question (or the problem) of scale, as David Harvey (2012) refers to it, is one of the main issues in almost all fields of action of the Initiative. It is a decisive factor that impacts on people's participation in these processes. It is possible to argue by looking at the directed critiques and the Initiative participants' responses to those critiques, becoming a part of the processes change people's approaches, hopes, and expectations. Beginning to change the daily lives do not necessarily mean adopting personal strategies or creating individual solutions in the face of structural problems. Market formulates subjects, who are responsible for greening their consumer choices. Therefore people rightfully approach with suspicion to the food-related movements. However, the focus of the judgment should not be on the end result e.g. the food community or the garden, but the processes of change in practices and relationships that formulate those spaces and collectivities.

For that reason, urban commons do not refer to particular spaces or resources but to the accumulation of possibly different practices and relationships. So it is possible to talk about a desire for change in more people's daily lives, practices and relationships. To achieve that, encouragement to participate in Initiative's different fields of action becomes necessary. However, as Harvey states, some sort of enclosure often becomes the best way to preserve valued commons (2012: 70). The dilemma of creating another form of enclosure and preserving commons by gathering around commonalities becomes visible in the negotiation processes.

The third question asks what kind of relationships emerge through practices of commoning and states the importance of exploring the social, political, economic and spatial possibilities of these relationships. This question, in relation to the first two, is aimed at figuring out the processes behind the organization of places and networks. The proposition is that the urban commons, and the practices of commoning, are critiques directed at private property and market relations. By referring to the early anthropological studies on exchange relations, it is possible to argue that a discussion on the production of common values is necessary to understand the practices and relations that construct urban commons. The value creation processes are crucial to think of possibly different webs of socio-economic relations as well as physical spaces. The exploration of the value creation processes shows how possibly different practices and relationships formulate an outside or a fracture in the existing market-regulated everyday urban worlds. However, the surrounding environment is still a significant point to take into consideration in these processes. As it is commonly argued, the plan and design of the city-spaces reiterate the existing socio-economic relations. Looking at the common urban spaces, instead of public or private ones, provides a chance to explore to what extent relationships, practices produce possibly different spatialities. The urban political ecology literature explores the production of urban conditions and meanings. Understanding the existing production and flows of the urban makes it possible to draw a background where the possibly different organization of everyday life and spaces emerge. Therefore, the contextualization of the research site and the applied methodology

94

draws a framework that also indicates the significance of the research in its particular geographical and temporal context.

Considering the different fields of the 100. Yıl Initiative; the Neighborhood Atelier, bostan, and the food community as processes of commoning rather than commons in themselves turns them into ongoing claim and hope making relationships. The encounters, relationships of reciprocity, and value making and responsibility taking practices are what produces the Neighborhood Atelier and bostan as urban commons. It is even possible to argue, the conflicts that emerge throughout these processes, which can also be called limits or challenges, also become a part of the processes of commoning. Through a constant negotiation of different meanings, values, uses of the space, the urban commons become a process of change.

The dominant narrative is straight: the neoliberal capitalist system can resolve almost all social, economic and political problems. If there will be an answer to today's crises, it will be within the system; either by *greening the capitalism* (Alexander, 2014) or finding ways of *good growth* (Barnes, n.d.). People will continue to pursue their self-interests, the state will continue to work closely with the market. All the other possible systems are tried and failed, so here we are, rapidly moving to our uncertain futures because there is no other alternative. The local, particular struggles and movements that are organizing in various spheres of life, continuously fight to claim the opposite. Though even the people who would share the values and concerns of these struggles accuse them of not being able to give answers to macro-scale, structural problems. However, the aims in the neighborhood initiatives are not to come up with global solutions as well as it is not to minimize the field of struggle into individual consumption choices. There is a need to develop collective actions that would turn into new collective habits. That is how it becomes possible to talk about the politicization of everyday life. In common urban spaces, like the Neighborhood Atelier or the bostan, everyone enters into a process of imagining, producing, repairing or reproducing. The relationships develop through these productive processes. Everyone has a pre-given idea on how to act in a private or

public space. However, when people encounter something different, they begin to negotiate their previously given sets of relationships and their ideas on the exchange and organization relations. The relationships and practices in open, common urban spaces provide a chance, invite to re-think and challenge, act upon the existing social relationships and the processes of the production of the urban and the everyday.

There are two possible ways of that rethinking and acting upon the existing social relationships can take place. The first way that directly comes to mind is the possibility of establishing potentially transformative relationships among different social actors through urban encounters. These are encounters that are expected to overcome the polarization in the society, build thresholds and lead to the formation of emancipatory spaces. However, this is one of the most challenging tasks in highly polarized societies. Though there is another way of rethinking emerges from these processes. When there is growing despair in the society about the possibility of socio-political change, it becomes difficult for even people with commonalities to come together and act. What often leads to disappointment is governmental politics, not the socio-political, and economic possibilities in the realm of everyday life. The everyday shows what actually can change. Like any other moment of crisis, our time and geography carry various possibilities waiting to be imagined and enacted. Everyone, while trying to figure out what to do with their lives, under the pressure of ontological, social, economic, ecological and political enclosures, come up with different creative ways, paths and possibilities. When people share their ways of dealing with the enclosures and its impacts on our everyday lives, they create waves of hope. The wave metaphor helps to express how one's excitement catches the others in the Initiative. Thus, these waves of hope emerging at different moments as different practices provide the continuity of the struggle. Therefore, the best thing to be done seems to create such urban spaces where these waves of hope can actualize and spread.

REFERENCES

Adaman, F. & Arsel, M. (Ed.) (2005). *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Adanalı, Y. (2013). Urban transformation and law on disaster prevention: A pretext for lucrative investment. *Reclaim İstanbul: Urban transformations, spaces of hope.* Retrieved from https://reclaimistanbul.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/adanali_disaster_law_eng.pdf

Agnew, J. (2005), Sovereignty Regimes: Territoriality and State Authority in Contemporary World Politics. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 95: 437-461. Retrieved from 10.1111/j.1467-8306.2005.00468.x

Alexander, S. (2014). Life in a 'degrowth' economy, and why you might actually enjoy it, The Conversation. Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/life-in-a-degrowth-economy-and-why-you-might-actually-enjoy-it-32224

Angelis, M D. & Stavrides, S. (2010). On the Commons: A Public Interview with Massimo De Angelis and Stavros Stavrides. *e-flux, 17.* Retrieved from https://www.e-flux.com/journal/17/67351/on-the-commons-a-public-interview-with-massimo-de-angelis-and-stavros-stavrides/

Barnes, P. (n.d.). How to Protect the Earth and Have a More Equitable Market Economy. Retrieved from https://www.humansandnature.org/how-to-protect-the-earth-and-have-a-vibrant-more-equitable-market-economy

Bartu Candan, A. & C. Özbay (Ed.) (2014). *Yeni İstanbul Çalışmaları: Sınırlar, Mücadeleler Açılımlar*. İstanbul: Metis.

Bodirsky, K. (2016). From the "state-idea" to "politically organized subjection". *Focaal— Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology, 2016*(75), 121–129.

Bodirsky, K. (2017). Between equal rights force decides? *City*, *21*(5), 672–681. Retrieved from 10.1080/13604813.2017.1374773

Bodirsky, K. (2018). The commons, property, and ownership, Suggestions for further discussion, *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology, 2018*(81), 121–130. Retrieved from 10.3167/fcl.2018.810109

Brenner, N. & Elden, S. (2009), Henri Lefebvre on State, Space, Territory1. International Political Sociology, 3: 353-377. Retrieved from 10.1111/j.1749-5687.2009.00081.x

Brenner, N. & Marcuse P. & Mayer, M. (2009). *Cities for People, not for profit, Introduction*, City, Vol 13, Nos. 2-3.

Bresnihan, P. & Byrne, M. (2014). Escape into the City: Everyday Practices of Commoning and the Production of Urban Space in Dublin. *Antipode*. Retrieved from 47. 10.1111/anti.12105.

Castells, M. (1983). *The City and the Grassroots, A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements.* Berkley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Chatterton, P. (2004) *Making autonomous geographies: Argentina's popular uprising and the 'Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados' (Unemployed Workers Movement),* Geoforum 36, 545-561.

Clammer, J. (2017). What (if anything) can economic anthropology say to neoliberal development? Toward new anthropologies of capitalism and its alternatives. *Dialectical Anthropology*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s10624-016-9445-2.

Classens, M. (2015). The nature of urban gardens: toward a political ecology of urban agriculture. *Agriculture and Human Values*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-014-9540-4

da Col, G., & Graeber, D. (2011). Foreword: the return of ethnographic theory. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.14318/hau1.1.001

Collis, S. (2011). Private, Public, or Common: Who Owns Space? *The Future of Occupy.* Retrieved from http://thefutureofoccupy.org/2012/02/private-public-or-common-who-owns-space/

Comaroff, J. (2010). The end of anthropology, again: On the future of an in/discipline. *American Anthropologist*. Retrieved from 10.1111/j.1548-1433.2010.01273.x

Cox, W. (2018) World Urban Areas: 1,064 Largest Cities: 2018 Update. Retrieved from http://www.newgeography.com/content/005933-world-urban-areas-1064-largest-cities-2018-update

Day, R. J. F. (2004). From hegemony to affinity. *Cultural Studies*. Retrieved from 10.1080/0950238042000260360

De Angelis, M. (2007). *The Beginning of History: Value Struggles and Global Capital*, London: Pluto.

Eizenberg, E. (2012). Actually Existing Commons: Three Moments of Space of Community Gardens in New York City. *Antipode*, 44: 764-782. Retrieved from 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00892.x

Elden, S. (2009). Introduction: Terror and the State of Territory. *Terror and Territory* (p. xi – xxxii), Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Erdem, E. (2014). *Reading Foucault with Gibson-Graham: The Political Economy of "Other Spaces" in Berlin,* Rethinking Marxism Vol 26.

Foley, D. E. (2002). Critical ethnography: The reflexive turn. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390210145534

Genç, F. (2018). İstanbul'da Kentsel Muhalefet ve Müşterekler Politikası, in *Teoriden Mücadeleye Müşterekler Siyaseti*, Erkin Erdoğan, Nuran Yüce and Özdeş Özbay (Ed.), İstanbul: SEHAK.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006). *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): A feminist critique of political economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ginn, F. & Ascensão, E. (2018). Autonomy, Erasure, and Persistence in the Urban Gardening Commons. *Antipode*, 50: 929-952. Retrieved from 10.1111/anti.12398

Graeber, D. (2011). *Revolutions in Reverse: Essays on Politics, Violence, Art and Imagination*, New York: Autonomedia, Minor Compositions.

Graeber, D. (2001). Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of Our Own Dreams. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Güney, K. M. (Ed.) (2009). *Türkiye'de İktidarı Yeniden Düşünmek*, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Hann, C. & Hart, K. (2011) *Economic Anthropology: History, Ethnography, Critique.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Hardin, G. (1968). The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science, 162*(3859), 1243–1248.

Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire. Harvard University Press*. Retrieved from
10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities. From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*, Verso:
London.

Heynen, N., Kaika, M. & Swyngedouw, E. (2005). *In the Nature of Cities: Urban Political
Ecology and the Politics of Urban Metabolism.* London, New York: Routledge.

Heynen, N. & Swyngedouw, E. (2003). Urban Political Ecology, Justice and the Politics of
Scale. *Antipode*, 898-915.

Ingold, T. (2017). Anthropology Contra Ethnography. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory,*
7(1), Retrieved from
http://dx.doi.org/10.14318/hau7.1.005

Ingold, T. (2014) That's Enough about Ethnography. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4
No: 1, pp. 383 – 395, Retrieved from
https://doi.org/10.14318/hau4.1.021

Ingold, T. (2008) Anthropology is Not Ethnography. Radcliffe Brown Lecture in Social
Anthropology, *Proceedings of the British Academy, 154*, 69-92.

İstanbul Tarihinde İlk Kez Göç Verdi. (2017, October 3), *Euronews*, Retrieved from
https://tr.euronews.com/2017/11/03/istanbul-modern-tarihinde-ilk-kez-goc-verdi

Jeffrey, A. & McFarlane, C. & Vasudevan, A. (2012). Rethinking Enclosure: Space,
Subjectivity and the Commons. Antipode, 44: 1247-1267. Retrieved from
10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00954.x

Kalb, D. (2017). Afterword, After the Commons – commoning!, *Focaal-Journal of Global and
Historical Anthropology*, 79: 67-73.

Kaika, M. (2005). City of Flows: Modernity, Nature, and the City. London & New York: Routledge.

Kaika, M. (2016). Maria Kaika | Urban Political Ecology [Video File]. Retrieved from https://vimeo.com/180669461

Karaman, O. (2014). Resisting Urban Renewal in İstanbul. *Urban Geography, 35*(2), 290-310, Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2013.865444

Klein, N. (2001). Reclaiming the Commons. *New Left Review,* 9, Retrieved from https://newleftreview.org/II/9/naomi-klein-reclaiming-the-commons

Kogl, A. (2008). Strange Places: The Political Potentials and Perils of Everyday Spaces Lanham, ND: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kostakis, V. & Bauwens, M. (2014). *Network Society and Future Scenarios for a Collaborative Economy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kose, B. (2013). 100. Yıl İşçi Blokları. Docomomo –Tr. *Türkiye Mimarlığında Modernizmin Yerel Açılımları IX Bildiri Kitapçığı*, Antalya.

Kühnert, N. & Anne P. (2015). Gregor Samsa and Don Kişot fighting against windmills -Squatting in Istanbul as an attempt to resist neo-liberal urban politics. *In: Mapping Global City Istanbul.* Retrieved from http://www.kaee.uni-goettingen.de/mapping-istanbul/project/squatting-2/

Lefebvre, H. (1996) *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (2017) *Ritimanaliz: Mekan, Zaman ve Gündelik Hayat,* İstanbul: Sel Yayınları.

Logie, S. & Morvan, Y. (2017). İstanbul 2023. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Low, S. & Lawrence-Zuniga, D. (2003). Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture, Oxford: Blackwell.

Marche, G. (2015) What Can Urban Gardening Really Do About Gentrification? Case-Study of Three San Francisco Community Gardens. *European journal of American studies, 10*(3). Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/ejas.1131

Mauss, M. (1990) *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies.* London & New York: Routledge Classics.

Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City, 13*(2–3), 185–197. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810902982177

McFarlane, C. (2011). Assemblage and Critical Urbanism. *City, 15*(2), 204-224, Retrieved from 10.1080/13604813.2011.568715

McMurtry, J. (1999). *The cancer stage of capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.

Mitra, W. (n.d.) The Diary And The Field: Methodological Reflections On Transformative Praxis, or, The Lesson from Anthropology. Ambedkar University, New Delhi. Retrieved from https://www.csu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1450344/Methodological reflections-on-transformative-praxis-Wrick-Mitra.pdf

Nettle, C. (2014). *Community Gardening as Social Action*. Farnham – Burlington: Ashgate.

Newbury, D. (2001). Diaries and Fieldnotes in the Research Process. *The Research Training Instiute*.

Parham, S. (2015). *Food and Urbanism: The Convivial City and a Sustainable Future.* London: Bloomsbury.

Polanyi, K. (2001). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rademacher, A. (2015). Urban Political Ecology. *Annual Review Anthropology, 44*(1), 137–152, Retrieved from 10.1146/annurev-anthro-102214-014208

Sahlins, M. (1972). *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago & New York: Aldine.Altheron, Inc.

Schanbacher, W. D. (2010). *The Politics of Food: The Global Conflict between Food Security and Food Sovereignty.* Praeger.

Schmidt, S. & Németh, J. (2010). Space, Place and the City: Emerging Research on Public Space Design and Planning. *Journal of Urban Design, 15*(4), 453-457, Retrieved from 10.1080/13574809.2010.502331

Sennett, R. (2012). *Together: Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Co-operation*, London: Yale University Press.

Stavrides, S. (2010). *Towards the City of Thresholds,* Trento: Professional Dreamers.

Stavrides, S. (2010). *Kentsel Heteretopya Özgürleşme Mekanı Olarak Eşikler Kentine Doğru*. İstanbul: Sel Yayınları.

Stavrides, S. (2016). *Müşterek Mekan: Müşterekler Olarak Şehir*, İstanbul: Sel Yayınları.

Susser, I., & Schneider, J. (2003). Wounded Cities: Destruction and Reconstruction in a Globalized World. In J. Schneider & I. Susser (Eds.), *Wounded cities: Destruction and reconstruction in a globalized world* (pp. 1-23). New York, NY, US: Berg.

Susser, I. & Stephanne T. (2013). Transformative Cities: The Three Urban Commons, *Focaal – Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, 66: 105 – 132.

Şık, B. (2015). Is there food security in Turkey? *Heinrich Böll Stiftung.* Retrieved from https://tr.boell.org/de/2015/11/17/there-food-security-turkey

Roohi, S. (n.d.) Space, Place and Social Sciences, Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/33239811/Space_place_and_the_Social_Sciences

Tsing, A. (2013). Sorting out commodities: How capitalist value is made through gifts. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory, 3*(1): 21–43

Turan, E. (2015). *Gardens of Resistance: Urban Agriculture in the Yedikule Market Gardens*, İstanbul (Thesis – Bilgi University Master of Cultural Studies)

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Uyar, V. (2018). *2017'de Hangi Şehirler Göç Aldı?* Retrieved from https://www.dogrulukpayi.com/bulten/2017-ic-goc-dalgasi

Velicu, I. & García-López, G. (2018). Thinking the Commons through Ostrom and Butler: Boundedness and Vulnerability. Theory, Culture and Society, 35 (6):55-73.

Wall, D. (2014). The Commons in History: Culture, Conflict, and Ecology, MIT Press.

White, C. & Shopov, A. & Ostovich, M. (2014). *An Archaeology of Sustenance: The Endangered Market Gardens of Istanbul*, Archaeology for the People Competition, Joukowsky Institute, Brown University, Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/20227324/An_Archaeology_of_Sustenance_The_Endangered_Market_Gardens_of_Istanbul

Wolfe, R. (2012). The movement as an end-in-itself? An interview with David Graeber. *Platypus Review, 43*. Retrieved from https://platypus1917.org/2012/01/31/interview-with-david-graeber/

Yeldan, A. E. & Ünüvar, B. (2016). An Assessment of the Turkish Economy in the AKP Era. *Research and Policy on Turkey*, *1*(1), 11–28. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/23760818.2015.1099779

APPENDICES

A. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu çalışma insanların sosyal, politik ve ekonomik kapatmalar (çitlemeler) yaşadıkları toplumlarda kentsel müştereklerin ve müştereklerime pratiklerinin nasıl örgütlendiğini ve olası özgürleştirici potansiyellerini araştırmaktadır. Var olan literatür, kapatmaları özelleştirme ve marketleşme süreçleriyle benzer bir anlamda ele almaktadır. Bu da kapatmalara karşı müşterekleştirme hareketlerini daha ziyade ekonomik kaygılar taşıyan mücadeleler olarak yorumlamaya yol açar. Kapatmaların ekonomik olanın yanı sıra, sosyal ve politik boyutları ve bunlara karşı geliştirilen müşterekleştirme pratikleri gittikçe önem kazanan bir araştırma alanı olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Ekonomik antropoloji, kent çalışmaları ve gelişmekte olan kentsel müşterekler literatürü de tartışmayı yürütmekmek için uygun bir teorik çerçeve çizmektedir. Bu çalışma alanlarını birbiri ile bir diyalog içine sokarak oluşturulan çerçeve bu tezin teorik arka planını oluşturur. Müşterek mekanlar, müşterekleştirme pratikleri ve ilişkilerinin süreçleri incelenerek gündelik hayattaki sosyal, politik ve ekonomik kapatmalara karşı nasıl yaşam alanları ve olası farklı pratikler ve ilişkilenmelerin üretildiği araştırılmıştır. Bu süreçler üzerinden, nasıl sosyo-politik koşullarda müşterek mekanların ve ağların üretildiği ve bu kentsel müştereklerin sürdürülme olanaklarına dair çıkarımlarda bulunulmuştur. Kim ve ne için araştırma yapıldığı sorusu, günümüzdeki sosyal, politik, ekolojik krizler altında gerçekleştirdiğimiz her eylemde olduğu gbi araştırma yaparken de nasıl bir tutum ve yaklaşım belirlediğimize dikkat etmek adına önem taşımaktadır. Bu sebeple bu araştırma Tim Ingold'un (2008; 2014; 2018) ontolojik bir bağlılık olarak tanımladığı katılımcı gözlem pratiğine başvurmuştur.

Aktaracağım üç alt araştırma sorusu bu araştırmanın sorunsalına bir çerçeve çizmektedir. Bu sorulardan ilki olası farklı yaşam deneyimlerinin kolektif alışkanlıklara dönüşmesinde mekanın rolüne odaklanır. Henri Lefebvre toplumsal mücadelelerin mekansal birikiminin gündelik hayatı dönüştürmede elzem bir rol

oynadığını ileri sürer (1996: 379). Bu araştırmaya alan açan iki müşterek kentsel mekan, 100. Yıl İşçi Blokları Mahallesi'ndeki Mahalle Atölyesi ve bostan da bahsi geçen birikimi sağlamak amacıyla ortaya çıkmış mekanlardır. Fakat bu mekanları salt açık ya da kamusal alan olmaları sebebiyle müşterek mekan olarak saymak mümkün değildir. Bu sebeple bu araştırmaya konu olan bostan, başka kent bahçelerinden, tarihi bostanlardan veya belediye bostanlarından, Mahalle Atölyesi de başka kolektif kafeler, mahalle dernekleri, ortak çalışma mekanları örneklerinden, benzerlikler taşımakla birlikte, temelde ayrışmaktadır. Barındırdıkları ilişkiler ve pratikler ile sürekli üretilmekte olma hallerinin, verili ya da üretilmiş olmaktan ziyade bir süreç olmalarının temel olarak bu mekanları kentsel müşterekler saymayı mümkün kıldığı iddia edilmektedir. Bu da müşterekler literatüründe, müşterekleri doğal kaynak havuzları olarak görmekten, müşterekleştirme pratikleri olarak görmeye doğru gerçekleşen yönelimi (Stavrides, 2010; Harvey, 2012; De Angelis, 2007; Kalb, 2018) destekler.

Kentsel yoksulluk, soylulaştırma, topluluk oluşturma, kapitalist sermayeye direniş (Marche, 2015) kent bahçeciliği literatürünün genel olarak odaklandığı konuları oluşturmaktadır. Tarih boyunca farklı sosyal ve ekonomik arka plana sahip insanlar, farklı sebepler ve motivasyonlarla kent bahçeciliği, bostancılık faaliyetleri ile uğraşmıştır. Susan Parham'ın (2015) kaleme aldığı kent bahçelerinin tarihsel analizi, İngiltere'nin hobi bahçeciliği geleneğinden, tam çevirisi Zafer Bahçeleri olan, savaş sırası ve sonrasında gıda üretimi için ortaya çıkmış bahçelere kadar geniş bir yelpazeyi göstererek bu çeşitliliği aktarmaktadır. Bu tarihsel analize bakarak, sadece belirli bağlamlarda ortaya çıkan bostancılık faaliyetinin, kapatmalara karşı gerçekleşen kolektif harekete açtığı alanla ilgili olarak tartışılabileceğini savunmak mümkündür. Türkiye'de bu konuya ilişkin güncel literatür de, tarihi Yedikule bostanları ile ilgili olarak gerçekleştirilen çalışmalarla (White, Shopov, Ostovich, 2014; Turan, 2015) bostancılık faaliyetini kentsel dönüşüme ve sermayenin büyümesine karşı bir hareket olarak ele almaktadır. Peki ya bostanları müşterekleştirme pratikleri ya da kentsel müşterekleri üretme süreci olarak, bu literatür aracılığıyla tartışmak halihazırdaki literatüre ve kent siyasetine, direnişine

nasıl bir katkıda bulunmayı hedeflemektedir? Diğer kent bahçeciliği faaliyetlerini inceleyen, Brenner, Marcuse ve Mayer (2009) kent mekanlarının tepeden gelen, zayıf katılımcı formlarla üretildiklerinde *yeni bir kent planlama stratejisine* dönüşebildiğini, Lizbon'da gerçekleştirdikleri saha çalışmalarında Gin ve Ascensao (2018) da kent bahçelerinin bir çeşit *orta sınıf çevreciliği* olarak ortaya çıkabildiğini gözlemlediklerini dile getirirler. Türkiye'deki Kuzguncuk Bostanı gibi pek çok mahalle bostanının da böyle bir biçimde varlığını sürdürdüğünü öne sürmek mümkündür. Kolektif bir biçimde yaşatılan bostanların oluşum, organizasyon ve varlığını sürdürme süreçleri anlayabilmek için daha farklı bir teorik çerçeve gerekmektedir. Neoliberal kentleşme sürecinde şehir kar sağlamayan herhangi bir aktiviteye alan açmazken, müşterek üretilen bostanlar, kolektif deneyimlerle sosyal, politik ve ekonomik bir değişim için ekip biçilen alanlara dönüşmektedir. Halihazırda var olan, geçimlik için üretilen bir bostanı marketin genişlemesine karşı koruma mücadelesinden farklı olarak, burada öncelikli mücadele, insan ilişkilerinin de ekileceği, yayılacağı, büyüyeceği bir mekansallık tasavvur etmekte yatmaktadır.

İkinci alt araştırma sorusunun çizdiği çerçeve yerel ve küçük ölçekli hareketlerin daha büyük, yapısal sorunlara nasıl cevap olabileceğine dair hem teorik hem de pratik olarak ortaya çıkan eleştirileri irdelemektedir. Bu kısımda çalışma David Harvey'nin (2012) ölçek sorunsalı olarak tanımladığı tartışmaya başvurur ve mahalle inisiyatifleri gibi yerel, küçük ölçekli hareketlerin yarattıkları olasılıkları yapısal sorunlara cevap olarak görmeye çalışmanın yanlış yönlendirmelere yol açabileceğini öne sürer. Burada ortaya çıkan yerel mücadele mekanları, kendilerini oluşturan pratikler ve ilişki ağlarını sürdürmeye olanak sağlayarak bir toplumsal değişimden bahsetmeyi mümkün kılmaktadır. Gıdaya ilişkin hareketler, gıda toplulukları ya da bostanlar gibi, çoğunlukla gıda rejiminin yapısal sorunlarını çözemeyecek olmakla eleştirilmektedir. Bu eleştirinin kaynağı çoğunlukla, kapitalist sistemin mücadele alanını bireyin tüketim seçeneklerine indirgediği düzene dayanmaktadır. Kapitalizmin çözülemez krizleri karşısında ortak mücadele alanından çekilerek bireysel stratejilere ve çözüm yollarına sıkça başvurulur. Fakat kentsel müştereklerin ihtimalleri ve bu gibi bireysel baş etme stratejileri arasında, benzer kaygılar taşıyor

olmanın ötesinde bir ilişki yoktur. Bu sebeple kentsel müşterekleri sadece ekolojik kaygılar taşımakla, yerelde kalmakla ve bireysel hareketler olmakla eleştirmek, başka bir deyişle müştereklleri sadece ortaya çıktıkları mekanların fiziksel sınırları içinde düşünmek yanıltıcı olabilmektedir. Fakat bu yaklaşım ve eleştiri ile sıkça karşılaşıldığı gözlemlenmiştir. Bu eleştiriye hareketin içinden verilen yanıt ise ne kadar anlam, etkinlik, umut vaat edildiğine dair müzakerede bulunabilmek için bu süreçlerin bir parçası olmanın deneyimlenmesinin gerekliliğidir. Müşterekler sadece kaynaklar ya da üretilen mekanlar, çıktılar değil, müşterekleştirme süreçleri olarak ele alınmaktadır. Bu sebeple, eyleme ve ilişkilenme süreçlerinin tam olarak bir parçası olmadan yöneltilen eleştirilerin hedef aldıkları deneyimden yoksun oldukları öne sürülebilir. Öte yandan müştereklerin ne kadar farklı sosyo-politik aktörlere açık olabildiği, yeni bir kapatma yaratıp yaratmadıkları da bir tartışma konusudur. David Harvey'ye göre değer verilen müştekleri korumanın en iyi yollarından biri yine bir çeşit kapatma yaratmaktır (2012: 70). Bu önerme, müşterekliği kuran ortak değerleri ve müşterekliği korumak adına ortaya konulan sorumluluk setlerini akla getirir.

Üçüncü alt araştırma sorusu ilk iki soruyla ilişki içinde kentsel müştereklerin oluşum ve örgütlenme süreçlerine odaklanmaktadır. Nasıl pratikler ve ilişkiler kentsel müştereki oluşturur, insanları bir araya getiren ortaklıklar ve onları bir arada tutmaya yarayan sorumluluk setleri nelerdir, müşterek mekan kamusal mekandan nasıl ayrılır gibi sorular bu süreçleri anlamlandırmaya olanak sağlar. Karl Polanyi (2001) günümüz (kapitalist) mübadele ilişkilerine dek hiçbir ekonomide kar ve kazancın başat bir rol oynamadığını ileri sürer. Marshall Sahlins'e (1972) göre de maddi alışveriş, mübadele ilişkilerinin sadece bir unsurudur. Bu yaklaşımlar erken antropolojik çalışmalara da işaret ederek ekonominin market tarafından yönetildiği değil sosyal ilişkilerin bir parçası olduğu; sosyal olanın ekonomik olana üstün geldiği bir düzenin mümkün olduğunu öne sürmektedir. Değer kavramının nasıl ortaya çıktığı antropologlar, sosyologlar ve iktisatçılar tarafından farklı şekillerde ele alınmıştır. Bir değer teorisi ortaya çıkarmak, bir topluluğun nasıl oluştuğunu anlama gayreti içinde olan antropologlar için özellikle önemli, zor ve farklı araştırmalarda yer tutan bir uğraş olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Franz Boas'ın (1875) Kuzey Amerika

Bölgesi'ndeki Kwakiutl yerlileri ile, Bronislaw Malinowski'nin (1922) Yeni Gine'nin doğusundaki Trobriand Adaları'nda ve Marcel Mauss'un (1925) Polinezya Adaları'nda gerçekleştirdikleri çalışmalar, mübadele ilişkileri ile toplumun nasıl organize olduğunu araştırmakta, bu ilişkilerin toplumu oluşturan *sistemlerin bütünü* olduğunu öne sürmektedir. Bu kapitalizm dışı sayılabilecek sistemlerdeki mübadele ilişkileri, ritüellerin, tutumların, sosyal bağların ekonomik ilişkilerdeki genel anlaşmayı nasıl etkilediğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu gibi topluluklara bakarak, kolektif üretim, dağıtım ve paylaşımın etik yükümlülükler ve sorumluluklar doğurduğu gözlenmektedir. Ekonomik ilişkilerin içine sosyal ilişkileri yeniden yerleştirme çabası bu bilgiye dayanmaktadır. David Graeber (2001), bir şeyin tam olarak (ekonomik) eş değeri ile takas edilmediği bir mübadele ilişkisinde değerin nereden çıktığını sorgular. Bu sorgulama bizi market ekonomisinin saydığı rasyonalitenin dışında bir ihtimalin varlığına götürmektedir. Massimo De Angelis (2007) alternatif bir siyasetin, bir değerler siyaseti olduğunu öne sürer. Günümüzde kapitalist sistemin karşısında tüm alternatiflerin denenmiş ve başarısız olmuş bulunduğu iddia edilmektedir. David Graeber (2011) bu iddianın neoliberalizmin umutsuzluğu üretme ihtiyacından kaynaklandığını öne sürer. Bu iddia karşısında dahi sosyal ilişkilerin yeniden ön plana çıkartıldığı ekonomi anlayışına dair denemeler gözlemlenmektedir. Bu denemelere, dayanışma ekonomileri, genelleştirilmiş karşılıklılık, müştereklleştirme pratikleri örnek verilebilir. Sistemin aynı anda hem içinde hem dışında sayılabilecek olan bu denemeler, toplumsal değişimi *şimdi ve burada* (Gibson ve Graham, 2006) gerçekleştirmeyi, salt bir sistem eleştirisinden tahayyül edilen kenti ve hayatı kurmaya mücadelesine geçişi ifade etmektedir.

David Graeber (aktaran Day, 2004) günümüzde, devletlerin politikalarını, idare yöntemlerini değiştirmelerini talep eden bir siyaset biçiminden daha çok, iktidarın gücüne karşı kendisi bir alternatif üretmeyi tercih eden bir siyaset biçiminin var olduğunu savunur. Bu durum Türkiye'de doğrudan eylem formundan başka bir hale bürünmek durumunda kalmaktadır. Klasik toplumsal hareketler literatürünün çizdiği stratejiler, kamusal politik alanın gittikçe daralmasından ötürü varlığını sürdüremezken, başka biçimler geliştirilmeye başlanmaktadır. Kriz zamanlarında

insanlar yaşanan ekonomik, sosyal ve politik kapatmalara karşı yaşam alanları üretmeye koyulur. Bu gibi zamanlar market ve devlet ikilisinin mantığındaki çatlakları görünür kılar ve insanlar o çatlaklarda farklı ihtimalleri denemeye başlarlar. Gündelik hayatı oluşturan pratikleri ve ilişkileri dönüştürmek, gelecekte gerçekleşmesi beklenen büyük bir kentsel devrimden söz etmek anlamına gelmez. Tam olarak bu sebeple hem bir sürü olasılık hem de sınırlar barındırır. Kentsel karşılaşmaların, eşik mekanlar yaratıp dönüştürücü ve özgürleştirici potansiyeller doğuracağı iddiasını (Stavrides, 2010) sosyal, politik ve hatta ekonomik olarak fazla kutuplaşmış toplumlarda pratik olarak gözlemlemek pek mümkün olmamaktadır. Fakat yine de, kentsel karşılaşmaların, doğrudan dönüştürücü olmasa da, özgürleştirici oldukları öne sürülebilir. Stavros Stavrides'e göre, eşik mekanlarda sınırların tamamen ortadan kalkmasından değil, sınırları esnetmekten söz edilir (2010). Bostan açık ve kamusal bir mekan olarak, mahalle sakinleri ve bostan mekanını yeşerten İnisiyatif katılımcıları ile bir raddeye kadar esnekleşen sınırlar sayesinde oluşabilen bir iletişim alanı kurabilmektedir. Bu iletişim Stavros Stavrides'in (2010) deyimiyle toplumsal hareketler süresince ortaya çıkmış kolektif hislerin ve deneyimlerin, kolektif alışkanlıklara dönüşmesi ihtimaline ön ayak olduğu ölçüde politik olarak anlamlı olmaktadır. Fakat her karşılaşma uzun soluklu bir sosyal ilişkiye dönüşmemektedir. Yine de bostanın bir sosyo-politik ifade alanı yaratarak özgürlük sağladığı öne sürülebilir. Daha çok kentsel karşılaşmaya olanak sağladığı ön kabulü ile dönüştürücü ihtimal bostandan beklenirken, Mahalle Atölyesi'nin etkinlikleri, uzun süreli kursları, yemekli forumları ve buluşmalarına ev sahipliği yaptığı, İnisiyatif'in bir öteki hareket alanı olan Gıda Topluluğu aracılığıyla kolektif alışkanlıklar oluşturma ihtimalini daha çok taşıdığı gözlemlenmiştir.

Bostan, Mahalle Atölyesi'nin tüm sene süren etkinliklerine kıyasla daha mevsimsel ve döngüsel bir takvime sahiptir. Bu döngüsel takvimle her sene erken bahar aylarında başlayıp, yaz ve sonbahar boyunca devam ederek tekrar eden bir dönüşüm süreci ortaya çıkmaktadır. Kent mekanında gözle görülebilir bir fark yaratmak; kentleşmeye, betonlaşmaya, sosyal coğrafyanın kent-kır ikiliğine ve olası sosyal, ekonomik ve politik kapatmalara karşıt peyzaj oluşturmak, insanları bir arada tutan

umut verici, yaratıcı ortaklıklardan biridir. Bostan mekanı içerisinde insanlar hem kent hayatının ritimlerinden, hızından hem de bedenlerinde hayata geçirdikleri verili hareket biçimlerinden ve bitkilerle kurdukları türler-arası ilişkilerinden olası bir şekilde farklı ihtimallerle karşılaşabilmektedir. Bu karşılaşma kentte halihazırda var olan eşitsiz ve adaletsiz ilişkileri görünür kılmanın yanı sıra hissedilir hale de getirir. Eleştirel coğrafyacılar kentteki eşitsiz ilişkilerin izini sürmenin, engellenemez, evrensel görünen kent koşullarını görünür ve değiştirilebilir kılacağını öne sürer (Kaika, 2005; McFarlane, 2011). Radikal coğrafya alanından gelişmiş bir literatür olan ve bu çalışmaya da teorik bir arka plan sağlayan kentsel politik ekoloji, uzun bir geçmişe sahip olan politik ekoloji geleneğinin başına kentsel kelimesinin eklemeyi gerekli kılan süreçleri inceler; kenti üreten karmaşık ağlara, süreçlere ve akışları araştırır. Heynen, Kaika ve Swyngedouw (2005) kentlerin karmaşık sosyal ve mekansal süreçlerin bir sonucu olduğunu belirtirler. Kaika (2005) aslında bu süreçlerin politik olduğunun aşikar olduğunu ama sürekli bir depolitizasyona maruz kaldıklarını için altının çizilmesinin önemli olduğunu ifade eder.

Ankara'nın ve 100. Yıl İşçi Blokları Mahallesi'nin kentsel politik ekolojisine bakıldığında, Türkiye'nin inşaat sektörü üzerinden şekillenen ekonomik modeline uygun bir şekilde bir kentsel dönüşüm sürecinin izini sürmek mümkündür. Mahallenin demografik yapısını çoğunluk orta sınıf aileler ve öğrenciler oluşturur. Fakat mahalle sakinlerinin gündelik hayat pratiklerini bu iki demografik gruba göre ayırmak ve genellemek mümkün değildir. 1970li yıllarda bir kooperatif konut projesi olarak hayata geçirilen İşçi Blokları, demografik yapısı ve tarihine dayanan bir dayanışma kültürüne sahiptir. Bu dayanışma kültürünün günümüzde farklı biçimlerde devam ettiği öne sürülebilir. Bu sebeple, bir mahalle forumundan doğan İnisiyatif'in farklı hareket sahaları da mahallenin sosyal, tarihi, politik, ekonomik bağlamlarıyla ilişkili olarak şekillenmektedir. Mahalle Atölyesi ve bostanı diğer benzer inisiyatiflerden ayrı ve kentsel müşterekler olarak tanımlamayı mümkün kılan özellikler burada yatmaktadır. İşçi Blokları Mahallesi'nde ortaya çıkan müşterek mekanlar, barınma müşterekleri ya da ucuz gıdaya erişim için kurulmuş müş, müştereklerden farklıdır. Bu gibi örnekler daha ziyade işgal evleri, parsellere

ayrılmış topluluk bostanları üretirken, burada üretilen müşterekler sosyal ve politik ilişkiler kurabilmek, ifade ve hak taleplerinde bulunabilmek, dayanışma ağları kurabilmek gayeleri çevresinde bir araya gelinerek oluşturulmaktadır.

Peki sosyal, politik ve ekonomik kapatmalara karşı müşterekler siyaseti ne ölçüde mümkün olmaktadır? Kentsel müşterekler ve müşterekleştirme pratikleri süreçlerinin karşısına çeşitli maddi, finansal kısıtlılıklar ve sosyal zorluklar çıkabilmektedir. Bresnihan ve Byrne (2015) belirli ihtiyaçları doğrultusunda kolektif yaratma ve mübadele süreçlerine girenlerin marketin ve kamunun dinamik güç ilişkileriyle karşılaşacaklacaklarını belirtir. Her ne kadar mevzubahis müşterek mekanların temel geçimliği (kira ve faturalardan oluşan) büyük ölçüde kolektif bir şekilde sağlanabilse de, çeşitli organizasyonlar için devamlı bir maddi sınır ortaya çıkabilmektedir. Ortaya konan emeğe karşı maddi bir geri dönüş beklenmemesine rağmen, mekanların ve organizasyonların kendilerini döndürebilmeleri için belirli bir bütçe gerekmektedir. İnisiyatifin kolektif ve yatay örgütlenme biçimi onu kolay sınıflandırılamaz bir hale sokmakta ve fon başvurularını güçleştirmektedir. Bunlara rağmen, insanlar bir araya gelmeyi sürdürmek istedikleri müddetçe müşterekleri sürdürmek mümkün görünmektedir. Bostanın sulama sistemi için açılan ve deneyimlenen kitlesel fonlama kampanyası süreci aslında sorunların ekonomik değil sosyal ilişkilerle ilgili olduğunu öne sürmeyi mümkün kılar.

Daha çok sayıda insanın bu süreçlere katılımı önündeki engeller neler olabilir sorusunu, halihazırdaki katılımcılar arasındaki ilişkilere bakarak da tartışmak mümkündür. Daha önce de belirtildiği gibi, müşterekleri üretmek ve sürdürmek belirli değerler çevresinde ortaklaşmak ve sorumluluklar üstlenerek bu süreçleri devam ettirmeyi gerektirmektedir. Üstlenilen sorumluluklar, gündelik hayat pratiklerini ve ilişkilerini değiştirmenin temel unsurlarından biri olarak sayılabilir. Genelleştirilmiş karşılıklılık ilişkilerinde, Sahlins'in açıklamasına göre (1972), dile gelmeyen, uzun vadede gerçekleşmesi olası olan, ama gerçekleşmese de sorun edilmeyen bir mübadele söz konusudur. Diğer mübadele formlarına kıyasla uzun süreli ilişkiler kurmak için uygun olan bu sosyo-ekonomik ilişkilenme biçimi,

114

müşterekler söz konusu olduğunda karşılıklı sorumluluklar almak olarak da yorumlanabilir. Bu doğrultuda sorumlulukların ve görevlerin tek bir kişi üzerinde yoğunlaşması, müşterekliğinin üretimini olumsuz yönde etkilemektedir. Bu gibi durumlar kolektif bir biçimde müzakere edilerek, kimi zaman haftalık forumlarda, kimi zaman ortak dijital iletişim alanlarda, görev ve sorumluluk dengeleri yeniden düzenlenmektedir. Buna dayanarak müştereklerin sürekli olarak müzakere edilerek üretildiğini öne sürmek mümkün olmaktadır. Bunlar dışında karşılaşılan sınırlardan biri de sosyo-politik açıklık ile ilgilidir.

Kentsel karşılaşmaların değil ilişkilere, karşılıklı saygı çerçevesinde gerçekleşen konuşmalara bile dönüşemediği durumlar mevcuttur. Bu gibi durumlar sebebiyle, bostan hiç kilitlenmeyen kapısı ve mahalleyi davet eden duvar yazıları ile fiziksel olarak tamamen açık olsa da aşırı ve şiddet içeren yaklaşımları kucaklayan bir yapıya sahip olduğundan söz etmek mümkün değildir. Herhangi bir verili kimliğe sahip olmadığı dile getirilse de, müşterekliği korumak adına ortaya çıkan belirli sınırlardan bahsetmek mümkündür. Ama bu sınırlar yine de tamamen engelleyici önemler olarak ortaya çıkmamaktadır. Bostanın karşılaştığı hırsızlık ya da duvar karalamaları karşısında verilen yanıt fiziksel bir çitleme yaparak kapıyı sağlamlaştırmak, kilitlemek yönünde olmamıştır. Bu gibi yaklaşımlar da bütün bu finansal, altyapısal ve sosyo-politik kısıtlılıklara rağmen, bu süreçlerin dahi müştereklşetirme siyasetinin nasıl yürütüleceğine dair olası patikalar çizme sürecine dahil olduğu öne sürmemizi sağlayabilir. Eğer müşterekler halihazırda var olanın yönetilmesi değil de karşılaşmalar, ilişkiler ve farklı pratiklerin müzakereleri sürecinde üretilmekte olan mekanlar, ağlar, değerler ve tahayüller ise, daimi sınırları, limitleri aşma çabası da bir müştereklşetirme pratiği olarak saymak mümkündür.

Kentleri çeşitli topluluklara ev sahipliği yapan, boş muhafaza etme kutuları değil, sürekli olagelen ilişkiler ve eylemler olarak tanımlamak mümkündür. İnsanlar kent hali ile bireysel ve kolektif yollarla, çeşitli başlıklar altında mücadele ederler. Gittikçe artan popülasyonların nasıl beraberce bir yaşam süreceği sorusu mevcudiyetini korumaktadır. Kent toprağının metalaştırılması ve özelleştirilmesi,

kapitalizmin hayatta kalmasının önemli unsurlarından biridir. Kenti tasarlayan politik ve ekonomik güç sahipleri, kentte görünür, görünmez katmanlar yaratır. Kentin üretimi aynı anda sosyal, ekonomik, politik ve ekolojik bir süreçtir. Kenti bir yaşam biçimi ve kültürel form olarak görmek daha dinamik ve diyalojik bir kent tanımı yapmayı mümkün kılar. Bu kent tanımı içerisinde kenti ve "doğayı" iki ayrı mevcudiyet olarak ele almak, problemli bir ikili düşünce biçimini oluşturur. Bu ikiliği kurmak doğayı saf, korunabilir bir mekansallık olarak tanımlarken, kenti de onun karşısında tahrip edilebilir kılar. Bu ikiliği aşmak için farklı kent anlamları ve bu anlamların birikimini sağlayacak müşterek kent mekanları üretmek anlamlıdır. Kentsel müşterekliğin üretimi de, tıpkı kent anlamı gibi farklı arka planlara sahip insanların, farklı pratiklerin bir ilişkiler ağı kurması sonucu mümkün olmaktadır. Esas önemli olan, Stavros Stavrides'e göre (2010), üretilen mekanlardaki şeylerin fiziksel yerleşimi değil, buralarda üretilen mekansallığın nasıl hayata geçtiğidir. Bu yüzden mekanın nasıl yaşandığının ve gündelik hayat ritimlerinin de göz önünde bulundurulması gerekir. Bu şekilde olası farklı bir kent mekansallığından ya da kentsel müştereklerden bahsettiğimizde, sadece biriktirdiklerimizden değil, hayalini kurduklarımızdan da söz etmek mümkün olmaktadır.

Tüm bunlar neticesinde, egemen anlatının iddia ettiği herhangi bir alternatifi olmayan, her türlü krize kendi sınırları ve mantığı içinde üreteceği çözümlerle baş edebilecek olan sistemin, aynı anda hem içinde hem de olası bir şekilde dışında bulunan modeller geliştirilebildiğini iddia etmek mümkündür. Mahalle inisiyatifleri, kendilerine yöneltilen eleştirilerin sorgusunda mevcut bulunan küresel sorunlara hemen çözüm üretme gayesi içinde hareket etmemektedir. Bu sebeple bunu başaramadıklarında, başarısız olmuş sayılmazlar. Üzerine uğraşılan, yeni kolektif alışkanlıklar geliştirmektir; bu kolektif alışkanlıkların zaman ve mekan içinde yayılacağını ve büyüyeceğini umut ederek ağlar kurgulamaktır. Müşterek mekanlarda birikecek bu farklı bir kent ve yaşam hayali (ve aynı zamanda olası gerçeği), sürekli tartışılmakta olan fikirler ve pratiklerin ilişki ve iletişim içine girmesi sürecinde ortaya çıkmaktadır. Şimdiki zaman tarihi içinde, toplumsal değişimlerin gerçekleştiği keskin noktalardan bahsetmek güç olsa dahi, jenerasyonlar

arası farklılıkları görmek, değişen toplumun doğurduğu olasılıkları ve çatışmaları analiz etmek mümkündür. Stavros Stavrides'e göre gündelik hayat tekrarlardan oluşuyor gibi görünse dahi, denizdeki dalgaların tekrar eder görünen ama aslında farklı olan şekilleri, ritimleri, ve farklı büyüklüklerde etkiledikleri çakıl taşları gibi, yaşamdaki her yeni dalga, dönem farklı olasılıklar doğurmaktadır. Bu dalga metaforu müşterek mekanların, umutsuzluk coğrafyalarında nasıl farklı insanlar, fikirler, pratikler ve ortayan çıkan ilişkiler sayesinde varlıklarını sürdürebildiklerini düşünmeye yardımcı olmaktadır. Her kriz zamanın, içinde çeşitli ihtimaller barındırdığı farklı bakış açıları tarafından çokça dile getirilmektedir. Herkes, gündelik hayatlarındaki kapatmalarla nasıl baş edeceklerini çözmeye çalışırken, yaşadıkları, birebir deneyimledikleri ontolojik, sosyal, politik, ekolojik ve ekonomik krizlere çözüm yolları ararken farklı yöntemler geliştirir. Bu yöntemlerin bireysel alanlarda kalması, sorunu çözemediği gibi, genel umutsuzluk ve başarısızlık hissinden kurtulmaya da yardımcı olmamaktadır. Bu sebeple müşterekleştirme pratikleri ve ilişkileri çevresinde bu hareketlerin bir araya gelmesinin, farklı anlarda ortaya çıkan umut dalgalarının birbirini etkileyeceğini ve bu sayede devamlılıklarını sağlayacağını öne sürmek mümkündür.

TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒ X

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Koçak
Adı / Name : Yağmur
Bölümü / Department : Sosyal Antropoloji

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : A Garden and Atelier in Common: Practices of Commoning in 100. Yıl Neighborhood, Ankara

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ☒ X   **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒ X

2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two year. *** ☐

3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. * ☐

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ....   **Tarih** / Date 07.02.2019