

CRITICISM OF CONTEMPORARY ART INITIATIVES IN ARTS  
FROM FEMINIST STANPOINT THEORY: THE CASE OF ANKARA / TURKEY

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

BY  
MERVE AKBIYIK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

JANUARY 2020



Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı  
Director

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

---

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber  
Head of Department

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

---

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Metin Özuğurlu	(Ankara Uni, ÇEKO)	_____
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit	(METU, SOC)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluoğlu	(METU, SOC)	_____



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

Name, Last Name: Merve AKBIYIK

Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **CRITICISM OF CONTEMPORARY ART INITIATIVES IN ARTS FROM FEMINIST STANPOINT THEORY: THE CASE OF ANKARA / TURKEY**

Akbıyık, Merve

M.S., Department of Gender and Women's Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit

January 2020, 188 pages

The purpose of this thesis is based on to claim that in paradigmatic problematization of art, contemporary art and specificities of subjectivities of contemporary art initiatives which is in contemporary art should be understood on the basis of knowledge and politics. The approach to contemporary art initiatives through Feminist Standpoint Theory will also bring the understanding of contemporary art that is critical to capitalist understanding of contemporary art. The institutionalized capitalist contemporary art is criticized by contemporary art initiatives both in their art practices and in their way of 'organizations'. Feminist Standpoint methodology, through interactions allows one to acquire the specificities of the subjectivities of contemporary art initiatives that portray their differences. These differences are crucial in the sense that identifying the subjectivities of these art initiatives that are critical to paradigmatically modernist based art groups. Furthermore, the differences of these initiatives produce different knowledge and politics. In this study, the contemporary art initiatives in Ankara in Turkey are tried

to be understood on the basis of knowledge and politics productions. What was found is that Ankara contemporary art initiatives, in general, do not effectively produce critical knowledge and politics to capitalist contemporary art. Moreover, some of the ‘members’ of these initiatives try to participate in capitalist contemporary art scene. However, the video based contemporary art initiatives in Ankara produces critical knowledge and politics contrary to plastic arts based or music-based initiatives. In that sense, different initiatives produce different knowledge and politics, yet, it is crucial to criticize capitalist formations of art.

**Keywords:** Contemporary Art Initiatives, Feminist Standpoint Theory, Contemporary Art, Turkey, Ankara

## ÖZ

### FEMİNİST DURUŞ KURAMI AÇISINDAN SANATTA ÇAĞDAŞ SANAT İNİSİYATİFLERİNİN ELEŞTİRİSİ: ANKARA/TÜRKİYE ÖRNEĞİ

Akbıyık, Merve

Yüksek Lisans, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit

Ocak 2020, 188 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı, sanatın paradigmatik sorunsallaştırılmasında, çağdaş sanatın ve çağdaş sanattaki çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin öznelliklerinin özgüllüklerinin bilgi ve politika temelinde anlaşılması gerektiğini iddia etmektir. Feminist Duruş Kuramı ile çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerine yaklaşım, kapitalist çağdaş sanat anlayışına eleştirel olan çağdaş sanat anlayışını da getirecektir. Kurumsallaşmış kapitalist çağdaş sanat, hem sanat pratiklerinde hem de 'örgütlenme' biçimlerinde çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri tarafından eleştirilir. Feminist Duruş Kuramı metodolojisi, etkileşimler yoluyla, çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin farklılıklarını gösteren öznelliklerinin özelliklerinin açığa çıkarılmasını sağlamaktadır. Bu farklılıklar, paradigmatik olarak modernist temelli sanat gruplarına eleştirel olan çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin öznelliklerini tanımlamak açısından çok önemlidir. Dahası, bu inisiyatiflerin farklılıkları, farklı bilgi ve politikalar üretir. Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'de, Ankara'daki çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri, bilgi ve politika üretimleri



temelinde anlaşılmaya çalışılmıştır. Ankara çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin genel olarak kapitalist çağdaş sanata etkin bir şekilde eleştirel bilgi ve politika üretmediği bulunmuştur. Dahası, bu inisiyatiflerin “üyelerinden” bazıları kapitalist çağdaş sanat ortamına katılmaya çalışmaktadır. Ancak Ankara'daki video tabanlı çağdaş sanat girişimleri, plastik sanat temelli veya müzik temelli girişimlerin aksine eleştirel bilgi ve politika üretmektedir. Bu anlamda farklı inisiyatifler farklı bilgi ve politikalar üretmektedir ancak, kapitalist sanat oluşumlarını eleştirmek çok önemlidir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Çağdaş Sanat İnisiyatifleri, Feminist Duruş Kuramı, Çağdaş Sanat, Türkiye, Ankara

To Pelin

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was honour to me to write my master degree thesis with my supervisor Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit. He is not just a sophisticated senior academician but the one who shares delicately his academic experiences and knowledges without hesitating, needing to build hierarchies and ignoring the subjectivities of his students to make them better in their academic lives. Always makes time for and encourages us with his admirable stance and inspirational comments to see the pathbreaking possibilities whenever we lost. His creative and artistic vision and approaches to life and academy gave me a lot and the words can't describe how much I respect him. I owe him thanks for everything he brought me. I also thank to Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokloğlu for her valuable and lovely comments and sharings. Her meticulous approach to my thesis with empathy led to relief in my stressful thesis process and helped me to rethink about my style of writing and the way of thinking about my topic. Lastly, I owe thanks to Prof. Dr. Metin Özüğurlu for his critiques and sincerely helpful suggestions. His mindful attempt to candidates, support and empathy in his communication is so precious to me.

I thank to the most beloved treasures in my life, my parents Zehra Akbıyık and Mehmet Akbıyık. They are both extremely devoted, supportive, warmhearted and gentle not only in my lifespan but were especially in my thesis process. I love you so much!

I also thanks to two of beautiful women in my life Eda Süner Koç and Cansu Dayan. I thank them for their friendships, sharings, chattings, together laughings and always encouraging me to do best, support and love in real senses.

Another thanks are for our seminar group and to the members of the courses which I assisted. I am so glad to learn many things in these sharings and moments.

I thank to Şahin Alp Taşkaya and Ozan Adıgüzel for helping me both for my technical stuff and to try to rescue my deleted files during my thesis process.

Lastly, I thank wholeheartedly to my lovely participants. Their eager and helpful attempts to my field research and sharings were so valuable. I thank to also the meeting-locations especially Amelie's Garden and Kakule Kahve in Ankara in which I mostly met with my participants to conduct my field research. Their tasteful coffee, sharings and sweets were so delightful!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ÖZ .....	vi
DEDICATION .....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	xi
LIST OF TABLES .....	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xvii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background and Scope of the Study .....	1
1.2. Methodology and the Research Problem of the Study .....	5
1.3. Expected Contributions of the Study .....	9
1.3.1. ExpectedTheoretical Contributions of the Study .....	9
1.3.2. Expected Methodological Contributions of the Study .....	10
1.3.3. Expected Practical Contributions of the Study .....	11
1.4. Structure of the Thesis .....	12
2. FEMINIST THEORY, INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF ART AND ART INITATIVES.....	14

2.1. Feminist Praxis and Social Theory.....	14
2.2. Modernity Theory, Feminist Modernity Theory and Politics .....	19
2.3. Criticisms of Modernist Theory and Modernist Feminist Theory and Politics.....	21
2.4. Postmodernist and Postmodern Feminist Thoughts and Politics .....	22
2.5. Criticisms of Postmodern and Postmodern Feminist Thought and Politics .....	23
2.6. Feminist Standpoint Theory .....	23
2.6.1. Feminist Standpoint Epistemologies: Epistemic Privilege and Epistemic Authority.....	30
2.6.2. Perspective and Achievement Theories .....	31
2.6.3. Feminist Standpoint Theory and Women’s Standpoint Theories .....	31
2.6.4. Situated Subjective Epistemologies .....	33
2.7. Institutionalisation of Art: Relations of Institutions and Art.....	34
2.7.1. Institutional Theory of Art .....	34
2.7.2. A Subjective Criticism of Institutionalization of Art: Contemporary Art Initiatives: Avantgarde Theory of Art.....	37
2.8. Art Initiatives and Civil Society: Intersections and Divergencies .....	39
2.9. Historical Specific ‘Origins’ of Contemporary Art Initiatives.....	41
3. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN.....	43
3.1. Introduction .....	43
3.2. Qualitative Research .....	43
3.3. Methodology of Feminist Standpoint Theory .....	44
3.4. Research Design and Research Problem.....	47
4. 4. ART AND CONTEMPORARY ART INITIATIVES IN TURKEY .....	66

4.1. Global Art .....	66
4.2. Art in Turkey and Ankara Specific .....	70
5. DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND EVALUATION .....	82
5.1. Introduction .....	82
5.2. Basic Characteristics of CAIs .....	82
5.2.1. CAIs and Youth Culture.....	82
5.2.2. Bohemian Culture .....	83
5.2.3. CAIs and New Social Movements .....	84
5.2.4. Subjectivities of CAIs .....	86
5.2.5. CAIs as an artist organization .....	87
5.2.6. Acting on the basis of being collective of CAIs .....	87
5.2.7. Institutionalization of CAIs.....	87
5.2.8. Independence of CAIs from power centers.....	88
5.2.9. Non-profit in CAIs .....	88
5.2.10. Not giving priority to support in CAIs.....	88
5.2.11. Interdisciplinary / transdisciplinary position in CAIs .....	89
5.2.12. Super-ideological position in CAIs.....	89
5.2.13. Intercultural position in CAIs .....	89
5.2.14. Project-oriented location .....	90
5.2.15. The position of the CAIs as a laboratory .....	90
5.2.16. ‘Do-It-Yourself’ culture in CAIs .....	91
5.2.17. Platform-providerness of CAIs .....	91
5.2.18. Display of CAIs in the periphery .....	91

5.2.19. Differences between CAIs .....	92
5.2.20. Nowness on CAIs.....	92
5.3. Conditions of Existence of CAIs.....	93
5.3.1. Opposition to Institutionalization in CAIs .....	101
5.3.2. Nomenclature and Contradictions of Initiatives.....	105
5.3.3. Individuality and Collectivity in CAIs .....	116
5.3.4. Unity in CAIs .....	125
5.3.5. Ankara CAIs: Spatial-Specific Initiative.....	129
5.3.6. Innovation in Initiatives .....	135
5.3.7. Artist in CAIs .....	140
5.3.8. Society and CAIs.....	145
5.3.9. Initiatives and Art History.....	146
6. CONCLUSION .....	150
6.1. Contributions of the Study .....	150
6.1.2. Theoretical Contributions of the Study .....	150
6.1.3. Methodological Contributions of the Study.....	151
6.1.4. Practical Contributions of the Study .....	152
6.2. Research Limitations of the Study .....	152
6.2.1. Theoretical Limitations of the Study.....	156
6.2.2. Methodological Limitations of the Study.....	158
6.2.3. Practical Limitations of the Study.....	158
6.3. Recommendations for the Future Studies .....	159
REFERENCES.....	161



## APPENDICES

A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE .....	168
B. QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE FIELD RESEARCH.....	169
C. TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET .....	171
D. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU .....	188

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1. Distribution of Initiative Members and Academicians in Ankara by Gender and Academic Title.....	57
---	----

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>JDP</b>	Justice and Development Party
<b>CA</b>	Contemporary Art
<b>CAIs</b>	Contemporary Art Initiatives
<b>DIY</b>	Do-It-Yourself
<b>FST</b>	Feminist Standpoint Theory
<b>WST</b>	Women's Standpoint Theory
<b>FRDs</b>	Field Research Deciphers
<b>NGOs</b>	Non-Governmental Organizations
<b>NSMs</b>	New Social Movements

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. Background and Scope of the Study**

Contemporary art initiatives (CAIs) have emerged as civil organizations in art on the basis of critiques of postmodernity and modernity, which paradigmatically refers to as contemporary art. Although the ‘roots’ of CAIs are predominantly based on avant-garde art practices in the historical academic literature of art, they are quite different from avant-garde art groups in terms of the inclusion of different paradigmatic queries in the current context and the diversity and richness of organization and activities. In the contemporary social science literature, underground culture, which is a conceptualization of critical cultural expression within the scope of cultural theories, criticizes the association of contemporary art initiatives with avant-garde theories, and opens up new areas for the interpretation of CAIs. In addition to underground cultures, CAIs fostered by youth culture and new social movements have the potential to be transformative actors of contemporary art. Non-profit, interdisciplinary, participatory, interactive, independence, loosely organized, horizontal, small, awareness-building, not to aim at permanence (non-persistence), project-based, experiential, owning at ‘do-it-yourself’ culture, facilitator/media/platform provider local, egalitarian, flexible, sharing-like conceptions can be considered among the subjective characteristics of the CAIs that are on the basis of criticism to capitalist contemporary art and to ensure their own sustainability. Although CAI is defined in the literature by different names, the paradigmatic contexts of all these concepts are different. Within the scope of this thesis,

the conceptualization of the initiative is considered to be more inclusive and is preferred over the other conceptualizations.

Understanding CAIs requires to make a definition of art and contemporary art in terms of context. The way art is understood is important in terms of explaining the relations of CAIs with the social and to be able to see the specific relationships they have entered in the context of the organization of art. Until the period defined as an institution in modernity, art has been tried to be explained mainly within the discipline of philosophy. The Representational Theory of Art, Neo-representationalism, The Expression Theory, Formalism, Neo-formalism and Aesthetic Theories of Art (Carroll,1999) are the theories that define and try to explain art until the discussion of institutionalization of art. The mentioned theories have deficiencies in the explanation of art.

Neo-Wittgensteinism, which forms the basis of institutionalization, has proceeded from defining non-art rather than defining art as the breadth of art at this point does not make it possible to define it. The theory of institutionalization of art freed art from the discussions of aesthetics and creativity and enabled art to be defined as a social institution (Carroll,1999). Theories of Old and New Institutionalization have enabled art to be explained as a social institution (Powell and Dimaggio,1991).

In the period which the debates of postmodernism revive, the new institutional theorists who explicate the social institutional explanation of art by conveying the art-life inextricability of postmodern query to the debates of art had provided the realization of the institutionalization efforts almost spontaneously.

The questions of the postmodernity debates towards modernity provided the transition from modern art to contemporary art in art. Contemporary art differs from modern art with its economic, political and cultural content. The form of organization of contemporary art is related to the organization of the society in which it is located.

While Capitalist society organization defines the roles played by the state, capital and civil sphere in the institutionalization of contemporary art, it has enabled capital to play an active role in global contemporary art, especially after 1980's neoliberal policies.

The experience of capital in contemporary art is contextual and historical specific, but has shown different forms of existence in different localities. But the common point is that capital is highly visible in the field of contemporary art globally. On the other hand, the state, has been visible in contemporary art as an institution that strongly supports capital while concentrating on to uphold the modern art.

The rapidly increasing number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) after 1990 had supported civil organizations formed in the arts as well as investing in capitalist contemporary art. While the funding sources of NGOs' were separated as capital-based and non-capital-based, they have been looking also predominantly the supportive of being of critical and alternative.

Artist initiatives that emerged widely in different geographies especially in the 1960s, in addition to being state and NGO supported initiatives on a global scale, especially in the context of Turkey, has been involved in art with significant differences. Turkey, also depending on the pre-1980 society where political characteristics, economic and cultural transformations based on, experienced modern art under the political regime the dominance of state protection of until the 1950s.

In the 1950s, trying to articulate global liberalism, Turkey has created a phenomenon of modern art began to change due to interaction with political and economic reforms entered in the arts and in this period, it was seen that private enterprises started their activities in the field of art. From the 1950s to the 1980s, intellectual and activity grounds for contemporary art began to be prepared. Neoliberal transformation of the global context in 1980s provided for the establishment of contemporary art in Turkey.

As of this period, and Turkey has started to realize international biennials and exhibitions by articulating to global contemporary art and has experienced the increase of individual and collective art's activities in art. An art system, in which capital is increasingly in a monopolistic position, has begun to emerge.

The process of initiatives which starts with art communities in Turkey, creating a different sensibility in contemporary art, as the founding actors of the art definition of the civil sphere and critically approaching to the capitalist contemporary art, began to strive to expand the field of its existence. However, this has not been realized as far from capitalism as desired. Initiatives organized or gathered in connection with different information and policy relations have collaborated with capitalism indirectly while carrying out project-based works with NGOs.

In the scale of Ankara, the initiatives in the field of visual arts and audiovisual arts brought limited criticism to capitalism in the context of knowledge and politics, while organizing themselves on the basis of difference, and displayed a very distant position in the context of opposing knowledge and policies. Although they differ from global art initiatives in terms of funding, they also diverge specifically in terms of the scope and form of their activities.

Initiatives, even if they are expressed with a single concept, exist in contemporary art by being subjectively differentiated from each other in their level of organization, activities and relations with society. In this context, especially the video activist art formations and initiatives established in Ankara can meet the theoretically desired initiative conceptualization in the context of the critique and awareness of capitalism. The art practice of video activists in Ankara fills the content of the initiative conceptualization envisaged on the basis of both knowledge and politics in the context of opening up the political and knowledge of image creation to debate.

In the approach to initiatives, the problematic of knowledge and politics in the initiatives was tried to be made based on the methodological and epistemological propositions of Feminist Standpoint Theory (FST). In its theoretical expansions, FST criticized Orthodox modernity in the early periods and tried to uncover the relations of power which Orthodox modernity has avoided in the production of scientific knowledge. The methodology it used also depicted the epistemological field and led to the development of methodology and epistemology together. Because of its position in social theory as a paradigm between Modernity and Postmodernity, FST has emerged in a context that is critically developed from the ideas of postmodernity and modernity and has a theoretical basis. Different views on the interpretation of the FST have emerged between the positions that are close to modernity and the positions not too far from postmodernity. However, all of these positional approaches were able to contribute to social theory in order to make rich subject inquiries and structure criticisms.

## **1.2. Methodology and the Research Problem of the Study**

FST has criticized the methodologies and epistemologies of modernity by considering politics methodologically with knowledge. Hierarchically positioned scientific knowledge on the basis of modernity, transferring the suppressed and not-being-expressed on experiential based positions of everyday knowledge to scientific knowledge by FST, tried to be revealed the hegemonic relations developed in science. The Feminist Standpoint Theorists, who link the universality of knowledge with subjectivity, state that the partiality of knowledge depends on situational, locational, contingent, embedded, reflective and similar conditions. It did not create a hierarchical position between the researcher and the researched in the methodological context, tried to ensure that both sides entered the conditions of knowledge production and research through interaction and on subjective basis, without the determinism of the structure.



Interaction and experience have enabled subjective reality inscribing to exist between the researcher and the researched by allowing them to reveal the specificities of their subjectivities during the research to prevent the formations of hegemonic information, and rejecting the narrative of reality that hegemonic knowledge establishes away from their own realities. Implicit, repressed, ignored experiences are considered as important, were taken as basis in terms of transferring subjectivities (eg emotions) to everyday, intellectual knowledge.

Unlike the science of orthodox modernity, the politics has been tried to be included in the research process and has also been recognized as an important component of the research process. In this context, the stratified formation of dialogue and transfer of experience between the researcher and the researched in the effort to reach the reality of the subject, during the research, by raising feminist political consciousness, the reality that is distorted by hegemonic capitalist knowledge production, enabling the reinterpretation of feminist subjects with their experiences and concealed or distorted reality may be revealed.

While the political consciousness of the individual is not an automatic realization and comprehension depending on the positionality/locationality of the subjects, this collective political consciousness emerges only on the basis of interaction. Since the methodology of FST is based on bringing new perspectives to concepts and issues through feminist theory, it paves the way for hegemonic conceptualizations and approaches to change, for flexible conceptualization that will establish the subject's own reality. Since the relationship between subjects and institutions is shaped as reflective and self-reflective, it allows for dynamic transformation and revision of both situations. The fact that the feminist posture theory was an intermediate paradigm did not result in the rejection of the structure in its relationship with the structure, but it was subject to intense criticism. The emphasis on the subjectivity of FST does not allow for the destruction of the institution, but for the reinterpretation of the institution in a different

way on the basis of contemporary modernity. The question of subjectivity minimizes the hegemony of the institution on the subject and enables the construction of a new subject and sociality with real knowledge of the subject based on the transformative subjective experience. The construction varies depending on the situation, condition and location. According to FST, transformative knowledge production seems to be directly related to the position of the subject who establishes the knowledge and the relationship s/he enters with politics. This creates subjective locational positions and allows the development of different epistemologies. According to feminist theory, knowledge is partially interpreted.

Partial conceptualization has been interpreted in two ways within the FST because it includes integrity and partial partiality. While theoretical positions referring to the oppressed knowledge think that the oppressed has holistic knowledge, the theorists advocating purely partiality argue that knowledge and reality are partial without realizing the positionality of the subject. The mobility that seems to be paradoxical in FST in between the questioning of structural and subject, causes the theoretical enrichment of feminist epistemology and strengthening of it on the basis of the understanding of the social.

Theorists of FST, which are predominantly close to postmodern theory, consider the emphasis on difference as an important opening for the theory. The methodologies of FST are critical in that they can pave the way for the discovery of all differences. The inclusion of different perspectives in knowledge can establish dialogues between universality and locality while criticizing essentialist epistemologies. In this way, stratified methodological and epistemological gains are achieved in achieving the reality of knowledge.

In the methodological approach of FST, the prominence of subjectivities both epistemologically and methodologically is crucial in the context of criticizing rationality.

FST, which criticizes orthodox modernity theory in methodological and epistemological aspects, has provided the development of Achievement and Perspective positions depending on the positioning of the politics in the production of knowledge. This distinction has different consequences in terms of epistemological and political theoretical transitions. Within the scope of the thesis, while obtaining the position of Achievement close to modernity theory, epistemologically the field knowledge and theoretical framework are prioritized.

However, on a methodological basis, the Achievement stance is considered to be important in terms of theoretical and political bases. The Achievement position sees feminist politics as an important component in the production of knowledge, including its establishment, and takes into account the Marxist connections of the underlying feminist politics. In this context, the necessity and importance of showing the material grounds of reality of feminist subject are taken into consideration.(Intemann,2010)

In order for the researcher to interact in the field sensitive to politics and to show the material grounds of reality and construct the reality for the subjects, the stripping of the participant and the researcher from the dominant relations should be taken as basis. The result of this is that through allowing subjective interaction on the basis of subjects' specificities in order to be the founder of its own realities and / or research, they were made to be self-founders of knowledge rather than passive language and action. The formation of knowledge in the founding of this self-experience was accepted as an important feature of emancipation and revelation of subjectivities.

Although the relationship between the researcher and the researched is not one-way, there is a possibility of change in both directions. In this case, the theoretical knowledge can be transformed by the researcher as well as the transformation of the researched subjects can be possible.

The main research problematics in the thesis is based on the defense of the thesis of “In the paradigmatic questioning of art CAIs should be examined on the basis of knowledge and politics within the specificities of subjectivity through the FST-methodology”.

### **1.3. Expected Contributions of the Study**

#### **1.3.1. Expected Theoretical Contributions of the Study**

From the perspective of FST, the contribution to scientific knowledge through multilayered interaction on the political ground, while the knowledge produced by FST methodology preventing the possibility of weakening the group movement of deconstructed modernity's post-structural explanation and decentralized subject of postmodern paradigm of the social and weakening in specific the feminist movement, marginalizes through focusing on interactive agentic politics of relational theory and weakness of it in structural explanations, it is thought that it cannot provide the social reality and exposing the subject's implicit knowledge of the social. In this context, specific and subjective expansions of the subject can be provided and it is envisaged that subject problematic can be done intensively within the intermediate paradigm.

The interaction and dialogue that provides change will lead to the creation of a more 'democratic' CA on multiple grounds and the formation of a theory that is sensitive to diversity. It is expected that hegemonic relations in the institutional narrative of CA will be revealed by the methodological and epistemological approaches used and will contribute to the writing of the theory in the interpretation of reality by revealing the embedded and constructed specific subjectivities of the more valid and social.

The theoretical criticism of contemporary art initiatives (CAIs) is expected to strengthen the epistemological and ontological positions in the knowledge and political positions of

contemporary art initiatives in contemporary art and provide the basis for theoretical perspectives that can produce theoretical knowledge and politics about themselves.

The approach of FST to social theory with feminist sensitivity is expected to make use of the theoretical perspectives on the basis of feminist subject and structure, as it is expanding the scope both horizontally and deeply, or to engage in dialogue.

Specifically, the limited knowledge and applications of FST in the literature of Turkey, it was thought to be that the possibility of expanding the usage of the theory while increasing its visibility in the context of Turkey.

With the increasing diversity of CAIs, a contribution was made from the approach of FST towards theoretical knowledge written in this field, and it was envisaged that it would enrich the understanding of initiatives and their theoretical explanation at the level of knowledge and politics.

### **1.3.2. Expected Methodological Contributions of the Study**

Considering the interaction between the researcher and the researched in the field as a reference will be provided the criticism of dichotomy and the real knowledge of the subject will be revealed through interaction of the parties.

In the field of CA, it is thought that CAIs can be the founding subject of a new understanding of CA and those that will transform the capitalist CA. In this context, it was foreseen that by interacting with the participants, it would be possible to propose the construction of theoretical and practical grounds with a new perspective on the dominant CA field. For this purpose, it is thought that it is possible to reduce the traditional sovereign position of the academy by trying to formulate the questions from a feminist perspective, even within the academy.

The hegemonic art narrative, which does not consider the CAIs as transformative subjects as peripheral formations, will be able to comprehend the theoretical and specific methodological basis of the reality by revealing the knowledge and politicized reality through a field research based on the interaction with the CAIs members.

### **1.3.3. Expected Practical Contributions of the Study**

The theoretical knowledge developed on the knowledge and politics of CAIs approached on the basis of the FST will have the potential to lead to a possible transformation by questioning the positioning of all actors in the art environment within CA. By understanding that FST has a special locational position among feminist theories, it will be seen that intersectional-like concepts developed within the context of relational theory can be used in different theoretical positions in a social relationship with FST.

Deepening the questioning of the subject will strengthen the politics by increasing the activism in the writing of the knowledge of the subject's reality. In this context, CAIs will be able to test their own thoughts based on their reflections and self-reflections of their responses during the field work speeches, it will be possible for a feminist researcher who conducts an academic study and academy-based research to see that they cannot see on the theoretical basis of their knowledge or may become possible to see how they are evaluated as an external eye.

The research environment will also make practical contributions to the extent to which the researcher can use the theory competently and how much feminist arguments can be realized. In an academic dissertation to be written at the master's level, it will make a multi-faceted contribution to the experience of an inexperienced researcher in terms of academic research. An important dimension of this contribution will be that the experiences experienced in the academic field and those that are hidden or neutralized will be written with self-experience, and the problems that the researchers who write

academic thesis may have will be expressed more clearly and contribute to gaining a different awareness.

#### **1.4. Structure of the Thesis**

This thesis consists of six chapters and sub-chapters. In the first chapter, a brief introduction to the theoretical query of the thesis is made and the discussions of the selected topic and the theory within the scope of the literature are tried to be summarized. Here, the historical development of the CAIs and the theoretical sources it is tried to be mentioned and the development and institutionalization of contemporary art are explained at the theoretical level. Mentioning the level of organization of contemporary art in Turkey, the adaptation and contradiction of CAIs in Ankara to the general profile of Turkey are mentioned. Taking into account the divergence of the Ankara initiatives within themselves, the opinions developed for them were expressed. In the following subtitle, the methodology of the thesis and the research problematic are presented. The methodological reference of the theory of feminist standpoint in the context of the study of CAI problematic is examined, the sub-headings questioned in the research are described. In the sub-headings regarding the expected contribution of the thesis, theoretical, methodological and practical potential contributions to the thesis are tried to be expressed. The areas and contents that are thought to contribute to both FST, initiatives and contemporary art in general are expressed.

In the second part, the theoretical basis of the thesis is tried to be explained. The theoretical ground formed on the basis of FST was tried to be explained with the expansions and paradoxes of the theory. The conceptualization stages of art as a social institution are aimed to be explained on the basis of intersectionalities of disciplines. Finally, it is tried to emphasize the collective organization of CAIs, which are civil fields, and their historical specificities in art.

In the third chapter, adaptation of FST methodology as a methodological approach in the field scale is tried to be explained within the scope of subjective experiences and relationships. Concerning the methodology of FST, the limitations of the field domain, experienced as a researcher, were tried to be explained. At the end of the field, the experiences were recorded with various methods and this information was tried to be transferred in the text.

In the fourth chapter, the developments of CA and CAIs in Turkey's particularity are tried to be explained on the basis of historical and specificities of contextual peculiarities of Turkey. Turkey's economic, political and cultural specific locations have been tried to be clarified on its local basis and the relations with the global.

In the fifth chapter, qualitative analysis of the knowledge obtained specifically from the field is carried out, by combining the field findings with the theoretical interpretation of the field, a critical interpretation of CAIs was made on the basis of FST. Accordingly, field knowledge has not fully met the theoretical expectations, but also revealed important realities of the knowledge and politics of CAIs.

In the Sixth Conclusion Section, theoretical and methodological limitations have been expressed and evaluations have been made regarding the knowledge and politics of the CAIs. Although it is thought that Ankara has a significant art potential, it is observed that the knowledge and politics potential of the CAIs in general is very low at the CAI level. In this regard, although art initiatives that are considered as transformative active subjects/agencies do not make knowledge and politics inquiries as expected, problems have been observed about the radicality of the relationship they have entered into with politics.



## **CHAPTER 2**

### **FEMINIST THEORY, INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF ART AND ART INITIATIVES**

#### **2.1. Feminist Praxis and Social Theory**

The forms of organization of capitalist societies transform the knowledge in terms of quality and quantity by developing original methods for the production, distribution and use of knowledge. Capitalist and advanced capitalist societies make use of the transformative power of knowledge -in a sense, from knowledge and politics coordination - to ensure the continuity and reproduction of capitalism. In this sense, conservative and reformist knowledge and politics maintains the order of capitalism and leads to the conclusion of this interaction in favor of capitalism in every new form of society in its spatial and temporal context. Breaking the continuity of capitalism and paving the way for radical knowledge and politics production seem to be directly linked to the relationship society has with the concepts of knowledge and politics. In the organization of capitalist society, in the elimination of the exploitation of labor, the concept of class consciousness in the orthodox context carries important clues for the contemporary knowledge and politics to be produced at the most fundamental level. In this dialectical relationship, the 'knowledge' produced / emerged in favor of labor also makes possible the transformation. Similarly, the radical production of institutional and non-institutional knowledge in the transformation of capitalist society, when considered together with politics, can lead to the conceptualization of capitalism as a system open to transformation.

Scientific knowledge that will be produced in the academy has an important potential in the formation of the knowledge set that ensures the continuity of capitalism institutionally. Higher education institutions, organized within the framework of neoliberal policies and producing knowledge, instrumentalize themselves as stakeholders of the system.

Paradoxically, it contributes to the improvement of the system by co-ordinating the methodological and epistemological processes followed by the scientific knowledge produced while referring to scientific practices. However, the transformation of this system, in which the relations of exploitation are increasing and deepening day by day, can change direction with the change of the parameters referenced by scientific knowledge. The qualitative and quantitative development of scientific knowledge sensitive to the society and the individual can be made possible through the political reorganization of the basin of knowledge produced in society in epistemological terms. Feminist praxis plays a critical role in changing the direction of this organization. Feminist politics and the production of knowledge have the potential to enable the establishment of new social relations by changing the capitalist knowledge that presents an unequal and exploitative, form of life contrary to human 'nature', through the establishment of new and sensitive conceptual relations. The organization of capitalist knowledge production, which is not limited to scientific knowledge, also shapes the accumulation of everyday and intellectual knowledge. Not only does it draw the boundaries of everyday and intellectual life, but it also directs its knowledge and keeps societies in the grip of capitalist knowledge. Feminist radical knowledge and politics can reveal the authenticity and reality of the individual in which the capitalist system is trying to suppress and distort, by methodological-and epistemologically related- methods. In this way, the organization of capitalist knowledge, which is patched on the individual and believed to be her/his knowledge, can be shaken.

The understanding of the relationship that scientific, everyday and intellectual knowledge enters with capitalism can be understood through different combinations in different contexts. These knowledge sets are transformed by realizing their own movements along with social change. In this context, the definition of each set of knowledge can also be expanded, narrowed, or intersectional. These changes are not unidirectional / linear but change depending on time, condition, location and similar positions. In this respect, the subjectivity and specificity of the knowledge sets compose important inquire areas.

The social and spatial-temporal conditions in which the capitalist system and order began to organize, and their intersection, coincide with the conditions on which the social sciences, which produce the knowledge and theoretical projections of the social and the related ones in the process of the emergence and development of social theory, refer to the acceptance as a science. On a disciplinary basis, social sciences contribute to the stratification of social theory by producing different critical or relational / intersectional theoretical knowledge. The theoretical knowledge produced differs in paradigmatic aspects. Knowledge produced on the basis of different paradigms is separated separately or as a whole with reference to the paradigm to which it is based on epistemological, methodological and ontological foundations. Considering this context, the approaches of classical and contemporary / late modern theories that emphasize scientific knowledge in the production and quality of knowledge and postmodern theories that bring criticism and / or rejection to science and open the tension between daily knowledge and scientific knowledge differ. This discussion includes not only the problem of epistemology, but also the methodological and ontological problems. The methodological dimensions of reaching or revealing knowledge also differentiate within themselves and transform the content of knowledge. Ontological assumptions compose the basis for the formation of problematics and social knowledge to be produced. Epistemological, methodological and ontological inquiries also vary when considered with different social paradigmatic perspectives. These parameters, which are the

constituent elements of scientific theory in modernity, gain different contents and meanings in postmodernity and relational paradigms. The development of different paradigmatic views and the knowledge generated on different paradigmatic bases can be said to be advanced views with reference to classical / orthodox modernity. These ideas, based on criticism or rejection of classical modernity, have led to the production of different knowledge. The ontological, epistemological and methodological view of classical modernity, objective scientific knowledge based on positivist science understanding, based on essentialist, universal / generalist and rational fundamental assumptions that refer to universal laws, led to the finding of meaning within the structure and determination of the subjectivity within the structure. Paradigmatic perspectives that criticize classical modernity have adopted a liberating attitude by criticizing this deterministic relationship between subject and structure.

From a cyclical and paradigmatic point of view, the Feminist theoretical perspective has emerged critically within the social theory in the general sense of the methodological assumptions of classical modernity in the production of scientific knowledge.

Based on the emphasis on objectivity of scientific modernity, the assumption that politics, more generally subjectivity, adversely affects scientific knowledge and cannot be a source of scientific knowledge, is thought to contribute critically to the development of Feminist knowledge and politics, scientific knowledge and scientific method.

This methodological and epistemological critique has led to the initiation of the radical critique of the classical modernist positivist scientific 'prejudices' on the evaluation of knowledge and politics as two incontrovertible phenomena.

In the theoretical conception of the idea of modernity, the politics, which is thought to lead to the distortion of objective values considered essential in the formation of

knowledge, is carried to the scientific field by the effort of feminist theory and politics, and it is important to show the visibility of the social reality of women and how it is possible to make possible change with the different dimensions of this visibility. The social reality of women, which makes it necessary to think together knowledge and politics, reveals the necessity of choosing both, not one of both parameters, in producing knowledge and politics in order to eliminate the existing social inequality. As with any social reality, there are different paradigmatic perspectives in the social theory of understanding, explaining and changing the social reality of women. The ontological, methodological, and epistemological differentiation of these paradigmatic perspectives in the way that they deal with women and the relations it enters with social institutions is obviously guiding the reflection of women's reality and feminist politics. Even if paradigmatic approaches differ on a theoretical basis, two criteria, including all paradigms, appear to be important for understanding, explaining, and changing the social position of women. These are knowledge and politics.

There are separate approaches to feminist knowledge and politics within feminist theory and politics. Modernist, contemporary modernist, postmodernist and relational feminist theory offer different approaches to the duality of knowledge and politics. However, in feminist knowledge and politics, the understanding of the feminist subject and the change of its unequal social position can be explained in the most meaningful way with FST in contemporary modernity theory.

Understanding the issue of women's knowledge and politics in contemporary manner calls for acknowledging Feminist Theories and Feminist movements' changes and divergencies in their accumulations. These accumulations in feminist praxis are not unified and total, but historically specific, partial, embedded and contingent.

## **2.2. Modernity Theory, Feminist Modernity Theory and Politics**

Feminist theory and politics emerged in modernity in the late 18th and 19th centuries with a central focus on women. Feminist theory can be said that politics has an important place in the formation of knowledge since it is a view that activism is the source of it. Feminist activism emerged with a liberal thought in the face of the social and political situation created by the inequality of men and women in society, which developed by using feminist theory. Of course, this unequal position and questioning of men and women in society is based before the history of the movement. However, the conceptualization of this unequal position as a collective political struggle contributed to the foundation of knowledge and politics on feminism, and to the critical (or partial use) of other modernist schools as a reflection of modernity. Feminist activism, which is the source of feminist theory, can be thought of as the first wave, namely the feminist politics of the late nineteenth century and the second wave of feminist activism that developed after the 1960s. Liberal thoughts and liberal understanding of modern democracy developed with the formation of modern capitalist societies paradoxically position the woman as a subject in its doctrine as an individual does not fulfill her rights and demands in society on the basis of equality. While the first wave feminist activism focused on the public sphere, it developed a politics based on theoretical texts that problematized the existence of women limited to the private sphere in the public-private sphere, and made demands based on women's missing rights of choice and property-like (McLaughlin, 2003, p.1). The fading of the first wave as a political movement and the emergence of the second wave movement, with the differentiation of demands and focus of thought, focuses on establishing a public-private relationship between the feminist movement and the second wave movement and expands the field of inquiry. In the public sphere, the second wave of feminism, where women's rights struggles as a subject, and in the private sphere, the conditions in which women's production and reproduction are opened to question, are important in the context of their different conceptualizations and their ability to bring issues into feminist action (McLaughlin,

2003, p.1). Additions to feminist literature and movement... included sexuality, reproduction, domestic labor and domestic violence. Again, during the second wave of a rich body of feminist theoretical ideas developed, closely linked to the activities of the Women's Liberation Movement ”(McLaughlin, 2003, p.1).

Feminist theory peculiar and shares classical modernist understandings in various ways. To begin, Feminist theory in modernist understanding as being critical realist like Orthodox Marxism which is influenced by, bases its premises on Modernity's main assumptions of Rationalism, Universalism and Essentialism.

Modernist feminist theory outsets its arguments through methodological problematizations of classical/orthodox science approach of modernist schools. Unlike Orthodox Marxist understanding and positivist and interpretative schools, modernist feminist theory challenges the unit of analysis of modernity in terms of gender. According to modernist feminist understanding, woman and man are two different analytical categories in social analysis. Challenging the unit of analysis, although partially substantiated by feminist philosophers in modernity, virtually is a claim of criticisms of modernity's theoretical understanding. Asserting woman's difference as analytical category tenderly objects epistemology of modernity so to ontology. However, this is not efficiently substantiated by modernist feminist theory. By the same token, this basic premise of modernist feminist theory is jointly accepted by the sub-theoretical categories in it. Liberal, Radical, Socialist, and Marxist Feminist Theories are all gender-based, dualistic and science-based approaches. However, the arguments and political propositions of each one are based on different grounds.

Furthermore, modernist feminist understanding is totalistic. Although it is composed of plural feminist approaches, its repertoire represents itself as a single feminism. It unifies different feminist approaches into one single definition with all their partial and specific attainments and objections.

Feminist politics in modernity is vigorously against patriarchal hegemony (namely patriarchy in modernist analysis) and dedicated itself to empowerment of women in economic and social life as unpaid reproductive labor and/or wage labor in capitalist society. Divergent fractions in feminist politics due to their specific approach to ontology of women and her labor, analysis of capitalist society, and neoliberal political economies engage in unified feminist politics with their specificities to emancipate woman from patriarchal hegemony together with creating an awareness towards the ideological operations in capitalist society.

### **2.3. Criticisms of Modernist Theory and Modernist Feminist Theory and Politics**

Afore-mentioned peculiarities of feminist theoretical and political approaches are profoundly criticized by contemporary modernist<sup>1</sup> and postmodernist perspectives of feminist theory<sup>2</sup> including political movements. Predominantly, modernist feminist understanding recognizes the main assumptions of modernity and being successors of them –may be unintentionally- in its theoretical and political approach. Despite these assumptions imply the hegemony of men which is fairly resisted by feminist theoreticians and activists, they are continued together with politics and theories of modernist feminism. Moreover, modernist feminist theory, like many modernist schools, focuses on methodology. Epistemological and ontological emphasises are not sufficiently supplied by modernist feminist understanding. Being dualistic, reductionist and totalistic are not positive connotations for contemporary modernist and postmodernist perspectives because of not explaining the social reality (specifically for

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the conceptualisation of ‘contemporary modernist perspectives’ referring to Mehmet Ecevit’s conceptualisation which deeply criticize modernist understanding but do not realize a paradigm shifting.

<sup>2</sup> Theoretical criticisms of social theory in contemporary modernist and postmodernist perspectives can also be included to this argument. So, it is not specific to contemporary modernist and postmodernist feminist theory alone. I did not include these argumenets due to specific focus of this study to feminist theory.



women) in expected manner. Specifically postmodernist feminism criticizes modernist feminism and also contemporary modernist feminism<sup>3</sup> to conserve the scientific approach to social reality.

Feminist political movement has also been criticized. Such politics is criticized as dualistic and reductionist by contemporary modernist theories and postmodernist approaches. It focuses only to dualistic character of the conceptualisation of the social in terms of man and woman and eliminates diversities and specificities of women within them. Additionally, the hegemony is plural. So, it is undesirable to attribute the word patriarchy to single signifier. Further, the subject of political movement is not single so not woman. There are subjects who are against the plural hegemony of social. Since modernity is not experienced in similar terms, its interpretation thus differentiate.

#### **2.4. Postmodernist and Postmodern Feminist Thoughts and Politics**

Before explaining why contemporary modernist feminist positioning, specifically Feminist Standpoint Theory is more eligible explanatory stance to understand women's knowledge and politics. Postmodernist feminisms, like all structural postmodern positionings, uses language as a base to understand social reality. The semiotic analysis of reality creates relative, dispersed, multiple realities. In structural and poststructural analysis of reality, structures are deconstructed and subject is decentered. No single center but multiple centers constitute the main focus of the discursive understanding. Equality of difference gains importance. So the subject of feminist politics has changed. The categories of sex besides gender regain its importance. The coalition politics become crucial to revolt against multiple hegemonies of neoliberal political systems. Post-structuralist Approaches to LGBTTTQQAAP (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, queer, intersex, asexual, ally, pansexual) identities become critical identical

---

<sup>3</sup> It will be clarified in the next part that, contemporary modernist position will be criticizing the scientific approach deeply as an answer to charges of postmodernist paradigm.

positionings that challenge gender understanding(s) of feminisms which are in and beyond postmodernist feminisms.

## **2.5. Criticisms of Postmodern and Postmodern Feminist Thought and Politics**

Postmodernist feminist thoughts leave no room for ‘feminism(s)’ at all. If the ‘analytical’ category of woman/women which feminist theory bases its arguments as a subject(s) of inquiry, deconstructed or dispersed, there would be no concept of feminism to sustain the women’s knowledge loaded with politics in its historical aggregations. There would be also a danger of not explaining the material conditions of feminist theor(-ies)y and politics if postmodernist language analysis has taken to be considered. To understand the value of feminist contributions to social theory and politics in general in terms of understanding and exhibiting the reality which is represented falsely in a capitalist society, there should be causal explanations of why and how this occurs. This causal explanation however can be relative, locational, contextual, situational, contingent and embedded in the specificities of subjectivities of subjects and of structures.

## **2.6. Feminist Standpoint Theory**

Feminist Standpoint Theory (FST) emerged in 1970s and 1980s as theory – especially as an epistemological and methodological criticism- which radically criticizes the Orthodox Modernity’s basic assumptions. (Harding,2004b; Cockburn,2015)

FST has developed as critique to not involving the politics in the process of production of knowledge that leads to risk of ruin the objectivism in the production of knowledge while emphasizing the importance of positivist science understanding’s objectivism in the production of scientific knowledge (Harding,2004d)

According to FST, production of scientific knowledge involves relations of power. (Hennesy,1993) So, knowledge which is thought as objective is not created as objective and if only the knowledge which will be set with the right politics will reflect the reality of the knowledge. In that sense, FST claims the necessity of thinking politics and knowledge together. It can be said that this theory criticizes other paradigmatic stances beside modernist theory while handling politics and knowledge together not only in describing the reality but in the context of explaining and revolting.(Jaggar,2004)

Although Feminist Standpoint Theorists do not consider themselves to be pure standpoint theorists, this citation has taken this name as a result of the fact that in the feminist interpretation of the theory, Harding (2004) gathered thinkers and activists who dealt with the feminist interpretation of the standpoint theory under a theoretical concept.

FST not only limited to social sciences, but also contributed to the development of the knowledge of natural sciences by criticizing and applying them with the contributions of Feminist Natural Scientists (Hoffman,2001; Rose,2004;Roy,2008).Although FST was formed critically by the Positivist and Interpretivist schools at the beginning stage, it was seen that the theorists who were especially close to Postmodern theory in the development of the theory were fed by the Interpretivist school, especially the Weberian interpretation.

In addition to being formed by the contributions of different disciplines and criticisms of feminist thinkers and activists with a different paradigmatic perspective, FST carries traditional aspects as it includes theoretical theorist modernist and postmodernist theoretical elements. Positions between postmodernity and modernity paradigms and sometimes close to one or the other may constitute paradoxicalities of the theory. Particularly, different epistemological and methodological approaches in the development of different schools lead to the use of conflicting ideas and arguments

because of their adoption of different themes in knowledge and policy production. This leads to the perception of a traditional, complex and eclectic contemporary modernist theory ground.

In spite of these contradictions, in order to develop different feminist knowledge and theories of different schools, efforts to create areas that have practical benefits and social and intersectional and dialogue about social issues can be considered as contributions of FST to theory and politics.

These theories and activists, historically and connected to the wave metaphor, including the second wave feminists, bring both theoretical and political criticism to the schools / schools of modernity and to the Orthodox Feminist view, which is also conceptualized as the first wave.

Ontologically, the FST's unit of analysis is individual because it does not reject modernity despite all its expansions, deepening and criticism, and because it is an in-modern criticism. However, since the individual's handling focuses on the specificity of the subjectivity of the individual, unlike modernity schools, the differences of individuals are based. This is not a unified and structured understanding of the individual, but a foundation that takes into account the multiple ontological positions of the individual. These multiple positionalities indicate that each individual is ontologically different individuals and that they are rich subjects that cannot be grasped by a general ontological understanding. Therefore, ontologically based epistemology of ontologically differentiated individuals also varies. In this context, feminist subjects are too extensive to be understood only by being reduced to the understanding of unified women. Although feminist activism and theory are tried to be defended and argued that women are different subjects than men in the emergence stage of modernity, with the development of feminist theories and activisms, the feminist understanding of the subject is shaped as the theoretical and political theory that includes women, but also

leads to different identities and ontological positions. In this context, it is possible to construct feminist subjects criticizing universality and essentialism. Orthodox modernist feminists' efforts to defend / support that women are different from men and, to a limited extent, do so coincide with the FST's attitude to the plurality of feminist subjects by theorists who are close to second-wave feminists. In this context, the thinkers who are close to postmodern feminism try to criticize this pluralistic structure and strengthen the ontology of the theory (Kourany,2009;Rouse, 2004;Hartsock,2004a, Harnois, 2010, Narayan,2004).

Since the thinkers located close to modernity could not bring in-depth criticism to the rationality and ontological conception of Modernity, these criticisms of the works of the theorists who maintained the modernist perspective were limited in theory. However, theorists emphasized pluralism, difference, and activism (but not explicitly in their debates on subjectivity and specificity), arguing close to the arguments of postmodernity, and offered methodological (and epistemological) propositions to criticize ontology and rationality (Rouse,2009).

The emphasis on specificity, which the FST deals with in trying to understand the specificities of the subjectivities of different subjects, does not show that the subject of the FST is in the indivisible understanding of the individual. The subject of the FST should be understood as a group. However, this group is a group understanding that includes differences, and is not universal and the essentialist (Pels,2004; New,1998).

In FST, group conceptualization as a subject can involve and expand without creating a decisive and unified structure. Critically criticizing the hegemonic constructivism of the structure and the duality of modernity, the FST deeply criticizes the determination of individuals by the structure. In this context, they approached the specificities of the subjectivities of subjects and thus the discussion of activism.

However, the fact that the structure is protected in spite of the criticism of the relationship between the structure and the subjects prevents it from having a mere actor discussion. Although the emergence of FST is mainly based on the epistemological basis, the position of the theory critically, especially in modernity, has led to intensive methodological criticism besides the opening to postmodernity.

Therefore, it was possible to provide the epistemology of FST with the methodology to support it. Methodologically, FST values the oppressed knowledge by revealing the mechanisms of power through interaction.

The FST opposes the submission of knowledge as general valid experiences by subjecting subjectivities to suppression and passing through the so-called objective understanding of science, as in the positivist understanding of science. FST takes care of interpreting the repeated questioning of experience, including the research process, depending on an intersubjective situation and condition and revealing differences.

Experience (subjectively or theoretically group experience) appears to be an important beginning in the production of knowledge and politics, and a breakdown of the power of theoretical / conceptual hegemony. Contrary to what is stated theoretically, the conceptual hegemonies of disciplines and the science / knowledge production policies are attempted to be overcome in FST methodology.

Rather than a sterile and isolated understanding of knowledge production, it underlines the extent to which politics, social influence and conditions are involved in the process of knowledge generation, and how distant the theories are supposed to reflect the reality of subjects.

To this end, FST provides the subjects with the 'tools' to write their own reality. In understanding what the social is, it deals with causality in the context of theoretical

perspectives that are located close to orthodox modernity and in particular to Marxist understanding in modernity criticism.

The explanation of the emphasis on causality is not sufficient to describe the facts, but because of the purpose of demonstrating the importance of historical material conditions in the formation of facts and developing appropriate policies. To show the reasons and results of the phenomenon, to analyze its hegemonic relations and to reach its current knowledge through feminist politics. Emphasis on causality is not the only and common methodology used in the FST. In this theory, it is tried to show the nature of intersectionality and interlocking by emphasizing the emphasis on causality in the theoretical position close to postmodernity, highlighting difference, specificity and pluralism.

In this context, to the smallest part of the cases discussed, the focus is on the ways of deepening and interrelation. This association is the moment when it is observed that it is located closer to the Interpretive understanding of the FST rather than the Critical Realist understanding. The political understanding of the FST, which is attempted to be shaped between causality and pluralism, is also guided by methodological and epistemological connections. The arguments of the FST, which are located close to modernity, do not place a duality-based patriarchal emphasis on man, such as Orthodox Modernist Feminist theory and politics, but oppose hegemony.

However, in this opposition, the political subject may still seem to be essentialist and universal, albeit critically, in terms of the approach of the group as 'the common policy of the same political demand of all oppressed' through the policy of the subject that hegemony crushes.

In addition, the feminist standpoint theorists, which are located close to modernity, suggest that despite all the oppressed subjects because the movement is feminist, they act with an understanding based on women's emancipation.

However, theorists who are located close to the paradigm of postmodernity show that different subjects within the group are trying to make a coalition policy with different demands of knowledge and policy on the basis of knowledge and politics.

In this context, feminist subjects, where all differences are included, are understood not only to be reduced to women; In a sense, postmodernity within the FST makes a significant opening in terms of methodology as well as epistemological pluralism. The intersection of intersectionality provides a rich analysis opportunity in the context of including different causalities and conclusions. However, this situation is weak in terms of showing historical material grounds.

The methodological orientation in the formation of knowledge and policy of the FST emerges from epistemological positions. Therefore, the positions of feminist subjects in society and their relations in this position provide the perspective and tools that reveal how they should produce knowledge and make policies.

It would be descriptive to discuss epistemological positivities that underlie the methodology of this theory under certain headings- strong objectivity, oppressed knowledge, epistemic advantage, epistemic authority(Harding,2004d).



### **2.6.1. Feminist Standpoint Epistemologies: Epistemic Privilege and Epistemic Authority**

Harding mentions three epistemologies in his 1983 essay on feminist epistemologies. These epistemologies are Feminist Empiricism, FST and Postmodern Feminism. Stating that there are differences between these epistemologies, Feminist Empiricism as theoretical approach coincides with orthodox modernist understanding, while FST's critique of modernity corresponds to epistemological approach with postmodern paradigm reference. Emphasizing the importance of politics as well as epistemologies, Harding conceptualizes the political part by conceptualizing it as Feminism. An important point in Harding's handling is that she still accepts the ontology of modernity here, and that there is no emphasis on subjectivity. In the development of post-1990 FST, we see an attempt to establish a connection between feminist epistemologies. We try to establish a link between feminist empiricism and FST by emphasizing the importance of FST. In a sense, this kind of handling can be said to be a sign of a hybrid science critique and an attempt to integrate politics into knowledge (the oppressed knowledge) (Intemann, 2010).

Harding emphasizes that integration of politics and knowledge is necessary to make better and more objective (strong objectivity) science. According to Harding, if FST and politics of it are used, the objective understanding of objective science is criticized and replaced by feminist values. According to Harding, the theory of standpoint strategically chooses the questions and answers about social reality and makes a choice among them, since the methodological approach brought to it is also important for this epistemological attainment. (2004) Considering that some spatial theoretical explanations are more valid for feminist theory on the basis of politics and knowledge, others are preferred over theoretical positions of other positional positions. The political aim pursued here is closely related to the objectivity of the standpoint (Crasnow, 2013). But this approach is criticized for the partiality of knowledge. Rather than being more

objective, reflecting differences and understanding that there can never be holistic objective knowledge is considered critical.

### **2.6.2. Perspective and Achievement Theories**

Another paradigmatic position that needs to be emphasized in the understanding of FST is the separation of FSTs on the adoption of Perspective standpoint and Achievement standpoint approaches. This positioning is closely related to Epistemic Advantage and Epistemic Authority. (Garcia-Selgas,2004;Janack,1997)

Achievement standpoint approach can be described as a return to Marxist roots. It should be noted here that the subject of the FST is the group rather than the individual. In this respect, although the specificity of the subjectivity of the subject is emphasized, it is important to consider the subject as a group in terms of emphasizing feminist politics. But this group understanding is not holistic and hierarchical. Differences of subjects may coexist on a politics basis. Regardless of the differences, politics is the point that unites them, but political gains are considered possible through group achievement (Harding,2009).

Hennesy (1993) emphasized the necessity of demonstrating the material ground when combining empirical experience with theory, emphasizing the importance of material social experience by advancing from the Marxist foundation, because it is not possible to go beyond the description of what is experienced without these grounds. It seems important to show why, rather than reveal why, rather than how.

### **2.6.3. Feminist Standpoint Theory and Women's Standpoint Theories**

The ontological interrogation of the FST is limited in relation to its methodological and epistemological critique. As a contemporary modernist theory, FST also brings radical

criticism to the hypothesis of universality and essentialism of modernity, but it cannot bring fundamental criticism to the understanding of rationality. The FST emphasized the partiality of knowledge by bringing radical criticism to the positivist conception of science. In addition to the ontological inquiry of knowledge, it also brought a radical critique to the positivist conception of science in terms of questioning the position and experience of the subject (eg the researcher) in the practice of scientific knowledge. The Feminist Standpoint Theorists (for example, Hekman), who were influenced by postmodernity theory, think that the expansions of the Interpretive School (especially Weber's), instead of the Marxist basis, could bring important expansions to the questioning of women. It should be noted here that there are significant differences in the basics of Realist school and Interpretive school. Perhaps one of the most important is the naming of this theory. Realist school emphasizes feminist roots, while interpretive school places the woman in the foreground. This means that two separate nomenclatures, FST or women's standpoint theory (WST), are based on different schools (Haraway,2004; Hekman,2004a; Collins,2004b).

Based on this idea, it is thought that in the relation of knowledge and politics, the emphasis on politics in WST is lowered than the FST nomenclature. The thought to be revealed in the naming of WST is to reveal the richness of the subject (the originality of the subjectivity of the subject) by deepening the subject's understanding emphasized by the theory.

In addition, the WST's criticism of the FST is that the 'woman' subject of feminist theory is insufficient to contain the plurality of subjects. The women experience, the claim that it should not be generalized as essentialist, draws attention to the emphasis on the difference between subjects. Although postmodern thought is criticized, it is emphasized that it may provide important expansions in terms of hegemony question. The theoretical interpretations of the WST advocates include the claim that policy will be made on a postmodern basis. The independence of women from the modernist-based

analysis as a social category and its approach to the postmodern basis includes the separation of a theory based on it and its Western-based, middle-class and white male-based thought, and thus the woman's ability to make her own and unique narrative possible (Bracke and De La Bellacasa, 2004; Crasnow,2009).

#### **2.6.4. Situated Subjective Epistemologies**

The contribution of black feminists to theory is important in the development of FST. The oppressed consciousness makes it possible, theoretically, to reinterpret social reality. But this consciousness is achieved through political struggle, not automatically. In this context, there is a distinction between Epistemic Advantage and Epistemic Authority. The epistemic advantage is interpreted as the consciousness that the oppressed consciousness automatically gains from the position of the subjects, while the Epistemic authority asserts that the oppressed consciousness is acquired as a result of feminist politics. The oppressed knowledge is considered to be more inclusive since it also includes the knowledge of the oppressed and the oppressor. But this is also criticized by the discussion of partiality of knowledge and partiality of situational, spatial and contingency (Collins,2004a; Harding,2004c; Hartsock,2004b; Smith,2004;Hekman,2004b)

The nature of the institutional systematic oppression phenomenon that constitutes the oppression conditions is an interlocking and the oppression phenomenon is embedded in it in this conception (Wylie,2004,Rolin,2009;Farganis,1986. In this context, the experience of oppression is possible by understanding the solidified and systematic state of the inter-institutional relations and ensuring that the knowledge about it as well as the elimination of this oppression is clearly emphasized.

## **2.7. Institutionalisation of Art: Relations of Institutions and Art**

The construction of social and capitalist organization of society on the basis of modernity is possible with institutionalization and creation of relations of institutions and smooth functioning. This organizing and institutionalization is beneficial of the order of society while constructing the social in the context of functionalism.

Functionalism of institutions, the ways of organizing of them was understood by different disciplines and modernity schools based on different theoretical foundations. Functionalism of institutions and its criticism in specific to art is problematic because of inquiry of subject which is hard in understanding and positioning on the basis of modernity.

### **2.7.1. Institutional Theory of Art**

Understanding this field is not only based on philosophy. At this point, the connection of art with life necessitates it to be handled on the basis of different disciplines. The effort to make art as an institution requires an understanding of the ontology and epistemology of art and its approach to it with different methodologies. The fact that art is a subject activity makes it immanent in the social. In this context, the meaning and understanding of the social and the meaning of art can be considered as parallel phenomena. The methodologies developed for the understanding of art are understood through the interdisciplinary character of multi-disciplinary methodologies and the intersection of these disciplines. In this context, art is a comprehensive and multi-dimensional institution that cannot be understood with a single discipline - especially aesthetics and / or art theories. Although the historical development of art does not progress linearly, the context is specific and historically probable / contingent / conditional and socially embedded. In particular, the changing social organization with capitalist production also regulates the ways in which the subjects and institutions that make up the social are

associated with the creation of a different social reality. Expressing and explaining art as a cultural institution gives an important dimension to the explanation of the relationship between institutions and subjects and social reality embedded in the social.

The emergence and development of art as a field of expression of culture can be traced back to prehistoric times, in which man began to shape his life. However, it is a different conceptualization and function of art in comparison to the previous existence of art in human being living as a social being and socializing with the related organizations.

In the process that developed until the beginning of modernity, art, which specifically influenced the socio-economic development of society in the Middle Ages, was considered as a branch of craft. The guild systems and the art and craft approach based on the master-apprentice relationship were considered as important organizations in the formation of the product to be exchanged. In these organizations, there is no distinction between art and craft. In this context, art is thought to be functional. The artistic and craft understanding developed in the guilds started to be considered as two separate activity areas with the rational narrative developed by modernity with the Enlightenment idea and pointing to the separation and autonomy of the institutions. Although art and craft were positioned as two different fields, it was thought that art developed a different and special artisan position and thus produced a more specific and specific product than a product based on craft. This particular and specific product was not necessarily a craft-based and reproducible product, but was inherently different in the sense that it contained different specific subjectivities in each production.

The difference in the sense of the art-produced object from any product of use value made it different and special from any object that can be used aesthetically in daily life. The object is shaped on an aesthetic basis with the development of a different sensation in addressing and perceiving a dimension or different combinations of senses and understanding of reality. Accordingly, the craftsman and artist subjects also differed and the artist and art were positioned at a higher level hierarchically than the craft.

The organization of the modern society on the basis of economy and politics, the institutions constituting the social infrastructure and superstructure on the basis of the understanding of the understanding of the expression expressed in the institutional basis of art in the cultural field, on the basis of the analysis unit could not make sense of the artist could not make due to the subject. Accordingly, the ontology of the artist as a subject remains ambiguous as the producer of the art object that finds expression in aesthetics. It is assumed that the artist creates the art object, which he creates aesthetically layered from the everyday object of use value, in a way that other subjects cannot reveal ontologically even by imitation. Modern social theory, which cannot explain the art object and the artist subject, has reduced art to these two concepts - aesthetics and creativity. Therefore, it can be said that art has a reduced social understanding in modern narrative.

However, the inconsistency of art, which cannot be explained with this reductionist view, is inconsistent with the social understanding of modernity, has led to inquiries about whether art can be told or not. The organization of the modern industrial society as a corporate society and the institutional-based approach of understanding the social make it necessary to analyze it on the institutional basis in understanding the sociality of art as an institution. However, the institutionalization of art as a social institution has been examined differently at the level of the components and scope of art as an institution, the level of entry with other institutions, that is, the relationship with the social. The history of the social corporate narrative of art has been tried to be formed by associating the subjective and specific perspectives of different disciplines in the period from the effort of explaining art as an institution to the development of contemporary art with social.

Until the period defined as an institution in modernity, art has been tried to be explained with the sub-discipline of analytical philosophy. The Representational Theory of Art, Neo-representationalism, The Expression Theory, Formalism, Neo-formalism and

Aesthetic Theories of Art are philosophical theories that define art and explain its ontology until the discussion of institutionalization of art. None of these theories defined art as an institution (Carroll,1999).

Neo-Wittgensteinism, which emerged later, proceeded through the definition of non-art instead of the effort of defining art, since the breadth of art at this point did not make it possible to define it. One of the criticisms of Neo-Wittgensteinism, the Theory of Institutionalization of Art, initially freed art from the discussions of aesthetics and creativity, thus enabling art to be defined as a social institution (Carroll,1999). Danto's conceptualization of the World of art, has been accepted as one of the 'Old Institutionalization' theories in the context of the lack of a broad scope of the social. The conceptualization of the art system developed by Dickie within the scope of 'New Institutionalization' theories, which was formed by the inclusion of the social in the problematicization (the addition of economy and politics), enabled art to be defined as a social institution (Carroll,1999; Powell and Dimaggio,1991).

In the period of postmodernity debates, the new institutionalization theorists who explained the social institution of art, brought the art-life interconnection of the question of postmodernity to art debates and made the institutionalization efforts almost spontaneous. The art 'institution' that creates a contradiction in the institutional analysis of Orthodox Modernity, the critics of the Orthodox Modernity approach, and the discussions of institutionalization of art and the institutionalization of art are placed in the social context.

### **2.7.2. A Subjective Criticism of Institutionalization of Art: Contemporary Art Initiatives: Avantgarde Theory of Art**

Although contemporary art initiatives, which are one of the forms of organization and expression of contemporary art, emerge on the basis of postmodernity and modernity



critiques on which contemporary art originates, it is important to form initiatives of contemporary art in the contemporary sense of the groupings that bring criticisms and oppositions to modern art during the modernity period.

These objections are important not only in terms of expanding the definition of art but also in changing and transforming the fields of artistic expression. The radical artistic opposition and criticism they bring to society and art in the conjunctural context in which they emerge is common in the context of their criticism of contemporary art initiatives against the institutionalization of contemporary art. Of course, contemporary art initiatives and avant-garde art groupings are very different in their formation, the ground on which they are based, paradigmatic understanding, artistic practices and similar fields. However, on the basis of criticism, on the basis of collective formations in art, they experience intersections with modernity. In this context, the avant-garde theory of art can be considered as an artistic perspective from which contemporary art initiatives can originate and engage in dialogue.

Avantgarde formations that emerged in the modernity period, brought criticism to the aesthetic understanding of modernity and made a social opposition on an aesthetic basis. Their realization of boundary aesthetic experiences in the aesthetic understanding of modernity (which expanded the concept of art object by incorporating the everyday object into the concept of aesthetic art object of modernity), incorporating the non-art into the art, has almost radical criticisms of the concept of modern aesthetics. Avantgarde ensembles, which opened the discussion of the liberating power of modern art to the subject and tried to strengthen the subjectivity of the subject by criticizing the institutions, tried to make an opening to the social by creating manifestos that criticize the institutionality of art and create a different aesthetic awareness. However, the criticisms that remain within the modernity at the aesthetic level have brought with them their inability to fully relate to society.

## **2.8. Art Initiatives and Civil Society: Intersections and Divergencies**

Contemporary art initiatives appear as civil organizations within contemporary art. These organizations constitute an epistemologically rich knowledge and policy making ground in that they can include artists, intellectuals (individuals from different occupational groups) and academics. These civilian contemporary art initiatives are distinguished from non-governmental organizations by their characteristics such as the aims of establishment, the forms of establishment and activities. However, among the founders of the cultural field, the state, capital and non-governmental organizations are organized outside the state and capital institutions and there is a closer position to civil society. Although differentiated from non-governmental organizations, they may also show intersections and similarities in terms of the forms and activities mentioned above. This similarity and difference can be understood on the basis of the specificities of the initiatives. As each civil society organization is differentiated, contemporary artist initiatives also differ from each other. However, this does not mean that there are no intersections on the basis of both civil society and initiative. Both groups can show intersections, similarities and differences depending on situational, contingent and conditions.

Art initiative conceptualization is a group, community and collectivity<sup>4</sup> that emerges in the context of taking an initiative in the cultural field and in particular in the field of art. This initiative has different epistemological and political character in terms of reception, context and content. These initiatives, taken directly or indirectly, are different from individual artists taking initiatives in the arts. This difference can only be understood in

---

<sup>4</sup> Among the different nomenclatures to define artist initiatives, alternative and art, emerging artist initiatives, grassroots, artist-run initiatives, artist-led initiatives, artist collective (s), artist cooperative (s), art initiatives, artist initiatives, artist-driven initiatives, The artist's organizations, arts based initiatives, art squat, community art, emerging artists, amateurs, independent artists, new collectivities, non-profit art organizations, not-for-profit art organizations, such as peripheral artists, public art initiatives are available. Although each of these uses seems to point to the same conceptualization (initiatives), they differ in their emphasis and paradigmatic references. Within the scope of the thesis, the preference of initiative conceptualization, which is widely used, is made considering the scope of the word..

the context of contemporary art in which art initiatives emerge, and in the context of their subjective and specific characteristics.

Initiatives of contemporary artists emerge as a form of anti-structural organization in which the collective production is based on the expression and organization of contemporary art. Modernist artistic groupings differ in terms of the way they are organized, the aims and activities of gathering.

Paradigmatically, contemporary art initiatives have a character that criticizes or rejects the paradigm of modernity based on the emergence of contemporary art. There is not a single contemporary art ontology and epistemology – and even methodology gibi and it can be said that contemporary art initiatives have a multiple character in terms of ontology and epistemology.

These different assemblies and differentiations enable variable policies and rich knowledge production. The rich and comprehensive association of contemporary art with the social broadens the definition and practices of contemporary art, and broadens the knowledge and policy of every element in contemporary art.

In this context, it does not seem possible to distinguish the beginning and end of civil contemporary art initiatives with strict limits. However, as mentioned earlier, it is a character that criticizes or rejects modern art, although it may have paradoxical features in terms of locality and context - in reference to contemporary art.

Although the activities of contemporary art initiatives include workshops, seminars, exhibitions, records and similar artistic activities on the basis of interdisciplinarity, the sharing, distribution, and similar material and intellectual requirements of these activities are carried out with their own resources and efforts.

## **2.9. Historical Specific 'Origins' of Contemporary Art Initiatives**

The emergence of contemporary art initiatives refers to contemporary art. In this respect, it creates distinctions in the paradigmatic context (postmodernity) with distinctive features from modern art collectives or groups. However, if a paradigmatic transition and continuity is mentioned between postmodernity and modernity, it can be said that the 'roots' or beginnings of contemporary art initiatives are formed in modern art groups.

The 'Salon des Indépendants (society of independent artist)' artist, composed of artists who were not taken into the places where art was exhibited in the 19th century, before the bourgeoisie developed against the church and aristocracy in art before the avant-garde modern art groups which were thought to be the roots of contemporary art initiatives. The group created an exhibition and moved the art from the patronage of the aristocracy and the church to the public space.

In the 20th century, modern avant-garde art groups developed in the art in response to the proliferation of movements with the understanding of modern aesthetics and the devastating effects of the First World War. In this context, modern art groups can be seen as the first proto-types of contemporary art initiatives due to collective organizations.

If this explanation is accepted, the formation of contemporary art initiatives, globally based on European and American references, such as Dada, Surrealism, Futurism, Suprematism emerged in the first half of the 1900s and 20th century art 'trends' and collectivity as a reference to the formations accepted It may be.

These avantgarde collectives that emerged in the 20th century in art can be regarded as collectives organized on the basis of modernity, historically and in the context of art

practices and intellectual references. These groups, which criticize modern art, take a seemingly paradoxical position within modernity in the context of rejecting aesthetics and bringing criticism to the rational subject. However, they should be considered as collectives or groups within modernity because they have not consistently criticized and accepted all of the basic assumptions of modernity.

In the context of the historical nomenclature of art, these groups, which are also considered as a movement, are organized differently from contemporary art initiatives, although it is thought that they are not a movement with current versions of social theory paradigms. These groups, predominantly formed around a manifesto with texts on the aims of the establishment and their artistic practices and 'ideals', are common in the context of the observation of the manifestation or definition of the purpose of the manifestation, although this is not common in the later established contemporary art initiatives. The majority of these groups collaborate on a disciplinary basis and are organized as a closed-core group.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

In the study, the methodology of FST is used which enables the qualitative research techniques. The methodology of FST brings rich epistemological outcomes.

#### **3.2. Qualitative Research**

In order to reach and produce scientific knowledge, different methodologies and methods are developed on different disciplinary basis, while different theoretical schools differ in methodological and methodological characteristics of knowledge (hence epistemology and ontology). These methods and methodologies as well as differentiating from each other in different two categories, they can be used intersectionally or relating in different ways. In general, qualitative and quantitative areas of research constitute two research approaches and principles that have relevant or different characteristics in accessing knowledge.

This study's thesis problematic is carried out by using the methodology of FST in which its qualitative research approach is within the Contemporary Modernity intermediate paradigm.

### **3.3. Methodology of Feminist Standpoint Theory**

Although FST-methodology acknowledges that politics is an important component in feminist knowledge production, the methods of this knowledge to be produced are critically approached to the orthodox modernist knowledge production method, positivist science.

They positively criticize the FSTs in their attempt to present the conditions of the production of scientific knowledge on a normal, neutral and objective basis by separating scientific knowledge from everyday science in a hierarchical, positivist, universal and rational superposition, and positivist understanding of science.

These theorists, who think that knowledge is never general and cannot be separated from subjectivity, think that knowledge is formed partially, embedded and subjectively. In this context, it does not constitute a hierarchical position between the researcher and the researcher, and is based on the fact that both parties enter the conditions of knowledge production and research on an interactive and subjective basis. The interacting researcher and the research makes it possible to avoid the dominant knowledge and to construct its own reality by revealing the specificities of the subjectivity during the research.

Interaction on a subjective basis, disrupting the hegemonic institutional knowledge and practices, and the implicit knowledge, experiences, everyday and intellectual knowledge, emotions and realities of the research process. In addition to this, unlike orthodox modernity knowledge production, this process prioritizes the inclusion of politics in the research process. In this context, the feminist political awareness between the researcher and the researcher while reaching the reality of the subject during the research provides the inclusion and revealing of the reality distorted by the hegemonic capitalist

knowledge production, the experience of the woman and the experiences within the scope of the feminist subject.

Although feminist political awareness is not an awareness that one can automatically grasp, depending on the position of the person, the interaction entered makes it possible. In addition, the research process, the creation of research questions and answers through interaction, and the effort to find their answers subjectively in a non-hierarchical order, pave the way for the conceptual hegemony imposed by theoretical knowledge to change, the flexible conceptualization that will establish the subject's own reality.

The subject and the institution involved in the practice of knowledge production interact with the reflective and the self-reflective, allowing them to be reinterpreted in terms of their position and reality. The relationship on the basis of subjectivity does not lead to the dissolution of the institution, but to re-interpret it on the basis of contemporary modernity in a different way.

FST-methodology minimizes the hegemony of the institution by revealing the specificity of subjectivity. In this way, transformative real knowledge opens the door to a new sociality and subject building process. This construction process varies depending on the situation, condition and location.

According to the FST, transformative knowledge production seems to be directly linked to the position of the constructor and the relationship it enters with politics.(Harding,2004) Any radical positioning that criticizes the practice of capitalist hegemonic knowledge production, not only at the border or crush, paves the way for the production of specific knowledge.



In this context, while the partiality of knowledge becomes the constituent components of feminist knowledge, the interaction that is introduced enables the politics to be revealed and feminist knowledge to gain motion.

The FST-methodology does not produce knowledge that is embedded only in subjectivity or only in the institution, but it is possible to create a position with outgoing within institutions and subjectivities, creating a similar position as 'outsider within', as Collins (2004b) suggests. To contribute to feminist epistemology. The subject, both indoors and outdoors, contributes to the formation of feminist knowledge by taking a methodological and epistemological position in view of the diversity of the partiality of knowledge, contrary to Collins's view.

The emphasis on difference seems to be important at this point. FST-methodologies are critical in that they can pave the way for the discovery of all differences. The inclusion of different perspectives in feminist knowledge, the inclusion of not only women's knowledge, but also of trans and queer knowledge, makes it possible to criticize dualities and essentialist epistemologies, making it possible to reach out to the real knowledge, by criticizing universality, and between the local and the singular and the universal (Hirschmann,2004; McCaughey,1993).

These rounds are important in that both universality and locality can be said to be important in the production of knowledge. It also provides important expansions in the context of the methodological activation of emotions-like subjectivities in the production of knowledge, criticism of rationality in a narrow sense, and criticism of the functioning practices of modernist rationality in general.

### **3.4. Research Design and Research Problem**

The experience, subjectivity, interaction and feminist politics emphasis mentioned in the FST's methodology have been tried to be considered as the main concepts active during the transfer of the process before, during and after the field process.

After defining the thesis subject and theoretical point of view, besides the epistemological and methodological criticisms brought by the FST to the orthodox modernist positivist understanding of the way the subject is studied, it advocates the coexistence of knowledge and politics, and argues that the scientific subject can be produced on the basis of political science and social sciences. They have a radical critique in terms of their relationship. In this context, this field order, which was directed towards the participants in the field and which took care to get the answers in interaction with them, was prepared by being critical of the positivist understanding of science and still sticking to the modernist science practice.

It should be noted here that the FST remained loyal to the scientific understanding of modernity, but criticized it extensively. Rather than adopting the traditional conceptualized and stereotyped conceptual dominant discourse of the questions that the FST foresees methodologically and which will affect the production of epistemological knowledge, the effort to ask new questions and interact with the researched and to bring new / fresh perspectives to the problems constitutes the limitation of this study.

Since the field questions were prepared with reference to the theoretical production and practice of social sciences within the university institution, the questions that were tried to find answers together were prepared not before the field. In this context, the literature review made reference to the theoretical, everyday and intellectual knowledge surrounding and constituting the problems. Since the reference is predominantly theoretic knowledge, the concepts used in the field and entered into the dialogue stem

from the theoretical based knowledge. CAIs, approached with a scientific curiosity, are handled with the paradigmatic approach of social theory to contemporary modernity. In the modern paradigm of modernity, the position of the FST is considered as the theoretical ground for understanding and explaining the CAI. Accordingly, the main research problematics is based on the defense of the thesis that ‘In paradigmatic problematization of art (Contemporary Modernity / FST-methodology), contemporary art (CA) and CAIs within CA should be examined on the basis of knowledge and politics within the specificities of subjectivities’.

Within the scope of this main research problematic, sub-research problems are discussed as follows:

*Sub Research Problem 1:*

The contemporary modernity approach has the competence to question the social one in general and the CAI in particular. The fact that contemporary modernity approach is an intermediate paradigm does not mean that it does not have a paradigmatic approach and methodology.

*Sub Research Problem 2:*

The FST has a competent approach to reject the categorical foundations of modernity and postmodernity of the original and subjective positions of art initiatives, but to make an intensive critique of them.

*Sub Research Problem 3:*

The CAIs have a dynamic and basic characteristic of contemporary art and can critically look at the traditional assumptions within contemporary art itself.

*Sub Research Problem 4:*

The conditions of existence of CAIs have the experience and knowledge to make a strong contribution to the formation, development and differentiation of contemporary art.

*Sub Research Problem 5:*

CAIs have a feature of existence that combines the politicity of knowledge and the knowledge of politics.

*Sub Research Problem 6:*

The problematicization of the specificities of the conditions of existence of CAIs within the scope of subjectivities made it possible to make a valid and powerful interpretation of contemporary art.

The most important assumptions that will make these basic research problems meaningful are discussed as follows:

1. The question of society and social relations (art and feminist thought) can be made on a paradigmatic basis.
2. Social relations of art can be made according to the most general characteristics and the distinction between modern and contemporary art.
3. In the interrogation of contemporary art, CAIs have an important explanatory feature.
4. In questioning feminist thinking, the FST-Modernity has a strong questioning power.
5. In the questioning of CAIs, the position of the Ankara CAIs outside of Istanbul has a descriptive specificity.
6. In the interrogation of CAIs, the knowledge of CAI members and relevant academicians was considered sufficient.

7. The use of qualitative methods in the collection and analysis of field knowledge is an adequate approach.
8. It is considered appropriate to address the research problematic in the global, national and local contexts, mostly at the local (Ankara) level.

The aforementioned negativity about the methodological and epistemological relationships of the FST was tried to be reduced by the interaction entered during the field time.

The FST's discussion of the problematic by introducing new concepts related to these social issues, so that the radical discourse of the dominant discourse is subject to the fact that subjects or groups write their own realities based on their own experiences rather than reflecting their realities, and the limitations of the university institution in making academic work and due to the conceptual hegemony brought about by the accumulation of literature.

This situation should be considered in two ways both for the academic conductor and the participant. Both sides experienced these limitations on the basis of educational / disciplinary, institutional and similar relationships. However, beyond the theoretical / conceptual orientations introduced by the FST, the experience of the participants, although limited, was allowed to determine the direction of the study. In this way, the researcher as a feminist social science researcher establishes a relationship of intellectual and experiential empathy with the participant, in other words, reflects and reflects the dynamic cyclic relationship / interaction in the pre-field literature / theory knowledge that is accumulated before the field, questioning and theoretical, experiential It has been tried to contribute to the transformation and change of prejudices that it has developed in this respect. In this way, the theoretical and experiential manifestation of the view that there is an illusion between reality and reality is tried to be revealed. Bilateral and hierarchical relations between the researcher and the participants were tried to be broken

by supporting the questions on the subjective basis with interaction and political stance. In this study, it is attempted to undermine the dichotomies on the basis of 'Contemporary Modernity' 'intermediate' paradigm different from methodological and epistemological relational paradigm based on the modernist and postmodernist paradigmatic positions which feminist posture theory takes direct reference. However, as the FST theorists have pointed out (Harding,2004a), the differentiation of politics positioning in the production of knowledge within the FST has led to the development of Achievement and Perspective positions. Although this nomenclature and distinction may seem to differ with minor differences, it has significant consequences in terms of epistemological and political (and even in the context of opening the door to postmodern ontology, politics, and epistemology). In this study, I adopt the position of Achievement in a position close to modernity theory. In this context, although I have prioritized my research on the content of epistemological field knowledge and the theoretical framework, I think that the question has a theoretical and political importance on a methodological basis.

From the theoretical point of view, the contribution of scientific knowledge to the knowledge base will be produced by the multi-layered (situational, spatial, conditional, conditional, contextual, relative, reflexive, self-reflexive, empirical, partial, buried, constructed and similar) forms of interaction on the political ground. To prevent the possibility of the postmodern paradigm's 'extra-institutional' explanation of the decentralized subject and deconstructed modernity idea weakening the group movement, and in particular to undermine the feminist movement and to concentrate on the interactive activist politics of the relational theory. It has been tried to take into consideration that the position of acquiring makes feminist politics an important component of knowledge in the production of knowledge, and the necessity of constructing feminist politics on the material grounds of feminist subject reality by keeping in mind the Marxist roots. It should be noted here that the researcher's communication with the participants in the field with a politics-laden identity is a

critique of the positivist approach of orthodox modernity. However, in order to show the material grounds of reality and to construct reality for the subjects, it is important that the participant and the researcher interact with the specificity of the research on a subjective basis so that the participant and the researcher can stand out from the dominant relationships and become their own reality and / or founder. This formation of knowledge, which is the founder of self-experience rather than passive language and action, can be considered as an important feature of emancipation and revelation of subjectivities.

Before the field, the idea that art initiatives will be an important subject in the critique of sovereignly institutionalized contemporary art and the prediction that contemporary art will be realized critically through artists' initiatives on a collective basis have been tried to be revealed by the problems that feminist knowledge and politics are taken into consideration. The questions were not directly formulated as questions pointing to feminist knowledge and politics objectives. However, in the relationship entered during the field, it has been expressed verbally that this impulse is the constituent elements of the field.

The reason why the questions were not questions directly pointing to feminist knowledge and politics was aimed at preventing questions from concealing reality by causing prejudice in the participants. This has become largely operational in the field. However, when these constituent elements were articulated and it was revealed that the researcher had a feminist identity, this knowledge was an obstacle to short-term interaction. Although close to fifty percent of the participants (15 Female and 20 Male) are 'women', a significant proportion of them are distant, prejudiced and even negative to feminism; It has been experienced that this knowledge and politics can be produced through interaction based on politics. It has been observed that this situation has subjective as well as 'institutional' reasons.

This situation was observed to be valid for men. The perception of institutional and subjective masculinity formed by heterosexual norms revealed the necessity of such an interaction in the construction of the subject to form feminist knowledge and politics. This feature made it possible to think that the identities interacted in the field were limited to being male and female. Therefore, this methodological and epistemological perspective has been stuck in the frame of two units of analysis as men and women, thus preventing potential potentials from being seen. However, this was tried to be overcome during the questions and informal conversations in the field. At the end of the study, the participants were specifically asked what they thought about the questions and which questions were supposed to change with the different questions that could be asked in this study. They were also expected to make an assessment of the study and how the researcher conducted the research.

In the reflexive communication here, both the field setup is not only a scientific 'fiction', but experiences create a moment to break the integrity of the scientific research by making 'notches / picks' in the scientific practical process, and the researcher is able to move from the conceptual order to two-way on the empirical / material ground. and by adding their own experiences to the process, it is aimed to create a questioning effect on the authority of the researcher identity.

This process has tried to ensure that the participant can break the sovereignty of the academy and create opportunities for the subject to see the political grounds and intervene in the scientific process. In addition to making the evaluation, reading the questions as a researcher and reading the self-reflecting and thinking multi-faceted. In addition to self-experience and participatory experiences, the theoretical knowledge of the possible reality established by the experience is tried to be formed instead of the dominant reality.



Another consequence of the interaction is that the institutional and subjective pressure of artist initiatives in the art world and the perception that the temporally more dominant secondary position in the past is the material and specific conditions of subjectivity and that they will be a source of radical change of their dominant position to change. The aim of this study is to show that a position as assumed is not real in contemporary art, to respond to the problems with the participants as much as possible the existence of contemporary art on the plural ground, not the mainstream.

Interaction and communication involving this due diligence and possible change and transformation have led to the breaking of the hegemony of the mainstream and the creation of a more 'democratic contemporary art on the plural ground. In this fresh / renewed perspective, it was aimed to make propositions / projections for constructing the theoretical and practical foundations of the ground by interacting with the field participants with the thought that the founding subject of this ground can be artist initiatives. The forms and contents of the subject that can prevent the hegemony of mainstreaming in contemporary art are considered as artist initiatives in terms of contemporary art practices.

The negative emphasis of the acquisition position on the partiality of knowledge is the dominant knowledge part, the feminist knowledge is the whole (Hartsock,2004), and besides its acceptance, field knowledge is approached from an epistemological perspective where knowledge is partial.

For this purpose, I argue that the participants' answers to the questions and their approach to the questions are a partial narrative and that even if the researcher has theoretical knowledge related to the field, he / she may have partial knowledge including his / her interaction.

In this case, it is assumed that the knowledge generated by the interaction constitutes a partial knowledge rather than a holistic knowledge, and since the interaction will not be unidirectional, it is assumed that the interacting participant is also likely to change the researcher's knowledge. In this case, the interaction between a feminist subject and a non-feminist subject reveals the possibility that the feminist subject may also transform (Harding, 2004). However, the second possibility is low due to the theoretical opening of feminist theory from Marxist origins.

It is possible to distinguish between the visible and the reality, to enable the identification of the ideological, and to be relatively advanced on the methodological and epistemological basis of the ideological, and to cause the participant to question the knowledge and experience of the subject more than the researcher rather than the feminist subject.

While the participant does not know whether her/his self-experience is influenced by hegemony (unless s/he is a social science scholar, even if s/he is not a feminist, s/he may not know it based on the results of different institutionalities and normative values), the feminist social scientist has developed tools in this regard.

Here, rather than establishing a sovereignty between theoretical knowledge and empirical knowledge, it can be said that the ability to move between the two sets of knowledge and both sides aim to prevent authoritarian structuring within itself. In this study, although the positions and conceptions considered in the approaches to Achievement stance seem to be paradoxical, this situation can become 'clear' considering the theoretical development of FST. Another paradoxical issue stems from the patriarchal approach. In this study, I prefer to use the concept of hegemony rather than the conceptualization of patriarchal relationship, which is an important emphasis of feminist theory. The reason for this is that hegemony is nurtured from all intersections and embedded in the society, taking into account the partiality rather than the rationality,

universality, essentialism and duality, on which patriarchy is based. I think that he is critical to universalism and essentialism, and that every moment of hegemony creates realities of specific moments. The research was completed in two years by conducting in-depth interviews on the feminist qualitative methodological basis with artists' initiatives and academics associated with artists' initiatives. Apart from the formal academic interviews, informal interviews constituted the knowledge of this field.

I think that these knowledge sets are important in terms of seeing the potential spheres of the interactions of knowledge arising from theoretical knowledge and experience. Each new and new relationship to be established with these two sets of knowledge will also create different sub-knowledge sets.

Table 1. Distribution of Initiative Members and Academicians in Ankara by Gender and Academic Title

	W	M	Academic Initiative Member										Sum
			Prof.		Associate professor		Assist. Prof.		Dr.		Lecturer		
			W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	
InitiativeA		1							1	1			
InitiativeB		1											
InitiativeC		1										1	
InitiativeD	2						2						
InitiativeE		4											
InitiativeF		2											
InitiativeG		1											
InitiativeH		1											
InitiativeI	2												
InitiativeJ		1		1									
InitiativeK								1			1		
InitiativeL	1												
InitiativeM		1											
Initiative Total	4	12		1			2	1	1	1	1	1	24
Academy				1									
					1								
				1									
				1									
									1				
					1								
											1		
			1										
Academy Total			1	3	2		1		1		1		9
The Overall													33

A total of 35 people were interviewed face to face. However, besides the formal interview with 35 people, the number of informal interviewees is over 35. Formally, 13 initiative groups and 17 academics were interviewed. Rather than having a group interview with 13 initiative groups, individual interviews were conducted with the

initiative members. The reason for this is to ensure that the hegemony of being a group disappears and that each member expresses his / her self-experience and thoughts on art initiatives. Interviews were conducted with all members of only 2 of the 13 initiatives mentioned. Interviews were conducted with 3 members of 1 of the other initiatives, 2 members of 5 of them and 1 member of 5 of the other initiatives. The total number of women who are members of the initiative and not academics is 5. The number of males who are members of the initiative and not academics is 13. The total number of people who are members of the initiative and the academy is 8. One of them is Professor, three are Assistant Professors, two are Doctor and two are Instructors. The professor who is a member of the initiative is a man. There are two female and one male members with the title of Assistant Professor. There is a woman and a man with the title of doctor. There is a male member of a woman who is a lecturer. In the interviews, the number of non-initiative academics was nine. Three of these participants were male and six were female. There are one female and three male participants who are not members of the initiative but only professors. There are two female members with the title of associate professor. There is one female participant with the title of Assistant Professor. Interviews were held with a female doctor and a female lecturer. Field interviews were conducted in a way not to cover all the members within the reach of the initiative members. However, the knowledge obtained from the interviewees includes a general knowledge about the ontology of the formation, albeit partially. In this context, in cases where the possibility of meeting with all members is limited and impossible, some characteristics of the partial knowledge (quantitative and qualitative characteristics such as number of members, 'manifest', number of activities) can be generalized. These features include situations where each member is guaranteed to receive the same answer jointly. Within the time frame of this study, the nomenclature of academic titles does not include any subsequent changes.

Therefore, titles as Assistant Professors within the field should be considered within the scope of the former title arrangement. There may be changes in the number of 'members

in of the initiatives due to the flexible structuring of the initiatives. In this direction, while the member of the initiative was in the process of interview, at the end of the research, some members were separated from this initiative.

In this context, the separated members were evaluated based on their position in the study area. In this context, this study has been tried to be written with the awareness of changes in a dynamic structure. The profiles of the members of the initiatives that were not interviewed based on active websites, electronic and printed sources (printed, newspaper and magazine articles) and verbal expressions of the initiatives included in the study can also be said to exist as individual artists. In terms of the artistic practices of the initiatives involved in the research, there are partnerships and divergences. Some of these initiatives focus on street art, while others continue to practice traditional contemporary art. In general, the attitude of the CAI discussed in the field has similar characteristics to the CAIs in the world by criticizing the practices of hegemonic institutional contemporary art on another basis. However, the content and form of this critique are different from their CAIs in different positions. In this context, there are local characteristics and criticisms of Ankara CAIs. The participants were met with initiative members in the form of exhibition, conference and daily relationship before the field. Almost all of the initiatives undertaken within the scope of the field were followed up until the end of the fieldwork of the thesis.

It is aimed to experience the experiences of the members of the initiative, the practices of production, the sharing of production with them in different institutional and subjective layers, to observe their subjectivity and to understand the interactions and projections of their own subjectivities as a feminist social scientist.

Although the relationship entered before and during the field is tried to be carried out through naked experience rather than the basis of the hierarchy of scientific and political

knowledge, the effect of institutionalities (university) and having the theoretical knowledge of social science has also created a barrier effect.

However, when this relationship is tried to be established on a subjective basis, the dialogue with the respondents, the quality of the relationship and the duration of coexistence, it can be said that the barriers called barriers are partially eliminated. On the basis of the partiality of knowledge, the artistic knowledge and experiences of the respondents were not purely decisive. It was tried to provide the respondents to express their views, thoughts and experiences about the questions directly by reflecting cross knowledge from both the field and literature.

It was tried to understand whether an empathy could be established with the answers of the other respondents by specifying the name and sometimes intentionally in the questions that were given to them.

In the selection of the participant group of the field, many academicians, individual artists and academicians, artists' initiative members were sent e-mail, telephone and face-to-face invitations and a request for a scientific study was stated. One of these invitations was rejected on the grounds that the researcher was unsure of the scientific basis of how to interpret her/his observations and findings methodologically. Although a few of the participants were confident in the researcher, they felt insecure to work in the context of the answers obtained at the end of the research or the subjective and political dialogue with the researcher during the research. At the end of the research, this was requested to be assured by obtaining verbal consent from the researcher.

Although some respondents stated that they trusted the researcher, they expressed the fear that only data could be leaked from the voice recorder used for voice recording and that this would have material and moral consequences, or verbally expressed or offered to shut down the recorder.

Some of these proposals have been tried to be overcome by establishing a trust relationship and interaction as a result of the guarantee that the study will be used only for scientific purposes. The feminist study led to bias in some of the respondents. Are you a feminist to the researcher? In order to determine whether the researcher recognized himself as a feminist identity was tried to understand. Since the answer is a feminist social scientist identity and the research is conducted within the framework of feminist theory and politics, the respondent is currently limited to the relationship that the respondent enters with the concept of feminism. Respondents who sympathize with feminism tried to express their sympathy and interest in this concept during the research and tried to make the researcher feel that the feminist stance was important. However, the view of feminism has been to cover a limited section of modernist feminist theories, mainly on the basis of duality. At the end of the field, written knowledge and documents regarding one of the initiatives that were not interviewed were sent by e-mail and telephone. One of the important issues underlined by the FST is the role of the researcher's self-experience in knowledge and politics production.

In this respect, I should not forget the effect of self-experience and subjectivity as a researcher in the field process, during the pre-field and field interviews, participants were involved in this academic study as eagerly as I am. This has destroyed the prejudices (duration, format and content of the interviews) as a researcher, but has contributed positively to the research process in terms of disciplinary differences, lack of resources and similar aspects of the problem. The dialogue with the field participants by phone and e-mail prior to the field and the flexible, tolerant, helpful and selfless approach of the participants enabled the methodological approach to be established at the beginning of the field process as functional.

During the field process, participants freely shared their positive and negative personal feelings and thoughts about the field questions due to the formal and informal relationships they established with me.



I was also a researcher and partial responder during the field interviews and I tried to convey what I thought and felt about the field to the participants. This mutual communication was continued with the same dedication and tolerance of the participants in the transcription section after the end of the field. At the end of almost every interview, I recorded my thoughts about that interview or the field in general by writing or voice, using one or two concurrently. Based on these notes, one of my observations of the CAIs in the local Ankara is as follows: Although the age groups of the members of the CAIs are different, there are initiatives made up of people from the same age group or close to the same age group. In these initiatives, as members get younger, they approach the issue with an attitude that emphasizes flexibility rather than an organized and modernist political initiative. Young members take the initiative more flexibly and do not favor other kinds of organized and rigid outlook. Rather than being a consistency, they think that the field and ground I work on should progress in such fluidity. This, in turn, makes it possible to express opinions with the flexibility rather than the modernist rigid opposition to questions about organized politics, the state, capital and the like. However, this situation can have two different results in that it may lead to the influence of the opposing ideas or to destroy it in the opposite direction. Although the research process is closely related to the chosen methodological position, the selection of the FST is important in understanding how it affects both the participant and his / her knowledge, the body language, gestures and facial expressions in terms of their subjectivities and how it contributes to or negatively affects the research process. One of the issues in which this is observed is that “You discriminate on the questions of feminist politics and art directed at the participants. Men and women are already equal!” The reason for this was that it was related to modernist feminist theory and political perception or deepening the subject questioning. Some participants, however, have made it clear that they think they have more or less knowledge of feminism.

Although snowball technique is often recommended by field participants to find field participants (without referring to the name of the method), some CAIs have explicitly or

secretly stated that they do not want to help me make an appointment for field research from participants through the network. It remains ambiguous in terms of not being able to tell whether this is due to the impression they have gained after the interviews or personally because of a feminist researcher like me. However, most CAIs have given a positive return both to the way they organize the site and the dialogue / relationship they have established with me during the research. Another subjective experience of the interviews and my voice-recorded note are as follows: It was stated that the person interviewed was a young artist in terms of his age group and the impression that he practiced art with a young and dynamic identity was obtained in terms of his artistic technique and attitude. The presence of a voice recorder during the field as a participant made her/him uneasy. This was reflected in her/his dialogue with questions and tended to answer the questions in a timid manner in the first stage of the research. The participant made the expression of his thoughts holistic and consistent.

This was supported by his informal speech at the end of the interview. When the participant and her/his initiative differentiated between politics and art and stated that they did not include politics in art practices, the interview period was completed much faster than the other interview periods. If this situation is further generalized, the fact that the initiatives do not merge the arts with the important concepts and deliberately refrain from thinking about these relations has caused the important problems of the interview not to be questioned. The consequences of this situation have multiple implications not only in terms of scientific research, but also in terms of both artist, initiative and contemporary art. In this context, the course of the interview has changed, rather than the targeted query, which has resulted in a discussion on the line of artist's art and the variety of his productions. Although the importance of the relationship between the CAI and the politics and the thought of its knowledge in terms of contemporary art is critical in terms of the nature of its CAIs and the clues to the art practices, the questions asked to be asked when the discussions are concentrated on the amount and technique of the art productions. Assuming that someone is connected to each other - some remain

unasked. At the same time, this is an important problem in terms of the lack of intersections and partnerships with field participants in the context of FST-methodology and epistemology. The link between knowledge and politics is either indirect or weak, since the ability of FST to link knowledge and politics requires equal attention to both knowledge and politics.

It should be noted that the politics and knowledge understanding of the CAI can differ from the FST's politics and knowledge understanding. In this respect, the need to understand how the CAI and the FST conceptualize politics and knowledge appears to be important. Since the duration of the study is participant-specific, the study accepts the initiative as a subject but attaches importance to subjectivity and specificities, it can only bring an interpretation of the overall initiative after interviews with other members of the initiative.

The content, duration and framework of the interviews should also be considered as an issue that needs to be evaluated on a speaker-specific basis, as the interviews are shaped differently in each initiative member. The approach of the members of the initiative to the concepts / questions and their handling of the issues are important in terms of showing specific results on the subject. The fact that all members of an initiative agree on any issue in the same way can be considered as important moments in which group / unity relations can be monitored. For example, it is important for all members of an initiative to mention that they do not use the relationship between politics and art in their initiative practices in terms of reflecting the form of group organization. If this is further extended, these moments seem to be important in the sense that it can create exceptions among the initiatives included in the field. As stated in this interview note, participants may tend to respond by answering questions closer to the researcher's request for different reasons when answering the questions. One of the reasons for this may be due to the fact that they feel some of the tension and the institutionalization of the interview environment. Although the participant mentioned in this note experienced tension in the

first place, s/he felt more comfortable after some point. However, he felt more comfortable as the interaction increased and the subjectivity became active.

With the development of dialogue and the researcher's use of gestures and gestures- for example her smile- the participant was actively involved. The fact that the researcher posed questions or opened a discussion with serious attitude caused the participant to withdraw herself, thus hiding her/his subjectivity in her/his answers.

In such a case, the participant felt the need to clarify his / her answer further, thinking that it was not understood or gave an incorrect answer. The participant also encountered questions that he / she was uncomfortable to talk with or asked questions that he / she did not think he / she was aware of, and he suggested alternative questions instead of these questions at the end of the interview. This, as mentioned earlier, brings critical results in terms of their narrow meaning and subjectivity in terms of explaining the relationship between the CAIs on the important epistemological and political relations of contemporary art.

## CHAPTER 4

### ART AND CONTEMPORARY ART INITIATIVES IN TURKEY

#### 4.1. Global Art

The institutionalization, knowledge and practice of modern and contemporary art should be understood on the basis of differences, paradigmatic, specific content and material historicity. The texts referring to the narratives of European-centric art history depict the beginning of modern art as the end of the 17th century, when the authority of the church and aristocracy, where modernity began to be experienced in art as a concept, began in the end of the 17th century and the period in which the bourgeoisie's institutionalism and culture<sup>5</sup> became more visible in art. Culturally, modernity focuses on the contradiction and dichotomy between the determinism of institutions and the freedom of the individual, referring to the freedom of the Enlightenment individual.

In the field of art, the artistic communities or associations that emerged in the modern era and called the movements- the artistic style unions that were initiated predominantly from the Impressionism movement- focused on the contradictions brought about by modern culture. They have diversified their critique of modernity in art, carrying an art practice different from the art practices of the Aristocracy and dominating the aristocracy.

---

<sup>5</sup> In art, the hegemony of the bourgeois class, art aristocracy and the power of the church was taken from the constructive and reconstructive function of the society and tried to form an understanding of art that interrupts the classes of society. Of course, this change, which is described as the 'revolution in of the bourgeois in art, creates contradictory positivities in the context of how the bourgeois instrumentalizes art and creates a new power, rather than the success of the bourgeois. Therefore, the hegemonic relationship of the patronage of art is changing hands and its content is institutionalized with a different class ideology.

Artistic movements or artistic style unions, which are formed simultaneously, consecutively or consecutively, have produced works that can be understood by modernist aesthetic conceptualization within the art up to the avant-garde groups that emerged in the thought of Modernity and brought radical criticism to the aesthetic conception of art. However, the fact that art cannot be explained in modernity on the basis of institutionalization as a field of cultural expression, that the critical artist is positioned as an exceptional subject to society as a creative subject and deviating from the concept of individual in society, creates a crisis in the context of art in the paradigmatic subject and structure explanation of modernity.

In the nineteenth century, with the dissolution of feudalism, the social structure that transformed into olan capitalism already existing in feudalism sebep led to a change in the way the society was organized and led to the evolution of the class society to a deepening dialectical relationship between the working class and capital. As a result of the exploitation and oppression experienced in this period, the detachment of the relationship between human and nature by the capitalist living conditions and the alienation of man from society and his labor, the importance of conscious collective struggle has emerged. With the class consciousness and feminist consciousness to be formed, it was tried to ensure that individuals opposed to exploitation and hegemony. This led to the emergence of working class struggles and social movements similar to feminism.

When Avant-garde art movements like Dada, Futurism and Surrealism are evaluated in terms of the historical context in which they emerge, a shocking aesthetic critique has been brought to the practices of modernity-based artistic approaches by using social and anti-aesthetic aesthetic criticism to the destructiveness of the war, especially between the

two world wars. With the emergence of avant-garde approaches<sup>6</sup>, the art field which has been transformed, the discussions of institutionalization in different disciplines and the postmodernity have given rise to an important opening in the evolution of the art field towards contemporary art.

The duality of art-life, which is assumed to have started with avant-garde art 'movements', has been carried to the material grounds with the discussions of postmodernity. Art can be defined as an institution and it is provided to understand the ontology of the subject (artist) which cannot be understood in modernity as culturally revealing the specificity of the subject's subjectivity of art. In the 1960s and 1970s, it was seen that art evolved into new social movements (NSMs) when social movements that emerged in the 19th century included demands on identity and environment-like issues. Starting from modernity based social movements, criticizing their essentialist, reductionist-like features and expressing the importance of differences took place on the basis of a horizontal organization. This horizontal position has created an effect that enables the dialogue between movements to develop. The formation of conceptual and performance-based approaches in contemporary art like Conceptual Art, Happenings, Fluxus, especially in the late 1960s and 1970s, led to the experience of the limits of body, textuality, identity and similar concepts at the discursive and operational level.

As the subject question expands, radical criticisms of the determinism of the structure, opposing cultures and subcultures become visible, and even the art environments and literary space in which the history of forgotten, otherized ones begin to be rewritten or

---

<sup>6</sup> Avant-garde approaches are considered as focal points of criticism in art, which is considered the beginnings of contemporary artist initiatives. However, this reading will later be criticized as the mainstream and hegemonic modernist reading of avantgarde, with the introduction of underground cultures, particularly in postmodernity. Of course, this approach can be reinterpreted on the basis of the paradigmatic reading of postmodernity and the differences in handling modernity. Especially the Modern Modernity paradigm can be considered as a theory of modernity due to its close positioning to the modernity paradigm as well as postmodernity. In this context, contemporary modernity is not hegemonic but liberating. Therefore, the structural narrative of modernity does not necessarily require a negative definition of hegemony.

added to mainstream history or in their autonomy have been tried to be opened. With the 1980s, the rise of capital in art and the weakening of the social state understanding with neoliberal policies led to the prominent popularization of the concepts of NGOs after the 1990s. The 1980s can be considered as the beginning of the years when the state intervention in the field of art was secondary and especially capital played an active role in contemporary art. Throughout the 1990s and 2000s, capital could be considered an important supporter of contemporary art, while NGOs supported groups and individuals organized at the local level who wanted to be critical or alternative to capitalist contemporary art.

The economy of art is supported by a company, bank or private-public philanthropic institutions, multinational partnerships or individuals dating back to the 14th century and guiding the politics of art. In addition, auction houses, private and state galleries, which are instrumental in the change of art, have increased their prevalence and accessibility especially with the increasing number of galleries. The private and institutional collector, which is closely related to the auctions and gallery system, is also supported by media-advertising while providing the circulation of capital between capital and institutionalities of capital. Advantages such as exemption or deduction from the tax system are also provided in the relationship established with the government. This explains the cooperation of the state and capital through the concept of incentives in the field of art.

The state collectorship is active in museology, but it is especially in the field of modern art rather than contemporary art. While private museums concentrate on contemporary art and partly on modern art, the capital is used to finance art and artists in the capitalist market through large and small-scale art fairs, exhibitions and biennials, supported and curated by multinational companies or private and circulation. Classical arts like Opera and Ballet are staged in addition to contemporary arts, especially with the support of state and capital. Artistic education is developed in alternative places for university



institutions (workshops, special workshop-course system, online-certificate courses, etc.) and alternative university education systems are developed. While providing the development of capital with the support of the state and NGOs, art also operates in areas such as alternative, non-commercialized underground organizations and artist initiatives to the capitalist organization of art. Initiatives, especially in the global arena, can provide their own sustainability as well as the support of the government and NGOs. This form Turkey relations entered a difference at the individual level, mainly with the support of NGOs and the local capital has created.

#### **4.2. Art in Turkey and Ankara Specific**

Turkey, like it does every locality has its own thriving arts is said to revolve around local specific and subjective conditions. Turkey's approach to the connection between social structure and organization of modern and contemporary art and art are available. When these relations are attempted to be understood with the existing paradigmatic theoretical connections with the concrete realities, it will be possible to reveal the historical contingency of the originalities and originalities of the art organized in society. This specific conditions appear to be made, in the specific historical context of the evolving contemporary art in Turkey, the organization of the conditions and why this art is important in terms of how they reveal that develops.

Seen historically as contemporary art in Turkey and contemporary art, modern art, a few began to be seen of artistic change marks 1970's end, perhaps mainly the historical context of the preparation of these conditions to understand the post-1980 process politically, it is necessary to understand the economic and socio-cultural perspectives. Society of Turkey, the Ottoman Empire's reign and the form of political and religious organization governed by the caliphate, secular, based on democracy, in terms of shifting political forms of organization of progressive and developmental Republican regime at the level of different political organizations have witnessed the social with the

conversion. Although both political governance and organizational forms are different from each other, it can be said that they carry continuity in terms of organization and association at the social level (Pelvanoğlu,2017).

The political decline of the Ottoman Empire as a result of World War I, and the attempts of the new political regime to protect the territorial integrity within the borders of the War of Independence and the National Pact which were initiated as a result of the provisions of the Mondros Armistice Treaty which made Anatolia and Thrace open to the interventions of the Allied group. Was thrown out of the public struggle. Although the bourgeoisie content of the Republican regime, it can be said that it differs from the sovereign regime in that it includes the popular struggle. Although there are different views regarding the content of economic, cultural and political arrangements realized within the Republican regime, the Republican regime sees the Republican regime as a political break from the Ottoman sovereign regime; There are also advocates. Boratav here (2003) economic sense with reference to the comparison of the Republican regime of the Ottoman sultanate regime breaks -political the first thought mentioned above, economic sustainability- Turkey's society different to be effective in the current review of the structure and labor-capital conflict in terms of the show and the transformation of the cultural field I think you can open a field with a look.

Although the Republican regime, as Boratav states, is considered as a political break, it has continuities in the economic field. Turkey's relationship is connected with the agricultural society into being and the development of modernization concepts in the field of industry of the Republic. An industrial and economic understanding based on agriculture has been tried to be supported by the developmental state policies of the Republic. (2003)

While the state's political and economic competence was in the early years of the Republic, the sovereignty established by the capital supported by the political authority

by the state policies in this field in the following years produced similar results with the reduction of the importance of agriculture and privatizations. The relationship of social policies with the domestic and global economy ek articulation ile increased the contradiction of labor capital and led to the deepening of labor exploitation and the struggle for precarious labor in capitalist society. In addition to the importance of the political and economic connections of modernization, cultural changes are also observed with the Republic.

The people of Turkey 'modernization' has entered the relationship with the concept of 'modern art' and 'contemporary art' is connection between conceptualizing said. In this context, modernization and modernization are included in the scope of intellectual and everyday knowledge as synonyms. The paradigmatic handling of these concepts differs from intellectual and everyday use. This is an important addition to the political positions of the developing conflict has created a problem in the conceptualization of art in Turkey. Mainly artistic type literature produced in Turkey, modern art and contemporary art conceptualizing the art theory in the development of modern art this distinction through separating principles contemporary art execute, there is illustrated a tendency equated conceptually of the modern and contemporary. In order to avoid this conceptual confusion, Vasıf Kortun aims to avoid this distorted narrative by presenting the conceptualization of contemporary art as an alternative concept defining contemporary art. In addition, the contemporary art world literature as well as art literature has also been used in Turkey synonymous with the conceptualization of postmodern art. In this context, world literature 'modern art' and 'contemporary art' while meeting the use of words as their conceptualization of contemporary art literature in Turkey, has led to different uses as contemporary art and postmodern art. The conceptions of modern art and contemporary art are considered as paradigmatic concepts. In this respect, modern art defines modernity from the point of view of contemporary art as paradigmatic point of view as an area of artistic expression, which is based on postmodernity, but also opens to contemporary modernity and includes

relational paradigm. Of course, paradigmatic views on contemporary art have specific differences. However, unlike modern art, contemporary art has the intersection of the three paradigms (contemporary modernity, postmodernity, relational sociology paradigm) in terms of the critique of institutionalization and the suggestion of art-life combination (Pelvanoğlu,2017).

While contemporary art criticizes modern art from the theories of art, it paradigmatically criticizes modernity. In parallel with this view, understanding of contemporary art is not an area that can be understood with a single discipline in order to develop intersections and dialogues, but it should be considered as an area that many disciplines can be described together and in dialogue. Contemporary art, as a field of expression that can be nourished from all spheres of life, is considered as a platform that can bring radical criticism to institutionalism and reveal the richness of subjectivity. By refusing or deeply criticizing the rationality, universality, and essentialism of modernity - and therefore can be traced in modern art - it has expanded the fields of artistic expression and created the possibility of transforming everything that is subject to the social into artistic expression or representation. Of course, this destruction and criticism leads to the destruction and criticism of contemporary art as an art expression field. However, in the context of contemporary modernity rather than this risk posed by the postmodern paradigm, FST, in addition to criticizing its institutional dimensions while bringing contemporary art closer to life, brings an approach that expands the richness of the subject and goes beyond the theoretical definitions of contemporary art and the transformation and change of contemporary art. The conceptual adoption of FST within the context of this thesis within the paradigm of contemporary modernity and its efforts to combine knowledge and politics are also valid for the understanding of contemporary art.

The importance and impact of political conditions in the production of contemporary art and knowledge, Turkey will basically be considered a thriving contemporary art in the understanding of the locality and the arts in general. Turkey developing before in order

to understand contemporary art to take into account the concrete conditions can be observed in the context of Turkey said the conceptualization provides significant modernization initiatives. Although the traces of the civilizations established in Anatolia and even the works of art dating back to ancient times were used in the literature to see these connections, the modern art that started from the modernization movements of the Ottoman Empire during the Tanzimat Period and / or the modern art developed since the proclamation of the Republic, started as a starting point. It is believed. If the Ottoman period observed artistic forms and crafts with the consideration can be considered in the context of modern art, from the Tanzimat period through diplomacy especially developed relationships with Europe, said in terms of affecting the arts, which will develop in Turkey are important. Three-dimensional art forms and styles that are sent to workshops with the artists in Europe through Turkey to transfer acquired knowledge of art, is the source of contemporary art in the form of training workshops also used today (Pelvanoğlu,2017).

Transferred art next move data showed that Turkey's unique subjectivity, sources stressed that the transfer as it is available. In addition, it is also important to consider that the limitation of these interactions mainly in Europe with the effect of a Eurocentric reading. Here in support of education for cultural artists of reforms ensuring that Turkey sent by the government to move as well as the artistic conception of travelers from Europe, as Europe has sought to art workshops. Osman Hamdi, who was sent to Paris High School of Fine Arts for education, established the Sanayi-i Nefise School in 1882 and opened the first art school in a 'western' sense. The first enrolled students of the school are men, and the students are military students. On November 1, 1914, it was extended to allow female students to receive education and a department was opened, which was named İnas Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi (Yasa-Yaman,2011).

It can be said that political and economic developments also spread to cultural life. Art, in particular, has experienced cultural breaks and continuities at the same time.

Republican regime, the arts, along with other reforms within the context of secularization and the government of Turkey to spread throughout Anatolia provider has developed due to the activities and policies seen as an element that supports them. In this period, art functions as an institution developed and supported in the state patronage, and it is observed that besides the ‘modern’ education transferred through the Western-based education modeling, the continuity of artistic activities brought from the Ottoman tradition is also ensured. In the narrow sense of cultural expression, the artistic activities of the Republican period and the political and economic policies of the period are in harmony as a whole. State exhibitions and artistic competitions that support the art and the artist are among the active relations of the state with art and concrete examples of the ways of organizing art. In particular, artistic competitions organized by the state are important because they are encouraging and encouraging art. Due to the increase and spread of artistic education throughout the country, the organization of the Dormitory Tours and the artistic activities carried out in the Community Houses until 1950s are important steps in this period. Especially in the cultural and economic context, it was tried to be educated and educated by the modernist principles of the ideals of the republic in the cultural context and especially in the artistic context of the economically insufficient people of the class society and to increase their interest in art.

Anatolia is seen as an important source in terms of its craft-rich artistic potential, and it is important to emphasize the localities that are specific to the geography. In this period, the top management cadres, administrators and soldiers of the state were the majority of the buyers of art. The artists were producing modernist ‘paradoxal’ contemporary works with the mission and ideal of conveying the political and cultural messages of the Republican regime. This form of artistic organization was carried out with state support until the 1940s. The impact of neoliberal policies in the 1950s and the capital market in Turkey with political and economic specificities of this market with the expansion 'has tried to articulation. Turkey's opening to the outside under these conditions will be experienced in every area of corporate dissolution led to take a long step toward. The

term of the Democratic Party is different from the one-party period and the multi-party period (1946) in terms of governance. Within the framework of the political economic conditions of this period, the country became open and fragile to the capitalist market as a result of the expansion of global capital, the dialogues and / or contacts with the foreign market also prepared the ground for the intense feeling of US hegemony throughout the country.

This period can be considered as the period in which the new social movements, especially from the 1960s to 1980s, including the radically based globally supported and / or national labor movements, student movements and women's movements and similar cores. During this period, the village policies, due to the weakening of the ruling center-right liberal administration, and impoverishment also increased significantly due to the large internal migration to the city has started. The onset and increase of horizontal mobility in the field of migration has influenced the economy of society in a vertical context, which is not limited to horizontal. The deepening poverty also affected the shape of the need for shelter for the immigrant people.

Starting in the year 1960 but especially works of art produced in the 1970s, considered the first examples of contemporary art in Turkey. The New Trends exhibitions, which took place between 1977-1987, are among the events where significant artistic breakthroughs have been made. The transformation that took place in every field during the 1980s also affected the cultural field and minimized the authority of the state in the field of contemporary art and led it to act as a monopoly of art. During this period, according to Marcus Graf years he has become synonymous with the world of contemporary art in Turkey. Contemporary art exhibition titled Kes A Cross Section of Pioneer Turkish Art 1984 between 1984-1988, contemporary art exhibitions A, B, C, D between 1989-1993, International Istanbul Biennials, State Painting and Sculpture Exhibitions since 1987, DYO Painting Competitions, New Trends, TPAO Painting

Competitions, Asian-European Art Biennial and State Painting and Sculpture Museums were opened in Ankara and Istanbul (Yılmaz,2015)

This exhibition, fairs, competitions and biennials, as well as being national-wide, also establishes a connection with the world. Faculties were opened. 1990 can be considered as the period begins to mature in the contemporary art in Turkey. Since then, CAIs have gained widespread visibility in the field of art. Since the 1990s, the concept of curating (the 4th Biennial, first known as the Exhibition Commissioner) has been used more frequently. In the same years, the support of banks for art has increased and companies and private galleries make contemporary art visible. Aksanat, Yapı Kredi Kazım Taşkent Art Gallery, Borusan Art, Garanti Platform, Project 4L-Elgiz Museum of Contemporary Art, İstanbul Modern, Sabancı Museum, Pera Museum, Santralistanbul, Kasa Gallery, Siemens Art, Arter, Maçka Art Gallery, Gallery Nev, BM Contemporary Art Center, Counter Art Works, Gallery Artist-like institutions have increased their visibility. (Kozlu, 2011).

Young activity exhibitions held between 1995-1998 are important exhibitions. Founded in 1999, ÇAĞSAV is one of the first foundations to realize contemporary art in Ankara. During this period, capitalists and families such as Koç, Sabancı, Eczacıbaşı, Kıraç, Ali Koçman and Sema-Barbaros Çağa were among those who supported art (Armutçu,2002). Advertisement, Social Sciences similar number of periodicals from the 1980s and 1990s to art in Turkey has increased to some extent. At the same time, since the late 1990s, private museums have become more involved in contemporary art.

In summary, it can be said that while the state has decreased its visibility in the post-1980 art, its effect has decreased gradually at the Ankara level before the 1980s, especially during the Republican period and between the 1950s and after the 1950s and 1960s. State in public sphere; collections, art activities, knowledge, education, legal structure, organization at the municipal level, while the capital, the art of the private



sector by focusing on the commercialization of art (art funding and stock exchange) has accelerated and managed with art markets and activities.

Capital, which uses technology intensively, aims to break the stagnation of the state in the field of art by associating the concept of speed with the channels such as telecommunication and internet. While directing the pricing, performance, sources of import and export and investment strategies of art, it has focused on the insurance operations against theft and fraud like art. In order to ensure artistic data security of the countries with organizations such as Interpol, joint efforts were made with the state on the protection of cultural heritage. All this shows that art has been shaped by neoliberal policies in the field of capital and has entered into national and global cooperation with the institutions of the state, in particular taxation and legal regulations, and security-related capital.

CAIs as collective organizations produce collective production in contemporary art. CAIs in Turkey, the civil society organizations in terms of organization (NGO) like 'voluntary and private areas of the sacrifices that,' 'organized in not hierarchical horizontal plane,' 'not the aim of creating power' and 'specialized on an issue (issue specific) occur' (Tekeli, 2012) in terms of similarities. Civil art initiatives, despite being similar to non-governmental organizations, are non-institutionalized. The distinctions between civil society and art initiatives, which are important actors in the transition from local representative democracies to participatory and pluralist democracies in the transformation of society, constitute the subjective and specific area of civil art initiatives.

Critical, interdisciplinary, non-profit, not limited to material production (conceptual and theoretical), participatory, interactive, cooperative and collective, independent, non-hierarchical, non-conservative, non-conservative, non-conservative , innovative, experiential, pluralistic in time and space, media provider, anti-institutional, non-

deterministic, caring for the sociality of space, globally related, caring for locality, independent, conceptual-theoretical, small, non-hierarchical, 'loose' organized on the basis of difference, process-oriented , multi-production (fanzine, music, dance, conversation, workshop, seminar, streaming), which is awareness, cross-sectional, amateur, interactive (both organizational and subject), nomadic and locally organized, comprehensive public art conceptualization to produce in different economies, One of the emerging artists, ontologically self-determined, experiential, alternative, perimeter, egalitarian, flexible, sharing, explorer, questioning the structurality of the social, questioning the totality of the subject, questioning the assumptions of modernity, questioning the theory of modernity (methodological, epistemological and ontological) features can be expressed.

Historically, the 2000s took place in the art as well as in capitalist contemporary art, when the initiatives were visible and widespread in the field of civil art. However, the beginning of their communities can be considered as 1929 (the establishment dates back to 1923), the Delegates, 1933'de D group, in the 1940s such as New (Port Painters Group) groups can be mentioned. Together with the communities that began before the 1970s, the Definition of Art Society in 1977 had a privileged importance. Initiatives such as Xurban\_Collective in 2000, Room Project, Nomad in 2002, K2 in 2003, Galata Perform, Siemens Sanat, Runway in 2005, Basve Six Months in 2006, IMC5533 in 2008 were formed. Afterwards, it is seen that there are increasing number of initiatives such as Arthere, Robotic Dreams, Subcontractor, Üçodabirsalon.

Although these initiatives are ontologically shared with initiatives around the world as non-profit and self-sustaining groups, they differ from each other in terms of installation and activity level. In addition, although they do not receive state support in general, they have intense relations with NGOs. This, of course, can be considered as an indication of their contradictory position on criticism and politics making.

With the institutionalization of modern and contemporary art in Ankara, many different groups of artists, associations, collective and initiative definitions have emerged in the field of art. Paradigmatic groupings as the beginning of modern art and contemporary art located in the Ankara initiative between the groupings formed in the field of contemporary art, modernist groupings Turkey's considered as the start of the initiative said that contemporary art reference. In addition to these modernist groupings and critically, the Helikon Society in the 1950s, "United Painters and Sculptors Association (1970), Watercolor Painters Group (1970), Ankara Women Painters Association (1970), Altılar Group (1970)" (Gören, 1998: 21, cited in Bek, 2007).

Turkey experienced after the 1980 economic, political and sociocultural transformations, this area of the state capital to increase the visibility of the neoliberal policies of the arts in Turkey has led to the almost complete cessation of the capital's hegemony. CAIs, which were founded in Ankara in the 1980s and criticized modernity paradigmatically within the context of social theory in the field of contemporary art, began to be established. Among the CAIs that were active in the art life of Ankara in the 2000s, Asikeyi / Ankara Art Initiative (2014), Kabahatler Atölyesi, Yaygara (2006/8), Kırmızı, Avareler, Pelesiyer, An + ıalan (2014), Yumuşak G, Açık Atölye Ankara, Hangar, Kitschen, Gerçek Kötüler, Torun, Karahaber Video-Action Workshop (web-based formation), Artıkışler Collective, Seyr-i Sokak (collective), Bak.ma Collective, İnadına Haber, Küf Project, Sokak 6, Mavi, VideA, Blockfactory initiatives can be mentioned.

While these initiatives or some of the collectives remain active, there are also initiatives that terminate their organization. Among these initiatives are the initiatives that terminate their existence and are re-established again and with a different artistic approach. The forms of organization of these initiatives, the aims of the organization, their approaches and criticisms to contemporary art, the spatialities they exist (internet environment, concrete art space, table form and the like), the relationships they establish with the art world and society (social institutions and subjects), their relations with

politics, disciplinary approaches While attending different approaches, the perspectives of the participants in the initiatives and their approaches to general initiative conceptualization differ. Initiatives in Turkey 'independent' be formations, are important features that remove them from the practical to institutionalize. This situation creates a lack of knowledge about whether the initiatives are visible or not, whether their assets are identified or terminated, that they have started again, and that they have changed forms. In particular, the visibility and awareness of initiatives created with the emphasis on radical politics is lower than other initiatives and collectives for different reasons (political pressure, experimental and open-source new communicative media).

The specific conditions of the subjectivities of CAIs are important in terms of showing their artistic and political criticism. Therefore, the knowledge set to be formed about them should be formed by the dialogue that can be formed between the 'structural' conceptualization of the initiative and the differentiation of each initiative on the basis of subjectivity and the experiential interpretation of the initiative on the basis of the subjectivities of the components of the initiative.

New local initiatives are being added to the initiatives in the local area of Ankara. Each joint initiative will re-influence and transform the establishment of reality knowledge about the Ankara locality. In this context, rather than a total phenomenon of Ankara art initiatives, removing this conceptualization from the structural narrative that is open-ended, changeable, transformable, and establish different relationships will allow different contexts and approaches in the experience of locality.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND EVALUATION**

#### **5.1. Introduction**

With the rise of contemporary art developing with the paradigmatic view of postmodernity and the destructive artistic, intellectual and theoretical criticism it brings to modern art, contemporary artist initiatives that emerged in the 1960s but became quite 'visible' in the 1980s and began to become widespread, on the basis of collectivity, they have maintained their existence by preserving, changing, transforming, and rebuilding certain characteristics.

#### **5.2. Basic Characteristics of CAIs**

There are some subjective characteristics that are peculiar to CAIs. CAIs are affected by different social and cultural events and their organizations are crucial to how they interact with these social and cultural events and shape their internal characteristics.

##### **5.2.1. CAIs and Youth Culture**

After the 1960s, 'underground culture' and subculture discourses, which developed especially in the field of music, but also influenced and associated with other artistic fields, resisting youth subculture, counter-culture rave culture, tribes and neo-tribes-like capitalist mother- expressive and cultural forms that bring current socio-cultural

criticism or rejection have been directly or indirectly influential in shaping contemporary artist initiatives.

Beat Generation writers and poets who emerged in America in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to the culture of resistance with the mystical metaphor and rhetoric of 'Path' (Zen culture) through a kind of apolitical politics in the literary field. This culture, in which large-scale music and art festivals, border experiences in sexuality were experienced and conceptually related to the prevalence of substance use and freedom, had a significant impact on the youth culture that had been brought up by the 1960s generation. At the same time, London-based underground culture in the 1960s was another important part of the resistance in music, literature, art-like fields. Flower children developed in the 1960s - Hippie culture, radical Yippi culture-like life forms that became widespread in the 1970s, took an anti-institutional character and brought criticism to the social order culture formed by orthodox modernity (Yüksel,N.D)

### **5.2.2. Bohemian Culture**

These politically charged initiatives have been organized by creating alternatif alternative art spaces on the periphery of the cities or in sub-culture areas, especially as a different and critical form of bohemian culture, in which artistic groups created in the period of modernity in art led to the development of cities like Paris and Zurich. Here, apart from the 'white cube', which can be described as gallery space, they transformed the spaces used or used for different purposes and turned them into spaces where art production and consumption were made. These initiatives, organized in a spatial context, were criticized because they later led to the gentrification of the city. Because these initiatives mostly belong to the subclass of the regions where they are settled, these settlements transform the economic and socio-cultural interaction in the region where they are located (in the current context, art can also be connected to urban transformation) and this has caused the life in these places to be affected negatively.

However, contrary to this common belief, this situation may lead to a transformation in the context of knowledge and politics in a way and it can always be shown that this situation will not be negative. It is also possible that art's transforming power can create a different impact between classes and in class, by influencing the social, creating awareness of knowledge about its own realities. These initiatives, which are spatially organized in space, have created layered spaces not only as closed spaces, but also by moving spatiality beyond the 'four walls' and creating additional social spaces in addition to concrete spaces.

In addition to CAIs organized in a spatial context, there are also initiatives that are not organized in a spatial context and whose traces of their existence can be sustained solely on the basis of their activities. While the 'members' that make up these initiatives can be anonymized, there are also contemporary art initiative organizations that are visibly acting as initiatives. The activities of these initiatives, unlike the spatially organized initiatives, have the opportunity to re-establish and express themselves in different spatialities and times due to their potential to be more reflective and mobile.

### **5.2.3. CAIs and New Social Movements**

The politics movements developed by the new social movements (NSM) on liberation and peace have led to the change and transformation of discourse and practice in the field of art as movements that are sensitive to the environment and defending the freedom of identities and revealing the subjectivity and specificity of individuals.

Despite the intellectual and political conflicts with capitalism, these art and literary developments, which NSM has prepared for the political ground since the 1960s, have also been criticized as being part of capitalist cultural forms of expression or itself as a means of representation. The postmodernity theory methodically creates the discourse of

emancipation by subject-centering the subject and structure-dismantling institutions, causing the illusion of emancipation developed by neo-capitalism.

After 1980, especially in the 1990s, cultural changes have been shaped in a sociality where technology is an active constituent component, creating differences in the methods and channels of artistic expression. These technological developments have led to spatial and temporal transformations at the global level by multiplying the formation of knowledge and knowledge and increasing the speed of circulation and prevalence.

The contemporary artist initiatives, established after the 1980s, especially in the 1990s and 2000s, have created specific and subjective localities on a global scale, with reference to the fact that technology, science, and the inclusion of non-art into art form different expression grounds. Although their numbers have continued to increase since the 1990s, due to their ontological anti-persistence organization, it is also possible that some of the contemporary artist initiatives that existed before would prefer to terminate their existence.

The social movements developed within the scope of modernity and the NSMs which are its critics, enabled the art initiatives in contemporary art to continue their activities and thinking mechanisms in an effort against capitalist institutionalization and socialization. CAIs have attempted to offer an alternative to liberal discourse on the basis of radical organizations, opposing capitalism, which centered on individuality, with sociality and collectivity, and attempting to incorporate the transformation of the social into a more egalitarian and marginalized, oppressed and ignored epistemology of the social.

These initiatives, which are critically or critically opposed to capitalist art organizations or institutionalizations, offer a different culture reading and suggestion to this field, as well as the more inclusive, democratic and egalitarian, non-exploitative sharing of



contemporary art, empowering the subject on its own and social reality. It should be accepted as an indicator of strong resistance and social resistance in terms of the flexibility, interchange and transformationability of the institutions and subjects. In terms of the potential to establish a social relationship in which the subjectivity and specificity of these institutions and subjects can be differentiated on the basis of situational, contingent and conditions, it provides an important basis for contemporary art. It should be noted, however, that the forms and activities of initiatives in art must be understood on the basis of the subjectivities and specificities of each of the initiatives. In this context, there are factors that separate them as well as common points.

#### **5.2.4. Subjectivities of CAIs**

The forms of organization and activity of CAIs can be considered as an important step in establishing a rich and critical opening to capitalist contemporary art organization and establishing the richness of the questioning ground. Identifying the founding and operational parameters of the initiatives will be enlightening to understand their ontology, epistemology and politics. Although each of these parameters is separated from each other by certain limits or small nuances, it is also common in the context of establishing and relating dialogues between each other.

CAIs are non-hierarchical, horizontal, decentralized, critical / political, innovative (not traditional, new language and new speeches), interactive, dialogue-based, local, participatory, democratic, egalitarian, free, instant, reflective, small, (new) artistic culture, temporary, irregular, cross, alternative / outside / in the wall, experimental (out-of-institutional experience), project-based, curatorial, conceptual, interactive, and an extensive and non-traditional features such as the publicity can create. Although they can be evaluated in this broad context, there are common features of different contemporary artist initiatives.

### **5.2.5. CAIs as an artist organization**

CAIs are the collective, group, and similar coexistence, unity and side-by-side constructions formed by the organizations of the artists that emerge in the arts. These associations can be composed of artists as well as working together with long and short term participants from different disciplines for similar reasons. These initiatives, which are formed with different disciplines, have the potential to contribute to artist initiative and art through individual artistic expressions that are common or collective, based on artistic activities (intellectual and practical).

### **5.2.6. Acting on the basis of being collective of CAIs**

CAIs, unlike NGOs, can be described as ‘loose’ organizations. These initiatives, which are predominantly anti-institutional, are organized in a sharing and egalitarian manner rather than a hierarchical organization. This organization can be defined as a form of organization that allows individuality, mobility, change and breaks.

### **5.2.7. Institutionalization of CAIs**

Institutionalization, which can be considered paradoxical, should be considered as critical in terms of being observed in CAIs. This intra-initiative structuring, also called ‘core group’ or ‘bone group’, which can occur in CAIs, is permanent‘ members that do not change, even if the variability of initiative participants is concerned. Although the concept of membership also seems to describe an institutionalization in terms of concept, the concept of member is a ‘loose’ use as in the concept of organization. Although CAIs are organized on the basis of civil society organizations and NGOs because of being a civil formation, they do not have a structural character like NGOs, but they do not have legal boundaries (internal regulations). Moreover, it opens up an important field of inquiry in contemporary art as a form of organization that brings

criticism or rejection to structural-organization. Some of the contemporary artist initiatives have created texts that include a manifesto or foundation purpose. Although these texts are considered to be a risk of institutionalization, these texts may be considered as a reflection of the rich and dynamic characteristics of the initiatives in that they are not fixed and invariable, but can be shaped and transformed.

#### **5.2.8. Independence of CAIs from power centers**

The organization of CAIs in art has an independent character. Although it interacts with all institutions of society, it is a relationalism based on its free will and independence. In this context, it creates a related but autonomous and subjective space. CAIs resist the capitalist institutionalization of contemporary art. It is political in this context and linked to its autonomous autonomous character. In addition, web-based initiatives have the freedom to expand their production at any time without the need for intermediaries, especially with the spatial and temporalities that the Internet can open.

#### **5.2.9. Non-profit in CAIs**

CAIs are non-profit organizations. It contributes to the participation of contemporary art through sharing, exchange and similar relations, either critically or rejecting capitalist economic arrangements. Exceptionally, however, there are some initiatives that make small-scale sales. However, this sale is often included in a cyclical use for the continuity of the initiative.

#### **5.2.10. Not giving priority to support in CAIs**

CAIs, by not giving priority to sponsorship and similar financial support due to their non-profit characteristics, endeavor to realize resource creation and sustainability with

their own resources. However, this does not mean that they are completely free from material and moral support. These supports are selective in initiative.

#### **5.2.11. Interdisciplinary / transdisciplinary position in CAIs**

CAIs are not only associations or coexistence of artists, but also participants from different disciplines. Interdisciplinary, in addition to providing the ground for the artistic activities or productions to be produced in the initiatives to bring the unique knowledge of different disciplines to the initiative environment, by providing the intersectionality and dialogue of this accumulation, the production can be made and the possibilities of research, material, place of experience contributes. In this context, not only disciplines close to the aim of the initiative, but also many disciplines thought to contribute to art can be produced. From this perspective, initiatives can work in the field of multi-disciplinary under a single roof.

#### **5.2.12. Super-ideological position in CAIs**

CAIs can work under a single ideology, but they are open to different ideas. Although they are inclusive in this respect, they can enable the visibility of ideological differences, produce policies and knowledge, and thus enable them to transform and change the initiative.

#### **5.2.13. Intercultural position in CAIs**

CAIs create a space where different cultures can produce together, enabling them to interact. They try to create liberating spaces and dialogues that enable the institutional and subjective expansions of culture to be experienced and interacted on a non-institutional basis, expanding, changing the concept of culture itself, including the specificities of the relationships that culture enters with initiative, in particular

subjectivities. This situation can create different awareness in contemporary art in terms of having the potential to be effective not only at the local level but also at the macro level by being connected with the society by the interaction of the participants on the basis of initiative.

#### **5.2.14. Project-oriented location**

CAIs, as well as activities and productions that involve processes (workshops, exhibitions, seminars, and so on), as well as short-term artistic activities. These activities are generally carried out on the basis of a project. Projects can be realized on the basis of self-sustainability of the initiatives and budgets shaped according to the characteristics of the project or by funding with the organizations or institutions to be cooperated, as well as projects that do not require budget. Projects can be carried out at local scale, but also through global collaborations and may be related to different localities.

#### **5.2.15. The position of the CAIs as a laboratory**

CAIs can also be considered as a laboratory environment in the context of creating space for different original experiences. In addition to the fact that different encounters can occur in the context of materials, knowledge and politics, they can provide a critical basis for the institutional structure of contemporary art in the context of the possibility of conflicts, making and distorting, processual, intermittent, intermittent artistic productions. In the context of the fact that art production is not an activity of the artist monopoly and that anyone who wants can create free channels that can do art, people can make initiatives for subjective experiential and artistic production.

#### **5.2.16. ‘Do-It-Yourself’ culture in CAIs**

Although the dating of Do-It-Yourself (DIY) culture dates back to the 19th century, this concept, which developed after the 1960s and became popular especially after the 1970s, may also appear to be related to self-sustainability and experimental character on the basis of initiatives. As a critical situation to the institutionalized form of artistic productions, this formation is also critical in terms of its ability to establish subjectivity and reinterpretation. DIY culture can be used in CAIs in production and distribution. This system, which can develop alternative economies, is important in the sense that it shows that CAIs can carry out art activities and build their knowledge and policies without being dependent on capitalist economy.

#### **5.2.17. Platform-providerhood of CAIs**

CAIs can be considered as a founding actor in terms of providing the basis for the artists or art workers who are critical of the institutionalization of contemporary art and are excluded by this institutionalism. Its political character and its own opposition to this institutionalism enable it to establish common experiences with the excluded (‘center’ to ‘periphery’) artists. This experience opens up a different and collective epistemological and political sphere; furthermore, CAIs are democratic and libertarian in that new ‘young’ artists can reduce their vulnerability to the art market and institutionalization and open up spaces of expression under minimal pressure.

#### **5.2.18. Display of CAIs in the periphery**

CAIs are organized against the ‘mainstream’ in terms of criticizing the capitalist society on the basis of underground and opposing culture, and in terms of being anti-institutionalization. This form of organization can be considered as a ground of empowerment, considering that the formation of the wall can be seen as hierarchical and

‘insignificant’ by the center and that the formation of the periphery can produce a different knowledge and politics. In this context, the periphery opens up an area of discourse and action against or outside the system by developing and criticizing the ‘alternative’ to the discourse and organization of the center.

#### **5.2.19. Differences between CAIs**

CAIs include ontologically different subjectivities, specificities, and specificities of subjectivities. In this context, although it is not possible to provide a single initiative statement, there are differences in the context of these initiatives in developing knowledge and politics of the art initiative. It can be said that different art initiatives have different subjectivities and localities, in addition to creating spaces of expression in contemporary art, they can create various intersections, criticize them by expanding the boundaries of institutionalism, and contribute to the cultural sphere in order to develop subjectivities.

#### **5.2.20. Nowness on CAIs**

CAIs focus on the contemporary in art activities based on their organization in contemporary art. The emphasis on contemporary art is reflected in the art practice of CAIs, thus making it possible to articulate the current reality. By opening up a niche and critical space in contemporary art, CAIs can bring historical specific art criticism. This focus can make it possible to create a critical and cyclical connection between subjective and structurality by carrying out current problems on an intellectual basis and keeping the agenda on the agenda, by reading the narrative of history through the moment, that is, through specificities.

### **5.3. Conditions of Existence of CAIs**

CAIs are paradigmatic within contemporary art both as being and naming, based on the critique or rejection of modern art, criticizing or rejecting the capitalist institutionalization of contemporary art, and being political in this context, and being sensitive to social issues due to the complex relationship that contemporary art has with life. Expected art organizations, groupings, collectives and similar definitions. Although CAIs can be generalized to define the reasons and the existence of their existence, they do not show a single form of organization, but they can carry out different activities by coming together. In this context, they have multiple ontologies, and the knowledge and politics of the CAIs they create are also differentiating and pluralizing. Although this is relative, it is the social responsibility and engagement that makes it possible for the contemporary art to reorganize as much as possible by criticizing or rejecting it by re-posing its existence, that is, its 'aims', and in this context capitalist contemporary art is politically opposed to organization and institutionalization. and to be both subjective and 'strong objective' at the same time.

In understanding the importance of CAIs in contemporary art, it is important that FST, which is shaped in contemporary modernity theory, is considered from the critics of postmodernity in terms of showing the importance of material grounds in the coexistence of knowledge and politics, and that the references are based on the subjectivity of these material grounds. These concrete experiences and subjectivities make specific expansions about the knowledge and politics of the initiatives.

The fact that CAIs create a different knowledge and politics question in terms of their organization forms and activities in contemporary art, and the relationships they have entered with different sets of knowledge and politics, poses a critique of their popular contemporary art narrative and positions them as a potential force to change contemporary art. This positioning is non-profit, non-hierarchical, sharing,



interdisciplinary, non-institutional, non-essentialist, partial, inclusive, reflective and self-reflective, process-oriented and may include changes in the process, non-order, relational, experimental, interactive, different alternatives producing, non-stationary / mobile, political, space creative, platform provider, critical, mostly young, independent, difference and innovation-constructive (entrepreneur), specific-content (local), non-permanent, inspiring, invisible, local and globally effective, autonomous / independent / free, base-based or guerrilla and similar features that contain more than one can be said to have features. However, they may also differ depending on the specific subjectivities and conjunctural changes in the interrelationships between initiatives on the basis of initiative.

Each concept that helps define the initiative ontologically needs to be understood as a result of different experiences in different initiatives. Although not all concepts mentioned are inherent in every initiative, their experience and political-epistemological implications are not the same. Ankara art initiatives, as initiatives established in the local area of Ankara, create moments of subjective experience in terms of influencing their locality and on the basis of global knowledge and politics. Organized mainly on the basis of close relations (friendship), Ankara initiatives are one of the active founding elements of contemporary art in Ankara. Due to their activities and presence in the public space in the city, internet space (social media, web pages and the like), which connect local to global, in different spatialities from large and small scale art spaces, there are different possibilities that can be critical or rejection of capitalist organized art (spatial, activity based, 'organization' form and so on).

In terms of their participation in public relations (subjects and public spaces), they are relational and sharing, reflective and self-reflective in terms of engaging participants in knowledge and political context. However, while these forms of association can be regarded as positive subjectivities in the context of Ankara's CAIs to move contemporary art from the auspices of the capitalist field to a more democratic, sharing

and egalitarian field, there are criticisms of the ontological characteristics of the initiative and the paradoxical relationships they may have entered.

Since the ontological characteristics of the initiative and the relationships entered are partial, each initiative needs to be understood in its own subjectivity. According to the FST, the idea that reality is partial and that holistic knowledge cannot fully explain reality is accepted, subjective partial experiences and material conditions are accepted and reflective of reality on the basis of initiatives. In this context, the study focuses on the sharing of subjective experiences of almost every participant forming the methodological initiatives. These experiences are critical to the forms of organization in initiatives both at Ankara level and in the general context.

In Ankara, the associations they take under the name of initiative, the relationship they have entered with the old and new social movements, anti-culture, ethnic culture-like and underground culture relations are limited or unrelated. The artists taking part in the initiatives mainly continue their individual art practices within the initiative, and in some initiatives, even the members who approach the anti-culture are willing to be visible or work with a gallery. The initiatives created tend to operate and institutionalize predominantly like modern groups. The necessity for the politics to be directly and naturally part of or linked to the initiative was either avoided or partially realized by individual participants, as can be seen in some explanations. The reason for this is that they are ultimately an artist and that they cannot make a politics like an activating subject.

Most of the initiatives in Ankara are problematic in terms of their criticality in terms of their positive view of being involved in institutionalizations such as large-scale art activities (similar to biennials). In the Ankara initiatives, although the individual is prone to political and cultural anti-culturalism, they are weak in terms of their association with global and local anti-culturalism.

The initiatives in Ankara, which consist mainly of young members as the age group, include minimum generations of 1990s and beyond, and age groups based on the 1980s and before, also have a different content in shaping the problems. In this context, there are deficiencies or inadequacies in the context of the relationship between the postmodernity theory on which postmodern art is based and predominantly modern education and expressing the traces of modern education in their attitudes or performances. Sharing the subjective experiences of the participants of the initiatives in Ankara shows that not all initiatives are carried out in a non-hierarchical and horizontal organization. In this context, there are conflicts of power and ego within the initiative and some members may implicitly or explicitly apply pressure / hegemony to other members in this sense. In addition, conscious or unconscious labor exploitation can take place in the division of labor, friendship and similar work sharing, implementation and similar issues of these initiatives.

Within the Ankara initiatives, there is little or no interest in the scientific-feminist political and knowledge positioning of the research, mainly because of prejudices, experiences or insufficient or limited knowledge on feminist knowledge and politics. This is an indication that ‘patriarchal hegemony’ continues in the initiatives based on the comments of the participants. The fact that feminist knowledge and politics is not needed to create an egalitarian environment also leads to the illusion that equality is already equal. The limited number or limited activities of the participants who are interested in high level feminist knowledge and politics in Ankara art initiatives shows that the subjects that will enable the conscious exchange of this field in the context of feminist knowledge and politics are insufficient. In addition, knowledge of feminist knowledge and politics of subjects who are thought to have feminist consciousness may be insufficient.

In Ankara art initiatives, it is understood from the experiences of the participants that the relationship networks established are important mediators in making an initiative visible

and more active, finding resources and support. This is an implicit power-visibility 'relationship that emerges as a factor reducing inter-initiative solidarity and cooperation. Field knowledge shows that even initiatives that have been able to establish more relationships than other initiatives in terms of the network of networks mention the lack of resources. This should be considered not only on the basis of initiative but also in terms of Ankara's capital accumulation and circulation.

The socio-economic and cultural contexts of Ankara are also the determinants of these relations. Initiatives in Ankara think that Istanbul is more decisive in contemporary art than Ankara. Even though they think that Ankara has a high potential in contemporary art and that the artistic activities and thoughts produced in Ankara should be important and visible, they think that artistic consumption is an important factor for the sustainability of art financing and initiatives in Istanbul. critically believes that knowledge constitutes the dominant epistemological field of art.

As argued in this thesis, it is assumed that, rather than hierarchical relations, subjectivity, detail, and locality are considered to be the founders of reality, each production being of value. In material conditions and institutionalization of contemporary art, economic and cultural knowledge establishes dominant relations in the field of contemporary art and directs contemporary art with speculative means due to the desire of capital to dominate the economy and knowledge. Considering Istanbul as a power is due to the fact that capital is concentrated in Istanbul. In this context, the issue is not related to a city locality, but to capitalism itself. The system of contemporary art, which is systematically guided and governed by the relations of power, creates destruction under the conditions of the existence of initiatives, in particular the CAIs of Ankara.

In the field of contemporary art, it is a phenomenon that can be understood through systematic mechanisms of power and subjectively established relations, which initiatives will be visible and supported, which knowledge will be written, which will be ignored,

and which will be visible in initiatives. However, as the FST foresees, the 'external' within ('outsider') position of the 'oppressed' initiatives by hegemony with large contemporary art constructions within these mechanisms as initiatives, more clearly, within and outside the field of art. Its location creates a condition and condition that increases its critique and enables it to produce richer knowledge and politics. However, this should be considered as a read of the fact that initiatives are the focus of power. While initiatives are adversely affected under structural and material conditions, they are essential to sustainability- which is not necessarily due to their ontology, but it should be an action taken with reference to the subjective preference of the initiative- in terms of their ability to demonstrate critical and political power in contemporary art.

Capitalism fosters the relationship between art and money and the necessity of the initiatives to require money in order to make art and ensure their sustainability creates the illusion that money is essential in contemporary art by being transformed into a commercial space and systematically managed rather than contributing to the cultural accumulation of individuals. However, there is a liberating aspect of contemporary art and it provides many opportunities for the subject in terms of artistic expression. CAIs are the revolutionary subject, which has the potential to establish the 'new' knowledge and politics of this field, which will allow a reading in this direction and enable the formation of a system in contemporary art that will allow the subject to open the specificities of the subjectivities and initiate and maintain the dialogue.

Since the conceptions of periphery formations, alternative formations for initiatives can be concepts developed by adopting a center and mainstream, it should be possible to improve the conditions of the initiatives with an anti-capitalist and critical politics with a conceptualization where free 'knowledge and politics-based CAIs are centered. In this context, Ankara initiatives should be positioned as the subject of the knowledge and politics that will initiate the transformation starting from the external but within 'position formed by the argument that they cannot be rendered sufficiently visible or

ignored. This position seems to be important in the sense that it can change not only the duality in which they are present, but also all the knowledge and politics of contemporary art.

What is striking is an evaluation of the Ankara initiatives in personal conversations and the initiatives taken within the scope of this study are considered to be initiatives that attempt to relate to capital in Ankara and whose aim is to be visible and whose political emphasis is lacking. In particular, it is stated that the risk that this idea may spread to the initiative due to the way its members are associated with capital and indirectly, constitutes the initiative, cannot be transformative and political power for the purpose of establishment and existence, and they cannot reflect the 'reality' of the initiative to be achieved. Paradoxically, there is also a criticism as to why these initiatives call themselves initiatives and that the word 'initiative' should not be the same.

In this context, the extent to which the initiatives within the scope of this study allow them to see and evaluate themselves within the scope of the initiative and their supposed political subject positions should be discussed. This should be understood in a sense by looking at how they relate to knowledge and politics. In this context, it cannot be said that Ankara art initiatives are predominantly willing to initiate a comprehensive transformation.

Ontological equivalents of these criticisms, which remain mostly at the level of activities, are quite low. However, due to the rich content of the activities and considering the broad ontological scope of the initiative, since it cannot be a single form of initiative, it is possible to consider these initiatives which are formed by different perceptions of initiative under the name of initiative. However, their position with capital, state and NGOs is also important in this definition. This evaluation, which mainly refers to the critique of capitalism, is important in terms of criticizing their cooperation due to the conditions in which capital initiatives exist. However, initiatives indicate that they are selective on capital, creating stratified ratings in this relationship.

This also applies to NGOs and government groups. Nevertheless, the initiatives that are expected to be against capitalist organization to the cooperation with capitalist capital, which is thought to be the dominant force in the field, which is called as ‘essential’, have a paradoxical result for Ankara initiatives.

In their relations with NGOs, Ankara initiatives, the NGOs they can contact, either do not know or support the meaning of artist initiatives, according to the participants. With their grants, they can receive national or global financial support on an annual or project basis. However, this is not sufficient. In this context, Ankara initiatives face economic challenges. The Ankara artist initiatives, which went into cooperation with the state, mainly at the municipal level, stated that they could work more easily with the politically close municipalities. Some initiatives did not want to receive support from the treasury fund and stated that they would be able to benefit from the funds of capital-supported NGOs rather than cooperating with the state.

The initiatives in Ankara, which are intensely intertwined with politics, are intimately connected with global capital connections and attach importance to social issues and organization. These initiatives also try to relate to different initiatives and meet the desired politics emphasis in the initiative by staying close to the modernist emphasis. In this context, in contrast to initiatives that stay away from politics or are partially interested, these initiatives are naturally organized by politics. In addition to ensuring consistency within the initiative, this organization is also inclusive in the context of the political relationship it has with NGOs. These initiatives, which are organized by centering the politics, approach social issues through art, and show the reality of the social as experiential and experiential and potentially source the possible transformation. Unlike other initiatives, these initiatives, which are socially conscious and sensitive to social opposition, do not work with an isolated understanding of art, they use art to spread social concerns and messages. This, of course, does not imply that other initiatives are not political. However, political focus is graded. Some initiatives have a

closer relationship with politics and position art, while others focus on art and subordinate it. This is not a binary and hierarchical approach, but is related to the positional status of the weighted parameter on the initiative scale.

The criticisms of Ankara CAIs should be understood on the basis of different relationships, subjectivities and specificities within each initiative. It should be noted that each of the participants in the initiatives does not deal with the phenomenon of initiative in the same way and carries out its activities by including its own subjectivity. Despite all these criticisms, the subjective authenticity of Ankara CAIs should be emphasized and their contribution to contemporary art should be emphasized. The attempt to make contemporary art partially away from the institutionalities contributes to the Ankara initiatives to make Ankara art more egalitarian and sharing.

Each sub-title that describes the ontology of CAIs and the relations it enters with institutions should be considered together with autonomy in itself. In this context, the layered CAIs will emerge by associating the subjective experiences of the participants with the constructs (both at the initiative and at the level of the social institutions).

### **5.3.1. Opposition to Institutionalization in CAIs**

Although their CAIs come together in different ways according to their foundational purposes, their real purpose is to organize against the capitalist institutionalization of contemporary art. The CAIs are created by means of creating different spatialities in the field of art and creating a hegemonic structure of contemporary art and distorting its reality.

Although the institutionalization effort is a form of organization that is tried to be avoided and opposed to form a hegemonic structure, the manifesto and core group formation, the division of labor, the structures that can be seen in the CAI due to the



conditions and conditions required by the activities. Here, however, the conception of the structure is not considered on the basis of pressure, but as a 'loose' conception of structure, which is created to ensure its sustainability and effective functioning. It also differs from capitalist and modernist perceptions in that it allows subjectivities embedded in the structure of the CAI.

The determinism of this structure is limited. In some initiatives, however, it should be considered that there is almost zero institutionalism, intense subjectivity constitutes the field of initiative, and a more dispersed coexistence is possible. In this context, initiatives exist with a gradual approach in terms of different ontological and paradigmatic queries. Although the initiatives organized on the basis of contemporary modernity paradigm care about the formation of a loose structure within their structure, the initiatives which are located close to the paradigm of postmodernity give less importance to the determinative and organizing structure of the structure and aim to open more space for subjectivity. This is closely related to the type of activity, the fields of activity, the dynamics and limitations of the formation of the group, and similar historical contextual contexts. Although hegemonic-repressive political management, depending on the capitalist organization of society, tries to limit the scope and organization of the initiatives, the alternative of the initiatives to use different spatialities and artistic environments provides their sustainability and enables them to resist.

The conservative-liberal (democrat?) Justice and Development Party (AKP) in the period in which the political power in Turkey (and the AKP's power is still ongoing in 2020), a dissident from the initiative formed art initiative members in Ankara, on the initiative of the activities and share the following knowledge about the form of formation:

The point we have started is that we came together as a reaction to the institutionalization and false institutionalization of art. And we wanted to practice that it

spread to the street, that is, to the public space. But the circumstances have brought us elsewhere. You know, we can not go out on the street. So we had to go digital. Or exhibitions in small places. We did not think of a gallery or anything, but the circumstances forced us to this point. We have a problem, we have a lot of instruments and we want to tell. But on the one hand, we are aware of the life of the city, the memory of the city. (FRD)

This initiative, which is close to institutionalism as an initiative, but in which the understanding and form of contemporary art among members differs specifically, is not limited to the public sphere, but strives to achieve civil transformation in contemporary art, and attempts to transform the ideologically sterilized state of contemporary art by capitalism by opposing-politicizing it. and re-writing the knowledge of contemporary art from a different perspective. The public sphere policies of the AKP political administration on the public sphere, the constraints and interventions that ensure the stable functioning of the state brought by both the political power and the municipal organizations and the security forces and reproduce the social structural-order; by using / discovering spatial intersections (concrete and abstract) or layered space perception.

In addition to being a different field of artistic expression, the initiatives organized in the digital environment can also bring criticism to the organization of the capitalist organization of contemporary art not only in concrete order but also in digital space by using the expansionary, fast, universal, inclusive, local contexts offered by digital. These initiatives, which can create their own areas of expression without the need for intermediaries in art, have the opportunity to bring radical criticism to institutionalism with the possibility of active participant audience / audience / audience to intervene in the initiative environment, to establish and interact with reflective and self-reflective areas. As a component of the initiative and civil artist, this initiative member is critical of the way capitalism organizes art and thinks that the initiative should be organized in opposition to it. However, among the initiatives in Ankara, anti-capitalism opposing attitude in initiatives that attempt to experience the question of public space against anti-capitalism, although one or two initiatives are not radical except for one or two

initiatives, the cooperations of the initiatives with capital, state, NGO and capital-money are hidden or open. Positive relationships. However, it should be noted that anti-capitalism is treated differently between initiatives, and even this difference varies even among initiative members. Even highly opposing initiative members may tend not to engage opposing subjectivities in their work productions. This is also related to the institutional structure of the initiative. Initiatives that care about their sustainability as 'institutional' may be reluctant to make radical active policies. This shows that institutionalism suppresses subjective politics and prevents the occurrence of risk and group interests form a hegemony on the subject. In addition, in a few of the initiatives in Ankara, members have implemented the concept of civil active politics. As a reason, there is also a lack of willingness to take risks against the possibility of violence, detention, imprisonment and similar actions that the state may impose.

Although anti-institutionalization is a very important concept in initiatives, the advantages of institutionalization can also bring practical results and benefits to the initiative. Initiatives engaged in activities that may be considered 'illegal', especially in the public sphere -but not limited to an illegal character- work sharing and sharing of work with its relative order understanding can ensure that they are not exposed to sanctions such as punishment, produce fast and result-oriented work and produce policies that can support each other. The participant states that the organization and the division of labor are necessary and a force for initiatives that produce jobs in the public sphere: But they have to be a band. They can not work without a group. When there is a band, they watch each other. They appear stronger. (FRD)

Since institutionalization, organization and division of labor can provide a strengthening mechanism, there may be situations and conditions in which initiatives need to be structured, although they emphasize subjectivity. In this context, it is important to understand the flexibility of the concept that the initiative should be treated as a phenomenon that needs to be reshaped in the focus of its activities, while the complete

rejection of structuralism is not possible in certain circumstances, situations and contexts.

Institutionalization is predominantly non-structural, rigid, flexible and variable, but may lead to contradictions in the relationship between the subject and its presence. However, Ankara initiatives are initiatives that are predisposed to institutionalization because they are intensively based on friendship ties / relationships. This stratifies the complex relationship that the subject enters with institutionalization.

### **5.3.2. Nomenclature and Contradictions of Initiatives**

They often criticize or reject the term initiatives, because they are restrictive in terms of constructiveness, postmodern paradigmatic view of contemporary art, and the conceptual pressure of free and broad ground created by contemporary art. Initiative conceptualization can create hesitation when used by initiatives, as it contains an intrinsic but embedded and embedded politics understanding. In initiatives where the emphasis on politics is not intense or absent, the connotation of this concept can be criticized. In addition, the initiative environment in which identities can be anonymized can also result in the rejection of these names altogether and being visible only in the name of contemporary art. Although the hegemonic relationship of conceptualization has been criticized, the concept of initiative can be used for practical reasons. One respondent expressed the following opinion: We use the word initiative in a single interview. We do not accept street artists. So we do not accept the group. We are just looking for a wave-making movement. It's just a wave we are aiming to turn from snowballs to avalanches. (FRD)

Wave conceptualization, or any alternative to the initiative, is not an escape from structuralism as it is thought to be because it is essentially an attempt to understand. However, it is important that conceptualization leads to questioning the relationship it

enters with structurality. In this context, wave conceptualization can be a criticism that can be brought to the structure of the initiative in terms of emphasizing dynamism, not static. This dynamism also makes a political opening to initiative knowledge because it is likely to include politics. Rather than using two different categorical formations, each move that could free the meaning from the conceptualization of initiative can be considered as approaches that break the staticity of the initiative but make it possible to conceptualize it as initiative. When the naming of initiative is not considered rational, essentialist and universal, or when all these categories are criticized, all possible definitions can be used under the title of initiative. In this context, the definition can be expanded and the meaning of the concept can be redefined.

Initiative conceptualization not only refers to the structure, but also criticizes its determinism, as it can also emphasize subjectivities. In addition to the collectivity that the initiatives attach importance to, the emphasis on individuality and the activism of the subject are also possible by using initiative conceptualization. However, beyond the relationships between the emphasis on individuality of the initiative conceptualization and the emphasis on structurality, it is also possible that the initiative conceptualization does not always evoke group-like and collective-like meanings. An interpretation that opposes the term CAI as an initiative in terms of organization and activity grounds is as follows: I see the initiative entirely personally... I did not use it to be collective. The initiative is to be able to act on its own choice. It means freedom! (FRD)

One of the contradictions that needs to be considered here is that the conceptualization of initiative conceptualization is stuck in the narrow meaning as a result of considering and evaluating the concept with the meaning of dictionary-word in Turkish. As this approach, which is differentiated from social sciences on a disciplinary basis, is used as the meanings that artists predominantly associate at the concept level in their productions, the breadth and flexibility of the comprehensive narrative of the concept cannot always be provided in the same way. It is, of course, possible to link the initiative

with the conceptualization of liberty. Because the initiative presents the freedom of personal choice to the members of the initiative in terms of being able to create space for subjectivity as well as being structural. In addition, the structures where the structurality is kept to a minimum and organized allow the concept of freedom in order to enable the subjectivities to experience and reveal their specificities.

However, what is meant here is the necessity of identifying the artist initiatives used in the current sense with the term collectivity. It should be emphasized that it is not possible to call initiatives to the organizational forms and activities of the CAIs, because the forms of organization are more coherent than taking initiative. However, it is underlined that individual exits are possible within collectivity.

In this context, the possible definition for the conceptualization of the initiative is assumed to be realized on the basis of collectivity by changing context. Because the participant thinks that taking the initiative is already embedded in the artist's understanding and there is no need to call such initiative and freedom. But the aforementioned contradiction stems from the conceptual use of the word. The criterion of whether the naming of initiative can be used for entities that are considered to have initiative-specific characteristics is linked to how they treat the concept of initiative in their activities. CAIs, as civil entities, conform to the definition of initiative in the context of articulating specific issues in art and creating their own knowledge and politics. In this context, the initiative can be considered as a concept pointing to pluralism rather than a singular subject. However, since the connotations and specificities of the definition of initiative are realized inadequately or contradictorily at the level of Ankara initiatives, the use of this conceptualization for these formations seems to be problematic.

Formations with a younger age group than the initiatives in Ankara and groupings that take care to remain anonymous may be prone to stay distant to the concept of initiative.

However, initiative conceptualization is not used in group names and collective, group-like conceptualizations can be used in different contexts and specific conditions. This shows that although the initiatives in Ankara do not have a conceptually common use, they are aware of the structural dimensions of the nomenclatures. In practice, however, this conscious position cannot be maintained consistently in general. Especially in the relations entered into with the social institutions in the activities and the interviews conducted, it was observed that the uses can be used interchangeably. This shows that there is no knowledge of conceptualization based on the concept. This situation shows that the knowledge created about the initiative contains almost a partiality. Because the knowledge of the definition of initiative, which is thought to develop automatically by action, is still abstract and insignificant to the extent that it cannot be understood by the members of the initiative. A participant summarizes the clarity of the situation as follows and criticizes self-reflection and initiative: We cannot express ourselves literally, so we have a missing side. (FRD)

The disconnection between initiatives' politics and knowledge prevents them from developing coherent initiative knowledge and politics. In spite of the potential of the paradigmatically desired modern paradigm and postmodern theoretical inquiry and cultural attitude of the initiatives which are opposed to naming, defining, conceptualization, the conceptual-practical conflict they experience, the knowledge of the insider and the experience and the knowledge of the outsider in a common sense. The attempt to define initiatives from the outside (which is also considered to be a hegemonic situation depending on the condition and content) leads to the experience of duality as an insurmountable crisis, since it is assumed by the initiative that the initiatives cannot reflect the authentic reality. One participant describes his experience as follows: There is no initiative pattern, no group pattern. The other party wants you to put a name is not accepted. (FRD)

However, the effort to define includes the knowledge and politics of the initiatives on a plurality of basis, together with initiatives, considering the specificity of the subjectivities of the initiatives in order to observe the differences within them. When the ontological identification effort is made in both methodological and epistemological contexts such as group-specific, plural, stratified, reflective, and self-reflective, it becomes an interactive and naked reality definition rather than the formation of a hegemonic knowledge set. One participant expresses his concern about the structuralism and universality of identification and naming: I don't know if it can define an initiative independently of the groups. There are groups that do not meet any definition; they all call it initiative. The dynamics, orientations, trends, styles of each initiative are different. (FRD)

Critically, the participant's view of the universality and hegemonic conceptual definitions and experiences of both initiatives and non-initiative knowledge founders implies the risk that initiatives can be based ontologically on what is hegemonic in the practice of definition. Initiatives should establish and experience the naming of initiatives with their own reality. In this context, it is necessary to establish the conceptualization itself with experience, not with the knowledge taken for granted. Even if initiatives that operate within capitalist contemporary art and define themselves as radicals state that they can transform their opposing attitudes with the paradigmatic connection of postmodernity from the inside to the ideological, the consistency of this situation is revealed in their relationship with the economy. In this context, the capitalist contemporary art politics and economy should be considered as a critical and / or rejected field in the context of the ability of CAIs to oppose their own knowledge and politics.

The curatorial practices of the initiatives in which plastic arts dominate the visual culture, which is one of the important findings of the CAI in Ankara, reveal the fact that they are not consistent in a critical or rejecting attitude towards capitalism. This striking



critique of the fact that the activities are not different from the mixed exhibitions and do not intersect with the context and purposes of existence of the initiative reveals the reality of the Ankara initiatives:

Bringing together a group of artists and organizing a group exhibition. Who did it? You mean a curatorial team? No elements of the initiative. Anything more than that? No. They say no to a number of writings of the exhibition that they do not come to the rope. He never says anything. In other words, they have a context, they determine a concept, then they find a number of writings under that concept, and someone writes. They write well now. Then they make nice explanations with them. This is a group exhibition. What's the difference of a curator? So there is a lack of soul. Perhaps this is due to the present age, so moving, so diverse, so much that you always exist, but never deprived as a situation (FRD)

The ideological interpretation of capitalism, which emphasizes difference, can also be observed in the conception of difference of initiatives. Intersecting production by intersecting contexts / references, and functionalizing it to show that the initiative is sustainable and viable, alienates the initiative from its own reality and knowledge and discharges the concept of initiative and deprives it of politics. The concept of tamed initiative is distinguished from the groupings produced within capitalism that do not constitute a threat to capitalism, as a critical force. Initiatives that do continuous but unqualified work and are not critical of capitalism should be considered as self-depleting entities.

It can be said that the current initiatives are different from the 'flowing' (or is flowed) groupings that make cultural criticism of modernity and modern art in the history of art, as well as the grouping or separation of initiatives within capitalist economies. A participant summarizes the subjective characteristics specific to the CAI as follows:

Initiatives do not act through binding text. It does not have a certain aesthetic understanding. Its discourses are perhaps largely disorganized and perhaps straight forward. But the currents are not like that. The currents are identified with the names that they call themselves or the names that others call them. Initiatives similar to what we call a movement or movement today may have a pluralistic exit. But besides that it

is smaller. The initiative nowadays is a somewhat smaller scale in the contemporary dimension, with fewer groups coming together and having different productions (FRD).

While the Avantgarde modernist ‘currents’ are considered to be the beginnings of the CAIs, they are formally similar, but in the context of knowledge and politics, and in the context of theoretical foundations, the CAI is considered to have very different characteristics from the currents. The environment of CAI, where original differences and subjectivities are constitutive parameters, is a ground in which individualities may also be visible in the loose structure subject to, although they are not “current creators”. The relationship that exists between the loose structure and the subject in the order of the initiative shows that in some initiatives the subject may evolve into structures where the activism of subjects is dominant. One participant shares this opinion: I mean, [*the name of the initiative*] doesn't make us valuable. Right now we're making it worthwhile. And this will continue, actually. We are now building a brick step by step into the future (FRD)

Capitalist contemporary art, capitalist state and capital, as well as artist organizations “have a critical eye and create a 'supervisory' oppression mechanism (Şen, Çelikaslan, Tan, 2016, pp.183-203). it is approaching. One participant shares his self-experience on this issue and reveals the hegemonic relationship between institutions and initiatives:

They were so afraid of initiative. What kind of initiative are you taking on the initiative? Now we, everyone, self-censorship, so that we do not have a job in one way or another. How aren't you going to apply it? You arrested. You go to jail. You lose your job. You have a kid. You're scared, aren't you? Aren't you afraid? Even the name of an initiative of yours is already dangerous. What initiative are you taking? (FRD)

The pressure created by capitalism on the initiatives led to the confrontation with practices such as self-censorship and non-political radicalization in some of the Ankara initiatives. While some initiatives prefer to resist this situation, they are often criticized not by linking criticism with radicalism, but through artistic expression or disrupting the functioning of capitalism. A participant thought to be ‘uncomfortable’ from the fact that

capitalism is an area where initiatives take place outside of himself shares this opinion: When you take an initiative, that's why they exclude you (FRD).

Seeing the position of initiatives as an 'exclusion' stems from the assumption that the capitalism is inherent in contemporary art. The expectation of initiatives to reject or criticize capitalist contemporary economies in contemporary art as active actors is common, although not observed in many of the initiatives in Ankara.

The CAIs, which are expected to be opposed to capitalist art organizations, are shaped differently at the level of different initiatives in the local area of Ankara. The artistic methods used by the initiatives in the way they express themselves limit or relate to the relationships they can enter at the capital, state and NGO levels. An initiative participant, who states that they emerged for the purpose of positioning independently of power foci, explains the positional position of the initiative in art as follows:

We mean organization here. [*the name of initiative*] takes the initiative in organizing art. It turns out with a claim about it. Otherwise, the initiative is not about art, but about art itself. Here we have the initiative to organize and basically an understanding of art, we never put such a perspective, we never entered such boundaries as we never do [*the name of initiative*] like this art or something like that, but we put it from the beginning: here we call these global power centers I will not go under the guidance of artistic powers. Here we take the initiative. Here, we take the initiative to cooperate with the structures that fit our vision in this sense. So they know that [*the name of initiative*] will not get support from the Ministry of Culture. (FRD)

The existence of initiatives in contemporary art is linked to criticism of the capitalist institutional organization of art. Although their CAIs are not organized on the basis of criticism in the context of artistic aesthetics, their proposition that their existence aims and practices may create a different artistic creation in the subjectivity of the initiative due to their separation from the groupings and individual artists that make up capitalist contemporary art and organizing on different grounds. Although this is thought to be possible in the subjectivity of every contemporary art maker, the artistic understanding and politics of the initiative in the form of organization can carry this potential in terms

of providing a different perspective and enabling experimentation.

Artists who think that capitalist contemporary art cannot exist in individual hegemonic relations can be added to capitalist contemporary art by forming collectives. The functionalization of collectivities as a mechanism of power leads to their formation as a focus that contributes to capitalist contemporary art by turning their political power in favor of the capitalist. However, the CAIs do not aim to be integrated into the capitalist contemporary art market, but remain the focus of power. In this context, the initiative has power as a formation, while it makes the individuals who make it strong through solidarity. One of the participants describes the initiative's solidarity and empowerment of individuals through a participatory experience as follows: We taught each other some courage. In private life, people who are now doing individual jobs should always be in conflict with each other. (FRD)

Initiatives should be formations that support socially engaged artistic creation on a collective basis to eliminate the competing individual and damaging personal interests that capitalism has brought forward. It should be included in the art as collectives that strengthen the collective knowledge and politics of the individuals who form the initiative and support their artistic, intellectual and activist aspects. A responder, who participates in a process that cares about collectivity and activism, evaluates the initiative as follows: Initiative is a state of ego. In two days, you will do it differently, maybe at home. Maybe there's no audience, but you did something. Every person has a creative side. The important thing is to motivate, fuel, and expose it. (FRD)

The support mechanism of the initiative is directly proportional to the labor put forward for the initiative. The organizational forms of the initiatives that attempt to provide their own sustainability are reflected in their contemporary forms of art. In this context, the return of support is also open to possible outcomes, but it has a politics that can change negative consequences as long as it is organized. One participant metaphorically

describes the experiences of the initiatives as follows: Here, everyone waives certain things and enters into a shared pool and work out from a shared pool. But when you get here, you're the king god, and you're the cockroach. It's possible that you're embarrassed or vizier (FRD)

The majority of the Ankara art initiatives, where the initiative's transformation and founding power are often put in the background, often instrumentalize the initiative to reinforce individual visibility, or view the initiative as a platform to make its name known. Most initiative members can work with private galleries, become individuals recognized in capitalist contemporary art, and even work as initiative on private galleries, even if they claim to criticize them.

This contradictory situation causes capitalism to absorb the criticism and use the initiatives with the claim that it can make room for freedoms within its own system rather than criticizing it from the inside. It is also possible for initiatives to wish to remain anonymous without claims of visibility. However, most of the initiatives in Ankara exist in contemporary art through relationships that make their collectives known and recognized. A participant interprets the rationale as self-reflective with the following question: So ultimately we do it to be known. Why would I be secret? Do I put it in my dowry? (FRD)

The definition of recognition is intended to be discovered by the capitalist market rather than by a small group. It may not be possible for a small group to be concerned about the anonymity of groups other than subjective expectations. In this context, its members are more likely to be interested in the nature of the work put forward, rather than being curious about how many people they are and similar active-viewers. However, the content of subjectively organizing can also be a matter of curiosity. But if the phenomenon of knowing and curiosity relates to the capitalist economy individually or collectively, this shows that collectivity is instrumentalized by interest.

The relative interpretation of initiatives from a neo-liberal capitalist point of view rather than referring to the liberating power of postmodern theory leads to an unqualified proliferation of initiatives. In this context, instead of providing visibility and supporting variability on the basis of knowledge and politics, the aims of formation of initiatives break the initiative away from its social context and social responsibility and base it on subjective conditions and preferences. Although flexibility is perceived as a positive concept at first glance, the ideological grounds of the concept should be revealed in order to see power relations within flexibility. The conceptualization of 'locomotive / trailer' in the initiatives is important in terms of showing the transformation of friendship relations into exploitation relations. One participant commented: At some point, we will have to evolve into something: It doesn't always work in the trailer of two people. It's a pity for the people who work here. One day, the future comes to a point, [*the name of initiative*], they rule me out. (FRD)

While the cliques in the initiative can bring the concept of locomotive, it can lead to both labor exploitation and hierarchical structuring. In an initiative where experiences are interpreted differently, another participant in the same initiative considers the contrary:

And we're doing some ridiculous things. There are fights, there are also separations, there is also being nervous, but there is a core consciousness, it does not dissipate. Nobody does anything when we don't do anything. Initiatives are necessarily the locomotives. As in any group. But we can't call them leaders. I mean, business-based thing. There are things that are more dominant in term-based leadership or that put all the work on your shoulders and back. Everybody knows you're the locomotive of that event. Right is given. (FRD)

Although it contains relatively different meanings with emphasis on difference, it can also be considered intersectional. Relativity and difference approaches form the power to re-establish the transformation and knowledge of contemporary art when it is politics-laden. Rather than emphasizing a simple difference in this context, it is necessary to support the diversity of initiatives that support rich knowledge and politics.

### **5.3.3. Individuality and Collectivity in CAIs**

CAIs open up a distinctive field of expression by organizing ‘loose’ on the basis of collectivity in contemporary art. This coexistence, in contrast to the groups organized in modern art, deals with contemporary art, and is involved in art activities involving contemporary art openings and criticisms, taking into account the subjective distinctions of the paradigmatic query, which are far from the effort of forming an artistic trend and indexed to the profile of the members of the contemporary art.

One of the most important features that distinguishes the contemporary artist initiatives from the groups that make up the artistic movement is the criticism of the current culture inherent in art in contemporary art and the formation of the anti-movement art understanding – although there are those who state that there are movements in contemporary art, but also the movement of contemporary art from the postmodernity is thought to be nurtured. It can be assumed to be disassembled- to take part in CAIs. In addition to organizing on a collective basis, these initiatives that bring contemporary art to the intellectual and practical sphere have a character that allows for individuality even if it is organized collectively. Initiative ‘members’ who come together with the core group and non-core group participants that form their CAIs through selection on a project basis without forming a core group, produce their production away from the phenomenon of institutionalized collectivity. This allows a ‘structure’ to be formed outside the organized structure, such as civil initiatives, even if it is a core group.

In addition, each component constituting the contemporary art initiative can be a part of different initiatives, make short-term or long-term productions with different initiatives, or exist individually within the art institution. The specificity of the production within the initiative is that, even if the initiative constitutes the entire production of the initiative, it is the production steps, the way of presentation and how it interacts with the audience / participant.

In this context, the initiative member can work both individually and collectively at the same time. Depending on the artistic production of the member, it is possible to produce together or together. While each stage of the artistic idea can be developed individually, it can be presented to the collective discussion, and it may require other members to share ideas. In addition, through open calls, these productions can expand beyond the initiative and allow interaction by creating dialogue spatialities.

As a result, society, which is the interlocutor of production, is also included in the production steps and the expression area of contemporary art is created in a participatory profile. This field of expression offers the opportunity to create layers of meaning that include all value judgments, artistic concerns, subjectivities, and specificities of the subjectivities of institutionalities while involving society. In addition, these practices and in-house production practices serve to a collective production consciousness, albeit individually. However, it should be noted that this collective consciousness does not determine individual consciousness, but it is also important in that it allows it to develop consciousness in its own subjectivity.

Another approach to individuality is the difference between being an individual artist and being an artist within the collective, unlike the definition of individuality within the initiative and with the initiative. In this context, two different artists are depicted. There are differences and specific situations and conditions between making individual production and constructing all stages of production through individual mechanisms, even if it involves social interaction, and thinking together with other variables in collectivity. One participant on the differentiation of collective production from individual production said, “We call it work, for example. For example, we do not look at painting.” (FRD), while it is possible that subjective decision-making mechanisms are possible in individual production, it is stated that what is wanted to be revealed in collective production can be thought as a ‘work’ idea, ie a commodity that can be



exchanged. Of course, this definition needs to be understood as a whole with the subjective and specificities of the initiative.

Job definition can be shaped by some initiatives on the concept of 'work' as a criticism of institutionalism in terms of flexibility and mobility rather than 'work' conceptualization of contemporary art that evokes institutionalism as a linguistic expression. This statement is also important in terms of explaining that when production is carried out on a collective basis, it acts as a planner for the continuity of artistic production, which provides a sustainability of the initiative by introducing a mechanism of responsibility and discipline unlike individual production. In this context, each individual is responsible for the initiative and the individuals who form the initiative within the collective organization and there is the institutional binding of collective production.

One difference of the initiatives from individuality in terms of acting and collecting space in contemporary art collectively can be considered as the realization of the concept of dialogue with different dimensions and layered. There are differences between the one-way – in-subject – relationship that individuality enters with the concept of dialogue and the multidimensional and dimensionality of the conceptualization of dialogue created within the initiative and maintained within and outside the initiative. A participant who experiences collective production within the initiative expresses this difference by emphasizing the institutionality of the initiative as follows:

...There are different aspects of being individual and being collective. ... They have similar difficulties but similar conveniences, ... let's say, for example, that you start a process, starting from a problem situation. That problem situation can be a problem situation for me individually, and I can worry about it and start a process about it. But when we act collectively, you have to determine the problem situation of this priority, make a census and create an infrastructure for this. And a little bit more in that sense... a process where the more dialog process works. At the beginning. So if you are very individual at first, you walk with most of them. That is, dialogs start from a much more internal process... but a process that is more dialogic in the collective and... there is a

democracy for fair order. ... First discussion, discussion, discussion is always an individual... when you enter the process, you may not be able to predict the end of the process again, but in your mind three or five more may become clearer. But when you enter a process when you are a collective, you will witness that the process is broken and changed a thousand times a thousand times (FRD)

Another aspect of being an initiative is that the interaction and dialogue with other individualities in the initiative can be temporal specific, and that this dialogue that spreads throughout the process can reshape production each time. In this respect, production is carried out on a communicative basis that is open to changes and interventions, rather than a uniform one, thus creating a democratic environment.

This democratization allows for the free inclusion of subjectivities by enabling discussion grounds, but explores the possibility of side-by-side rather than a hierarchical basis. This side-by-side or co-production in the initiatives, on the other hand, allows the formation of democratic grounds for the realization of contemporary art in a more general sense. This will allow space for the production of a politics that can bring about a more egalitarian institutionalism and subjective existence. Another aspect of the development of a concept of dialogue that is different from individuality being collective can be considered as emphasizing both collectivity and individuality in a collective production as well as the possibility of reflective and self-reflective processes to develop different perspectives. In this context, the developed dialogue enables subjectivity and specific and inclusive productions to be made simultaneously. An respondent embodies this by saying:

... exchange ideas on the name in the collective more. So take a common attitude. Of course, in this common attitude, individual things are put forward... as a result, this collective is made up of individuals. Even in the problems that he thinks... in the other [in individuality], daha a job emerges in his own mind or in his own knowledge or from his own point of view. Here, ... there are many other processes such as a mutual exchange, thinking, discussion, disagreement, fighting, discouraging or accepting. In this respect, of course, the result is an art production in both, but I think the processes are different. (FRD)

It is important for the realization of politics that the production on a collective basis can be organized on a dialogue basis and in a democratic way open to individualities. The fact that man naturally possesses this political character in his production in the context of being ontologically acting and a political subject and his transference to it may not be interpreted naturally by the subjects of this field in the context of artistic production. In this context, the convergence of art and politics can be considered as two contradictory concepts. While this relationship can be clearly established due to the specific subjectivity of artist initiatives, there are also constructions in which this connection cannot be established at all and remain as two different fields. One participant expresses his / her experience as follows:

... In fact, not as a closed box, art initiatives, that is, every artist that exists within him/her is actually doing her/his own work individually. In order to be a critical part of the art initiative, even if the artist is on the individual level... they need to keep this line it is also about the relationship of initiatives with politics and the artist's relationship with politics. As I have observed in my... my deneyim experiences, this does not happen much in this way. (FRD)

In Ankara, artist initiatives are structured as those who articulate the relationship of politics with art in an open and indirect manner and initiatives that do not have any relation with politics. The relationship between art and politics should be designed not as two sterile fields, but as fields where both nurture each other and form a dialogue. The basis of this argument is possible because the artistic production of human beings is related to the ontological being of a political individual. Even in street art, which is one of the production areas where this connection can be observed most concretely, there are initiative participants and productions where this relationship cannot be established. Although this is largely related to the structuring of the initiative, the specificities of subjectivities and artistic production can be observed as important factors determining the process. One participant expressed that this relationship is not a natural one:

The thoughts in my head, are different things I want to do. But the things I do on the street are different. It's not political. it's nothing but street ... Something that people can

see. and not halls..., not galleries, but something that people on the street can see. but it wasn't what we did because people on the street would see it. Let's do that, people see what you say is always on the street or... even if it's political, it's always on the street. (FRD)

In the spatial context, the difference between collective production and individual production in the public sphere can also lead to differences in the relationship with the political. Not being politically individual and emphasizing this in collective production in the public sphere makes us think that there is a discrepancy in the production of art. In addition, as can be observed in the majority of these collectives, it can be said that as a result of the narrow perception of the conceptualization and practical application of the conceptualization of being political, it is avoided from being political. This, of course, needs to be understood in the specificity, diversity and locality of the art initiative. Criticism and political character in initiatives, local contexts, relations and supports with state-capital-civil society-like institutions; comprehensible. One participant describes the locality of this multiple position of the initiative and the relationship it enters with politics:

... If the initiative was established by considering... an interference with both the art and the political field... very closely related to how the initiative was established then of course you would expect them to continue. Or you can expect that in relation to what they highlight in the manifesto. But as a result, this is also related to the difficulties of running the initiative, ie initiatives in cultural politics in Europe giving grants both from organizations and from the municipality and from the state, which greatly increases their chances of criticizing independently. Now, when he does that, of course, it's not about the individual stance of the artist, but it's something that changes the discourse of the initiative. In Turkey, it is very difficult to occur. So if we go back again, this time the artists who form the initiative approach to politics, how they approach the market relation to the market relation within the art field directly affect the initiative in how they approach these fields. ... We accept each project over and over again by taking the same questions back to our agenda and questioning them again and again by asking them for each project veya or trying to share. It is important that they rethink it on a per project basis, even if at least nothing changes (FRD)

Turkey special in the artists' relationship has entered initiative of the social institution compared to other localities and globalization, political in which it conjuncture, the

increase being able to criticize it as connected with economic and historically specific condition or decrease is concerned.

Economically supported initiatives can broaden the scale of their production, increase their ties with the global and different localities, and thus become an organism that can accommodate many critics. A binding condition of such collaborations and artistic productions is historically related to the increasing visibility of initiatives in the field of art. It appears that the initiative of Turkey and proliferate in the 1990s, considered as a political conjuncture with the visibility that initiative. In this context, the increase in the production practices of different initiatives can be blamed on the prevalence of the tendency to turn towards collaboration and dialogue among artist initiatives. However, it can be said that the economy is fundamentally binding on the individual and collective production of the artist. The desire to be visible in the initiatives is also closely related to their relationship with the economy. A responder calling the initiatives “non-profit group communities ”(FRD) expresses the relationship between economy and art initiatives in the following way:

... You can produce on your own..., you can try to be an artist by standing alone... you can try to stand by creating a collective. Of course there are differences. When you set out as a solo artist, you have to struggle with many things. At the same time, the business is involved in something or something, so the initiatives are obviously not too much for sale. It's more... sharing ideas. Our aims to establish a dialogue between each other, our formation was obviously so. ... Our production... that is, Let us criticize each other and move to somewhere, both in the artistic dimension and on the basis of ideas. But let's just say it's too much for the market. So it doesn't matter if it gets shining or not. so what a beautiful thing after all. (FRD)

An important difference between being an initiative and being an individual is being seen as instrumentalizing the initiative environment as a catalyst / carrier step, providing the visibility of the artists on an individual and collective basis and ultimately enabling them to find a place in the art market.

Although this attitude is seen in many initiatives in the local area of Ankara, it is desirable to be involved in the market mechanisms of such institutionalism and to gain an economic and status gain even if it is thought that it is important to criticize the institutionalization and organization of capitalist contemporary art. This data shows that the power to change the organization forms of contemporary art expected from artist initiatives, and the ability to dampen the hegemony of capitalist contemporary art by creating a new aesthetic, artistic and political perception and practice, has not yet emerged. It can even be said that many initiatives are not even aware of this power.

The possibility of contemporary art to produce critical knowledge of the art initiatives of the capitalist art organization needs to establish a relationship with the position and position of CAIs in contemporary art and their political and political knowledge and existence of themselves –ontological and epistemological, and write their own reality. This is also the product of a collective effort, but it is a knowledge and politics that does not ignore individualities and differences.

In the initiative, the formation of knowledge and politics due to the dialogue between collective subjects makes it possible to create a dialogue between both local and universal by breaking down the dichotomy between the local and the universal and to bring the local and universal culture to the productions. These collective productions, which bear the traces of locality and universality, also provide a critical projection for the strengthening of politics. In a responder that since Turkey Anatolian tradition of collective production in the local language (symbolic) and that the transfer and sensual as it is reflected in the current collective production is expressed as follows:

Strength comes from unity... so you know this is a very important proverb. When it's collective, of course, something very important isn't actually the local thing in our tradition? ... Or rather something in our culture, and we can see that they are more universal, but not all. (FRD)

In this context, although there are different realities embedded in specific and different situations and conditions between collective production and individual production, it can be mentioned that the fields where they intersect and establish a dialogue can also occur within the initiatives. In the initiatives where individuality and collectivity intersect, the aim of being an initiative and the creation of layered query areas within the initiative contribute to the collective while also supporting individualities. The participants expressed the following:

They do this to get rid of individuality as much as possible. In other words, the idea of individuality, being an individual and being different from other individuals is a modern discourse. Individual, difference. Signature. You know, for me 'or something. However, there is no signature in the collectivities. Sometimes we don't even know their names. We know the name of the collective. Should we say more communal? More anarchist. (FRD)

The number of disciplines that you will become competent individually is certain. But he will never have that power and skill to create when ten artists come together, once a single person. This is more visible in interdisciplinary arts, but there is specialization; like cinema theater. The combination of all the differences in CAIs is also transformed into an artistic product under the direction of a group of artists consisting of several people. In that sense, I think collective production initiatives are very developer for the artist in this sense. That is, he does not have to take part in an art initiative for a lifetime, but when he starts to produce from his own workshop and his own shell with other artists, even for a very short time, his perspective changes. And I think it has a big impact on the audience. So seeing a person's products is a separate thing. You connect with one person, you enter the world of that artist. and you're going into a world where several artists come together, so they're two very different things. (FRD)

One participant, who states that there is no obligation to take initiative in contemporary art, is guided by the power relations in the field of art.

Turkey already has something to do little mediatic and money that have a say in how the Who art: Well, after doing solid work behold 'T' an artist can tell, does not have to necessarily initiatives that can be individual, more unfortunately, is going individual, but initiatives may also be that I believe because of one person, from one perspective, or from the perspective of five or six people in the initiative, think more people and more eyes. More knowledge. So you can have more of your critical side. So when you look at an event as a whole, you can pull that ego a little further back and see

something more realistic. So I wish I could have a say for the Turkish art I'm not very hopeful for now. (FRD)

The interconnected relationship of contemporary art with the economy and power can cause CAIs to question their own existence. However, the method that can eliminate the capitalist fragilities is the creation of power through the organization of art.

#### **5.3.4. Unity in CAIs**

The emergence of CAIs on the basis of collectivity in contemporary art is different from the production of contemporary art on individual grounds. The emergence on a collective basis allows the discussion and realization of contemporary art on a more sharing, participatory, democratic basis (either institutionally or non-institutionally, in relation to activities and in similar relations), while it provides the possibility of criticism or rejection of the capitalist liberal discourse on individuality. How these associations are formed in contemporary art and their motivation for emergence differ due to the specific development of each initiative. Even if each of them is conceptualized on the basis of theoretical knowledge as a contemporary art initiative, considering these different specific conditions separately appears to be important for the richness of expression of the initiatives.

There are different subjective and specific conditions between the motivation of the people who form the initiative to participate in the initiative as well as the differences between the collectives of each other and the establishment of initiatives together. These specific conditions can be shared between the initiative participants depending on the situation and the situation. But this partnership is also contingent and buried. Since CAIs are predominantly organized in an anti-institutional character, each participant constitutes the initiative, acting with the freedom and flexibility to end artistic production and sharing in the initiative. In this context, the motivation to participate is not constant and unchangeable, from the stage of installation to the moment of departure



from the initiative, but can be transformed and transformable and formable for interaction.

In this sense, manifestos or texts of purpose of establishment, which can be created by some initiatives at the stages of establishment, should not be considered as final texts, but have a characteristic that can be changed and transformed. In addition to separation and breaks in the initiatives, new participants can participate in the initiative in a semi-free manner with their own motivation. As a subjective participant, the initiative can work based on the collective perception of the initiative, while some initiatives are fully flexible, suggesting that participants may be involved in any kind of subjective motivation of participation, whether or not they are consistent with the overall perception of the initiative.

This is related to how initiatives look at institutionalism. If the initiative is more prone to institutionalization, the group's organizational motivation, while identifying participants and acting semi-flexibly, allows initiatives that refuse institutionalization, while not delimiting the boundaries of the initiative, but allowing the distribution of production to dissipate in a very flexible manner. However, both cases are participatory and sharing. In this context, while enabling the knowledge and participation of differences and making room for these subjectivities in the formation of the knowledge of the initiative, it is important in the context of organizing production in a political sense democratically and developing a different consciousness. Knowledge production and political organizations of different CAIs are related to the specific conditions in which they come together. One participant shares the following knowledge: “The initiative, comes together with the desire to do something together. I mean, first, you don't think about your place in art or your place in society. You think about it later, of course it stays with her” (FRD).

While CAIs are organized in the field of art on the basis of knowledge and politics, it is important that this organization includes society and contribute to art, opening a different field of expression, discussion and change in art. However, the situation that the participant states is important in the context of the fact that the organization does not evaluate the content it is embedded into at the first moment. In this respect, the motivation of the organization is shaped in an individual or initiative-specific manner and away from the subjective and institutional determinations of society and art. Society and art can be described as secondary institutions that direct or influence the formation of the initiative. In this context, it is not organized naturally with society, but is organized on the basis of existence in art through a subjective initiative. This situation may be in parallel with the way in which the artist individual is a different individual in the idea of modernity, in terms of organizing and making sense of the production of the artist, organizing the art in the initiatives. The artist as a subject in the idea of modernity could not be analyzed in the category of individual, which is the unit of analysis of modernity, since it is a subject that cannot be explained institutionally. In this context, the artist is seen as a different and unintelligible individual. In the initiatives, the fact that the social connection of the organization is done without being established arises from the fact that the artist, who is a different individual, is still organizing on the basis of this difference. There is also the effect of approaching contemporary art with the perception and practice of modern art from an artistic point of view. On the basis of contemporary art's criticism or rejection of modern art, the artist subject differs from other individuals in terms of being within the components of art and in the association of art with life, within the art institution. However, the situation mentioned here is paradoxical to contemporary art in that it breaks its connection with society in its establishment.

CAIs contribute not only to the formation of artists, but also to some other initiatives that contribute to contemporary art as a group of participants from different disciplines. Interdisciplinary formations open up multi-layered areas of inquiry in the context of

different disciplines bringing their knowledge and politics knowledge into the initiative environment and opening and relating them. In addition, each discipline has its own methodological and epistemological approaches in this field, where production is diversified, expanding its boundaries by interacting intersectively. Dialogue between disciplines, complementary or critically, is important in terms of demonstrating that a connection can be established between each by criticizing the individual categorization of knowledge sets in the context of orthodox modernity. The contribution of different sets of knowledge also enables the diversification and proliferation of artistic material, the diversification and proliferation of the subjects to be covered in the arts, while enhancing and improving the politics area of the initiative in contributing to the use of time and resources economically by the expert who is specialized on the subject. One participant states the importance of being collective:

...the fact that it is a collective thing and a combination of power, in quotes, sometimes it can be in any field of work, whether in the personal sense of solo work or in producing something, but you do not always dominate every subject, especially in the field of art, that is, the branches of the subject you are interested in. close, similar, parallel you cannot dominate and you need to produce something and I need it. I think that the initiative here is a very powerful and very logical movement, an act, an act when it is gathered for this purpose. If it goes in this direction, especially in art, there is also such a systematic and technical part of the work, there are many gains; It's like you're gaining time, you're gaining in terms of diversity of ideas, it's like you're gaining in terms of material diversity. For example, if I give an example from my own group, the group I'm involved in or the groups I know and know, this is the case for us. There is a distribution of tasks, there are things that everyone understands a little more, and when they all come together, it's like a very, very classic example, but like the engine, you know? (FRD)

The division of labor and the interdisciplinary collective positions of the initiative participants increase the political power of the initiative, while enabling participants to train each other through interaction. Participants who have specific knowledge of the sub-disciplines in initiative formations enrich the collective growth of knowledge and the epistemological field on a horizontal and vertical basis by providing resources to other participants in these fields and sharing their knowledge with them. This enables participants to learn about new areas and make their production qualified.

### **5.3.5. Ankara CAIs: Spatial-Specific Initiative**

The understanding of the social and physical space of artist initiatives and their relations with it should be considered together with the specific characteristics and artistic activities of the initiative. While some of these initiatives are physically established in the context of space, it contributes to contemporary art by creating layered spaces and creating contexts in relation to society. In this sense, it is possible to create social spaces with the creation of space from a physical point of view. Initiatives that are not physically organized in space but make connections with social activities can create both temporary spaces and temporary and permanent societies with different empirical and site-specific creations. This multi-layered understanding of physical and social space and artistic practice, situational, contingent, condition-dependent static-response-oriented, random and reflective yf can develop. CAIs can also be established physically in the context of having a say / taking initiative in the urban space. They can play an active role in making artistic decisions about the city with the state and capital group and similar power centers in the city by referring to having the right to have a civilian voice in the physical space as the purpose of establishment.

On a spatial basis, the urban space of Ankara (considering that the contemporary art activities are organized in terms of intensity) also creates a spatial environment for the CAIs in the context of art activities. In addition to the initiatives related to the space physically and socially and as an activity, there are initiatives that problematize the urban space and arise for this purpose. As the capital of Ankara, the modern artistic approach developed by the cultural institutions (education institutions as well as art institutions), which has been promoted by the state structuring in the city space, has taken over the artistic patronage of the post-1980 capital, and led the management of contemporary art together with big cities such as Istanbul. As a result of the activation of large-scale activities such as galleries, fairs and special artistic initiatives in the field of contemporary art, and continues to create the local art context of Ankara. In addition to

these initiatives and organizations, Ankara CAIs have created another space for reading and action to the canonized art expression and activity by creating different spatialities of art.

The fact that their CAIs are critical to mainstream contemporary art in general and that they show the possibility of practicing contemporary art by emphasizing the difference from mainstreaming themselves and creating different fields of expression can show the different artistic labor processes and flexible structuring on a collective basis by breaking the linear expression and practical application of contemporary art.

In the context of locality, the historicalities of the initiatives that produce on a collective basis in Ankara also play an important role in the comprehension of contemporary art and the moment. One participant talks about Ankara's introduction to CAIs in a historical specific context:

In particular, one thousand nine hundred and eighty in the next process when we look at the art scene in Turkey, Istanbul There are a number of artists' initiatives in Ankara and Istanbul to be a priority. These artist initiatives actually take place in two ways, the first of which they continue as a group and open an exhibition, or the group-core group protects itself. Generation of artists in the concept of young artists we invite artists and exhibitions. Now in Ankara, the international plastic arts association had exhibitions for a time as a young influence. It was organized in the center of contemporary arts. These exhibitions were held at that time under the leadership of Bedri Baykam, Hüsametdin Koçan and Tansel Türkdoğan, and it was quite good.... exhibitions held at the end of the nineties (FRD)

In the spatial context, the CAIs established in Ankara, as the participant pointed out, art initiatives in the sense of generations between the 1980s and 1990s, and the concept of young artists, which were established after the 2000s and which were mainly described as 'young artists', have different meanings. It is seen that there are groups of artists who work with different tools and artistic perspectives and who make – time-specific – production.

While it can be observed that there are groups of founding ‘members’ similar to the core or core formation established before and after 2000 in Ankara, especially after 2000, the core group approach has decreased even more and more flexible structures define this area. The difference in the pre-2000 and post-2000 organizational forms of Ankara CAIs is also closely related to the effect of transforming the way it reads the postmodern paradigm in relation to the overall CAIs in relation to artistic practice. From the CAIs established in Ankara, especially after the art initiatives established after 2000, they are closer to postmodern paradigmatic readings and they do artistic works with postmodern concepts. There is a complexity in the sense that they use each paradigmatic view in an eclectic manner.

In terms of production, the artistic activities of the art initiatives that were established historically first and then established maintain their continuity. That is, while various partnerships and old and new initiatives have the chance to work together- and occasionally by including individual artists in the project - a pure initiative can produce in the field of contemporary art in Ankara. When we consider the relationship between art and capital as an art-money / budget relation, we can say that these art activities are ‘even’ important relationships on the basis of the realization of art.

In general, these 'self-organized' initiatives against the capitalist institutionalization of art are self-sustaining in terms of art-budget and their sustainability with the specificity of their subjectivity, that is, in a context of their own need, and that the relationship between money and capital and art is minimal. While it is expected, the relationship between the art field and the money in which the CAIs operate on the basis of neo-liberal capitalist society organization, that is, a cooperation between the budget providers and the CAIs is observed.

Considering that NGOs are outside the state and capital, it can be considered that among these three institutions, NGOs should be the most important material and moral

supporters of the CAIs, which can be considered as a kind of civil initiative. Even if there is a project to be carried out with these CAIs, it is clear that the relationship between art and money is also a critical situation in the relationship with NGOs. The same participant shares the following details about the relationship between art and money: “Already [*the exhibition*] took place one to three. After that, it was interrupted because of the organization of an exhibition, which is based on a certain budget” (FRD).

The existence of CAIs in the field of contemporary art differs on the basis of self-organized activities with external institutions - for example, more and more extensive work can be done with more budgets, while less and limited work is produced with less and limited work with autonomous budgets. It can be said that they have specificity and specificity directly and indirectly on the basis of their relationship with money.

All CAIs in Ankara differ in terms of their relationship with money / capital. This is directly related to how the members who make up the CAI define the CAI. There are discrepancies between initiatives that criticize on the basis of the capitalist organization of contemporary art on a radical basis, and initiatives whose political emphasis is poor and whose aim is to art simply. Of course, the position and meaning of the relationship between art and politics is decisive here.

Given the relationship between feminist knowledge and politics, which is the proposition of the FST, the relationship between art feminist knowledge and art and feminist politics is considered in terms of their CAIs. The activities of the CAIs, which make this query more consistent, include insights and narratives closer to the social reality in which they are located. This is partly because the knowledge is partial. Therefore, due to the partial social reality, the artistic narratives of the initiatives that can make the knowledge-politics question better can be positioned closest to the partiality of reality.

The autonomy of the initiatives in Ankara is important to understand the way they are organized and their activities, and to understand the relationships with other institutions and the more generally social ones. In other words, the knowledge and politics of Ankara CAIs require a feminist position to be grasped by their perspectives on the specificity of their subjectivity.

In this context, how the first initiative established in Ankara affects temporarily the later established initiatives and their experiences in a historical-specific context gives important clues about the general and subjective epistemology and partly ontology of the CAIs formed in Ankara. One participant expresses his / her experience in this way:

...continued with the rest. So they started doing small and small activities. For a long time, of course they did nothing. They waited for such a. Maybe the process required him. But if we're going to take the Hangar first, we need to address the Hangar in Ankara. People who set an example for us when we were students. (FRD)

The formation of CAIs can be a process that develops through interaction and dialogue with each other, and can be established as an autonomous area at the beginning with different artistic and social concerns. However, in the context of Ankara, in the process until the 2000s, groups were established with a tradition of student / breeding. Of course, each initiative has its own autonomy, even if it is an interaction. Each initiative, like the first temporally established initiative in Ankara, also interacts with subsequent initiatives and develops a dialogue with contemporary art in total and within the initiatives. However, it is important that the initiatives established reflect the social on the basis of revealing the richness of their subjectivity and specificity and creating different forms of artistic expression. In addition, the relationship between education (not only academic but all forms of education) and CAI can be said to be an effective relationship in a certain period of time until the 2000s after the start of CAIs in Ankara. The flexible organization and artistic practices of the CAIs, which are mostly based on anonymization, can be concealed despite the practice and diffusion of contemporary art,



which is predominantly mainstreamed and institutionalized, and even its members can be concealed.

Even written, visual and auditory accumulation, which is mostly based on their general and original subjectivity, has some limitations in explaining them. In this context, one participant voiced by six groups of Ankara's first initiative to ensure that this hangar was established in Istanbul, including initiatives established historically before the Community Description Art (Sanat Tanımı Topluluğu) and a 'initiative with its description as' in Turkey it constitutes an exceptional case about the beginning of the initiatives established. A participant critical of the specificity of this initiative and the example of Ankara as the first initiative shares the following knowledge:

The group of six, for example, is one of the first initiatives I think. And they are all female artists... over fifty years of age. Some... sarcastic, but there are also academia. These are the artists that Kayhan Keskinok really supports.... I think they are one of the first initiatives... they have been exhibiting since the nineties.... it's a beautiful group, and I think one of them... has passed away, and I know they've joined together to exhibit on his behalf.... A group of six reunited in eight. and the Turkish American Association's painting studio. They are in the age group of more than fifty-sixty and eighty-fifty and sixty-one. We call it a group but they are on the initiative of today because at one time he started to work at the Turkish American Association, as I said, some of the artists are mocked and some of them are educated. (FRD)

The fact that the Altılar Group (Gören, 1998, p.21 cited in Bek, 2007), which was stated to be established in the 1970s, was dated by the participant in 1968 creates a contradiction in the formation of certain knowledge regarding the year of establishment of the group. However, as stated by the participant, if the Altılar group is considered as a contemporary art initiative, there is almost no initiative in determining the beginning of the initiatives of Ankara groups and associations established in the 1970s in Ankara locality before the Hangar initiative in the knowledge set and knowledge set about Ankara's CAIs. In this sense, there are gaps in the knowledge set of the initiatives, or they are ignored in the knowledge set up.

Here, due to the limited access to knowledge in the field, insufficient knowledge about the field, and the relationship between the artists expressed by some of the participants, the effect of some artists not being involved in the narratives may be affected. This situation also shows important results both in terms of the position of the female artist in the society and the position of her knowledge and activities in the relationship with the society. The ‘inadequate’ visibility of the female artist's knowledge and activity in the field is rendered systematically invisible at the macro and micro levels. Therefore the beginning of local initiatives in Turkey and Ankara, are shaped out of the mainstream knowledge into circulation and most of this potential onset of sharp placelessness also be ignored.

Even if there are divisions in the group, the remaining group members can move from where they left off and move in the freedom of adding. Production does not depend on strict conditions. There is a chance to adopt flexible production and to make the productions when they want / feel ready, to perform small, frequent, small and large sizes.

### **5.3.6. Innovation in Initiatives**

Another aspect of the critique of the idea of innovation is that, as thought, the forms of expression are not at all new. Turkey's private and is considered to be innovation in contemporary art in the local Ankara numerous activities stated that earlier similar or different forms made, can be considered a part of the innovation of specific local experience but is transferred in general is not easy to date to speak of a novelty.

Our actions have already been done. Oh, maybe we can call it local. Not all billboards. An innovative situation for them may be said. But in general, what we did was already done in the world. There is such a thing as street art. Even though we don't call ourselves street artists, there is such a thing as street art (FRD)

Initiatives in Ankara regard the concept of innovation as positive or negative in terms of their position on the basis of politics and knowledge. Contemporary art, while staying close to the concept of innovation, triggers the liberation in the context of different experiences and boundary experiences in the initiatives, and can connect the concept of innovation to the instrumentalization of capitalism with its forms of institutionalization and discourse in relation to capitalist political economy.

From this point of view, when the concept of innovation can be put into action with the combination of counter-culture and feminist critical knowledge and politics formed with a consciousness that can be developed against capitalization, it can help to transform the initiatives from the formation of their activities to the micro level transformative and distinctive character of the initiative. The views of a participant are as follows:

... Art is a field that should be free and I think it will be to its advantage if there are many different alternatives. The initiative also has a new innovation, discovering already in the soul. Of course, it depends on the ideology of the initiative. One of the important gains of being collectivity in contemporary art is the formation and strengthening of the production and reproduction of the artist / art laborer from the power relations that continue within the 'institutionalization of contemporary art (FRD)

CAIs are the major actors in contemporary art that create new problems, create new fields of expression and different forms of communication and association. New questions that CAIs dare to ask raise the awareness and development of contemporary art while criticizing the traditional questioning and practice of contemporary art. Through the experimental features of contemporary art, it discovers new encounters and intersections and reveals the authenticity of the specificities on the positional basis. These experiments and new interrogations and practices create subjective conditions in terms of innovations not only on the basis of ideas but also in terms of material, location and context, and reveal the difference of CAIs in contemporary art. On the basis of an initiative, a participatory innovation in contemporary art traditionally practiced in Ankara expresses the activity they bring:

For years, there has not been an exhibition in Ankara that has been working with women only. Okay, it can be individual or something, but the exhibition with 86 people seems to me to be something innovative. We brought together women working in different disciplines (FRD)

Innovation is realized on the basis of initiative not only through a single channel, but also through the intersection of different topics and queries. As the participant mentioned, it is important that the three interrogative areas, such as feminine identity, interdisciplinary position and inclusiveness, be opened in an initiative-based environment and connected in a discursive manner, in order to initiate the formation of an activity that has not been based on Ankara in traditional art to date.

This innovation and initiative can include initiatives from the establishment stages to their activities, their view of artistic material and forms of expression. In this respect, the difference of initiatives can also be considered as an innovation. While the conceptual meaning of innovativeness differs according to initiatives, it also creates subjective innovations in the forms of relations that the initiative establishes with the state, capital and civil society. A participant expressed the following opinion with the demand that the problematic addressed by the initiative should be supported by the institutions with new approaches, and the demand for the continuation of new support and approaches in order to make the new problems occurring and noticed in life visible: “The initiative must be open. A different approach to different events. Everybody should have a problem with themselves. We should act together with civil society to oppose what concerns us all. So we innovate. As you experience it, you renew yourself.” (FRD)

Some of the anti-institutional initiatives think that they should be in a certain consciousness when dealing with institutions, as well as that there should be no relationship with repressive state and capital groups. This approach is also related to the purpose of establishing the initiative. Spatially, initiatives that focus more on artistic activity in the public sphere may think that new collaborations should be established for

support, but this is demanded from collaborations that recognize the originality of the initiative and are expected to be sensitive to it. These collaborations and new problems allow the initiators, and therefore the initiative, to question and establish itself again ontologically. This allows the initiative to evolve from uniform and institutionalized and to develop different tactics, different approaches and new perspectives.

The fact that the main focusing initiatives reflect a current problem to artistic activity is related to the idea as well as being related to the artistic style. The interdisciplinary position seems to be critical in terms of introducing new areas of expression and artistic materials, as well as introducing new ways of thinking and methods. This can be thought of as a resource that feeds both initiative collectively and individual initiative participants. The renewal of self and initiative as a living organism can be an important source of motivation for contemporary art to open new and anti-capitalist channels. Contrary to the fact that the initiatives are thought to have an ideologically stable art production practice for the purpose of establishment, a participant declares:

So even though it may seem uniform, it's actually new. If I could produce a job right now, it's what I see today. Something I'm really worried about today. I reflect it. Of course, everyone reflects this in different disciplines. But innovation is not about this style, but being innovative as an idea. You have to renew yourself (FRD)

The meaning of innovation in initiatives requires that the initiative be understood both in contemporary art and with spatial specificity between initiatives. Innovation can be evaluated positively in terms of creating constructive formations that can destroy institutionalism and enriching the inquiry in order to open new channels of activity.

Innovation, as an ideal suggested and supported by neoliberal policies, can have a widespread impact on societies within the popular culture due to the desire to destroy the old and make room for the new. In this respect, the effect of the ideological connections

established by the concept of innovation on the contexts should be considered. An initiative member shares this opinion:

How you see it depends on how you read it. Say something new. No such thing. They're always populist movements. What is populism like? So this is something that happens everywhere the word pop. The most populist movement is community houses. Look at their banners. Look at their banners since 2000 (FRD).

In addition to being identified with populist attitudes, the concept of innovation appears to be a concept that must be considered and criticized historically through the way that the development of the initiative relates to the concept of innovation. The fact that the initiatives are constantly aimed at the new in terms of production and ideas can lead to the emptying of the position that the initiative can take on the basis of knowledge and politics in contemporary art, distorting the 'aim in of the initiative and causing the disconnection of the initiative with its reality. The historical changes of the initiatives, the activities they have formed in relation to the historical original conditions and realities of their activities, besides showing the material conditions entered through innovation, may make it necessary to consider the historical development and projections of the problematic discussed. The risk of detachment from its historical content can lead to the 'reification in of the matter, and the transformation of it into an easily consumable capitalist commodity. The problematic, whose historical specific contexts can be demonstrated, can contribute to the way in which the initiative is associated with the realities embedded in the society, and to the foundation of the anti-capitalist politics and the knowledge that can be produced.

### **5.3.7. Artist in CAIs**

Contemporary artist initiatives are distinguished from artists who make individual contemporary art because they are formed through collectivity in contemporary art. There may be collective labor production within the initiative. On the initiative basis, individual and collective production is spread and shared. In the face of institutionalization of capitalist contemporary art, one participant expresses the importance of artists' being collective and organizing and taking initiative: "Housewives should also be organized; The organization of artists is of such a value that... art is currently oppressed in this country: from that point of view... it is highly important that artists are organized." (FRD)

Turkey is located specifically in the AKP political era art on the basis of conservatism, combines with Islam to politics of the neo-liberal policies, ethnic its liberating power of contemporary art, identity, and the like based on the policies and sanctions to remedy said to take control of the printing. On the other hand, capital states that it supports the freedom of contemporary art in a limited way only by creating so-called freedom platforms on the basis of neo-liberal policies, but it acts together with conservative political state policies. For this reason, artist organizations can open up areas of expression as potential eyes that can be transformative actors of the oppressive art environment, and can spread radical criticisms not only locally but globally. While these organizations may be anarchic, nomadic, temporary and radical organizations, they may exist as collective and more institutional and critical organizations compared to the previous ones. In this context, they value individuality as well as collective action.

CAIs, which emphasize the individual as well as collectivity due to their criticism or rejection of modernity theory, create platforms and interactions that enable mechanisms to support the production of the individual. The initiative environment, in which

collective and individual production has the opportunity to engage in dialogue, is also a response to the duality of ‘art is for the sake of art’ and ‘art is for the sake of society’. The collective initiative environment is sensitive to the social in terms of allowing interactions and inviting society to artistic production, education and interaction. However, it also creates autonomous spaces in terms of making room for the individual (artist, audience-participant and the like). Members of Ankara artist initiatives take different positions on this subject. However, although included in the initiative, the following statements that individuality was emphasized were shared in the interviews: “We think more individually. Even if we take the initiative. First they establish themselves as individuals. Common interests had to come together. If we do not make effort, if we do less, it is our fault or our power. (FRD)”, “I never did. As a result, when a work is mentioned, it is asked who made the work, who is the author, or who is the painter. In the end, after we die, there will be artifacts, but they must be good for your name to continue. (FRD)”, “Art is something for the artist. Art is not made for society, or for anything else.” (FRD).

The understanding of modernist tradition and art in the way artists work can emerge as an ongoing trend, even in their CAIs. Coexistence or side-by-side appears to be an effort away from forming an initiative. Context based on politics and knowledge, which includes differences rather than benefit-based or non-benefit, can allow the initiative to loosely organize and develop self-awareness and action.

Since the initiatives are political organizations, they have the capacity to criticize artistic interventions and social issues. Since they are important actors of social opposition, they should be organized so as to be neutral with a closed understanding of art and to avoid social responsibility, which is also called making art for art. Few number of initiatives of Ankara art initiatives take risks to realize this activity. It would be more meaningful to produce works at the intersection of contexts and interactions on the basis of interdisciplinary and dialogue rather than at the level of practice of artistic education.



Ankara art initiatives are limited in the realization of intersections, and they cannot provide the expected level of connections in the global and inter-personal relations due to subjective or different structural reasons.

The ideological and hegemonic formation of art history in the expression of capitalist contemporary art distorts the history of art by reducing it to the smallest parts by abstracting the relations and contexts of art by reducing it to names or works. The narrative of art, which is detached from its social context, neutralizes the position and criticism of the opposing identities in art history in a way that does not pose a risk to capitalism, while conveying the message that artists should come to the forefront with their works or works and ideologically including artists.

The opposing identities or organizations that are consciously forgotten or ignored in the art literature are not included in the capitalist contemporary art narratives because they may have power centers that can change the art history writing and the art institution. Individuals or groupings that are constantly repeated in the expression of art and constitute a structural standard are at risk of being exploited and detached from the context by capitalist contemporary art.

There is no consistency in the context of Ankara between the texts that the CAI ‘introduces’ themselves in the field of art-or unstructured manifestos ile and political opposition. Many of these initiatives are unable to realize the radical-politics they envisage and believe they will do. Those who have the purpose of realization are subjectively to emulate bourgeois culture. The presence of members of the initiative who define themselves as lumpen and anarchist but strive to make radical activist art reveals the contradictory position that the initiative enters collectively and with the subjectivities of the individuals who make up it. Even self-reflective positions of individuals are contradictory. In this context, it is clear that they experience epistemological deficiencies, distortions or inaccuracies about conceptualizations.

Unlike the perception of individual artists emphasized by postmodernity, the predominance of individuality is a tendency arising from the concept of culture in modern artist and modern art, but it is also related to the purpose of forming art initiatives. Individuals who form the initiative create subjective spaces differently from each other and share this partially in collective production. A participant questioning the independence and subjective areas of artists, including initiatives, shared the following ideas: “I never believed in being independent or being involved in the system. So we're not consulting anyone. In other words, I think that we are free, more spacious in ourselves while producing work. In general life, I don't believe in the freedom of anything” (FRD).

Interpretation of the knowledge and politics of the initiative with an autonomous and closed initiative approach shows that the formation of initiative, the transformative power of the system and the political power of the individuals that make it up, are also denied and approached with a closed and insurmountable perception of capitalism. Liberal postmodern literature, one of the intimidating agents of capitalism, focuses on a system understanding that dissolves the oppositions of individuals and collectives rather than focusing on the fragile soft stomach of the system and tries to dampen social opposition. However, the specificities of the subjectivities of each individual include their capacity to intervene and transform social change as an actor. A participant who discovers his own subjectivity at both the individual and initiative level makes the following subjective sharing: “Being able to do what you think means having confidence in it. I mean, it's high in terms of liberating yourself. Then I wasn't so brave. Enough to do what I think” (FRD).

A participant who is not a member of the initiative but who is knowledgeable about the initiatives wants to think of the environment as a side-by-side organization as a side-by-side, as well as having a relationship with the capitalist market despite his contacts with the initiative members. This shows how fragile the art environment is about the capitalist

market and is open to the direction or influence of capital.

I'm not on the market. I don't have a market. I do not know if I would have established the right relations with the market or if I had been there in Istanbul from the beginning. It's a bit of luck. But don't we have artists who grew up in Ankara and opened up to the world? There is. (FRD)

The existence and training of artists whose primary purpose is to accumulate sales or symbolic capital - recognition, reveals the ideological organization of the field of art. In this context, educators, individual artists and collectivism are openly involved in this ideological direction and are not even aware of the effect of this ideological direction. A participant in the ideological orientation of contemporary art, in order to make a connection with the theory, quotes Baudrillard in particular that the production of the artist and the self-experience of the individual can be guided: “Baudrillard mentions that in the past there was feeling and feeling and feeling in the face of art. Today's contemporary art balloon called seduction and seduction. It's a matter of selling colors, extreme gigantic installations, or overly small things incessantly a deviation and excess. Now, the affect is reduced” (FRD).

The ideological orientation of contemporary art, coupled with technology, creates spatialities and temporalities that need to be read critically. This situation is also related to the educational dimension. Production and experience realized with the use of technology and the natural relationship and experience that man enters in his own production are realized as different niche productions. The contradictory conditions that capitalist technological development can create about the capacity and subjective experience of mass human labor can lead to its inability to use its capacity in a desirable way with social responsibility and consciousness. When the dimension of education is added to this situation, not all artists will develop themselves as an experience and the artist will not be able to use the ability of opposition that he can develop through the awareness and critical eye of the artist. a participant on the artistic educational approach can be extended also to Turkey and Ankara on local shares this view: “The emotions you

are experiencing one by one [*through the Internet*] are always more robust. Teachers are also missing, or many universities are opening, many inexperienced teachers can be. That is why many people who graduated from fine arts are inadequate because those people cannot give much to the students” (FRD).

In this context, the relationships between the people who make up the artist initiatives and art education and their own subjective experiences are a matter that should be considered within a broad framework since it can affect many fields from the establishment of the initiative to the activity. Most of the artists who make up the Ankara artist initiatives show their expected artist awareness due to structural or subjective reasons, although they are well educated in the artistic sense, they are far from the theoretical development of social science.

#### **5.3.8. Society and CAIs**

CAIs are distinguished from capitalist contemporary art organizations as organizations that develop socially sensitive art. These initiatives, which are expected to be in a socialist understanding, should avoid groupings and purely aesthetic concerns by incorporating transformative knowledge and politics and neutral conceptualizations of liberal initiatives. In this context, many initiatives are carried out in urban and community-specific ways by means of being able to associate and cooperate with NGOs. The different but common views on this are expressed by the initiatives: “Our business is a lot of risk. We walked really solid. We don't do our work with concern. If they can, they should; Let everyone like us. What would be nice. More modifier becomes converter people. (FRD)”, “Why should I go and make Cankaya beautiful? Çankaya doesn't need to be more beautiful. There are worse places. Thinking like this, we said to establish an association. Because we said let's go, functional parks and playgrounds in the southeast. (FRD)”, “In this period, art has to be done for the society. (FRD)”, “Make art for art, so where does it go? So you sell business to collectors. We have another

problem now. (FRD)”, ”You need to have an idea about a social event. You need to have a counter defense. You need support. (FRD)”.

Although the participants mentioned that they produce art sensitive to the society, Ankara's art initiative lacks an art practice that encompasses the social and conscious knowledge of the society. The social knowledge entrusted to the development of most subjective knowledge levels is unlikely to approach the reality of society. One participant who is contradictory due to the contextual confusion of his subjective position of the relationship he has with the social, expresses his opinion on Ankara initiatives where social anxiety is not driven:

An art collective is opposed to everything. You're saying there's nothing to worry about. Art concern exists because the artists do the work. Everybody thinks how I can do the work he / she should do in the most aesthetic way. Because he does it for himself, even if there are five of you. It's a shame if I told you why you did it, didn't I? Other than that, no worries. Showing to society, social concern. (FRD)

### **5.3.9. Initiatives and Art History**

Although CAIs are anti-institutional organizations, they have knowledge about the historical narratives of the artistic movements and socio-political contexts that develop within the scope of modernity in art. The Ankara art initiatives, which consist of one or more artists, follow the historical development in art with a focus on the subject, as the number of people receiving art education is the majority.

In spite of the institutional and structural narrative of art history, CAIs have been formed with an awareness of their historical contexts or ‘origins’. Paradigmically, CAIs, which are critical of the break with modern art or criticize it, criticize the emergence of oppositions in art, radical criticism, and the avant-garde movements as a reference to the institutionalization of contemporary art. This way of handling is, of course, relative. Although it cannot be said that each initiative is formed with the same consciousness,

the specific focuses in the references differ according to their multiple initiatives. Nevertheless, the perception and consciousness of art historical connections is important in terms of showing the content of the concept of initiative. One of the participants of this conscious initiative expresses the historical connections of art and its transformations in contemporary art as follows:

... The real Manet is breaking... For the first time in Manet's Olympia painting, prostitute is being modeled.... They're building the Rejected Hall. Fathers [*major artists*] support Monet. The gallery system... is how it works. This is the beginning of modernism. The Rejected Hall is being set up in front of the full salon exhibition. When Monet's Lilies are mentioned, it is perceived as if it is understood as a decoration or not. These are very serious bends. (FRD)

While the art criticized the discourse and interpretation of historical narratives, the participant stated that this discourse is important in terms of reflecting the transformations and 'crises' of contemporary art, while the 'Rejected Hall' - a group exhibition of artists supported by the bourgeois against the aristocracy and the church. It is one of the historical events in which the first cores of criticism began to be seen.

These radical critiques are important in terms of being one of the first examples of criticisms that will be brought to the formation of institutionalization in contemporary art. However, the way this art-historical knowledge takes place in art education and the pedagogical teaching style also shows that the ideological dimension of art history is imposed on the artists by transference. However, the artists who question, research and read as self-conscious and self-reflective have the awareness that they see that the quality of the education they receive may not be as intended. One participant describes his / her experience as follows: “For example, when we start the art of Picasso Allah or something like that, you understand that very adolescent things, but you see that. (FRD)”, “He sifted his flour and hung his sieve; we were looking at it as nothing more. But then you read it, not so much. Now it's not idol, it's not a taboo for me [*John*]

Berger. But he's a good, successful man and he has good observations, he reads well. (FRD)".

Another aspect of the interpretation of art history by initiatives is that CAIs can accommodate art history experts and academics in the context of participants / members. In addition to opening up areas of expression in the context of knowledge and politics, and expanding the field of production, art history experts and academicians also focus on the process with the help of art history knowledge. Since the structural narrative and connections of the process and the emphasis on CAIs are criticized or rejected as ontological-paradigmatic, their historical position within the initiative is an issue that can be understood by the internal balance of the initiative. However, in-initiative interpretation of the knowledge of art history does not always bring about institutional narrative. In this context, the methodology of historical reading should include its own internal dynamics. In this respect, the discipline and conceptualization of art history is situational and original in the initiative.

Ankara's CAIs are also aware of the interdisciplinary and art history of the relations they have entered with the discipline of art history, both because they include art history academics and mainly artists who have received art education. However, this awareness and awareness varies according to the initiative and the individuals who make up the initiative. In some cases it may be inadequate. The institutional structure of the initiatives that include art history experts or academicians is felt more at the activity level. However, the development of intra-initiative dialogue in terms of structuring makes their effort to keep the initiative more flexible. One participant shares that initiatives create a free space in the history of art and that initiatives are needed today:

Together with the Medici family, art is salable and collecting is actually emerging. After that, artists who survived the churches begin to do business for the rich. 'Business' because that's it. As a result, the process becomes boring after a certain place and people

can actually say that they have experienced their full rise with conceptual art. Because why? Dada, for example, is not an art movement. Dada is actually an initiative. Either conceptual art is something that started at the beginning as an artists initiative. But history makes things easier, shelves them. Initiatives are needed now because artists leave the galleries and look for the real space, and they start to act the way they do. Everything that enters the gallery is a work of art, okay we accept it, because that's what the white cube brings. But, when the galleries come into play, when the collectors come in, things get a little messy. Art initiatives are really needed. Because it's a very free space. (FRD)

The creation of a free space by the CAIs gains a context with consistent reflexes to their opposition to capitalism on the basis of politics and knowledge. In this respect, the 'free spaces' created with the lack of conscious and responsible knowledge and policies cannot go beyond the appearance of free spaces and cannot improve the quality of the initiative on an individual and collective basis.



## **CHAPTER 6**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **6.1. Contributions of the Study**

##### **6.1.2. Theoretical Contributions of the Study**

The contradictory position of feminist praxis within academic institutions has shown that research is an important component in the production of knowledge of feminist politics. In this context, the radical policies produced supported the development of knowledge.

In addition, the reflective and self-reflective nature of the positions in politics has led to the questioning of the theoretical knowledge itself, thus criticizing the hegemonic theoretical position in the relationship entered into with the policy. In the information created about CAIs, the context established with different cultures was able to show the broad connection of CAIs on epistemological and political basis and broadened the theoretical knowledge about CAIs. The importance of everyday knowledge as well as scientific knowledge has been shown to be important knowledge sets at the level of CAIs.

In the field of contemporary art initiatives, the scientific information obtained from the literature was questioned through dialogue and the theoretical knowledge was revised and the contemporary art initiatives were revised in terms of their realities and experiences. The experience of the distant position of even female participants in feminism has contributed to some extent to the thinkers who advocate the theory of

Achievement in the sense that feminist knowledge and politics show that it is not only inherent to women, but is an achievable state of consciousness.

This study contributes to the theoretical knowledge in the context of the fact that the initiatives refer not only to the knowledge of the academy but also to the knowledge of different organizational channels. The information of the non-interviewed initiatives was also reached through the web site, electronic and printed sources, and it was tried to create comprehensive knowledge sets. As the initiatives are discussed on an individual basis, not collectively, it is provided to reach a comprehensive knowledge of the criticism of subjective experiences at the level of both subjectivity and initiative structurality. It is understood that the different production and organization of the initiatives broadens the scope of the knowledge and politics to be created for them (both shared and exceptional).

The formal and informal relations established by the participants in the field with the researcher enabled the participants to share their ideas freely. In addition, formal and informal interviews enabled information to be expanded on information sharing.

### **6.1.3. Methodological Contributions of the Study**

In this context, this field order, which was directed towards the participants in the field and which took care to get answers in interaction with them, was prepared by being critical and overflowing from the positivist understanding of science, yet still remaining faithful to the practice of modernity science. Reflective and self-reflective attempts to answer the questions interactively enabled the subject to see the political grounds of the subject as well as to discover areas where the academy could intervene. Reflected interaction in the field enabled two-way movement between both empirical and theoretical knowledge in the field layout, and opened both sets of information for discussion.

The fact that field questions are not specifically feminist has reduced the antipathy that field participants can develop into the concept of feminism in problematizing knowledge of CAIs. The fact that the field participants entered the relationship with the researcher at the subjective level and with helpfulness helped to break the prejudices about the field as a researcher.

#### **6.1.4. Practical Contributions of the Study**

In terms of knowledge and politics, contemporary art initiatives were opened to questioning their own realities through speeches during and after the field, enabling them to re-establish and reassess potential changes in knowledge sets about their grounds of existence or the connections they think about knowledge.

#### **6.2. Research Limitations of the Study**

The FST remained loyal to the scientific understanding of modernity, but criticized it extensively. Rather than adopting the traditional conceptualized and stereotyped sovereign discourse of the questions that the methodological stipulated by the FST and which will affect the production of epistemological knowledge, the effort to ask new questions through interaction with the researched and to bring new / fresh perspectives to the problems constitutes the limitation of this study.

In this context, this study has been tried to be written with the awareness of changes in a dynamic structure. Based on the active websites, electronic and printed sources (printed, newspaper and magazine articles) and verbal narratives of the initiatives included in the study, profiles of the members who were not interviewed were also able to exist in the art environment as academia, private sector and individual artist. In terms of the artistic practices of the initiatives involved in the research, there are partnerships and divergences.

The aforementioned negativity about the relations that the feminist posture theory predicts methodologically and epistemologically was tried to be reduced by the interaction entered during the field time. Discussing the problems by introducing new concepts related to social issues of FST, in this way, radical criticism of the dominant discourse and the fact that subjects or groups write their own realities based on their own experiences instead of the dominant reality thoughts that do not reflect their realities, in this study, it has been tried to be carried out in a limited way due to the limitations of the university institution in conducting academic studies and due to the conceptual hegemony brought about by the accumulation of literature.

This situation should be considered in two ways both for the academic conductor and the participant. Both sides had the opportunity to experience these limitations on the basis of educational / disciplinary, institutional and similar relationships. However, beyond the theoretical / conceptual orientations brought by the FST, the experience of the participants, although limited, was allowed to determine the direction of the study. In this way, the feminist social science researcher who conducts the research by establishing a relationship of intellectual and experiential empathy with the participant, in other words, it was tried to contribute to the opening of the literature / theory knowledge accumulated before the field in the reflective and self-reflective dynamic cyclic relationship / interaction, to the questioning and to the transformation and change of the prejudices that it developed in the theoretical and experiential aspects. Thus, in multiple ways, it is tried to be provided that the view that there is an illusion between appearance and essence in its the theoretical and experiential manifestation. Bilateral and hierarchical relations between the researcher and the participants were tried to be broken by supporting the questions on the subjective basis with interaction and political stance.

Although the age groups of the members of CAIs are different, there are initiatives made up of people from the same age group or close to the same age group. In these

initiatives, as the members became younger, the tendency to approach the problems with an attitude emphasizing flexibility rather than an organized and modernist political initiative was observed. Young members take the initiative more flexibly and do not favor other kinds of organized and rigid outlook. Rather than being a continuity and consistency, it is thought that the working area and ground should progress in such fluidity. It is understood that it is possible to express opinions with the flexibility rather than the modernist rigid opposition in questions about organized politics, state, capital and similar issues. However, this situation can have two different results in that it can lead to the influence of the opposing ideas or to destroy it in the opposite direction.

Although the research process is closely related to the chosen methodological position, the choice of FST was seen as an important ground in terms of the inclusion of subjectivity that gives possibility to understand how both the participant and his / her knowledge, body language, gestures and facial expressions affect the other person and experiencing how this to make a contribution or negative impact to the research process. One of the issues in which this is observed that the reason for a reactive approach as “You discriminate. Women and men are already equal !” that the feminist politics and art questions directed to the participants, was related to modernist feminist theory and political perception, or to a very shallow deepening of the subject question. Some participants, however, have made it clear that they think they have less knowledge especially in feminism or in some issues.

Mostly, the snowball technique is recommended by the field participants to find the field participants some CAIs have explicitly or secretly stated that they do not want to help me make an appointment for field research from participants through the network. It remains ambiguous to understand whether this is due to the impression they have received after the interviews or personally because of a feminist researcher like me. However, most CAIs have given a positive return to both the way I organize the site and the dialogue / relationship with me during the research.

Another subjective experience of the interviews and my voice-recorded note are as follows: It was stated that the person interviewed was a young artist in terms of age group and in terms of artistic technique and attitude, it was observed that she/he had practiced art with a young and dynamic identity. As a participant, the presence of a voice recorder during the field made her/him uneasy and this was reflected in her/his dialogue with questions and at the beginning of the research, s/he tended to answer the questions in a timid manner. The participant made the expression of her/his thoughts holistic and consistent. This was supported by her/his informal speech at the end of the interview. After the participant and the initiative he / she was a member of with the view of separated politics and art and stated that they did not include the politics in the art practices, the interview period was completed very fast compared to the other interview periods.

If this situation is further generalized, the initiatives are not combining the arts with the important concepts and they refrain from ‘deliberately’ thinking about these relationships caused the important problematics of the interview not to be questioned. The results of this situation were thought to have multiple results not only in terms of scientific research but also in terms of both artist, initiative and CA. In this context, the course of the interview has changed, resulting in a discussion rather than a targeted query, on a line towards the artist's way of doing art and the variety of her/his productions.

The relationship between CAIs and politics, and the importance of thinking about its knowledge in terms of CA is crucial in terms of the clues of whatness of CAIs and their art practices. However, when the discussions focused on the amount and technique of art production, some of the questions that are wanted to asked – that assuming each of the questions is linked – remained unasked. At the same time, this was seen as an important problem in the context of Feminist Standpoint Theory’s methodology and epistemology in terms of not establishing commonalities and intersections with field participants.

### **6.2.1. Theoretical Limitations of the Study**

FST is a powerful theoretical approach on the basis of epistemology and methodology. However, the criticism of modernity in terms of ontology is quite weak. In that sense, the explanation of FST that is related to CAI about the ontology of CAIs does not done as authoritatively. Knowledges of CAIs was acquired thorough Internet, oral explanations, academic papers, journals and social media about their compositive and coverable knowledge acuring beacuse of organized more on non-instiutitonalized areas more than institutional knowledge.

This situation shows dispersed and juxtaposed knowledge clusters that constitute knowledge of CAI, does not present coherent narrative. Moreover, Internet space that includes the knwoledges of CAIs refreshes and some knowledges disseppear by deleting. So, this leads to not attaining the knowledge that is attained attained before about them

Among the initiatives in the field, initiatives were mainly conducted in the fields of plastic arts in the visual arts, and music. In this context, the information of the initiatives in different fields were obtained through books or internet texts. This shows that they cannot obtain their subjective experiences in the field environment. However, this has been attempted to be overcome by paralleling the arguments in the thesis. Although the relationship entered in the field and in the field environment is tried to be made in a non-hierarchical way, the theoretical knowledge has caused a partial barrier effect between the researcher and the researched. However, the intensification of interaction with the interaction and the length of the field that create a sense of trust has contributed to the formation of shares through more subjective experiences and thus to the real knowledge. The subjective gestures of the researcher also created environments that direct the knowledge of the field environment. For example, in the face of questions asked with serious attitude, the participant concealed information about its reality. This suggests

that participant felt the pressure of academic knowledge. The presumed sovereignty of academic knowledge, besides creating a barrier in the participant, also disturbed her/him. However, all these problems have been tried to be reduced with the increase of subjective speech and interaction.

In case of doubt or lack of knowledge about the competence of the questions to explain the issue, the participants made suggestions and they thought that the knowledge of the matter could be guided by the questions they proposed. The equality of the knowledge and politics link established within the FST is indirect and weak with the knowledge and politics established in the context of CAIs.

The feminist nature of the study led to prejudice among some of the participants and the information to be obtained in this field has limited to the participant's feminist politics and knowledge competence. Since knowledge of feminism is considered on the scale of feminist knowledge and politics, which is predominantly organized in modernity in CAIs, other theoretical debates within feminism have not been adequately discussed.

The feminist identity of the researcher also created a certain limitation for the participants. Since the interviews took place on an individual basis and not on a collective basis, the approach to knowledge and politics remained at the individual level. In terms of knowledge and practice, the participants posed a risk of concealing their real knowledge in that they tend to answer the answers in the direction the researcher wants for subjective and structural reasons. However, this has led to the testing of opinions through dialogues and opposing questions.

Field interviews were conducted to the extent that access to initiative members was possible. In this context, subjective experiences are limited to the interviewees. However, this problem has been tried to be overcome by the fact that the partial information can be generalized.



The fact that the initiatives are flexible groupings also allows them to experience changes. While the member was an initiative member before the interview, the separation of the member from the initiative during the research and the inability to conduct an interview lead to the inability to obtain subjective knowledge.

Field participants identify themselves mainly as men and women in the context of identity, both the lack of interaction of the experiences of the potential participants and the limited knowledge in the context of different identities have led to an ineffective debate on the knowledge of these identities.

### **6.2.2. Methodological Limitations of the Study**

One of the invitations to the research area was rejected due to the mistrust of the scientific basis of the researcher. This resulted from the methodology of the FST on researching the hierarchical relations, and the unwillingness of the researcher to take risks resulted in the fact that they did not share their knowledge. The fact that the participants' shortcomings in their subjective and political dialogues, hierarchical relations and similar situations were revealed through interaction caused them to be disturbed. This situation caused distrust of the study and indirectly to the researcher. However, it was tried to provide assurance through verbal approval. Some of the respondents wanted to influence the methodology of the research on the grounds that they could receive subjective damages from the sound recorder, which was used in accordance with the ethics of the university. This problem was tried to be overcome with the trust relationship established.

### **6.2.3. Practical Limitations of the Study**

The fact that the criticisms of contemporary art initiatives are not considered by the initiatives on the grounds that they are academic (considering that they are opposed to

institutionalities) will result in the lack of information about the potential information and politics developed about them, and remain as the information circulated within the academic circles.

### **6.3. Recommendations for the Future Studies**

It will be possible to understand the broad scope of the diversity of contemporary art initiatives within and between each other, by evaluating and expanding different initiatives within the scope of future academic researches. In addition to the initiatives discussed in this thesis, new art initiatives are being established in contemporary art. Inclusion of them in this knowledge set will contribute to the understanding of the specificities of the subjectivities of the initiatives on the basis of difference.

Specific inquiry of not only cultural resources but also economic, political and social resources that are benefited in the constitution of initiatives will create politics and knowledge basis that empower them about being the transformative subject of CAIs and will make wider the knowledge about them. The search for CAIs not only on the specificity of CAI but the constructed connections with social institutions will empower them in terms of context.

Moreover, the search of connections of CAIs with different initiatives will be important in terms of seeing of them how much they use supportive mechanisms and watching how to position themselves in society as a collective subject.

It should be shown that different paradigmatic basis can authoritative açılıms about CAIs in terms of the understanding of CAIs on the foundations of relational theory on these days. The relation of wide scale of feminist politics with CAI should be able to inquired authoritatively by widening the inquiry about FST and considering even different feminist paradigmatic standpoints. Different theoretical openings should be able

to done on the bases of knowledge and politics which lead to transforming both fields by searching the dimensions of relations of CA with CAIs.

CAI took place in the scale of this thesis with individual interrogations. The group interrogations with initiatives can make possible the construction of connection of subjective and group knowledges in this area.

## REFERENCES

- Armutçu, E. (2002, 19 October). Koleksiyoncuların koleksiyonunu yaptılar. [online] [www.hurriyet.com.tr](http://www.hurriyet.com.tr).
- Bek., G. (2007). *1970-1980 Yılları Arasında Türkiye’de Kültürel ve Sanatsal Ortam*.İstanbul: Salt E-Books.
- Boratav, K. (2003). Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-2009. İmge Kitabevi Press.
- Bracke,S. and De La Bellacasa, M. (2004). Building Standpoints. In S. Harding, The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies. (pp.309-316). Routledge.
- Carroll, N. (1999). *Philosophy of Art: A Contemporary Introduction*. Routledge.
- Cockburn, C. (2015). Standpoint Theory. In S. Mojab, Marxism and Feminism (pp.331-46). London:Zed Books.
- Collins,P. (2004a). Comment on Hekman’s “Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited”: Where’s the Power?. In S. Harding, The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies. (pp.247-253). Routledge.

- Collins, P. (2004b). Learning From the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.103-126). Routledge.
- Crasnow, S. (2009). Is Standpoint Theory a Resource for Feminist Epistemology? An Introduction. *Hypatia*, 24(4), 189-192.
- Crasnow, S. (2013). *Feminist Philosophy of Science: Values and Objectivity*. Philosophy Compass. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 413-423.
- Farganis, S. (1986). *Social Theory and Feminist Theory: The Need for Dialogue*. Wiley, 50-68.
- Garcia-Selgas, F. (2004). Feminist Epistemologies for Critical Social Theory: From Standpoint Theory to Situated Knowledge. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.293-308). Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (2004). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.81-101). Routledge.
- Harding, S. (2004a). A Socially Relevant Philosophy of Science? Resources from Standpoint Theory's Controversiality. *Hypatia*. 19(1), 25-47.
- Harding, S. (2004b). Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 1-15). Routledge.

Harding, S. (2009). Standpoint Theories: Productively Controversial. *Hypatia*. 24(4), 192-200.

Harding, S. (2004c). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited": Whose Standpoint Needs the Regimes of Truth and Reality?. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.255-262). Routledge.

Harding, S. (2004d). Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What Is "Strong Objectivity"? In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.127-140). Routledge.

Harnois, C. E. (2010). Race, Gender, and the Black Women's Standpoint. *Sociological Forum*. 25(1), 68-85.

Hartsock, N. (2004a). The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.35-53). Routledge.

Hartsock, N. (2004b). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited": Truth or Justice?. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.243-246). Routledge.

Hekman, S. (2004a). Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.225-241). Routledge.

- Hekman, S. (2004b). Reply to Hartsock, Collins, Harding, and Smith. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.269-271). Routledge.
- Hennesy, R. (1993). Women's Lives/Feminist Knowledge: Feminist Standpoint as Ideology Critique. *Hypatia*. 8(1), 14-34.
- Hirschmann, N. (2004). Feminist Standpoint as Postmodern Strategy. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.317-332). Routledge.
- Hoffman, J. (2001). Blind Alley Defining Feminism. *Blackwell Publishers*. 21(3), 193-199.
- Intemann, K. (2010). 25 Years of Feminist Empiricism and Standpoint Theory: Where Are We Now? *Hypatia*, 25(4), 778-796.
- Jaggar, A. (2004). Feminist Politics and Epistemology: The Standpoint of Women. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.55-66). Routledge.
- Janack, M. (1997). Standpoint Epistemology Without the "Standpoint"?: An Examination of Epistemic Privilege and Epistemic Authority. *Hypatia*. 12(2), 125-139.
- Kourany, J.A. (2009). The Place of Standpoint Theory in Feminist Science Studies. *Hypatia*. 24 (4), 209-218.

Kozlu, D. (2011). Türkiye'nin 1990 ve 2000'li Yıllardaki Çağdaş Sanat Ortamına Genel Bir Bakış. *Türk Sanatları Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 2(1), 147-160.

McCaughey, M. (1993). Redirecting Feminist Critiques of Science. *Hypatia*. 8(4),72-84.

McLaughling, J. (2003). *Feminist Social and Political Theory: Contemporary Debates and Dialogues*. Palgrave Macmillan

Narayan, U. (2004).The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Nonwestern Feminist. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.213-224). Routledge.

New, C. (1998). Realism, Deconstruction and the Feminist Standpoint. *Blackwell*. 28(4), 349-372.

Pels,D. (2004). Strange Standpoints, or How to Define the Situation for Situated Knowledge. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. (pp.273-289). Routledge.

Pelvanoğlu, B. (2017). *Pek Kronolojik Olmayan Hayatımız: Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Sanat*. Corpus Press.

Powell, W. and Dimaggio, P. (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.



Rolin,K. (2009). Standpoint Theory as a Methodology for the Study of Power Relations. 24(4), 218-226.

Rose,H. (2004). Hand, Brain, and Heart:A Feminist Epistemology for the Natural Sciences. In S. Harding, The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies. (pp.67-80). Routledge.

Rouse,J. (2004). Feminism and the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge. In S. Harding, The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies. (pp.353-374). Routledge.

Rouse,J. (2009). Standpoint Theories Reconsidered. 24(4),200-209.

Roy, D. (2008). Asking Different Questions: Feminist Practices for the Natural Sciences. 23(4),134-157.

Smith,D. (2004). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited". In S. Harding, The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies. (pp.263-268). Routledge.

Şen, A., Çelikaslan, Ö, and Tan, P. (2016). *Otonom Arşivleme*. Sivil Düşün.Bak.ma.

Tekeli, İ. (2012). *Türkiye İçin STK'lar ve Katılımcı Demokrasi Yazıları*. Tarih Vakfı Yurt Publications.

Wylie,A. (2004). Why Standpoint Matters. In S. Harding, The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies. (pp.339-351). Routledge.

Yasa-Yaman, Z. (2011). Beyond the Apparent: A Selection from the Art Collection of The Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey,Pera Museum Publication.

Yılmaz, N. (2015). *1980 Sonrası Türkiye’de Sanat ve Siyaset*. Ütopya Press.

Yüksel, U. (n.d.) <http://www.beatkusagi.com/yeni-baslayanlar-icin-beat-kusagi/>

## A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

168

## **B. QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE FIELD RESEARCH**

### **1. Art (Turkey and Global)**

11. How can speak of a relationship between science and art in Turkey?
2. The state in the development of art in Turkey's capital and how civil society has a lot to you?3. How do you evaluate the art market?
4. How do you assess the role played by large-scale art activities (especially biennials, fairs, etc.)?
5. What is the role of the artist-artwork-viewer in art?
6. What would you like to say about the importance of actors (especially critics / advisors, curators, collectors, etc.)?
7. Do you think art in Turkey (CV and SV) has been improvement in how the role of artistic movements?
8. Do you think the breaking point of the art in Turkey / What are the factors affecting the change?
9. Differences between Modern Art and Contemporary Art
10. How do you interpret the relationship between art and politics?

11. Information and communication technology developments in how you think it played a role in the arts that took place in Turkey?
12. How do you interpret locality in art?
13. How do you interpret the existence of art in Ankara and the difference of art in Ankara-other cities?
14. How do you see the future of art?

## **2. Feminist Art**

15. What do you think about feminist art?
16. What do you think is the importance of women artists in the art world?
17. How do you see the future of feminist art?

## **3. (Contemporary) Art Initiatives**

18. How do you interpret the importance of art initiatives (communities, collectives, groups, formations) in art?
19. What are the specific characteristics of the initiatives and what do you think about them?

## C. TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

### FEMİNİST DURUŞ KURAMI AÇISINDAN SANATTA ÇAĞDAŞ SANAT İNİSİYATİFLERİNİN ELEŞTİRİSİ: ANKARA/TRKİYE RNEĐİ

Çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin feminist bilgi ve politika temelinde anlaşılması, kapitalist çağdaş sanat anlayışına eleştiri getirerek çağdaş sanatın gerçek bilgi ve politikasının anlaşılmasını sağlamaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Ankara'daki çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin öznelliklerinin özgüllüklerine odaklanılarak onların farklılık temelinde anlaşılması ve bilgi ve politika üretimlerinin öznellikleri ortaya çıkarılmaya çalışılmıştır ve ana araştırma problematiĐi "Sanatın paradigmatic sorunsallaştırılmasında (Çağdaş Modernite/FST-methodoloji), çağdaş sanatın (ÇS) ve ÇS içinde ÇS inisiyatiflerinin öznelliklerin özgüllükleri kapsamında bilgi ve siyaset temelinde incelenmesinin yapılması gerekir." tezini savunma üzerine kurulmuştur. Bu açıklığın, Türkiye'deki çağdaş sanatın bilgi ve politikasının anlaşılmasına olan etkisinin göz önüne serilmesi de amaçlanmıştır.

Ankara özelindeki çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin anlaşılması, çağdaş sanat inisiyatifi kavramsallaştırılmasının tanımlanmasını ve kapsamını gerekli kılmaktadır. Çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri, çağdaş sanat içerisinde sivil örgütlenmeler olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Bu örgütlenmeler, sanatçıları, entelektüelleri (farklı meslek gruplarından bireyleri) ve akademisyenleri içerebilmesi bakımından epistemolojik olarak zengin bir bilgi ve politika yapma zemini oluşturmaktadır. Bu sivil çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri, sivil toplum örgütlerinden kurulma amaçları, kurulma biçimleri, faaliyetleri gibi özellikleri ile ayrılmaktadır. Ancak, kültürel alanın kurucularından olan devlet, sermaye ve sivil toplum kurumları arasında, devlet ve sermaye kurumlarının dışında örgütlenen ve sivil topluma daha yakın bir konumlanış söz konusudur. Sivil toplum örgütlerinden

farklılaşsa da, yukarıda bahsedilen kurulma biçimleri ve faaliyetleri açısından kesişmeler ve benzerlikler de gösterebilmektedirler. Bu benzerlik ve farklılık, inisiyatiflerin özgüllükleri temelinde anlaşılabilir. Her sivil toplum örgütünün farklılaşması söz konusu olduğu gibi, çağdaş sanatçı inisiyatifleri de birbirlerinden farklılaşmaktadır. Ancak bu, hem sivil toplum hem de inisiyatif temelinde kesişimselliklerin oluşmadığı anlamına da gelmemektedir. Her iki grup da kendi içerisinde durumsal, olumsal, koşullara bağlı olarak kesişmeler, aynışmalar ve farklılıklar gösterebilmektedir.

Sanat inisiyatifi kavramsallaştırması, kültürel alanda, özel olarak da sanat alanında bir inisiyatif alma bağlamında ortaya çıkan grup, topluluk, kolektivite gibi bir araya gelişlerdir. Bu inisiyatif alış, bağlamı ve içeriği bakımından farklı epistemolojik ve politik karakter taşımaktadır. Doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak alınan bu inisiyatifler, bireysel olarak sanatçıların sanatta inisiyatif almasından farklıdır. Bu farklılığın anlaşılması, sanat inisiyatiflerinin özellikle ortaya çıktığı çağdaş sanat bağlamında düşünüldüğünde, onların öznel ve özgül özellikleri bağlamında ele alınması ile mümkündür.

Çağdaş sanatçı inisiyatifleri, çağdaş sanatın ifade biçimleri ve örgütlenmesi içerisinde kolektif üretimin temel alındığı yapısal-örgütlenme karşıtı bir örgütlenme biçimi olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Modernist sanatsal gruplaşmalar örgütlenme biçimi, bir araya geliş amaçları ve faaliyetleri açılarından farklılıklar göstermektedirler.

Paradigmatik olarak çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri, çağdaş sanatların ortaya çıkışı esas alınarak modernite paradigmasını eleştiren ya da reddeden bir karakterdedir. Tekil bir çağdaş sanat ontolojisi ve epistemolojisi –ve hatta metodolojisi– olmadığı gibi, çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin de ontolojisi ve epistemolojisi bakımından çoklu bir karakter taşıdığı söylenebilir.

Bu farklı bir araya gelişler ve farklılaşmalar, değişken politikaların yapılmasını ve zengin bilgi üretimini sağlamaktadır. Çağdaş sanatın sosyal olan ile kurduğu zengin ve kapsamlı birliktelik, çağdaş sanatın tanımını ve pratiklerini genişletirken, çağdaş sanatın içinde bulunan her ögenin de bilgi ve politikasını da genişletmektedir.

Sanatta 20.yüzyıl'da ortaya çıkan bu avant-gart kolektifler, tarihsel olarak ve sanat pratikleri ile düşünsel referansları bağlamında, modernite temelinde örgütlenen kolektifler olarak kabul edilebilir. Modern sanat eleştirisi yapan bu gruplar, estetiği reddeden ve rasyonel özneye eleştiri getirmeleri bağlamında, modernite içerisinde görünürde paradoksal bir konumlanış almaktadırlar. Ancak, modernitenin temel varsayımlarının tamamını tutarlı biçimde eleştirememiş olmaları ve kabullenmeleri nedeniyle, modernite içinde yer alan kolektifler ya da gruplar olarak düşünülmelidir.

Araştırmada kullanılan Feminist Duruş Kuramı (FDK), bilgi ve politikanın birlikteliğini savunarak çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin anlaşılmasını sağlamaktadır.FDK-metodolojisi, feminist bilgi üretiminde politikanın önemli bir bileşen olduğunu kabul etmekle birlikte, üretilecek olan bu bilginin yöntemlerini orthodox modernist bilgi üretim metodu olan pozitivist bilim anlayışına eleştirel yaklaşmaktadır. Pozitivist bilim anlayışının hiyerarşik olarak, bilimsel bilgiyi gündelik bilimden ayırarak özcü, evrensel ve rasyonel üst bir pozisyona yerleştirmesi ve bilimsel bilginin üretiminin koşullarını politikadan ayırarak normal, nötr ve nesnel temelde sunma çabasına FDK'ları eleştirel yaklaşmaktadırlar.

FDK-metodolojisi, öznenin özgüllüğünü açığa çıkararak kurumun hegemonyasını asgari düzeye indirmektedir. Bu sayede dönüştürücü gerçek bilgi, yeni bir toplumsallık ve özne inşa sürecine kapı aralamaktadır. Bu inşa süreci duruma, koşula, konuma bağlı olarak değişkenlik göstermektedir. FDK'na göre, dönüştürücü bilgi üretimi, bilgiyi kuranın konumlanışı ve politika ile girdiği ilişkiyle doğrudan bağlantılı görünmektedir.



Sadece sınırdaki kalış veya ezilme değil, Kapitalist hegemonik bilgi üretim pratiğini eleştiren radikal her türlü konumlanmış özgül bilgi üretiminin önünü açmaktadır.

Etkileşime giren araştırmacı ve araştırılan, araştırma süresince öznelliklerinin özgüllüklerini ortaya çıkararak egemen bilginin önüne geçmeyi ve kendi gerçekliğini inşa etmeyi mümkün kılmaktadır. Özne temelde etkileşim, hegemonik kurumsal bilgi ve pratiklerini bozarak, araştırma sürecine örtük bilgi, deneyimler, gündelik ve entelektüel bilginin, duyguların gerçekliğin bilgisini oluşturan önemli bileşenler olarak düşünülmesini sağlamaktadır. Araştırma süresince öznenin gerçekliğine ulaşırken araştırılan ve araştırılan arasındaki feminist politik bilinçlenme sayesinde, hegemonik kapitalist bilgi üretiminin çarpıttığı gerçekliğin, kadın deneyiminin, feminist öznenin içerdiği kapsamda deneyimlerin oluşacak olan bilgiye dahil edilmesi ve açığa çıkarılması sağlanmış olmaktadır.

Feminist politik bilinçlenme, kişinin bulunduğu pozisyona bağlı olarak otomatik olarak kavrayacağı bir bilinç olmamakla birlikte, girilen etkileşim bu bilinçlenmeyi mümkün kılmaktadır. Ayrıca, araştırma süreci, araştırma sorularının ve cevaplarının etkileşimle oluşturulması ve cevaplarının hiyerarşik olmayan düzende özne olarak bulunma çabası, teorik bilginin dayattığı kavramsal hegemonyanın da değişmesine, öznenin kendi gerçekliğini kuracak olan esnek kavramsallaştırmanın önünü açmaktadır. Bilgi üretim pratiğinin içinde olan özne ve kurum, yansımaları ve öz-yansımaları olarak etkileşime geçerek konumlanışları ve gerçeklikleri açısından yeniden yorumlanma olanağı sağlamaktadır. Öznellik temelindeki ilişki, kurumsalın çözülmesine değil onun yeniden ve farklı bir şekilde çağdaş modernite temelinde yeniden yorumlanmasını sağlamaktadır.

Araştırma, sanatçı inisiyatifleri ve sanatçı inisiyatifleri ile ilişkili akademisyenlerle feminist kalitatif metodolojik zeminde derinlemesine mülakatlar yapılarak iki sene içerisinde tamamlanmıştır. Akademik olarak yapılan formal görüşmeler dışında enformel olarak da yapılan görüşmeler, bu sahanın bilgisini oluşturmuştur. Bu bilgi

kümeleri, teorik bilgi ve deneyimden ortaya çıkan bilginin etkileşimlerinin potansiyel uzamlarını görebilmek açısından önemli olduğu kanısındayım. Bu iki bilgi kümesi ile kurulacak her yeni ve yeniden olacak olan ilişki, farklı alt bilgi kümeleri de oluşturacaktır. Araştırma toplam 35 kişi ile yüz yüze görüşmeler yapılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Ancak formal olarak 35 kişi ile görüşülmenin yanında enformel olarak görüşülen kişi sayısı 35'i aşkındır. Formal olarak 13 inisiyatif grubu ve 17 akademisyen ile görüşülmüştür. 13 inisiyatif grubuyla grup olarak görüşme yapmak yerine inisiyatif üyeleri ile tek tek görüşmeler gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bunun sebebi, grup olma hegemonyasının ortadan kalkarak her bir üyenin sanat inisiyatiflerine dair öz-deneyim ve düşüncesini dile getirmesinin sağlanması içindir.

Türkiye toplumunun 'modernleşme' kavramı ile girdiği ilişki ile 'modern sanat' ve 'çağdaş sanat' kavramsallaştırmaları arasında bağlantılar mevcuttur. Bu bağlamda, modernleşme ve çağdaşlaşma eş anlamlı kavramlar olarak entelektüel ve gündelik bilgi kapsamına alınmıştır. Bahsi geçen kavramların paradigmatik ele alınışı ise entelektüel ve gündelik kullanımdan farklılaşma göstermektedir. Bu, önemli bir çelişki olarak politik konumlanışların yanında Türkiye'de gelişen sanatın kavramsallaştırmasında bir problem yaratacaktır. Ağırlıklı olarak Türkiye'de üretilen sanatsal yazın literatürü, modern sanat ve çağdaş sanat kavramsallaştırmasını sanat teorileri içerisinde geliştirilen modern sanatı çağdaş sanattan ayıran ilkeler üzerinden bu ayrımı uygulasa da modern ve çağdaş kavramsal olarak eş tutma eğilimi göstermiştir. Bu kavramsal karışıklığın önüne geçilmek için Kortun 'güncel sanat' kavramsallaştırmasını çağdaş sanatı tanımlayan alternatif kavram olarak ortaya koymakla bu çarpık anlatının önüne geçmeyi hedeflemiştir. Ayrıca, çağdaş sanat dünya literatüründe olduğu gibi Türkiye sanat literatüründe de postmodern sanat kavramsallaştırmasıyla da eş anlamlı kullanılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, dünya literatüründe 'modern art' ve 'contemporary art' kavramsallaştırmaları modern sanat ve çağdaş sanat kavramsallaştırmalarını kelime olarak kullanımını karşılarken, Türkiye literatüründe modern sanat, modern sanat kavramsallaştırmasını; çağdaş sanat, güncel sanat ve postmodern sanat çağdaş sanatı

kasteden kavramsallaştırmalar olarak çeşitlenmektedir. Modern sanat ve çağdaş sanat kavramsallaştırmaları, bu tez kapsamında ise paradigmatic bakışla anlaşılan kavramlar olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu açıdan modern sanat moderniteyi çağdaş sanat ise postmoderniteyi kaynak alan fakat çağdaş moderniteye de açılım yapan ve ilişkisel paradigmayı da içine alan bir sanatsal ifade alanı olarak paradigmatic açıdan tanımlamaktadır. Elbette ki çağdaş sanata getirilen paradigmatic bakışların spesifik olarak farklılıkları mevcuttur. Ancak çağdaş sanatın modern sanattan farklı olarak kurumsallaşma eleştirisi taşıması ve sanat-hayat birleşimi önermesi bakımından bahsedilen üç paradigmanın da (Çağdaş modernite, postmodernite, ilişkisel paradigma) kesişimini taşıması söz konusudur. Çağdaş sanat, sanatsal teoriler içerisinde modern sanat eleştirisi yaparken paradigmatic olarak da modernite eleştirisi yapmaktadır. Bu görüşe paralel olarak çağdaş sanatın anlaşılması modern sanattan farklı olarak kesişimler, dialoglar geliştirebilmesi açısından tek bir disiplinle anlaşılabilen bir alan olmaktan çıkarak pek çok disiplinin bir arada ve dialog içerisinde tarifleyebileceği bir alan olarak düşünülmesi gereklidir. Çağdaş sanat, hayatın her alanından beslenebilen bir ifade alanı olarak kurumsallığa radikal eleştiriler getirebilen ve öznelliklerin zenginliklerini açığa çıkarabilen bir zemin olarak düşünülmektedir. Bu yaklaşım, modernitenin– ve dolayısıyla modern sanatta izlenebilecek olan– rasyonelitesini, evrenselliğini ve özcülüğünü reddederek veya derinlemesine eleştirerek sanatsal ifade alanlarını genişletmiş, sosyale konu olan herşeyin sanatsal ifade aracına veya temsiline dönüşme imkanını oluşturmuştur. Elbette ki bu yıkım ve eleştiri, çağdaş sanatın bir sanat ifade alanı olarak yıkımına ve eleştirisine de yol açmaktadır. Ancak, postmodern paradigmanın taşıdığı bu riskten ziyade çağdaş modernite ele alışı özelinde de FDK, çağdaş sanatı hayata yaklaştırmak onun kurumsal boyutlarını eleştirmenin yanında ve özne zenginliğini derinlemesine açan bir yaklaşım getirerek, somut koşulların ön görülen teorik çağdaş sanat tanımlamalarının ötesine geçme ve çağdaş sanatın dönüşümü ve değişimi için gerekli politikayı sunmak açısından alanlar açmaktadır. Kavramsal olarak çağdaş modernite paradigması içerisinde FDK'nın bu tez kapsamında benimsenmesi ve onun bilgiyi ve politikayı birleştirme çabası, çağdaş sanatın anlaşılması için de

geçerlidir. Çağdaş sanatın bilgisinin üretimindeki politik koşulların önemi ve etkisi, Türkiye yerelliği içerisinde gelişen çağdaş sanatın ve genel olarak sanatın anlaşılmasında bir temel olarak düşünülecektir. Türkiye’de gelişen çağdaş sanatı anlamak amacıyla daha önce de bahsedilen modernleşme kavramsallaştırmasının Türkiye kontekstinde somut olarak gözlemlenebilen koşullarını göz önünde bulundurmak önemli açılımlar sağlamaktadır.

Ankara’da modern ve çağdaş sanatın kurumsallaşması ile birlikte sanat alanında birçok grup, dernek, kolektif ve inisiyatif tanımlamasıyla birbirinden farklı sanatçı örgütlenmeleri ortaya çıkmıştır. Paradigmatik olarak modern sanatta yer alan gruplaşmalar ile çağdaş sanat alanında oluşan gruplaşmalar arasında Ankara’da yer alan çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin başlangıcı, Türkiye’nin çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerin başlangıcı olarak düşünülen modernist gruplaşmaları referans aldığı söylenebilir.

1980 sonrası Türkiye’de yaşanan ekonomik, politik ve sosyokültürel dönüşümler, neoliberal politikaların Türkiye’de sanat alanında sermayenin görünürlüğünü artırmasıyla devletin bu alanı sermayenin hegemonyasına neredeyse tamamen bırakmasına sebep olmuştur. Ankara’da 1980’lerde kurulan ve çağdaş sanat alanında sosyal teori bağlamında paradigmatik olarak modernite eleştirisi yapan çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri kurulmaya başlanmıştır. Ağırlıklı olarak 2000’lerde Ankara sanat hayatında aktif olan çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri, güncel sanatın ve şimdinin farklılık temelinde gerçekleşmesini sağlamaktadırlar.

Bu inisiyatifler ya da kolektiflerin bir kısmı aktif olarak varlığını devam ettirmekteyken örgütlenmelerini sonlandıran inisiyatiflerde bulunmaktadır. Bu inisiyatifler arasında varlığını sonlandırıp tekrar yeniden ve farklı bir sanatsal yaklaşımla kurulan inisiyatifler de bulunmaktadır. Bu inisiyatiflerin örgütlenme biçimleri, kuruluş amaçları, çağdaş sanata yaklaşımları ve eleştirileri, varlık gösterdikleri mekansallıklar (internet ortamı, somut sanat mekanı, masa formu vs) , sanat dünyası ve toplumla (toplumsal kurumlar ve

özneler) kurdukları ilişkiler, politika ile bağlantıları, disiplinler yaklaşımları gibi konularda farklı tutumlar sergilerlerken inisiyatifleri oluşturan katılımcıların inisiyatiflerine olan bakış açıları ve genel inisiyatif kavramsallaştırmasına olan yaklaşımları da farklılaşmaktadır. Türkiye’de inisiyatiflerin ‘bağımsız’ oluşumlar olmaları, onları kurumsallaştıran pratiklerden uzaklaştıran önemli özelliklerindendir. Bu durum, inisiyatiflerin görünür olup olmamaları ile de ilgili olarak varlıklarının tespit edilmesini veya sonlandıklarını, tekrar başladıklarını, form değiştirdiklerinden haberdar olma konusunda bilgi eksikliği oluşturmaktadır. Özellikle radikal politika vurgusuyla oluşturulan inisiyatiflerin görünürlüğü ve bilinirliği (o inisiyatiflere dair bilgi) farklı sebeplerle (siyasi baskı, deneysel ve açık kaynaklı yeni iletişimsel mecralar vs) diğer inisiyatif ve kolektiflere oranla daha düşüktür. Çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin öznelliklerinin özgül koşulları, onların sanatsal ve politik eleştirilerini gösterebilmesi bağlamında kritiktir. Bu nedenle onlara dair oluşacak bilgi kümesi, inisiyatif ‘yapısal’ kavramsallaştırması ile öznellik temelinde ( her inisiyatifin kendisini ve inisiyatifin bileşenlerinin öznellikleri temelinde inisiyatifin deneyimlenerek yorumlanması) farklılaşmaları arasında oluşturulabilecek dialog ile oluşturulmalıdır.

Ankara yerelinde yer alan inisiyatiflere her geçen gün yeni örgütlenen inisiyatifler de eklenmektedir. Her eklenenecek inisiyatif, Ankara yereline dair gerçekliğin bilgisinin kurulmasını yeniden etkileyecek ve dönüştürecektir. Bu bağlamda total bir Ankara sanat inisiyatifleri olgusundansa bu kavramsallaştırmanın ucu açık, değişebilir, dönüşebilir ve farklı ilişkiler kurabilir gibi yapısal anlatıdan uzaklaştırmak, yerelliğin deneyiminde farklı bağlamlara ve yaklaşımlara imkân tanıyacaktır.

Mekansal bağlamda örgütlenen çağdaş sanat inisiyatiflerinin yanısıra, mekansal bağlamda örgütlenmemiş, varlıklarının izleri yalnızca faaliyetleri temelinde sürdürebilen inisiyatifler de bulunmaktadır. Bu inisiyatifleri oluşturan ‘üyeler’in kendilerini anonimleştirmeleri söz konusu olabilirken, inisiyatif olarak görünür biçimde faaliyetlerini sürdüren çağdaş sanat inisiyatif örgütlenmeleri de söz konusudur. Bu

inisiyatiflerin faaliyetleri, mekansal olarak örgütlenen inisiyatiflerin aksine daha yansımali ve hareketli olabilme potansiyeli sebebiyle farklı mekansallıklarda ve zamanlarda varlıklarını yeniden kurma ve kendilerini ifade etme imkanına sahiptirler.

1980 sonrası, özellikle 1990’larda gelişen kültürel değişimler, teknolojinin aktif kurucu bileşen olduğu bir sosyallik içerisinde şekillenerek, sanatsal ifade yöntem ve mecralarında farklılaşmalar yaratmıştır. Bu teknolojik gelişmeler, bilgi ve enformasyonun oluşumunu çoğaltıp, dolaşımını ve yaygınlığının hızını artırarak küresel düzlemde mekan ve zamansal dönüşümlere yol açmıştır.

1980’lerden sonra özellikle 1990lar ve 2000’lerde kurulan çağdaş sanatçı inisiyatifleri, teknolojinin, bilimin, sanatsal olmayanı sanata dahil edebilmenin farklı ifade zeminleri oluşturduğundan referansla, küresel çapta özgül ve öznel yerellikler oluşturmuştur. 1990’lardan itibaren sayıları artarak devam etmekle birlikte, ontolojik olarak kalıcılık-karşıtı tavırla örgütlenmeleri nedeni ile, daha önce varlık gösteren çağdaş sanatçı inisiyatiflerinin bir kısmının, varlıklarını sonlandırmayı tercih etmeleri de söz konusu olmaktadır.

Çağdaş sanat inisiyatifleri hiyerarşik olmayan, yatay, merkezsiz, eleştirel/politik, yenilikçi (geleneksel değil, yeni dil ve yeni konuşmalar), etkileşimli, diyaloga dayalı, yerel, katılımcı, demokratik, eşitlikçi, özgür, anlık, yansımali, küçük, (yeni) sanatsal kültüre sahip, , geçici, sıradüzensiz, çapraz, alternatif/dışarıda/çeperlerde olan, deneysel (kurumsallık dışı deneyim), proje-temelli, küratöryel, kavramsal, etkileşimli ve and geniş ve geleneksel-olmayan sanatın kamusllığını oluşturabilmesgibi özelliklerine sahiplerdir. Bu geniş bağlamda değerdendirilebilmelerine rağmen, farklı çağdaş sanatçı inisiyatiflerinin ortaklaşılan özellikleri söz konusudur.

Akademik kurumlar içerisindeki Feminist praksisin çelişkili konumu, araştırmanın feminist politikanın bilgi üretiminde önemli bir bileşen olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bağlamda, üretilen radikal politikalar, bilginin gelişimini desteklemiştir. Ayrıca

politikadaki konumlanışların yansımaları ve öz-yansımaları oluşu, teorik bilginin kendisine soru sorarak politika ile girilen ilişkide hegemonik teorik konumlanışın eleştirilmesini sağlamıştır. ÇSİ'lerine dair oluşturulan bilgide farklı kültürlerle kurulan bağlam, ÇSİ'lerin epistemolojik ve politik temelde bağlantılarının genişliğini gösterebilmiş ve kuramsal olarak ÇSİ'lerine yönelik bilgiyi genişletmiştir. Bilimsel bilginin yanında gündelik bilginin de önemi ÇSİ düzeyinde önemli bilgi kümeleri olduğu gösterilmiştir.

ÇSİ'leriyle saha sorularında literatürden alınan bilimsel bilgiler diyalogla sorgulamaya tabi tutularak teorik bilginin gözden geçirilmesi ÇSİ gerçeklikleri ve deneyimleri açısından revize edilmesini sağlamıştır.

Kadın katılımcıların bile feminizme uzak konumlanışının deneyimlenmesi, feminist bilgi ve politikanın sadece kadınlığa içkin olmadığını, elde edilebilir bir bilinçlilik durumu olduğunu göstermesi bağlamında kuramın Elde Edilebilme savunuculuğunu yapan düşünürlere bir ölçüde katkı yapmıştır.

Bu çalışma, inisiyatiflerin sadece akademideki bilgilerini değil farklı örgütlenme mecralarının bilgisini de referans alması bağlamında teorik bilgiye katkı yapmaktadır. Görüşme yapılmayan inisiyatiflerin de bilgisine websitesi, elektronik ve basılı kaynaklar aracılığı ile ulaşılarak kapsamlı bilgi kümelerinin oluşması sağlanmaya çalışılmıştır. İnisiyatiflerle toplu olarak değil, bireysel temelde görüşüldüğü için öznel deneyimlerin hem öznellik hem de inisiyatif yapısalılığı düzeyinde eleştirilerinin kapsamlı bilgisine ulaşılması sağlanmıştır. İnisiyatiflerin üretim ve örgütlenmelerinin farklı oluşları, onlara yönelik oluşturulacak bilgi ve politikanın kapsamını (hem ortaklaşılan hem istisnai olanı) genişlettiği anlaşılmıştır.

Sahada katılımcıların araştırmacıyla kurdukları formel ve enformel ilişkiler, katılımcıların fikirlerini özgürce paylaşmalarını sağlamıştır. Ayrıca formel ve enformel görüşmeler, bilgi paylaşımı konusunda da bilginin genişletilmesini sağlamıştır. Bu

bağlamda sahada katılımcılara yöneltilen ve onlarla etkileşim içerisinde cevapların alınmasına özen gösterilmiş olan bu saha düzeni, pozitivist bilim anlayışına eleştirel ve ondan taşan ancak yine de modernite bilim pratiğine uzaktan da olsa sadık kalınarak hazırlanmıştır. Yansıtılmalı ve öz-yansıtılmalı olarak soruların etkileşimle cevaplanmaya çalışılması, öznenin politik zeminlerini görebilmesinin yanında akademiye de müdahale edilebilecek alanların keşfedilmesini sağlamıştır. Yansıtılmalı olarak sahada girilen etkileşim, saha düzeninde hem ampirik hem de teorik bilgi arasında iki yönlü hareket edilmesini sağlarken her iki bilgi kümesinin de tartışmaya açabilmiştir.

Saha sorularının özgül olarak feminist olmaması, saha katılımcılarının ÇSİ'lerine yönelik bilginin sorunsallaştırılmasında feminizm kavramına geliştirebilecekleri antipatiyi azaltmıştır. Saha katılımcılarının araştırmacıyla girdikleri ilişkinin öznel düzeyde ve yardımseverlikle yapılması, araştırmacı olarak sahaya dair ön yargıların kırılmasında yardımcı olmuştur.

Bilgi ve politika olarak ÇSİ'lerin kendi gerçekliklerini saha esnasında ve sonrasında yapılan konuşmalarla sorgulamaya açılarak, onların varlık zeminleri hakkında bilgi kümelerinde yapabilecekleri potansiyel değişimleri ya da bilgi konusundaki düşündükleri bağlantıları yeniden kurmaları ve değerlendirmeleri sağlanmıştır.

FDK, modernitenin bilimsel anlayışına sadık kalmış ancak onu yoğun şekilde eleştirmiştir. FDK'nın metodolojik olarak öngördüğü ve epistemolojik bilginin üretimini etkileyecek olan sorunlara ilişkin soruların geleneksel kavramsallaşmış ve kalıplaşmış egemen söylemini benimsemek yerine, araştırılanla girilecek olan etkileşimle yeni sorular sormak ve sorunsallara yeni/taze bakış açıları getirme çabası, bu çalışmanın sınırlılığını oluşturmaktadır.

Bu bağlamda bu çalışma, dinamik bir yapılaşma içerisinde değişimlerin de farkındalığı ile yazılmaya çalışılmıştır. Çalışmada yer alan inisiyatiflerin aktif websiteleri, elektronik



ve basılı kaynakları (matbu, gazete ve dergi yazıları) ve sözlü anlatımlarına dayanarak görüşme yapılmayan üyelerinin profilleri de akademi, özel sektörde çalışan ve bireysel sanatçı olarak sanat ortamında varoluşlarını sürdürebildikleri görülmüştür. Araştırmaya katılan inisiyatiflerin sanatsal pratikleri açısından ortaklaşmalar ve ayrışmalar söz konusudur.

FDK'nın metodolojik ve epistemolojik olarak öngördüğü ilişkiler hakkında yukarıda bahsedilen olumsuzluk, saha süresi boyunca girilen etkileşimle azaltılmaya çalışılmıştır. FDK'nın söz konusu sosyal konulara ilişkin yeni kavramlar ortaya atılarak sorunsalların tartışılması, bu sayede egemen söylemin radikal biçimde eleştirilerek öznelere ya da grupların onların gerçekliklerini yansıtmayan egemen gerçeklik düşünceleri yerine kendi deneyimlerine dayalı gerçekliklerini kendilerinin yazması, bu çalışma içerisinde üniversite kurumunun akademik çalışma yapma konusundaki sınırlamaları sebebiyle ve bununla bağlantılı olarak literatür birikiminin getirdiği kavramsal hegemonya nedeniyle kısıtlı bir biçimde yürütölmeye çalışılmıştır.

Bu durum hem akademik çalışmayı yürüten kişi açısından hem de katılımcı açısından iki yönlü düşünölmelidir. Her iki taraf da bu sınırlılıkları, eğitim/disipliner temelde, kurum temelinde ve benzeri ilişkiler temelinde deneyimleme olanağını bulmuştur. Ancak, hali hazırda FDK'nın de getirdiği teorik/kavramsal yönlendirmelerin de ötesinde, yine de kısıtlı da olsa bu çalışmada katılımcıların deneyimlerinin çalışmanın yönünü belirlemesine olanak tanınmıştır. Bu sayede, feminist sosyal bilim araştırmacısı olarak araştırmayı yürüten kişinin de katılımcı ile düşünsel ve deneyimsel empati ilişkisi kurarak, diğör bir değışle yansımalı ve öz-yansımalı dinamik döngüsel ilişkisi/etkileşimi içerisinde saha öncesinde biriktirdiği literatür/kuram bilgisinde açılım yapılmasına, sorgulamasına ve kuramsal, deneyimsel açıdan geliştirdiği ön-yargıların dönüşmesine, değışmesine katkı yapılmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu sayede çok yönlü olarak, görünen ile gerçeklik arasında bir yanılsama olduğı görüşünün kuramsal ve deneyimsel tezahürünün ortaya çıkması sağlanmaya çalışılmıştır. Araştırmacı ile katılımcıların arasındaki ikilikli

ve hiyerarşik ilişki, soruların öznel temelde etkileşimle ve politik duruşla desteklenerek kırılmaya çalışılmıştır.

ÇSİ'leri üyelerinin yaş grupları farklı olmakla birlikte aynı yaş grubundan olan veya aynı yaş grubuna yakın kişilerin oluşturduğu inisiyatifler mevcuttur. Bu inisiyatiflerde üyeler gençleştikçe örgütlü ve modernist tavırlı politik bir inisiyatiften ziyade esnekliği ön plana çıkaran bir tavırla sorunlara yaklaşma eğilimi izlenmiştir. Genç üyeler daha esnek olarak inisiyatifi ele almakta ve diğer türlü örgütlü ve katı bakışı tercih etmemektedirler. Bir süreklilik ve tutarlılık olmaktan ziyade çalışılan alanın ve zeminin böylesi bir akışkanlıkta ilerlemesi gerektiği düşünülmektedir. Bu da örgütlü siyaset, devlet, sermaye ve benzeri konulara ilişkin sorularda modernist katı karşı çıkıştan ziyade o esneklikle görüşlerin dile getirilmesini olanak sağlandığı anlaşılmıştır. Ancak bu durum karşı durdukları düşüncelerin etkisine girme veya tam tersi yönde onu yıkmaya da yol açabilmesi bakımından iki farklı sonuç getirebilmektedir.

Araştırma süreci seçilen metodolojik konumlanış ile yakından ilişkili olmakla birlikte FDK'nın seçimi, öznellikleri içermesi bakımından hem katılımcıyı hem kendi bilgisini, vücut dili, jest ve mimiklerin karşısındaki kişiyi nasıl etkilediğini anlamak ve bunun araştırma sürecine nasıl bir katkı veya olumsuz etki yaptığını deneyimlemek açısından önemli bir zemin olarak görülmüştür. Bu durumun gözlemlendiği konulardan bir tanesi, katılımcılara yöneltilen feminist politika ve sanat sorularında “siz ayrımcılık yapıyor musunuz? Kadın-erkek zaten eşit!” şeklinde tepkisel bir yaklaşımın sebebi, modernist feminist kuram ve politik algıyla ya da özne sorgusunda oldukça sığ bir derinleşme durumu ile ilgili olduğunu düşündürmüştür. Ancak bazı katılımcılar, özellikle feminizme dair ya da daha az bilgisinin olduğunu düşündüğü konuları açıkça dile getirmiştir.

Çoğunlukla kartopu tekniği saha katılımcılarını bulmak açısından saha katılımcıları tarafından önerilse de bazı ÇSİ'leri ağ yolu ile katılımcılardan saha araştırmasına dair

randevu almam konusunda yardımcı olmak istemediğini açık veya gizli olarak ifade etmiştir. Bu durumun mülakatlardan sonra edindikleri izlenimle mi yoksa kişisel olarak benim gibi feminist bir araştırmacıdan dolayı mı olduğunu anlamak açısından muğlak kalmıştır. Ancak çoğu ÇSİ, hem sahayı organize etme biçimime hem de araştırma esnasında benimle kurdukları diyaloga/ilişkiye dair olumlu bir dönüş vermiştir.

Mülakatlara ilişkin bir diğer öznel deneyim ve sesli kaydedilen notum ise şu şekildedir: Görüşme yapılan kişinin yaş grubu açısından genç bir sanatçı olduğu belirtilmiş ve sanatsal tekniği ve tavrı açısından da genç ve dinamik bir kimlikle sanat pratiğini yaptığı izlenimi yalın bir şekilde gözlemlenmiştir. Bir katılımcı olarak saha esnasında ses kayıt cihazının varlığı onu tedirgin etmiş ve bu durum, onun sorularla girdiği diyaloga yansımış ve araştırmacının başlangıcında çekingen bir şekilde sorulara cevap verme eğilimi göstermiştir. Katılımcı, düşüncelerinin ifadesini bütüncül ve tutarlı yapmıştır. Bu, mülakat bitiminde yaptığı enformel konuşması ile desteklenmiştir. Katılımcının ve üyesi olduğu inisiyatifin politika ve sanatı birbirinden ayırması ve sanat pratiklerine politikayı dahil etmediklerini belirtmeleri üzerine mülakat süresi diğer mülakat sürelerine göre oldukça hızlı tamamlanmıştır.

Bu durum daha da genellenirse, inisiyatiflerin önemli kavramlarla sanatlarını birleştirmiyor oluşları ve bu ilişkileri ‘kasıtlı’ olarak düşünmekten uzak durmaları, mülakatın önemli sorunsallarının sorulamamasına neden olmuştur. Bu durumun sonuçları sadece bilimsel araştırma açısından değil hem sanatçı, hem inisiyatif, hem de çağdaş sanat açısından çoklu sonuçlar doğurduğu düşünülmüştür. Bu bağlamda, mülakatın seyrinin değişerek hedeflenen sorgudan ziyade sanatçının sanatı yapış biçimine ve üretimlerinin çeşitliliğine yönelik bir çizgide tartışmanın açılması sonucunu doğurmuştur.

ÇSİ’nin politika ile girdiği ilişki ve onun bilgisine dair düşüncenin çağdaş sanat açısından doğuracağı sonuçların önemi, ÇSİ’lerinin ne’liğine ve sanat pratiklerine

yönelik ipuçları taşıması bakımından önemlidir. Ancak, tartışmaların sanat üretimlerinin miktarına ve tekniğine yoğunlaştığında sorulmak istenen soruların -ki soruların her birisinin birbiriyle bağlantılı olduğu varsayılırsa- bir kısmı sorulmamış olarak kalmıştır. Aynı zamanda bu durum, FDK-metodolojisi ve epistemolojisi bağlamında da saha katılımcısı ile ortaklıklar, kesişimsellikler kurulamaması açısından da önemli bir sorun olarak görülmüştür. FDK'mı, epistemolojik ve metodolojik temelde güçlü olan bir kuramsal yaklaşımdır. Ancak, ontolojik açıdan modernite eleştirisi oldukça zayıftır.

Bu bağlamda ÇSİ ile ilişkilendirilen FDK'nın ÇSİ'lerinin ontolojisine dair açıklaması yetkin bir şekilde yapılamamıştır. ÇSİ'lerin bilgileri, kurumsal bilgi olmaktan çok kurumsallık dışı mecralarda daha çok örgütlendiğinden onlara dair bütüncül ve kapsayıcı bilgi edinimi internetten, sözlü anlatımlardan, akademik çalışmalardan, süreli dergilerden ve sosyal medyadan elde edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu durum dağınık ve birbiriyle yanyana gelemeyen bilgi kümelerinin ÇSİ'nin bilgisini oluşturduğunu göstermekte, tutarlı bir anlatı sunamamaktadır. Ayrıca ÇSİ'lerine dair bilgilerin yer aldığı internet ortamı, güncellenmekte ve bazı bilgiler silinerek kaybolmaktadır. Bu da onlara yönelik daha önce ulaşılan bilgiye tekrar ulaşılamamasına yol açmaktadır.

Sahadaki inisiyatiflerden görsel sanatlarda ağırlıklı olarak plastik sanatlar ve müzik alanlarında çalışma yapan inisiyatiflerle görüşülmüştür. Bu bağlamda farklı alanlarda çalışan inisiyatiflerin bilgilerine kitaplar ya da internet metinleri aracılığı ile ulaşılmıştır. Bu durum, onların da öznel deneyimlerini saha ortamında elde edemediğini göstermektedir. Ancak bu, metinlerin tezde sorgulanan argümanlarla paralellikler taşımasıyla aşılmaya çalışılmıştır.

Saha öncesi ve saha ortamında girilen ilişki, hiyerarşik olmayan biçimde yapılmaya çalışılsa da teorik bilginin araştırılan ile araştırılan arasında kısmen bariyer etkisi yapmasına neden olmuştur. Ancak etkileşim ile ve sahanın süre olarak uzunluğuyla

etkileşimin yoğunlaşması, güven hissi oluşturarak paylaşımların daha öznel deneyimler üzerinden şekillenmesine, dolayısıyla gerçek bilginin elde edilmesine katkı yapmıştır.

Araştırmacının öznel mimik ve jestleri saha ortamının bilgisini yönlendiren ortamlar da oluşturmuştur. Örneğin ciddi tavırla sorulan sorular karşısında katılımcı, gerçekliğine dair bilgileri gizlemiştir. Bu durum onda akademik bilginin baskısını hissetmesiyle de ilişkili olduğunu düşündürmüştür. Akademik bilginin varsaydığı egemenlik, onda bir bariyer oluşturanın yanında onu rahatsız da etmiştir. Ancak tüm bu sorunlar öznel olarak konuşmanın artması ile ve etkileşimle azaltılmaya çalışılmıştır.

Soruların meseleyi anlatabilmedeki yetkinliği konusunda şüphe duyan ya da bilgi sahibi olmadığını düşündüğü durumda katılımcılar soru önerileri yapmışlardır ve meselenin bilgisinin kendilerinin önerdiği sorularla da yönlendirilebileceğini düşünmüşlerdir. FDK içerisinde oluşturulan bilgi ve politika bağlantısının eşitliği, ÇSİ özelinde kurulan bilgi ve politika ile dolaylı ve zayıf kalmaktadır. Bu bağlamda ÇSİ'nin bilgi ve politikasının FDK'dan farklılaşması söz konusu olabilmektedir.

Çalışmanın feminist oluşu, katılımcıların bazılarında ön yargı oluşturmuştur ve bu alanda elde edilecek bilgi, katılımcının feminist politika ve bilgi yetkinliğinin sınırlılığı ile çevrenmesine neden olmuştur. Feminizm ile ilgili bilgi ağırlıklı olarak modernitede örgütlenen feminist bilgi ve politika ölçeğinde ÇSİ'lerinde düşünüldüğü için, feminizm içerisindeki diğer kuramsal tartışmaların yeterince konuşulamamasına neden olmuştur. Araştırmacının feminist kimliği de katılımcılar açısından belirli bir düzeyde sınırlılık yaratmıştır.

Mülakatlar, inisiyatiflerin toplu olarak değil bireysel temelde gerçekleştiğinden bilgi ve politikaya olan yaklaşım bireyler düzeyinde kalmıştır. Bilgi ve pratik açısından katılımcılar öznel ve yapısal nedenlerle cevaplarını araştırmacının istediği yönde cevaplama eğitimi göstermeleri bakımından gerçek bilgilerini gizleme riski

oluşturmuşlardır. Ancak bu, girilen diyaloglar ve karşıt sorularla görüşlerin teste tabi tutulmasını sağlamıştır.

Saha görüşmeleri, inisiyatif üyelerine erişimin mümkün olduğu ölçüde gerçekleştirmiştir. Bu bağlamda öznel deneyimler, görüşme yapılan kişilerle sınırlıdır. Ancak yine de kısmi bilgilerin genellenebilir olmasıyla bu problem aşılmaya çalışılmıştır. İnisiyatiflerin esnek guplaşmalar olmaları, onların değişimler yaşamalarına da olanak sağlamaktadır. Görüşme yapılmadan önce inisiyatif üyesiyken araştırma esnasında üyenin inisiyatiften ayrılması ve görüşme yapamaması, kişi özelinde bilginin elde edilememesine neden olmaktadır.

Saha katılımcılarının ağırlıklı olarak kimlik bağlamında kadın ve erkek olarak kendilerini tanımlamaları, hem potansiyel katılımcıların deneyimlerinin etkileşimle aktarılamamasına hem de farklı kimlikler bağlamında bilginin sınırlı olması bu kimliklerin bilgisine dair etkili tartışmaların yapılamamasına neden olmuştur.

## D. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

### ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

☒

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 : AKBIYIK

Adı / Name : Merve

Bölümü / Department : Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı.

### TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) :

Criticism of Contemporary Art Initiatives in Arts From Feminist Standpoint Theory:  
The Case of Ankara / Turkey

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master

☒

Doktora / PhD

☐

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

☒

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

☐

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 .....