

On Which Gezi Gives Birth To: Turkey's First Squat Don Quixote House

Burcu Ateş ,

Middle East Technical University Dep. of Architecture., ba.burcuates@gmail.com

Keywords: squat, occupy, social movement

Every single marginal group belongs to what is called subculture . This marginal group has *their different sense in politics, sociality, music, arts, and fashion, which make them stand as an opponent of mainstream: Mainstream media, mainstream fashion styles, popular music, dominant political ideology, accepted social gender, and so on. Henceforth, their opposing stand and antagonist position make them be transgressive . Hereby, the space has a potential to be a space for crime, from view of power holders. On the other hand, where they inherently express themselves are the spaces for other or the heterotopia sense. These are the spaces where intersections, juxtapositions and superimpositions of many differences take place. Indeed, such urban spaces become a means of free expression, personal experience and collective memory. The other spaces of those marginals, therefore, are what Lefebvre called as lived space , since they initiate a collective habitability by appropriating and reclaiming the urban space. Here, urban space becomes an effective tool to express oneself and such expression particularly manifested itself whereby a social movement, an uprising where small groups of marginals have chance to act together. This paper analyzes such spaces for other where marginal groups habit themselves and maintain an alternative life. The Don Quixote House in Istanbul which emerged as a squat is a space to create an other space , which initiated after Gezi Uprising. Therefore, this paper is for how Gezi Uprising triggers marginals to create such squat as a communal habitability use.*

1. As an Introduction

Man make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past. (Marx, 1852)

People, the subordinated, citizens of somewhere have been under an illusion of imitated democracy interjections, which just whispers justice, freedom and equality while shouts submission, obey, hegemony and authority as an indirect voice of the power. Such illusion is inserted in our very daily life; in schools, in workplaces, in street, in park, in museum, in justice hall, or merely in our homes. We are, subliminally, exposed to certain rules and obligations through which we are conditioned to do or not to do. Such illusion, therefore, would be maintained as we, people, accumulate impositions and oppressions while they accumulate surplus and capital. Such illusion prevent us to see the reality, or we just wait for a milestone that would trigger us to break from the given, break our everyday routines and go beyond shackles that we were urged to be submitted. We inherently respond this trigger as seeking for a ground to manifest ourselves, both individually and collectively, and form a collective resistance to overwhelm invasion of public realm by the government. We, therefore, create a room to breathe again where we lose fear and live dream;

taste the freedom. This ground, which is encouraged through a social movement or makes us real we ; such we does not belong to any typical group or i homogeneity. Rather, in a social movement, as it s a collective action, we contains n men, children, elder, disabled, LGBTI, conservative, nonbeliever, marginal, political and even, apolitical. This collectiveness prompts people to pull away their labels and act as a whole in this heterogeneity. The ground this collective action initiates becomes a very unique place for those who labelled as marginal from subculture , since they, as others , find a gr actively and freely. This ground, physically and mentally, would be turned into a space where they contaminate their marginality. This marginality comes from their unusual way of dressing and hair style, unconventional behaviours unlike majority and different everyday routines. This marginality comes due to their different sense in politics, sociality, music, arts, and fashion, which make them stand as an opponent of mainstream: Mainstream media, mainstream styles, popular music, dominant political ideology, accepted social gender, and so on. Maintaining, therefore, an opponent standing in urban life, they take antagonist position against the homogeneous, the ordered, which makes them to be treated as transgressive . The spaces they produce tend to be regarded as spaces for crime or illegal operations. On the other hand, the spaces they produce are those where they inherently express themselves as an active participant of urban life. Those spaces are the spaces of other who are too different to be anywhere else. (Zurkin, 2008, pp. 724-728) Reminding us Foucauldian concept of heterotopia , such spaces of other do exist in terms of intersections, juxtapositions and superimpositions of differences and interactions within urban life, by its actors. For that matter, heterotopias are the spaces that cannot be utilized through conventional type of property regulations; again they cannot be limited within borders of physical plans and; therefore, cannot be reduced into a physical space. Rather, those spaces can be what Lefebvre called as lived spaces social interactions and daily experiences with urban space. Within these frames and lived space , it should be pointed here that how social movements trigger and encourage, especially marginals, to produce their other space via emerging collective action in such would be discussed throughout this paper. Among those productions, which require use and appropriation of space, squatting is one of them based on the concept of occupying an abandoned uninhabited space to form a communal habitat for uncovering public use. Regarding such concept, this paper aims to seek how Don Quixote House, Turkey s first squat emerged after park forums organized as an extension of Gezi Uprising, was prompted by inhabitants as an other space whereby triggers of Gezi and its inherent call for collective action.

2. Introductory on Social Movements

Social movement is a system of practices resulting from the articulation of a conjuncture of the system of urban agents with other social practices, such that its development tends objectively towards the structural transformation of the urban system, or towards a substantial change in the balance of power in the class struggle, that is to say, in the power of the State. (Pickvance, 1975, pp. 29-49)

Social movements, with various initiator causes, recall public action and collective decision-making processes in a way to obtain a social change regarding civil rights, environmental problems, rights of homosexuals and trans, labour, anti-globalization, anti-capitalism, feminist action, women rights, workers rights, student rights and so on. Whether they eventuate with systems or not, they tend to uncover potentials of societies emerged through collective action. It cannot be ignored that revolutions may be occurred via ineradicable changes in systems, as Luther King stated: A social movement that only moves people, is merely a revolt. A movement that changes both people and institutions is a revolution. (King, 2000) However, it is also in regard social movements with their revealed potential and encouragement to make people change their

daily routines to change whatever they would be able to. Even could not reach concrete results for some cases, social movements tend to uncover various interactions in society with its actors. Whether emerged as an organization or a spontaneous occurrence, social movements often exhibited a capacity to contain transcending social borders through cross-class mobilization (Prujit, 2007, p.516), which leads to horizontal cooperation rather than the vertical one with hierarchical requirements. This non-hierarchical cooperation consists of participants of different class backgrounds such as urban poor, middle-class activists (like students), workers, academicians or public employees. This variety is obtained since such movements are prompted via public action, not with top impulse or authority order. People from different backgrounds, with different reasons behind them, participate in such actions.

Regarding their organizational patterns, social movements may differ as bottom-up or top-down. Bottom-up mobilizations are more likely to what we discussed as horizontal cooperation, as it involves networks of activists and occasional participants, creation of committees, newsletters and neighbourhood centers. On the other hand, top-down mobilization occurs via political parties to build local organizations when they aim to dominate or exploit a movement started by bottom-up. (Prujit, 2007, p.516) At that point, any top-down intervention by political groups or parties often considered as detrimental since it may turn into a state-oriented bureaucracy, which clashes ideal of self-management. (Prujit, 2007, p.516) Such state-like interventions cause contradictions among inner formation of social movements. Souza also pointed that out:

It goes without saying that social movements are not free of contradictions; they operate inside heteronomous societies, that is, in the middle of a more or less hostile environment, and in terms of political culture and political practices one can find quite often problems such as imitation of statecraft and state-like structures at the microlevel (or to remember Foucault [1984], at the level of the microphysics of power) on the part of authoritarian leaders, ambiguities, and so on. However, civil society and even the poor are not only or entirely powerless people who need to be empowered ; emancipatory course mean revolutionary changes sometimes, but it is also a *process*. A process of conquering *autonomy* and overcoming *heteronomy*. (De Souza, 2006, p.329)

Being discussed by philosophers since the 18th century, the concept of autonomy and heteronomy are also valid for today's discussions where former means living a law and later means an external law or a law imposed from outside or above. (De Souza, 2006, p.329) Here, our previously mentioned bottom-up mobilizations fit well to concept it consists direct action of oppressed groups who are the subordinated. Unlike top-down mobilizations, that of subordinated deals with production of a local power that resists through inner potentials of daily life in a spontaneous and temporal action sublimed from commanders and imperial orders. (qtd. in Sarg n, 1997, p.29) What Foucault also contributed to relation between bottom-up mobilizations and social movements is that he emphasized the power of knowledge, particularly, which refers to knowledge of the space, of people's needs and language and important for oppressed groups to exert some kind of power. For him, that bottom-up power is based on people's knowledge, the local one, and for social movements; the more they use their knowledge, the more strategic they can think and act. (De Souza, 2006, p.330) By this local knowledge, which should not be underestimated, local tools and ways of operations can be produced against state apparatuses. Such local knowledge, which makes way to a local resistance, can be able to unpredictable, unplanned, indeterminate, but new, domestic and perspicacious actions, tools, methods and ways to define its respective sphere of resistance and ground for counter-hegemony. Providing its impressive reflections by means of public participation and their bottom-up power, such social movements gain relatively great success even if they do not result with what is understood as

conventional type of revolution. Their success is in what they revive and whom they awake, that is to say, it inspires a revival and an awakening, at least.

3. What Gezi Revives, Whom It Awakes

In Gezi, you first met with yourself. There was a specific moment when you came face to face with who you are and what you fear. Then, you also had to take a look at what you believe in; how you relate to your body, to authority, to justice, to knowledge; and ultimately, of course, to freedom. After this first check-up came the sensations. Feeling Gezi came before thinking it. Sensations ran along the soft core, because it is through bodies - rushing up hills, hidden in staircases and in each breath- that desires stretched into force. Gezi started with a joyful display of real anger against the assemblages of capitalism, urban pillage, environmental destruction, conservative morals, body policing, selective justice, and whirling injustices. Gezi was just the beginning -the struggle continues. Freedom has a price and a hope its joys.

Love was hypnotic in Gezi. It brushed away the rational. It left you naked, vulnerable, and happy. It breathed air into passion-torn little hearts. It had a transformative effect, like some psychedelic trip that queers you up some more. Love was surprising, again and again. Death was there too. One, two, three, four dead in the street, shot in the h
One does not get used to death. Smiling sweet people have been dying in this country before, during, and after Gezi.

Killed by some sort of love; dead at work; found dead in the street; crushed in factories; strangled by family, hanged, starved to death; lynched in the neighborhood; burned alive with fire or acid; just missing. Some of the dead become heroes while others become martyrs. Death has a texture in this country, just like love. More soft.
selves collectively died in Gezi, each in their own way. Smooth quiet deaths of the ego faced the monstrosity of unaccounted crimes. With its dosage of love and death, Gezi was poetic.
(Ayka , 2014)

In our previous discussions on social movements and the bottom-up power as the most effective initiator of such movements, Gezi Uprising should be placed as one of the bottom-up mobilization which breaks out with a spontaneous manner of people. Being leader-free, party-free and free from any kind of political groups, Gezi (I d prefer to use Gezi , instead of Gezi Uprising) social movement for those people who had never participated in any political actions, any rebellions, any manifestations or meetings, even who had never, merely, think of what is going in world, in country or just in street. For those, and others of course, Gezi is an awakening which opens a path to think, question, challenge and act. Looking back to beginning of the protests, one can surely say that it was, at first, a call for environmental, also urban, action which exhibited an antagonist standing against transformation of a public park into a shopping mall with a replica architecture body of Ottoman style. This detrimental, discretionary (on Sultan s desire) and hege
urban public space not only damages publicity, but also the life there; the trees, the homeless, the lovers, the children, the elder, the graffiti-maker, the street artist, the street hawker, the friends who just drink beer after work or the lonely who just passing through. This intervention of state under its brutalism is for submitting its power, baring its teeth, and showing how its authority can control everything, even private lives as well as public one.

Here, a Lefebvrian classification of levels; global (state), mediatory (mixed) and private (habiting) fits well to our discussion regarding Gezi. For Lefebvre, in global level, we simply see the representation of power of state both mentally and physically; like the hegemonic pressure of politicians over public or their political strategies. For that matter, the built and unbuilt domain like schools, churches, monuments, towns, roads, highways, and urban fabric could be considered as physical representation of power. (Lefebvre, 2003, p.79) All of them remind the desire of state to control people by means of creating a centrality which eases the dominate everything. Those built and unbuilt domain also shows the capacity of state to collect capitalist commodities. The mediatory level; the mixed one, is like a link between global and private levels. As Lefebvre indicated, it is the level of city :

...Yet this level is nothing but an intermediary (mixed) between society, the state, global power and knowledge, institutions and ideologies on the one hand and habiting on the other. Wherever the global attempts to govern local, whenever generality attempts to absorb particularities, the middle level (mixed, M) comes into play: it is a terrain suitable for defence or attack, for struggle.(Lefebvre, 2003, p.80)

The misperceived, but relatively the most significant level is the private one, which is the level of habiting . However, it is somehow misconcepted with term habitat which merely typologies; like apartments, private houses, squatters and campgrounds. Different from habiting, habitatis a basic formal frame that reduces human being into simple life acts and reproducing. However, on the other hand, habiting , which private level substantially of, is more than a physical boundary or a collection of simple habits. Habiting includes all lived experiences of a human being, her/his being and her/his acts on public sphere, her/his resistances, and her/his reactions to pressure. Habiting covers the revolutionary potential. (Lefebvre, 2003, p.82) It implies that revolution will be on street; so it encourages acting on street. Therefore, appropriation of public space will emerge right after that, and a space which initially belongs to mediatory level will transform into something else, like in Gezi, where a public park turned into a communal living space after such protests against state.

Regarding Lefebvre s levels, in the case of Gezi, it is so clear that the Gezi Park is simply the direct interference of global level to mediatory one and later on, the private level of habiting. Although the protests started up with environmentally conscious concerns, together with continuing brutal interventions of state and its police force and accumulated oppressions and prohibitions of state, the protests turned to be something else: It is the transition of a to social movement which instigated masses of people. With this transition, Gezi should be attributed to be achieved a success to reach masses of people without containing them under single monotype shelter. Therefore, Gezi achieves a certain potential for social change, which Castells put forward three goals to get it: First one is to realize collective consumption demands which promotes city as a use value against commodification. Second is to establish and strength an autonomous cultural identity and promote communication instead of programmed one-way information flows. Third is to provide territorially based self-management. (Castells qtd. in Prujit, 2007, p.516)

4. Something of Personal Gezi Experiences

No matter which satisfying concrete results Gezi does reach, what it revived has, still, been affecting socio-political conjuncture of Turkey. Feeling Gezi, in person, makes me to see, hear, and observe this revival; in streets, squares, parks, and even wherever one could keep her/himself hiding

from police. Nazim Hikmet called you to be as unique and free as a tree while being as friendly as a forest. Marx reminded you that the shadows of trees were not for sale. On the walls, you could read that the revolution would not be televised- that was the point at which penguins met Guy Debord DenizGezmi and his friends called out for a long life to the brotherhood of Kurds and Turks. Emma Goldman invited us to dance through the revolution. (Ayka , 2014) It is a great challenge for those who dreams revolution from his couch reading a book on it, writing an article on it, thinking on it or just growing an endless desire to get it. It was also an experience of challenge for those who had never think of a revolution, who even know nothing on revolution, or who had never questioned the life we forced to live and just kept living like however it goes.

Gezi called something new which we had never met or faced before: It is to act together I don't mean reduced/restricted togetherness of people from same political ideology, same ethnicity, same religion, same team supporters or any other same purpose. By acting together, here, I mean real all, except lovers of Erdoğan. Had I not experienced it myself, I would hardly believe that those people have never leagued together, come and move as a whole. I would hardly believe those people can barely sleep at night because of thinking other people, even they don't know who they are, who still continue protesting on streets. I would hardly believe people, even me myself, trust a stranger from resistance and stay at her/his home to protect from police and gas. I would hardly believe people, me myself too, forget all their fears on gas, pressurized water Akrep , police or even, custody. In this sense, Gezi is the groundbreaking; it provided a ground to surpass all conventional discourses, prejudices, charges and old methods. We just woke one morning and saw brutal treatment of police to protestors on 28th of May, and after we found ourselves in streets as if we have always been there. Had I not saw it myself, I would hardly believe such thousands immediately and spontaneously come together after organizing on social media. I would hardly believe such thousands, after being exposed to gas for several times, still keep waiting for some other time to be exposed by gas again. I would hardly believe, every morning I wake up by hoping- surely know that the rest also wake up with that hope- resisters who injured previous night can also wake up too. I would hardly believe I have difficulty in controlling my anger and nerve when I saw lawyers were beaten or when I saw, on 15th of June, that Gezi blockaded and resisters sheltered Divan. Gezi, therefore, is where we left our fears behind, where we started to learn thinking from different perspectives, where we tried to think of others. It is where we saw potentials of collective reaction and where we regret traditional resistance templates. By means of it, we constructed Gezi Spirit, which maintains itself not only in street mobilizations but also in park forums and other post activities emerged as an extension of Gezi Uprising.

5. Gezi Spirit: From Streets to Park Forums and *Post-Gezi*

Gezi Spirit which recalls our humane sides does not limit itself with street mobilizations and active resistance; rather it continues in passive field and begins as Post-Gezi events one of which is park forums emerged after violent evacuation of Gezi on 15th of June. These forums are what Gezi gave birth to our urban lives like other concepts it did so: passive resistance, horizontal organization and civil disobedience. Before Gezi, we used parks and other urban public spaces as if they are merely urban blanks . Parks, therefore, are spaces where state attributed a function where we subliminally force to recreate our bodies there by sitting on proper and definite arrangements and maintaining certain activities that state lets us to do. Theoretically, such parks are the unique spaces of cities where people can touch and feel green; however, in order to step on grass. That is, even in a space to recreate , people are strictly restrained saying them what and where to do. Despite their innocent appearance of serving a space citizens; what is in real is that parks as recreational spaces obscure a hidden message which provides a

social control over people by state. (Batuman&Ak , 2000, p.23) This reduction of green into an imitated nature functions as a control mechanism of state causes certain misconceptions towards parks as a combination of green and urban public space. Park forums, as a Post-Gezi activism, straighten this misconception by reclaiming parks as an urban public space and revealing its essence; publicity. As a society, we had not been familiar to such alternative uses of parks in a way that we desire to use it. Organizing forums there? Before Gezi, it was almost impossible to organize a forum in parks and gather people there to make them mention their problems, solutions, and proposals on agenda and also listen others whether they agree with them or not. However, with revival and awakening by Gezi, we start to question every operations and interventions of state and other power blocks, as well as concepts like democracy, equality and freedom. Here, one of the essential impulses to arrange such forums is privation of democracy. Horkheimer also explains privation of rational basis of democracy and its relation with power-holders:

Deprived of its rational foundation, the democratic principle becomes exclusively dependent upon the so-called interests of the people, and these are functions of blind or all too conscious economic forces. They do not offer any guarantee against tyranny. In the period of the free market system, for instance, institutions based on the idea of human rights were accepted by many people as a good instrument for controlling the government and maintaining peace. But if the situation changes, if powerful economic groups find it useful to set up a dictatorship and abolish majority rule, no objection founded on reason can be opposed to their action. If they have a real chance of success, they would simply be foolish not to take it. The only consideration that could prevent them from doing so would be the possibility that their own interests would be endangered and not concern over violation of a truth, of reason. Once the philosophical foundation of democracy has collapsed, the statement that dictatorship is bad is rationally valid only for those who are not its beneficiaries, and there is no theoretical obstacle to the transformation of this statement into its opposite. (Horkheimer, 2004, pp. 19-20)

Seeking democracy's rational foundation, park forums are pertinent and hopeful to maintain Gezi Spirit by addressing to all. The horizontal cooperation they have, also gives opportunity to make all people, especially marginals/others those who were exposed to certain prejudices, participate in and give voice. Providing a platform for freedom of speech, park forums have a single rule which is to be respectful to others and listen to them. Therefore, a remarkable awareness is raised up which provides working in solidarity and collective production of ideas, solutions and actions. Even in the most crowded forum, every participant could directly express themselves. People discussed political issues, organized meetings and reported forum sessions in the media to inform the public and create a web of solidarity. Since some forums harboured a great number of individuals from various ideological backgrounds, there was great effort to continue the emphatic dialogue that was discovered at Gezi, mostly successful. Workshops were continued in public spaces. Some forums emphasized a communication strategy with local residents who did not necessarily support Gezi. (Ahkat, 2014) With such inclusive approach, park forums reach different voices and alternative decisions would be taken whereby free expression. Here, urban public spaces are attained more importance since people realize what those spaces really submit if they occupy it, use it and appropriate it.

Yelde İrmeni Forum, one of park forums in Kadıköy, was initiated as a street car park in their neighbourhood into a green area. Like other forums flourished different regions of country, Yelde İrmeni Forum tends to raise a public awareness to protect unity of their neighbourhood and the heterogeneity their neighbourhood brings. They try to uncover forgotten relationships and

practices through expressing and discussing their ideas freely in forums. As one of the concrete results of such discussions, they planted car park in their neighbourhood which is a concrete urbanization/overbuilding in Istanbul. They, therefore, provide a room for breath within this overbuilt environment. Apart from discussing territorial issues, their very domestic demands for their neighbourhood includes more green, safe places for kids to play, convenient restoration of historical buildings, and arrangement in bus lines. (Yıldırım, 2014) several discussions and meetings in neighbourhood, sometime, Don Quixote occupied Yelde İrmeni.

6. In the Way of Gezi: Don Quixote Occupied **the Neighbourhood!**

Gezi Park continues blowing its spirit! 'Chapullers' have interiorised freedom, solidarity and communication of the Gezi period and now they transform the inspiration they got from Gezi into new forms. Yelde İrmeni Solidarity, one of the forums which neighbourhoods after Gezi invaded a desolate building which has been functioning as garbage for 20 years and now is trying to turn it into a public space. This organisation with no hierarchy wants to create here a 'miniature' Gezi, put it into service of the inhabitants and in this way show that another world is possible. (Pinar, 2013)

Watching Fatih Pinar's, an activist participated both Gezi protests and Post-Gezi mobilizations, documentary on Don Quixote House and how it was constructed with solidarity and voluntary consciousness, it can conveniently be said that *Another world is possible*. Even saying that motto shows how Gezi change minds, how it encourages and triggers all, especially others/marginals to express themselves. These precious attempts of organizing forums, squatting, solidarity events, barter and second hand bazaars, workshops, direct actions and the rest, at least, make us satisfy ourselves that those hearts of Mehmet, Ethem, Abdöcan, Ali İsmail, and Hasan Ferat can feel free in peace that their loss is not needless.

In documentary, one of the activists said Under the domination of money and unearned income, all the commonly used places are being taken away. Whilst they are invading our lives, we need new public spaces to make possible again our sense of community, and one another adds What we are after is, in fact, to create again the public spaces that have been taken from us. (Pinar) Their attempt is for reclaiming the space by occupying it, redefining and reproducing with a necessary appropriation. Those people in Yelde İrmeni, by taking all the responsibility organized a community by themselves rather than to wait local politics to do so. (Pinar, 2013) Why they did occupy this abandoned building is so clear, as one of a marginal activist explained in such documentary: Because they have not left us any space in city, because there are no more places where we can breathe, because there are no areas where we can express ourselves, or because we cannot find the real tranquillity and from now on we take the initiative. (Pinar, 2013) Don Quixote House, a miniature Gezi, is a cultural, political and economic encounter-intervention that reclaims public space not on behalf of any particular group, but for the ancient and progressive notion of a popular commons. (Pinar, 2013)

Being a production of a collective initiative, Don Quixote House is Turkey's first squatting initiative formed via courage of Gezi. It is the first for Turkey, but squatting is not a new phenomenon in the world. It has been done in New York City, indeed, in this very neighbourhood, for more than 130 years -that is, ever since the 1860s, when urban development became an observable, cyclical process (of construction, inhabitation and use, abandonment, dereliction and destruction) that repeated itself every 30 years or so. Squatting, as either an individual act or as a movement of some kind, is

little, if any, attention in the world of surveillance. (Pinar, 2013) Later on first in New York, it had flourished along different parts of world where people suffer from capitalism, property rights, human rights, lack of social space or any other state oppression. Activists, punks, hippies, street kids and other homeless individuals took over and reclaimed derelict buildings and squatting would continue whenever housing crisis emerge, or whenever some others are alienated from society and have no place to breathe, to act, simply, to live. As Mayer further explains:

As with squatters of social centers or large buildings, the occupied squares represent(ed) not only a collective form of residence on the basis of shared resources, but also a political action: in this case laying siege to centers of financial and political power. Importantly, they have also served to explore direct-democratic decision-making, to prefigure post-capitalist ways of life, and to devise innovative forms of political action. As with squatting, the practice of occupying has enacted a democratic (re)appropriation of public squares epitomized by their inhabitation. As with squatting, the power of bodies that continue to be present that don't go home at the end of the demonstration and that speak rather than being represented by others exerts a forceful message as it gives *ongoing presence* to political protest. In today's situation of the worldwide spread of the Occupy movement, it is helpful to take some lessons from squatters they have influenced the trajectory of many contemporary movements and struggles. Squatting is a unique form of protest activity that holds a potential of unfurling energies; it focuses action in a way that is prefigurative of another mode of organizing society and challenging a paramount institution of capitalist society: private property. (Mayer, 2013, pp. 1-2)

For that matter, squatting recalls Lefebvre's right to the city together with his lived space and habiting. For our case of squatting, these concepts intertwined that one requires another to be realized. The emergent need for a communal gathering space for inhabitants of Yeldeirmeni generated Don Quixote Housing as a lived experience of collective domestic memory. As for Lefebvre's question of Who has the right to the city in terms of the problematic of possession regarding struggle between private and communal use of public space. For case of squatting, the appropriation of space to establish the notion of dispossession through a communal production and sharing of space turns individual interest into a communal one, which eliminates conventional forms of possession. By this way, the squat becomes a place of resistance not only for providing a social and cultural action, but also towards emerging gentrification which is the privatization of public domain. The new definition that squats submitted for public space recalls what Lefebvre suggested as lived space. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.33) Approaching space as a social production, lived (social) space is where inhabitants, as real actors of urban life, generate either individual or collective actions to provoke new formations both spatially and socially. Therefore, lived space is the immeasurable one; a space that directly interacted with limitless borders of imagination, experience, personal and collective memory, and individual expression, where expression deserves quite importance among others; since, expression requires an act, a stand, and a real use. By this expression, inhabitants would play key role in organizing urban life where s/he resists, decides, uses, initiates, changes, appropriates, and gets. Interrelated deeply with lived space, Lefebvre's has freed itself from formal guidelines of *habitat* and reaches an alternative meaning of comprehension of existence, series of experiences and a collective place of change and revival. Habiting can simply and essentially considered like being, as he pointed out in *The Urban Revolution*:

Although we cannot arbitrarily assimilate habiting to unconscious of psychology and psychoanalysis, there is a definite analogy to the extent that our failure to recognize habiting can serve as an illustration of the theory of the unconsciousness. In order to rediscover the word and its meaning, in order even to utter them, we need to make use of concepts and categories that fall within the scope of the inhabitant's proximity to the unknown and the misunderstood in the everyday, and go beyond, to general theory, to philosophy and metaphilosophy...the relation of the human being to its own nature, to being and its own being, is situated in habiting there. (Lefebvre, 1991, pp.81-82)

Don Quixote House, regarding those theoretical conceptualizations, is a new means of habiting and lived space which constructed in the hands of activists and inhabitants. The occupation story of that building abandoned for fifteen years is best summarized with Selin Top's words who is a participant of the occupy: We came and opened the door. So then we said: This is ours, this is everybody's. (Zucker, 2014) Her words do not only describe the squatting process but summarize their mission as well: it was never the squatting of the house, like in most other European squats. Rather, it was about giving the Gezi experience a home; finding a place for the newly reclaimed sphere of interaction, political activism and non-hierarchical deliberation to put down roots. To create a free space, outside of the reach of capital transformation in the interest of capital - open to everybody. (Zucker, 2014) Unlike other examples of squats in world, Don Quixote House is not for permanent living; indeed, it serves as a social center where everyone can come and join the meetings, workshops, and other activities of art or just drink a tea and have a chat with others. With its temporal usage, it desires to appeal to everyone, not only inhabitants of Yeldeirmeni. At that point, Talat Doğanolu, who played a role in the and reproduction of squat, words are remarkable to catch an attention towards dynamic structure of Don Quixote House: Here, every change is welcomed. For instance, the name of the house will change next month as Hacıvat Karagöz. Or if somebody come and suggest placing a table instead of windows, new stuff would be placed there. Here, a dynamic structure would exist. (Zucker, 2014) For that matter, Don Quixote House serves an autonomous ground where anyone can do/organize whatever s/he wants providing writing down the program table.

Here, the context of Yeldeirmeni neighbourhood should be emphasized that the squatters have remarkable contributions in development of solidarity for constructing Don Quixote. For Kadıköy, the district that Yeldeirmeni neighbourhood is part of, this is a vital issue. Moreover, another urban renewal project is threatening to raise the rents in the area even more: the train station Haydarpaşa, a huge historical building at the water front right next to Kadıköy, an iconic site in Istanbul for over a 100 years. In 2010, a fire of still undefined origin destroyed part of its roof. Having lost its function to other means of transportation like the recently inaugurated intercontinental underground railway Marmaray, Haydarpaşa has been abandoned. (Zucker, 2014) Having such critical position regarding rent ownership and land value, inhabitants of Kadıköy, has maintained a kind of reactive and conscious attitude towards brutal urban renewal. Being close to leftist ideologies, Kadıköy is a home to what society called as marginal groups: artists, intellectuals, punks, hippies, rappers as well as neo-nationalist youths. This heterogeneity therefore, provides an inclusive atmosphere towards differences, changes and novelties, one which is the initiative of Don Quixote House. Selin G. from squat also pointed inhabitants' respectability during construction process of house: While we were working in house, the neighbourhood brought tea; another cooked some food and gave us. Except from our solidarity, inhabitants of neighbourhood also supported us so much. (Kural, 2014) Selin Top also recognizes the need to do something for them, to catch their attention and make them feel that this is everyone's. For her, this task is essential to the squat's mission of creating a new space.

center and free space for the neighbourhood. (Zucker, 2014) Therefore, all necessities of house are tried to be provided via this solidarity between activists and domestic inhabitants.

One last, but quite important, point for Don Quixote House is that it reclaims publicity by means of an unconventional way of redefinition/reproduction of space. Its nonapparent motto of turning street into a space/moving space to street is just a result of seeking the other space and reclaiming that other . Therefore, activists of Don Quixote started such reclaiming by putting exterior walls away which sets a barricade-like separator between house and street. They placed transparent glass walls instead of previous masses, which was the first attempt to gain *publicity* back. The others followed that initial attempt: open up space to sky, transforming space into a street and spatialize the street. Don Quixote, therefore, become a communal house that serves as a street in winter and summer. (Balpetek, 2014)

7. Conclusion

Don Quixote House in Yelde ırmeni, has its very inspiration from Gezi and wh as Gezi Spirit, have put important contributions to our public lives by attributing new meanings to it; collective production, communal life, solidarity and space for others, of those also recalled during and after Gezi. Being as a concrete reflection of Gezi, Don Quixote does not merely construct a new physical space for communal sharing; however, it also presents a social space that make us dreaming of again: another world is possible. Yes, another world is possible where money is not the ba necessity, where individual awareness turns into a collective one, where personal interest becomes an interest for all and where all people kindly welcomed without questioning who they are. It might appear as a romantic dream, but it is what Don Quixote and other squats co Let me say again: *another world is possible*. which lives on public space, which is not televised, which is not on books, may be which is not written; but which is on streets.

References

- Akhat, R zgar. Gezi: LosingtheFear, LivingtheDream. Retrived19January 2014 from<http://roarmag.org/2014/01/gezi-reflections-protest-forum/>
- Ayka ,`a la. StrongBodies, DirtyShoes: An OdetotheResistance . Retrieved20January from<http://roarmag.org/2014/01/gezi-spirit-poetry-art-resistance/>
- Balpetek.Mahmut. Gezi nin Don Ki otlar . Retrieved 22 January 2014 from <http://www.toplumsal.org/gezinin-don-kisotlari-mahmut-balpetek/>
- Batuman, B lent&Ak , Tongu . KentselMekanOlarakDo a , Mimarlık, vol.291,2000.
- Castells,Manuel.As cited in HansPrujit, Urban Movements in *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology* Malden: Blackwell, 2007, p. 5116.
- De Souza,MarceloLopes. TogetherwiththeState, DespitetheState, AgainsttheState. S as Critical Urban Planning Agents in *City*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 2006, p. 329.
- Fiske,John. As cited in G ven Arif Sarg n, Myth, Ideology, andHegemony: ThePolit AmericanEnvironmental Design Tradition , in *METU Journal of Faculty of Architecture*, vol.17, 1997, p.29
- Horkheimer,Max. MeansandEnds in *Eclipse of Reason*, Londonand New York: Continuum, 2004, pp. 19-20.
- King Jr.,Marthin Luther,Why We Can t Wait, Boston: Beacon Press, 2000, p.137.

- Kural, Beyza. Don Ki ot Yel de irmeni ni gal Etti . Retrived 21 January 2014 from <http://www.bianet.org/bianet/toplum/150716-don-kisot-yeldegirmeni-ni-isgal-etti>
- Lefebvre, Henri. Levels and Dimensions in Urban Revolution, London: Univ. Of Minnesota Press, 2003, p.79.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, Maiden: Blackwell Publishing, 1991, p. 33
- Marx, Karl. Chapter I: Feb. 1848 to Dec. 1851 in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Retrieved 21 January 2014 from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire/>
- Mayer, Margit. Preface in *Squatting in Europe: Radical Space, Urban Struggles*, Wivenhoe, New York and Port Watson: Minor Compositions, 2013, pp.1-2.
- Patz, Christopher. From Madrid to Istanbul: Occupying Public Space . Retrieved 19 January 2014 from <http://roarmag.org/2014/01/madrid-istanbul-occupy-squat/>
- Pickvance, Chris. On the Study of Urban Social Movements in *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1975, pp. 29-49.
- Pınar, Fatih. Donki ot Sosyal Merkezi. Don Quixote Social Center. 30 Kasım/November 2013. Kadıköy/İstanbul. [Video]. Retrived 21 January 2014 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lrl3ySaXq_o&feature=share
- Prujit, Hans. Urban Movements in *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, Malden: Blackwell, 2007, p. 5116.
- Website. Squat the World! Retrieved 22 January 2014 from <http://www.notbored.org/squatworld/>
- Yıldız, Elvin. Direniş in Hedyesi Park Forumları : Yel de irmeni . Retrieved 21 January 2014 from <http://birgun.net/haber/direnisin-hediyesi-park-forumlari-yeldegirmeni-4450.html>
- Zucker, Lou. Reclaim the Urban Commons: Istanbul's First Squat . Retrieved 17 January 2014 from <http://roarmag.org/2014/01/istanbul-first-squat-gentrification/>
- Zurkin, Sharon. Consuming Authenticity: From outposts of Difference to Means of Exclusion . *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 5, 2008, pp. 724-748.