

ACADEMIES OF POSSIBILITIES:
AN ANALYSIS OF INTELLECTUAL FIELD,
SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN TURKEY

İNCİ ÜNAL

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2019

ACADEMIES OF POSSIBILITIES:
AN ANALYSIS OF INTELLECTUAL FIELD,
SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN TURKEY

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

İnci Ünal

Boğaziçi University

2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, İnci Ünal, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date ..10.07.2019.....

ABSTRACT

Academies of Possibilities: An Analysis of Intellectual Field, Social Movements, and Knowledge Production in Turkey

This thesis compares and contrasts the intellectual field in the 1980s and today by examining the alternative academic structures founded in these two periods. The thesis analyzes these two contexts separately and traces the influence of the increasing precarization of intellectual labor throughout the world and the historical particularities of Turkey on the transformation of the intellectual field since the 1980s. At the same time, by dwelling on the changing discourses of social movements in the world, the thesis aims to show that the organizational models of the alternative academic structures in Turkey have changed significantly since the 1980s. Lastly, the thesis aims to show the influence of these organizations on the knowledge production in the country through the space they offer for the flourishing of new ideas. The thesis argues that these structures can be regarded as “academies of possibilities” because of the promises they offer for the academic and cultural circles in the country.

ÖZET

Olasılıklar Akademileri: Türkiye’deki Entelektüel Alan, Sosyal Hareketler ve Bilgi Üretiminin Analizi

Bu tez, 1980’lerdeki ve günümüzdeki alternatif akademi oluşumlarını inceleyerek bu dönemlerdeki entelektüel alanı karşılaştırmaktadır. Bu tez, bahsi geçen iki dönemi kendi bağlamlarında ayrı ayrı inceleyerek dünya genelinde entelektüel emeğin güvencesizleşmesinin ve Türkiye’nin tarihsel özelliklerinin ülkedeki entelektüel alanın 1980’den bu yana dönüşmesindeki etkilerine odaklanmaktadır. Aynı zamanda dünyadaki değişen sosyal hareketler diskurlarını tartışarak Türkiye’deki alternatif akademilerin organizasyonel yapılarının bu süreçte ciddi oranda değiştiğini göstermektedir. Son olarak, bu tez, bahsi geçen organizasyonların yeni fikirlerin ortaya çıkmasına alan sağlamak suretiyle Türkiye’deki bilgi üretimine etki ettiğini iddia etmektedir. Bu sebeple bu oluşumları “olasılıklar akademileri” olarak tanımlayarak ülkedeki akademik ve kültürel çevreler için sundukları olanakları incelemektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Ayfer Bartu Candan for her interest and guidance for this project. Her comments have been truly helpful in further clarifying my analysis. I would also like to thank Saygun Gökarıksel and Begüm Özden Fırat for their time and energy as my thesis committee. During the research process, Saygun Gökarıksel had significant contributions for this thesis through his suggestions and ideas in times needed.

I would also like to thank TÜBİTAK (Turkish Scientific and Technical Research Council) for financially supporting this project through its national scholarship.

Doing a research on academics had been an amazing opportunity for me to meet and work with intellectuals to whom I owe so much. I am very grateful to all the scholars from solidarity academies who not only kindly accepted to be part of this research but also offered their valuable insights and motivated me to throughout this process. I am very excited to see how their plans and projects will unfold in the future.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family who have been supporting me through all stages of my life. I am sincerely thankful for their years-long patience and understanding.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my friends who have always been a major source of support for me. I would like to thank Dilan, Diloan, Sebastian, Öykü, and Sidar for making me feel at home at Boğaziçi for three years. I am also thankful to Ozan for all the ideas and time we shared together. Also, I am very lucky to have my friends from Koç in my life, especially Zeynep, Betül, İrem, Atıl, Nesile,

Selin, Ece, İdil, Ege, and Eren. They have had a significant role in my personal growth through their friendship. I am also indebted to my dear brother Öncel and my sisters Çağla, Sevim, Şeyma, Deniz, and Hülya who have always been there for me.

Writing a thesis while working full time has been one of the greatest challenges in my life and I could not have done it without the amazing support of my colleagues at Istanbul Policy Center. I cannot thank Pelin, Gülcihan, Meryem, Cana, Megan, and Ecem enough for everything they have done for me during this process.

The inspiring and motivating conversations we had with Yohanan Benhaim enriched this thesis so much. I am deeply grateful for all his time and encouragements. I would also like to express my gratitude to Maissam Nimer who has been incredibly helpful and caring for me while writing my thesis.

Last, but most importantly, I would like to thank Souad Osseiran for being an amazing mentor, editor, and friend. Without her sincere and generous support, I would not be able to complete this thesis. I am forever indebted to her for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Academic autonomy and the acts of opposition by intellectuals in the history of Turkey	5
1.2 Collective actions of the dissenting intellectuals: Moral vs. political responsibility	13
1.3 Allegiances of the dissenting intellectuals: “From the sociology of intellectuals to the sociology of interventions”	16
1.4 Establishing ‘alternative’ academies in Turkey: Field of power, internal struggles, and external sanctions.....	21
1.5 Carving out new spaces for the public: Democratization, anti-globalization, and ideas of commoning	24
1.6 Methodology	29
1.7 Overview of the thesis	32
CHAPTER 2: SOLIDARITY AND DISSENT: INTELLECTUAL FIELD AND ITS TRANSFORMATION IN TURKEY	35
2.1 Being a dissenting intellectual in the 1980s in Turkey: The case of Ekin BİLAR	37
2.2 Being an Academic for Peace today in Turkey: The case of solidarity academies	48
2.3 Conclusion	63
CHAPTER 3: SURVIVAL AND RE-LEGITIMIZATION: DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS IN EKIN BİLAR AND SOLIDARITY ACADEMIES	66

3.1 Building a democratic front: The organizational model of Ekin BİLAR	68
3.2 Creating spaces of commoning: The organizational models of different solidarity academies	74
3.3 Reclaiming the idea of being an intellectual: Legitimacy and institutionalization	92
3.4 Conclusion	95
CHAPTER 4: INTERVENTION AND POSSIBILITIES: THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF EKIN BILAR AND THE PROMISES OF SOLIDARITY ACADEMIES	
4.1 Intervening into the university structure in the 1980s: The role of Ekin BİLAR in transforming the relations and fields of study in the academia	102
4.2 Intervening into the university structure today: The experiments and promises of solidarity academies	109
4.3 Conclusion	119
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	
5.1 End of an era: The closing process of Ekin BİLAR	122
5.2 Looking into the future: Problems and limitations of solidarity academies .	124
5.3 Remaining questions for future research	126
APPENDIX	128
REFERENCES	140

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It was only four of us on the top floor of Carmela Cafe in Kadıköy that Saturday morning. It was the regular venue for the “Graduate Study Group” meetings of *Kampüssüzler* (Academics with No Campus), a solidarity academy that was founded in April 2016 in Istanbul. Along with many other similar organizations founded in the different cities of Turkey, *Kampüssüzler* came together as a group of scholars and students after the beginning of the government purge on the scholars called the Academics for Peace who made a declaration regarding the state of emergency and curfews in the Kurdish districts in 2015-16. During the 2017-2018 academic year, I was also part of the Graduate Study Group run by *Kampüssüzler* which brought graduate students and academics from different disciplines together every two weeks in order to assist the former with their thesis, give feedback and suggestions. The main motive of these meetings was to contact the graduate students who did not have the necessary support for their theses after being expelled from their positions at universities as research assistants or because their thesis advisors had been purged. Even though there were not many students who encountered such problems among those that answered *Kampüssüzler*’s call,¹ the program has continued with the participation of graduate students who needed support as their advisors had to change, whose advisors were overburdened due to academic purges or who faced other problems in their university environments.

As a graduate student undertaking research on solidarity academies, I was also warmly welcomed in the study group. On November 25, 2017, a meeting was

¹ The call by *Kampüssüzler* was sent to the mailing list of the Academies for Peace. I was informed about the call through their announcement on social media.

held for me so that I could have a discussion with some of the members focusing on the key questions and topics that I introduced. Although we started the meeting with three academics from Kampüssüzler, more people from the study group joined our conversation as time passed. Before the arrival of the rest of the group, I asked the scholars from Kampüssüzler what they thought brought the Academics for Peace together for the petition “We will not be a party to this crime”.²

Betül Acar: Well, you say Academics for Peace but there are all kinds of people behind it, among us. I mean their political views are so different, reactions are so different...

Zeynep Solmaz: Their reactions while signing [the petition] are so different...

Güzin Çelik: Their reasons to sign [the petition]...

B: I mean, now, one should never forget this. Maybe, I don't know, it's my opinion... I mean everything that happened after June 7 [the general elections in 2015] and the accelerating pace [of events] in the fall... they were such horrible things! For instance, I'm sure that there are certain events that stuck to each of our minds more and made it... I mean it's like you've become... your humanity can't take it anymore. It is something like that, it's not really about being political. It was something that the conscience, the way of being human could not take it anymore. I mean, I suppose that the thing that made many people sign was like that. There is also, of course, the thing: you give... I don't know how many signatures but nothing happens.

Z: Yes, I mean some signed it coincidentally.

G: We signed a lot of things [before], but nothing happened, I mean.

B: And that... I mean you don't think about it. You don't think that it's such a grand political action or something.

G: You think that it's nothing. You say, what use will it be... Just another signature... By feeling... I mean... with sorrow!

Z: I thought about this for a few days.

B: For example, I remember myself... I've had it up to here with this. I mean I'm signing, but actually it has nothing in it. I mean the man politicized us, it happened somehow like that, indeed. When he spoke like that, when the state gave such a reaction we immediately turned into something political. And therefore it's [Academics for Peace] a group of all kinds of people.

² As will be explained later in this research, the petition was signed by the Academics for Peace to raise their voices against the conflict between the state and PKK in 2015-2016 that caused many civilian killings and human rights violations in the Kurdish districts of Turkey.

(Kampüssüzler, personal communication, November 2017) (See Appendix, 1)

As stated by Kampüssüzler, making a public declaration against the actions of the state has moral, political, and social implications about the motives and purposes of the agents involved. On that note, forming an ‘alternative’ organization like solidarity academies in the face of attacks by the government against the signatories furthers this reactionary response into a long-term act of opposition. As an aspiring academic who is witnessing the processes that the Academics for Peace went through after the petition and the foundation of solidarity academies, I initiated this project to examine the motives and purposes of the scholars who became part of solidarity academies. My original research questions were: Do they take part in these ‘alternative’ academic organizations for the sake of an autonomous idea of science and university, to make a political statement, in pursuit of a realm for solidarity or to use it as a step for structural transformations in the future? Based upon these preliminary questions, I found it necessary to understand and reflect on the similar experiences of previous intellectuals in the history of Turkey that could shed light on the processes that the Academics for Peace are going through. Reflecting on the former experiences in the history of the country expanded my research interest to a focus on the conducts and characteristics of the dissenting intellectuals in difficult times, which brought up other avenues for inquiry: How do dissenting intellectuals react in times of crisis? How are these actions influenced by the social and political context of their era? How are the existing discourses and practices of social movements reflected on the actions of the dissenting intellectuals in question?

In this research, I will focus on two particular periods in which intellectuals in Turkey share similar experiences, namely the 1980s and today. These two specific periods are similar in terms of the types of government launched attacks against the

intellectual community and in their responses within distinct socio-political contexts. Due to these similarities, I will compare and contrast the academic purges and intellectuals' opposing actions in the 1980s and today with respect to their own conjunctures. I will make note of the academic purges in the 1980s after the military coup, the prominent petitions of the intellectuals in that era, and the foundation of the 'alternative' academy institution called Ekin BİLAR. In a similar manner, I will examine the expulsions of the Academics for Peace from universities since 2016, their declarations against the actions of the government, and the foundation of solidarity academies. In undertaking this comparison, the main focus of the research is the 'alternative' academy structures founded in the 1980s and the current period.

This research serves as a historical record for these two unique acts of resistance as well as providing an analysis of the trajectory of the dissenting intellectuals and their responses in each case. This research project helps to fill a significant gap in the existent literature as there is little research so far on these 'alternative' academy structures. Especially in the case of Ekin BİLAR, there are only a few resources that give mostly descriptive information about the highly-regarded organization of the 1980s and 90s (See Ulusoy, 2017; Işıklı, 1987) yet a more detailed analysis of the organization has not been undertaken so far. The literature on solidarity academies includes research with a more comprehensive line of inquiry (See Erdem and Akın, 2019; Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi, 2017; Bakırezer, Demirer, & Yeşilyurt, 2018; Acar and Coşkan, 2019), nonetheless the current literature is still limited due to the actuality and versatility of the issue. My research aims to contribute through a comparative in-depth analysis of these cases. I argue that this research undertaken will identify the transformations in the

intellectual field as well as in the discourses of social movements, intellectuals, and knowledge production in Turkey.

To understand the means, purposes, and conducts of the intellectuals involved with Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies, it is of crucial importance to make note of the contexts they were founded in and their acts against the governments of their era in the forms of declarations and petitions. For this reason, in this chapter I will start by discussing these acts of opposition to set them as a basis for my inquiry on Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies. First, I will give a brief historical background for these actions in the history of Turkey and discuss them in terms of moral and collective responsibility. Afterwards, I will provide a theoretical framework for these two cases in the 1980s and today by making a reference to the literature on sociology of intellectuals, field theory, and social movements.

1.1 Academic autonomy and the acts of opposition by intellectuals in the history of Turkey

Although my research primarily focuses on the attacks against the academic community and their responses in the 1980s and today, I find it necessary to make note of other academic purges and forms of actions taken by intellectuals in the history of Turkey to be able to historicize the cases of this research. As these kinds of crisis are mostly considered as attacks against the academic autonomy of universities, having a perspective on the history of academic freedom in the country is also of significant importance. In other words, if scholars have the role of revealing scientific truth and speaking truth to power, academic freedom and autonomy is regarded as crucial for the actualization of that role. Nevertheless, academic freedom and autonomy have always been fragile and open to intervention

throughout the history of universities in Turkey. At the same time, there has been many campaigns initiated by intellectuals that aimed to take a stand against government actions throughout the history of the republic, irrespective of the autonomous or non-autonomous position of universities. In this respect, declarations and petitions have been the most frequently used means for the claims, requests, and opposition of the intellectual community in Turkey. Some of these actions have been politicized and gained national and international repercussions as was the case of the Academics for Peace, yet many of them went unnoticed and did not stir much reaction in civil society. In this section, I will give a brief historical background of academic autonomy and significant forms of action by intellectuals in different time periods that gained public repercussion in the country.³

The question of academic autonomy has been a problematic issue since the first university structure in the territory, founded during the Ottoman Period under the name of *darülfünun*, which means the dorm of science, in 1863 (Kavili Arap, 2010, p.7). After the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, the autonomous position of this university structure became a topic of discussion among the ruling elite, who claimed that the autonomy led academics of the institution to focus mainly on protecting their positions rather than scientific research and progress (Mazici, 1995). Consequently, *darülfünun* was closed in 1933 with a reformist action under the Law No. 2252, to be replaced with Istanbul University that would be more in line with the values of the Republic (as cited in Kavili Arap, 2010, p.8). Ninety-two out of 151 scholars were removed from duty during this transformation (Mazici, 1995) and the institution was deprived of its scientific and administrative autonomy (Arslan, 2011,

³ For more detailed information about the university organization and administration in different time periods as well as the processes behind each transformative era in the history of Turkey, see Hatiboğlu (1998), Aras et. al (2007), and Dölen (2009). For information about the student movements and a detailed record of the relationship between universities and politics under the rule of different political parties in Turkey, see Arslan (2011) and Timur (2000).

p.121). Until 1944, Istanbul University remained the only university in Turkey and was under the rule of *Maarif Vekaleti* (the Board of Education) while the university president was defined as its representative (pp.121-22).

The introduction of academic autonomy to universities became part of the agenda once again during the transition to the multi-party system in Turkey. University Law No. 4936, which was introduced in 1946, defined universities as legal entities with scientific and administrative autonomy (*Üniversiteler Kanunu*, 1946). Yet, the institution was under the supervision of the Minister of National Education who was defined as the head of universities and was responsible for controlling universities, faculties, and related institutions on behalf of the government (Yüce, 1971, p.5). This supervision by the ministry was regarded as natural and necessary by the ministry, as universities were public institutions (Hirsch, 1998, p.823). Still, according to the Ministry of National Education in Turkey, the Law No. 4936 decreased the tight connection of the institutions of higher education with the ministry, provided democratization and autonomy for universities, and aimed for universities to deal with the issues of the country through a better university organization (*Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı*, n.d). What was meant by working on the issues of the country carried along the purpose of “raising citizens with a national character and faithful to the ideals of the Turkish revolution” (Arslan, 2011; Aras et. al, 2007). Despite the legally assured autonomy of universities, Çelik (2008) defines the years of transition into the multi-party system as the years in which reactionism and conservatism became more hostile (p.13). According to Çelik, there were attacks on the “leftist” circles in the country in this time period, influenced by the tense relationship with the Soviet Union, fragile relations with the U.S. that carried along the effort to give messages of anti-communism, as well as the struggle

between two political parties, namely the Democrat Party and the Republican People's Party (p.13). Consequently, this social and political background paved the way for the expulsion of three "leftist" scholars, Niyazi Berkes, Behice Boran, and Pertev Naili Boratav from the Faculty of Language, History, Geography (DTCF) at Ankara University, who were already taken off classes in December 1947 as a precaution after the anti-communist demonstration of the students in Ankara. As one of the scholars who experienced this expulsion, Boratav comments on the character of this experience as being a normality rather than an exception:

I think, what we have gone through carries bitter and teaching characteristics that will be recorded as a disgrace in the history of politics, law, and universities in Turkey. Turkey has gone through similar eras with a brewing witch cauldron and there has been other science people who have gone through similar bitter experiences. For this reason, we were not people who had an accident during an exceptional time period. (as cited in Çelik, 2008, p.5)

Despite the debatable character of academic autonomy in the period, *Barışseverler Bildirisi* (Peace Lovers Declaration) was announced in 1950, which can be considered as a significant act of opposition by the intellectual community. Written by *Barışseverler Cemiyeti* (Peace Lovers Community), the declaration gained public repercussion and included one of the expelled scholars of 1948, Behice Boran, who later became one of the prominent figures in the foundation of the Workers Party of Turkey (TİP). The declaration criticized Adnan Menderes government for the decision of sending soldiers to Korea during the Korean War. Adnan Menderes government was formed by Democrat Party in 1950, after they won the elections in 1950 and terminated the single-party rule by the Republican People's Party that lasted until that period. Written in this context, the Peace Lovers Declaration can be noted as the first intellectual declaration to be followed by many throughout the history of Turkey. As contended by Orman (2005), it can be

considered as traditional for the intellectuals of Turkey to write declarations, petitions or newspaper notices to declare their thoughts and attitudes about different political, economic, and social issues (p.5). In this case, the intellectuals of the Peace Lovers Community were taken into custody and later arrested for this action, which has also almost become a routine that has been experienced by different generations of the intellectual community in Turkey.

After the military coup of May 27, 1960, the statute number 115 was introduced by the National Unity Committee, which can be considered as the move that brought universities to their most autonomous form. Nevertheless, about the same time that the control of the ministry over universities was decreased, the National Unity Committee also introduced the Law No. 114, which required 147 scholars to be taken off duty for being “lazy, untalented, and against reform” (Arslan, 2011, p.337). After a period of negotiations, discussions, pressures from prominent scholars and students, and the problems in universities without the existence of 147 expelled scholars, the purged academics were reinstated to their duties on March 28, 1962 (p.352). In that time frame, there had been another important action of the intellectual community in Turkey, which included prominent figures like Doğan Avcıoğlu, Niyazi Berkes or Aziz Nesin: Yön Declaration in 1961. The declaration neither entailed any tight connections with the 147 expelled scholars nor was it a response against the academic purges. Rather, it aimed to show the ideas and recommendations of the intellectual community in Turkey regarding the main political, economic, and social issues of the country. The declaration, which was published in the first issue of Yön Magazine, was signed by a wide range of intellectuals and was also open for the readers of the magazine to participate in. The declaration consisted of an analysis of the socioeconomic structure of Turkey and

suggestions by the intellectuals of the community. The main political line of the declaration was support to the principles and reforms of Atatürk, yet its main importance lied in its representation of the intellectual community of the period on a large scale. In this respect, even though the autonomous character of the universities of the era was questionable due to the case 147ers, the intellectual field in Turkey had the respective autonomy to speak up against the political issues that they found relevant without facing charges or violent reactions by the government. After this declaration, Yön Magazine continued its contributions to political and ideological discussions within the intellectual circles of the country until the state of siege in 1971, when it was closed and the editor-in-chief Doğan Avcıoğlu and his friends were arrested.

The comparatively autonomous period of the academy was shattered after the ‘68 movements throughout the world, which also found its reflections in the case of the universities of Turkey. The sociopolitical atmosphere of the era hosted right and left wing clashes, students boycotts and occupations, as well as armed conflicts. This climate of instability and social unrest in the country paved the way for the *12 Mart Muhtırası* (Turkish Military Memorandum) in 1971 during which the Chief of the General Staff and the commanders-in-chief of armed forces gave memorandum for the resignation of Demirel’s Justice Party government. The reflection of this turning point on the universities had been the Law No. 1488 which was issued in September 1971 and which enabled government control over the universities as well as the use of police force within the campuses in case of ‘danger’. At the same time, the relationship between academy and politics was once again prohibited through this law that took away the rights of scholars to be members of political parties, which was given in 1961 (Arslan, 2011, p.441).

Another significant event in the history of Turkey and universities had been the coup d'etat in September 12, 1980 which resulted in the foundation of *Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu* (YÖK, the Higher Education Board), which became a central institution for the management of universities by the government. Through the foundation of YÖK, with the purpose of consolidating authority under one state institution, “higher education came to be regarded as a matter of national security” in Turkey (as cited in Erdem and Akin, 2019, p.4). At the same time, 120 academics were expelled from universities through the Law No. 1402 that is today known as the case of 1402ers. The time course and processes in 1980 will be further discussed in later chapters while discussing the ‘alternative’ academy institution called Ekin BİLAR. Today, the Higher Education Board continues to function, although it had been and still is subject to various critiques. As explained by YÖK itself on its website, all institutions of higher education are centralized under the roof the Higher Education Board, which makes it the only responsible institution for higher education. As a constitutional institution, whose foundations lie at the 1982 Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, the Higher Education Board entails autonomy and legal entity (YÖK, n.d). As Tekeli (2010) notes, even though almost all oppositional parties declared their intentions to change YÖK, they have failed to fulfill their intentions after they came to duty.

As mentioned earlier, there is an intimate relationship between major structural transformations and academic autonomy in Turkey, which can be observed in the expected roles of the universities in the eyes of the various governments in different periods. In this respect, the aim of the universities was decided as upbringing in 1934, raising students according to the “ideals of Turkish revolution” in 1946, as “nationalists” in 1973, and in accordance with the principles of Atatürk in

1981 (Arslan, 2011, p.499). At the same time, the dissenting scholars and intellectuals have yet tried to separate themselves from the ideas and ideals of these governments through declarations, petitions, and announcements. In this respect, it is necessary to make note of other important actions and declarations before the declaration of the Academics for Peace that were initiated by the intellectual community in Turkey. Among them, two of the most significant forms of actions can be considered as the Petition of Intelligentsia and Bread and Rights Petition initiated by the expelled 1402er academics as well as other intellectuals in the 1980s, which will be the topic of discussion further while discussing the time period in Chapter 2. In addition to them, there was the Democracy Congress which was convened by the author Yaşar Kemal in 1993. The congress was organized by the Human Rights Association in Turkey and aimed for an intellectual intervention for the Kurdish problem. There were also other significant actions such as the widely discussed declaration of “What do Kurds Want?” initiated by the Kurdish intellectuals in 2004, “*Kaygılıyız, Uyarıyoruz* (We are Worried and Warning)” that was signed by some intellectuals in 2005 against the rising nationalist actions in the country, and the *Aydınlar Bildirgesi* (Declaration of the Intelligentsia) that was announced against militarism and chauvinism in 2005.

As Vatansever (2018) contends, “the authoritarian state tradition in Turkey and the organic ties of the universities to the state since their foundation have always impeded critical thought to a certain degree” (p.4). In this respect, considering the fragility and shattered position of academic freedom throughout this brief history of universities in Turkey, it is possible to argue that different forms of action taken by the intellectual community is mostly irrespective of the academic autonomy the scholars had in different time periods. Furthermore, as seen from these earlier

experiences, the actors who take part in these reactions were not merely university constituents but included other cultural producers, hence the emphasis on the concept of ‘intellectual’ instead of ‘scholar’ as the subject of discussion. Within this context, it would be problematic to understand the acts of opposition by the intellectual community as dependent on the university autonomy in the country. For this reason, even though I will evaluate the ‘alternative’ academic structures founded by these actors with regards to the role of academics in independent knowledge production and distribution, I will discuss these actions and reactions by the dissident intellectual community in general in terms of the role of intellectuals in taking a stand in social and political issues of the country.⁴

1.2 Collective actions of the dissenting intellectuals: Moral vs. political responsibility

As discussed previously, the brief history of academic autonomy and intellectuals in Turkey reveal that academics have undertaken many acts of opposition to take a stance against the actions of governments in different time periods. As the title of the declaration by the Academics for Peace “We will not be a party to this crime” indicates, these acts of opposition in the forms of declarations, petitions, and announcements bear within themselves notions of moral and political responsibility. Young (2011) contends that,

Because we dwell on the stage of history, and not simply in our houses, we cannot avoid the imperative to have a relationship with actions and events performed by institutions of our society, often in our name, and with our

⁴ As I will explain later in this thesis, I take neither intellectual nor dissenting intellectual as a definite concept referring to a particular social type. Rather, this research aims to show that the definition of intellectuals is a contested issue within the intellectual field. To clarify the subjects of this contestation, I make a differentiation between the dissenting and conforming intellectuals. However, I do not take dissenting intellectual as a particular social type either and underline that taking part in an act of dissent is the definitive moment for a cultural producer to become a dissenting intellectual. This identity is, thus, subject to change over the course of time and in accordance with the different contested meanings inherent to the concept of intellectual.

passive or active support. The imperative of political responsibility consists in watching these institutions, monitoring their effects to make sure that they are not grossly harmful, and maintaining organized public spaces where such watching and monitoring can occur and citizens can speak publicly and support one another in their efforts to prevent suffering. To the extent that we fail in this, we fail in our responsibility even though we have committed no crime and should not be blamed. (p.88)

Young expresses that observing social institutions and speaking publicly when bearing witness to public suffering are responsibilities of an individual even if s/he does not commit the crime him/herself. For the purposes of this research, being part of a petition campaign can be considered as a means of separating the signatories from the bystanders and collaborators who remain silent or passively or actively support the actions of their government agents in the context of repression, conflict or war. These reactions are ways of stating that the participants of these declarations do not want to be party to the wrongdoings of their government representatives.⁵

Opposition against the conduct of a representative government emerges in different discussions across academia. In democratic theory, the issue is addressed with regards to the moral responsibility of a democratic citizen for the wrongdoings of coercive governmental representatives (See Beerbohm, 2012; Archard, 2013; DeWijze, 2014). From the perspective of criminal justice, the problem is discussed with regard to the conviction of guilty after a criminal or coercive act practiced by the government and how to assess the ordinary citizens who passively witnessed this act performed on behalf of them (See Meister, 2011; Arendt, 2003; Young, 2011). Reviewing the moral judgments of individual signatories and discussing their responsibilities as citizens for the repressive acts of their governments would provide significant contributions for this case. However, for the integrity of this research as a

⁵ Even though I find these ethical considerations inherent to the actions of the signatories, I would like to underline that the motivations of the scholars to be part of this declaration cannot be considered as the same. As contended by Kampüssüzler earlier in this chapter, some signed the petition out of habit, some did not think much before signing, and some had different political aims.

whole, I will keep this discussion within the framework of collective responsibility, considering that the subjects of this research came together as a group of intellectuals with the intention of giving a collective response in a time of crisis. Still, while discussing the moral responsibility in the collective actions of these dissenting intellectuals, it might be problematic to assign an a priori identity to the individuals who take part in these acts and assume collective responsibility as part of that identity. To avoid this problem, I will take the aforesaid acts of opposition as the points of departure when individuals became part of a collective, hence became the dissenting intellectuals whose acts will be regarded with respect to collective responsibility.

Smiley (2017) contends that collective responsibility “associates both causal responsibility and blameworthiness with groups and locates the source of moral responsibility in the collective actions taken by these groups understood as collectives.” Yet, there is a dispute in the literature about the moral responsibility of collectives, for the concept is understood as inherent to individuals (See Arendt, 2003; Downie, 1969; and Lewis, 1948). Arendt (2003) argues that the concept of collective responsibility and the problems it implies “owe their relevance and general interest to political predicaments as distinguished from legal or moral ones. Legal and moral standards have one very important thing in common - they always relate to the person and what the person has done” (p.148). She contends that moral sentiments like guilt are personal and that their center of interest is the self, whereas “in the center of political considerations of conduct stands the world” (p.153). Following Arendt, I will base my inquiry on the connection between political and collective, and focus more on the political rather than moral aspect of the different forms of actions taken by the dissonant intellectuals in question. For this reason, I

exclude the moral sentiments that underlay individual signatories' motivations to take part in these collective acts and discuss their actions with regard to the political responsibility of dissenting intellectuals.

As stated earlier, while looking at the collective acts in the forms of declarations, petitions, and 'alternative' academy structures of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies, I will take intellectuals as the subject of my research, relying on their position in the society as cultural producers and distributors. The actions in question will then be considered as the political responsibility of the actors involved both for raising voices against a government that commits immoral acts on behalf of its citizens and maintaining public spaces where the monitoring of public institutions and social aggregation can occur. Nevertheless, discussing these actions in terms of collective responsibility leads to further questions: Can we consider the intellectuals who are part of these collective acts as a group with similar intentions and motives? If so, to whom or what these group of intellectuals owe their allegiance to? In the next section, I will focus on this discussion within the framework of sociology of intellectuals.

1.3 Allegiances of the dissenting intellectuals: "From the sociology of intellectuals to the sociology of interventions"

As argued in the earlier section, individual cultural producers and distributors who took part in the acts of opposition such as declarations, petitions, and 'alternative' academy structures can be regarded as dissenting intellectuals who position themselves against the status quo as part of a collective. The collective identity of intellectuals has been subject to different speculations in the academic literature. "All men are intellectuals, one could therefore say: but not all men have in the society the

function of intellectuals”, says Gramsci (1971, p.9), while remarking that every person has an intellect but does not have the mediating function of intellectuals in the class struggle. Along with that of Gramsci, there are many different conceptualizations for the term ‘intellectual’. Merton (1968) describes intellectuals as people who “devote themselves to cultivating and formulating knowledge” (p.263), Foucault (1984) as someone “who utilizes his knowledge, his competence, and his relation to truth in the field of political struggles” (p.70), and Kurzman and Owens (2002) contend that it appears in the literature as “persons with advanced educations, producers or transmitters of culture or ideas, or members of either category who engage in public issues” (p.63).

In addition to different understandings for the concept of intellectuals, the collective responsibility of the social group has also been a much-debated topic with respect to the role of intellectuals in the society as well as their allegiances. In “The Sociology of Intellectuals,” Kurzman and Owens (2002) identify three approaches to this issue: theories that regard intellectuals as a class-in-themselves, as class-bound, and as class-less. In the first cluster, they classify the authors who understand intellectuals as a specific social group with distinguished interests that are different from other groups in the society, in the second they mention the academics who regard intellectuals as those who are able to separate themselves from their group of origin through their education and pursue different ideals, and in the last they make note of the scholars who contend that intellectuals represent and work for the social groups that they belong to. Their classification is useful to understand the main differences between these various theorists within the framework of the sociology of intellectuals regarding the questions of who intellectuals are, what their allegiance are to, and thus what kind of a collective responsibility they have for the society. For

this reason, in this section, I will briefly discuss the main figures who have problematized the issue in the literature following Kurzman and Owen's categorization, if these questions are still applicable under today's conditions, and how this research builds on these conceptualizations.

As part of "intellectual class mobilization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries" (Kurzman, 2008, p.25), an idea of intellectual emerged who has a responsibility to understand the world, form a theoretical framework for their society, and speak in the name of universal truth and justice. An important cornerstone for this mobilization and "collective self-identification" was the well-known Dreyfus affair in France in 1898, which was initiated by the famous essay of Emile Zola titled "*J'accuse!*" against the conviction of a Jewish military officer imprisoned for treason (p.12). After this event, the collective identity of the Dreyfusard intellectual who speaks in the name of universal values had become a prevalent issue in the academic literature. Some scholars perceived intellectuals as a distinct social group or class (Benda, 1955; Gouldner 1993), some put them into a class-less position with an ability to empathize with each existing group in the society (Mannheim, 1993), some gave a distinguished position and nature to intellectuals which caused tension between them and the actual institutions of the society (Shils, 1972), some argued that intellectuals have allegiance to their class origins as every class creates its own "organic intellectuals" as opposed to traditional intellectuals who conceal their relationship to class struggle (Gramsci, 1971).

Rather than attributing common characteristics to intellectuals, some authors drew attention to the different positions intellectuals might be situated in. Merton (1968) makes a distinction between bureaucratic and unattached intellectuals based on their autonomy from government officials and positions. Foucault (1984)

identifies universal and specific intellectuals, while the former refers to those who regard themselves as the “spokesman of the universal” and the latter to those who use their expertise within their local contexts and struggles (p.67-68). Said (1994)’s understanding of a ‘true’ intellectual is “as exile and marginal, as amateur, and as the author of a language that tries to speak the truth to power” (p.xvi) unlike the insiders who conform to the status quo without “the sense of dissonance and dissent” (p.52). Publicness and “worldliness” become distinguishing features for scholars like Giroux (2006), whose concept of “transformative intellectual” requires the scholars to “think and act in terms of transforming present unjust social relations and “carve out different democratic public spaces” (Mayo, 2015, p.140).

Lately, the literature on sociology of intellectuals have started to move away from the idea of universal intellectual to the “decline of the independent public intellectuals” (Donatich, 2001; Posner, 2003) and “delegitimization of intellectuals” (Fuller, 2004). At the same time, the term intellectual has gradually become more associated with the academic world:

By the end of the twentieth century the balance between independent and academic public intellectuals had changed. The relative number of public intellectuals who were not academics had shrunk—dramatically so if numbers are weighted by prominence or contribution. (Posner, 2003, p.28)

The increasing concentration on the academic intellectuals have shifted the focus towards the problems like commodification of higher education (Oullet and Martin, 2018), corporatization of universities, and precarization of students and academic labor (Roggero, 2011; Gill, 2009), as well as the increasing bureaucratization and government control in universities (Lorenz, 2013). The devaluation of academic and intellectual labor (Vatansever, 2018) resulted in a decline in critical subjectivity as intellectuals found themselves in precarious conditions during the neoliberal era. This crisis of intellectuals and academia have found its reflections for the case of

Turkey as well, which is discussed in terms of the infusion of market relations into the different segments of the society including the academic/scientific realm (Vatansever and Yalçın, 2016), commodification of higher education (Fırat and Akkuzu, 2015), intervention of the state and hegemonic order into universities (Aytaç and Yılmaz, 2008), and increasing academic careerism (Özel, 2017). As Vatansever (2018) contends, “The structural anxiety over exclusion from the sphere of formal work [due to the precarious conditions of academics during the neoliberal era] is further reinforced by the absence (or gradual undermining) of normative standards in the political arena” (p.17). Under these conditions, being a critical public intellectual and adhering to universal intellectual values have started to have higher consequences throughout the world and especially in Turkey.

Aware of the problems related to the idea of intellectuals, Eyal and Buchholz (2010) argue that today it is no longer relevant to talk about autonomous, independent, universal intellectuals or trace the problems that resulted in their decline or betrayal. Following Foucault’s emphasis on specific intellectual instead of universal intellectual, they contend that there is a need to shift to focus from the allegiances or characteristics of intellectuals to the their interventions through “conversion”:

Conversion in this sense means that one carefully identifies the enduring element—the movement by which knowledge acquires value as public intervention—and translates it into a new set of conditions and corresponding research strategies. (p.119)

In this regard, they underline the necessity to withdraw from the idea of a homogenous collective intellectual identity in favor of multiple relevant actors and multiple forms of interventions.

In this thesis, I argue that it is not possible to speak of intellectual as a particular, universal social type with common ideals. Even though reviewing the

literature on intellectuals is crucial to understand the concept from a historical perspective, it is inadequate to comprehend the contradictions and transformations with regards to intellectual attributes and values. In this respect, I will use the concept of “field” by Bourdieu to define the space these actors in and argue that intellectuals are not distinguished social groups with particular allegiances but are part of a field that involves internal struggles and changing positions. For this reason, there is a need to make a distinction between dissenting intellectuals and conforming intellectuals who are both part of the same field. At the same time, it is crucial not to take these two groups as definite and homogeneous, and make note of the multiple actors in these groups and changing positions within the intellectual field. In the next section, I will discuss this issue further with reference to the purpose and subjects of this research.

1.4 Establishing ‘alternative’ academies in Turkey: Field of power, internal struggles, and external sanctions

A field is defined as a “space of objective relations between positions defined by their rank in the distribution of competing powers or species of capital” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.113). The concept of fields is useful in this research to examine the trajectory of the intellectuals with respect to their varying values and discourses, understand the changing positions of intellectuals in the society, and highlight the changes in the attributes of the dissenting intellectuals as a result of internal and external influences. Here, I must underline that the object of this research is not to make a comprehensive analysis of the intellectual or academic field in Turkey through a Bourdieusian framework. Rather, I will make use of the concept to make sense of the characteristics, means, and methods of the subjects of this

project. In this section, I will briefly discuss the field theory and how it relates to the intellectuals who participated in this research. In a similar manner with Büyükokutan (2010), I will characterize the internal structure of the intellectual field as dissenting intellectuals in the face of “all of their peers who are on the side of the status quo” (p.5) and define these two groups as subfields. I will base my arguments on the former through a comparison between the 1980s and today, which will provide the trajectory of the transformations in their values, dispositions, and position-takings.

Bourdieu (1996) proposes the methodology to comprehend the different levels of social reality a field is linked to as follows:

First, one must analyze the position of the literary (etc.) field within the field of power, and its evolution in time. Second, one must analyze the internal structure of the literary (etc.) field, a universe obeying its own laws of functioning and transformation, meaning the structure of objective relations between positions occupied by individuals and groups placed in a situation of competition for legitimacy. And finally, the analysis involves the genesis of habitus of occupants of these positions, that is, the systems of dispositions which, being the product of a social trajectory and of a position within the literary (etc.) field, find in this position a more or less favorable opportunity to be realized (the construction of the field is the logical preamble for the construction of the social trajectory as a series of positions successively occupied in this field). (p.214)

In accordance with this methodology, situating the intellectual field in Turkey within the field of power and examining its evolution in time will be useful to understand the acts of opposition by dissenting intellectuals with respect to their changing positions in the society. Bourdieu defines the field of power as “the space of relations of force between agents or between institutions having in common the possession of capital necessary to occupy the dominant positions in different fields (notably economic or cultural)” (p.215). This approach allows me to position the intellectuals who are part of ‘alternative’ academy institutions in a site of struggle with the existing institutions and government agents. Even though the dissenting intellectuals started a re-autonomization process in the face of government repression by founding

Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies, thus gaining some autonomy from external demands and constraints, they still face(d) economic conditions that put them in a dominated position in the field of power. Comparing the cases of the 1980s and today reveals that the value of the educational, social, and cultural capital intellectuals possess has changed. This change also alters their position in the field of power and changes possible solutions and methods relied on in the site of struggle. Analysis of this change accompanies an analysis of the values and dispositions of these actors and how they were transformed during this period. Throughout this thesis, I focus on this transformation and its implications for the organizations the dissenting intellectuals establish and the means and methods of their struggle.

To analyze the internal structure within the intellectual field, I will focus on the struggle between the dissenting and conforming intellectuals in Turkey for legitimation and recognition. Here, “conflicts over the definition and boundaries of the field” and “the principle of vision and division (*nomos*)” define the intellectual field (p.223) will be relevant with regards to the discussions of what it means to be a “true” intellectual or scholar and the meaning of “true” science. I will dwell on this conflict both in terms of the organizational structure of these ‘alternative’ academic structures and the perspectives of the intellectuals involved on knowledge production and distribution. Dissenting scholars’ different approaches to pedagogy and education as well as their political declarations will be evaluated as their position-takings in the intellectual field. Based upon this discussion, I will also trace the changes in the dispositions of the dissenting intellectuals between 1980s and today, and reflect on the influence of their position-takings in the transformations of knowledge production and distribution in Turkey.

Bourdieu argues that “Internal struggles are to an extent arbitrated by external sanctions” (p.252). The external influences on the transformations in the attributes, means, and dispositions of the dissenting intellectuals will be an important part of this research. To understand the trajectory of the dissenting intellectuals in the 1980s and today, I will examine the internal struggles within the intellectual field as well as the transformations in the field of higher education, and in the discourses of social movements throughout the world. In the next section, I will focus on the latter and explain how they are relevant for this research.

1.5 Carving out new spaces for the public: Democratization, anti-globalization, and ideas of commoning

In order to contextualize Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies, it is essential to speak of the discourses of social movements within their particular time periods and how they influenced the formation and execution of these organizations. In this section, I will first describe the period of transition Ekin BİLAR was founded in through the literature on democratization and new social movements, which will be relevant to understand the actions of the intellectuals who participated in this organization in the 1980s. Afterwards, I will focus on the discourses of commoning and anti-globalization movements that have become influential in the last two decades, and had an effect on the organizational structure and practices of solidarity academies. Lastly, I will draw upon some similar examples with these ‘alternative’ academic structures from the world and reflect on their inspirational roles for the cases of this research.

The time period of the 1980s, which corresponds to the foundation of Ekin BİLAR, can be considered as a period of transition for social movements in the

world. While describing the increasing prevalence of the concept of “transition,” Paige Arthur (2009) makes note of the “global decline of the radical Left during the 1970s and a concomitant ideological shift in favor of human rights” (p.339). In the social movements literature, the student movements that started in 1968 is marked as an important turning point for this shift that replaced class-centered movements with cultural and identity-based actions (Lelandais, 2009, p.65). During this period, as social organizations have started to get more involved with the human rights discourse, the idea of social change has been transformed. Unlike the revolutionary movements that focused on socio-economic transformations, the emerging social movements have shifted their interests and requests to “legal-institutional reform” (Guilhot, 2002; Arthur 2009). In this regard, the main difference of these “new social movements” became their emphasis on autonomy, identity, and defensive action instead of a struggle for power (Çetinkaya, 2008, p.36). In other words, while the “revolutionary paradigm of social change” has been dismissed (Guilhot, 2002), processes of democratization started to be promoted in forms of the “resurrection of civil society” and the “restructuring of public space” (Arthur, 2009, p.347). Within this context, the foundation of Ekin BİLAR as a public space is very representative of the movements that the waves of democratization brought along, yet the organization still bears the traces of the leftist organizations preceded. I will explain this issue further throughout this thesis, as this socio-political context is influential in understanding the ideas and ideals of the dissenting intellectuals in the 1980s.

With the end of the Cold War and increasing influence of global economy, new social movements have gained a different momentum in the last two decades, which found their echoes in the protests that took place in cities like Seattle, Washington, D.C., Cologne, London, Prague, Melbourne, Gothenburg, Porto

Allegre, Okinawa, Davos, Chiang Mai, and Genoa (Szeman, 2002, p.4). The characteristics of these global justice movements have been their change of focus from class struggle to anti-globalization, emphasis on spaces of action independent of political parties and ideologies, replacement of hierarchical organizational models with heterogeneous, dispersed structures, increased usage of media, communication and organic ties with the social movements in different countries, and self-identification in a cosmopolitan sense (Lelandais, 2009, p.84-85). Dirlik (2008) argues that this model defined as “the movement of movements” does not restrain various entities under one structure with a specific goal, but rather creates spaces where different purposes can be articulated in temporary togetherness without the need to have a common ideology (p.70).

The waves of these anti-globalization protests in the 2000s brought the debates of “commons” and “commoning”⁶ to the table, which refer to the political discussions about the potentialities of producing anti-capitalist values, norms, and social relations against the systematic encroachment of capitalism (Firat, 2018). As prominent authors on these potentialities of resistance, Hardt and Negri (2009) explain the idea of common as follows:

First of all, the common wealth of the material world—the air, the water, the fruits of the soil, and all nature's bounty—which in classic European political texts is often claimed to be the inheritance of humanity as a whole, to be shared together. We consider the common also and more significantly those results of social production that are necessary for social interaction and further production, such as knowledges, languages, codes, information, affects, and so forth. (viii)

⁶ There is a vast literature on commons and commoning while the concepts have different meanings for different authors. For the idea of common, I use the definition proposed by Hardt and Negri (2009) in this chapter. Following Erdem and Akin (2019), I will focus on the emphasis of the practices of commoning on “social labor and cooperation as constituent factors of what is generated in common”, “the process - the ambiguities, contradictions, and tensions associated with learning-by-doing how knowledge can be produced and shared within a collectivity”, and “space for a postcapitalist politics” (p.7).

Although anti-globalization protests have gradually faded from the scene in the last decade, the attacks of capital on the areas regarded as commons have found reactions from the communities for the defense of the commonwealth throughout the world and in Turkey. As Hardt and Negri demonstrate, theories on this topic focus not only on reclaiming these commons but also in building autonomous spheres within the system in the field of social reproduction:

Without ignoring the facts of the systematic encroachment on life, resources, and spaces once held in common, at the same time we envisage the opening up of new spaces of cooperation and collective action, such as the digital commons, new practices simply of ‘being in common’, community economies and solidarity networks. (Amin and Howell, 2016, p.2)

Through the emergence of these new struggles, practices, organizations, and collective actions, the term “commons” has been infused into the social movement literature although used differently by various sources (Firat, 2018). The idea of commoning found reflections within the terrain of universities and education as well:

Today, free education is autonomous education plus appropriation of the social richness, or the production of the commonwealth. Finally, the struggles are over the new organization of knowledge. In the crisis of the disciplines, there are attempts to impose new forms of measure (i.e., inter-, multi-, or postdisciplinary codes), as well as a backlash of the old disciplines. As a result, the constituent challenge for these struggles is the immediate organization of a new university, a university without borders. (Roggero, 2011, p.11)

Being founded within this context, solidarity academies adopt some of the ideas of common and commoning in their organizational structures, practices, values, and perspectives on education. Erdem and Akin (2019) define solidarity academies as “spaces of commoning” for their role in the experimentation of the “reterritorialization of academia” which for them “signifies the desire to transform academic space through emancipatory collective practices, imaginaries, and institutional structures; in other words, to put in place concrete alternatives that go beyond a reform to the current university system” (p.3). Along the same lines, I will

evaluate the influence of the discourses of commons on solidarity academies with respect to “sharing resources and governing them and their own relations and (re)production processes through horizontal doing in common, commoning” (De Angelis, 2017), “re-inventing the city through commoning” (Stavrides, 2016), and re-territorialization (Raunig, 2013).

The cases of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies are not the only examples for the idea of creating an alternative to the existing structures in the society. The most well-known movement in this new age of social movements can be considered as that of Zapatistas (See Burbach, 2001), which has been influential in organizations like solidarity academies. The Zapatistas of Mexico is an important example for the idea of commoning because of the “autonomous economic development”, “self-help approaches”, and “alternative, viable economies at the local and regional levels” experimented by the indigenous communities of Chiapas (Burbach, 2001, p.112). There have also been other ‘alternative’ academy examples from the world such as the Social Science Center, Lincoln in England – a co-operative organizing free higher education (See Neary and Winn, 2017) or Brisbane Free University – “an autonomous space in which the empowering processes of teaching and learning belong to everybody” with the idea that education should be a commons (See Brisbane Free University, n.d; Thompsett, 2017; Carlson and Walker, 2018). Although these examples are inspiring for ‘alternative’ organizations like solidarity academies, there is an emphasis on the specificities of local contexts that prevents actors from adopting the same models in different places. This situation brings forward new solutions and approaches while at the same time runs the risks of creating restrained “islands” (Fırat, 2018). This issue will be further discussed in the thesis with regards to the promises and constraints of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity

academies. In the next section, I will explain the methodology used for this research as well as the ethical considerations this project entails.

1.6 Methodology

In this research, by using different methods in various combinations, it was possible to triangulate the data gathered. In the mixed-method approach adopted, I relied on “distinct historical comparison”, participant observation, interviews, and focus groups. These various methods complemented each other to ensure the research was comprehensive and systematic. As the project includes comparing two different time periods, the distinct historical-comparative approach allowed me to identify the similarities and differences between two sets of similar yet distinct organizations founded in the 1980s and today. As the method implies the combination of “a sensitivity to specific historical or cultural context with theoretical generalization” (Neuman, 2006, p.388), I was able to interpret the data of the 1980s and today with regards to their specific time periods but also provide a theoretical framework that could encompass both cases. For the case of Ekin BİLAR, I benefited from an online database generously developed by *Hafıza Kaydı* (Memory Record)⁷ about this specific historical case, which includes primary resources such as newspaper articles, photographs, and brochures as well as detailed transcriptions of eleven interviews with the founders, lecturers, and students who were part of this organization at the time (See Hafıza Kaydı, n.d.-a). This “memory record” of Ekin BİLAR allowed me to collect information about the foundation processes, organizational structure, and activities of the organization, gain insights about the main discussions underway

⁷ Hafıza Kaydı is an open platform initiated by a group of volunteers who came together in the forums that were organized in the parks of Istanbul after Gezi protests. Inspired by the discussions in the Seğmenler Forum about collective conscience and societal dialogue, the group decided to create a digital calendar based on the events that occupy a place in the collective memory of the country. For more information about the story of the initiative, please see Hafıza Kaydı (n.d.-c).

during this era and the company.⁸ From the eleven interviews, it was possible to gather data in which key individuals involved in the project reflected on the organization and the period. As such, an important part of this research is indebted to the volunteers of Hafıza Kaydı who developed an extensive research on this unique issue and made it accessible to researchers and interested readers.

In an effort to document the experiences of members of the Academics for Peace, I interviewed eight scholars who are part of Kampüssüzler, *Kültürhane* (House of Culture), and the solidarity academies in Kocaeli, Ankara, Izmir. Five of the interviews were conducted in person, while three of them were done via skype due to time and resource limitations faced during this research. All of the interviewees were scholars expelled from public universities, including two professors, two associate professors, one assistant professor, and three research assistants.⁹ There were four women and four men, who were all specialized either in social sciences and humanities or administrative sciences and economics, except for a professor from the engineering department. The predominance of academics from the different departments of social sciences is also seen in most of the solidarity academies. These organizations consist mostly of 10-15 active members and there are in total of maximum 30 people in each solidarity academy (except for *Kültürhane* which is founded by three scholars). The active members in each group are mostly social science scholars. Although there are equal numbers of men and women who

⁸ The “memory records” are prepared by Hafıza Kaydı as an act of looking into the past from today’s perspective. Rather than approaching the information provided in this database as objective and neutral, the group assigns particular significance and value to the cases selected to be part of the calendar. For this reason, it is crucial to make note of the mediation processes inherent to the creation and distribution of the data gathered on these past events. In this respect, this database is open to discussions about reliability and objectivity, as the events may be elaborated, changed, and interpreted in the longue duree of memory and culture. Aware of these issues inherent to this data (and oral history in general) I believe that using today’s experiences and perspectives to understand the past is also important and nourishing for this research.

⁹ One of the professors was retired but was still expelled through a decree law despite her retirement.

agreed to participate in my research, the active members of these organizations are predominantly female.¹⁰

In the interviews, I focused on interviewees' life stories, political histories, personal processes that led them to be involved with these 'alternative' academic organizations and the Academics for Peace, as well as their thoughts on the current academia, the relationship between science and politics, solidarity academies and their promises, and the structure of the organization they are involved with. In preparation for the interviews, I developed semi-structured interview questions, but the interviews were formed dialogically in a friendly, intimate setting rather than taking on a formal atmosphere. In addition to these interviews, I conducted a focus group with three members of Kampüssüzler who offered their insights on the Academics for Peace, solidarity academies, and their organization in the graduate study group that I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. As Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) argue, "Focus groups offer unique insights into the possibilities of or for critical inquiry as a deliberative, dialogic, and democratic practice that is always already engaged in and with real world problems." The focus group enabled us to brain-storm about the problems and questions surrounding the Academics for Peace and solidarity academies.

As part of the research methodology, I relied on participant observation and attended the seminars and meetings of solidarity academies to observe their practices, daily interactions and discussions. I attended different seminars, meetings, and events of solidarity academies in Istanbul, Kocaeli, and Karaburun Science

¹⁰ The predominance of women and social science scholars in solidarity academies is an issue that requires more research. In some solidarity academies, it is argued that most of the work is carried out by research assistants which brought out discussions among the members of solidarity academies about the existing hierarchies within these organizations despite the motivation to have horizontal organizational structures. In this respect, a research focusing on the everyday life within these institutions would bring different perspectives and understandings to solidarity academies. For the integrity of this thesis as a whole, I will not dwell on these discussions any further.

Congress which allowed me to develop a perspective about the issues they focused on and problems they discussed. As mentioned earlier, I also became part of the graduate study group organized by Kampüssüzler and attended their bi-monthly meetings to discuss the theses of different graduate students and other issues related to universities, Academics for Peace, and solidarity academies. Through the help and guidance of the Kampüssüzler members, I was also able to attend the Solidarity Academies Workshop that took place in Eskişehir in November 2017. Attending the workshop enabled me to gain valuable information about the projects, problems, hopes, and plans of these organizations and get to know scholars from different cities and discuss the research with them.

I am personally engaged with these issues concerning the dissenting intellectuals and ‘alternative’ academy structures. Although the subjects of this research are scholars who contribute to the academic literature through their own publications and works, I hope that my research will help to bring their work and voices into center stage. In order to ensure the anonymity of the scholars I interviewed, I use pseudonyms in the thesis. Although most of the persons interviewed for this research are well-known public figures, I still find myself ethically responsible to prioritize the privacy and anonymity of our discussions. However, as the interviews that Hafıza Kaydı provides are part of an open access resource that includes the actual names of the interviewees, I will not change names while quoting from them.

1.7 Overview of the thesis

This thesis aims to understand the actions of dissenting intellectuals in times of crisis and how the intellectual field is transformed in different sociological contexts. With

this purpose, in Chapter 2, I will explain the historical and socio-political background of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies as well as the foundation processes of these organizations. While focusing on the formation of these acts of resistance, I will dwell on the demographics, values, and different capitals of the intellectuals who became part of these organizations. In this way, I will provide an insight on the members of these organizations in two different time periods and contexts, and map the trajectory of the intellectual field in the 1980s and today.

Chapter 3 will explore the different organizational models and structures that were formed in these two time periods. To compare with Ekin BİLAR, I will focus on three different solidarity academies founded in three different cities: Kültürhane in Mersin, Kocaeli Solidarity Academy (KODA) in Kocaeli, and Kampüssüzler in Istanbul. While discussing the case of Kampüssüzler, I will also elaborate on the formation of the umbrella structure called *BirAraDa* (Together) Association that united different solidarity academies under one roof. Through these different examples, I will compare the dispositions and methods of the intellectuals in the 1980s and today as well as compare the cases of Kültürhane, KODA, and Kampüssüzler to understand why these organizations developed in these ways. In the case of the comparison between these three cases, I argue that the cities where these organizations emerged are key factors influencing the structure, aim and activities of the three organizations. Through these comparisons, I explore the changing discourses of social movements and public sphere in different local contexts and across time periods.

Chapter 4 will focus on intellectuals' position regarding knowledge production and distribution, which will also be useful to understand the space Ekin BİLAR opened for future generations and the potential solidarity academies hold for

the future. To situate the argument about the role of these two sets of academics, it is necessary to examine the problems in the university structure in these two time periods and identify if these organizations offer alternatives to existent structures. This mapping will enable me to discuss if these organizations have influences on the field of education and social movements in Turkey.

CHAPTER 2

SOLIDARITY AND DISSENT:

INTELLECTUAL FIELD AND ITS TRANSFORMATION IN TURKEY

Our 1402er friends left. There were news coming every day. There were new yellow envelopes arriving every day. I also attach a lot of importance to the influence of YÖK in the following years. I remember how much of a tough environment we were in, how we were inspected, controlled. (Yıldız Ecevit, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017) (See Appendix, 2)

I was expelled with the decree law on February, the Decree-Law No.686, it was one of the most crowded ones. Anyway, until that period ... it has started in September. In September, October, in December if I'm not mistaken, on January, and lastly us. I mean, we were seeing the process and even saying 'Don't leave us in limbo, expel us if you will. We're tired to leave everything aside every time a decree law is announced and come together side by side to review the lists, not from the purge itself! Let us have some relief by seeing that name there already!' (Dilan Yıldız, personal interview, July 2018) (See Appendix, 3)

I start with these two quotes because of the glaring similarities between the comments though they were made about two different periods. In the interview conducted by Hafıza Kaydı on July 2017, Yıldız Ecevit explains the university environment in 1980, during the period of liquidation and oppressive socio-political climate after the coup d'état on September 12. In that context, she talks about how the dissenting scholars were awaiting the arrival of yellow envelopes which brought the news about their purge from the university through the Law No. 1402. Twenty-six years later, in the two years between July 2016 and July 2018, with the state of emergency in place, Dilan Yıldız, an expelled scholar from Ankara University who is now part of Ankara Solidarity Academy, brought up the similar waiting process experienced in the recent purge. This time it was the Academics for Peace who found themselves waiting for the decision about their expulsion through the decree laws announced in the official gazette. There are significant similarities between the two

periods in terms of the waiting process, method of academic purges, and the fragile conditions the dissenting scholars experienced during oppressive socio-political climates.

There is a repetitive process of academic purges in the history of Turkey, as the universities in the country have always been influenced by the political atmosphere of their era. Along the same lines, the prevalent discourses in social movements have found their reflections in the intellectual field as well as in knowledge production. In this regard, some intellectuals managed to transform their dissent from the socio-political conditions in their eras into collective forms of action and searches for alternative structures for knowledge production and distribution. Despite the similarities in the situations of dissenting scholars in the years of 1980 and 2016, there are also significant differences in terms of the particularities of the academic field in these two eras. In this chapter, I will focus on outlining the similarities and differences between these time periods to identify the sociological characteristics of the dissenting intellectuals in these two eras and how the academic field has been transformed in Turkey.

While speaking of intellectuals in this chapter, I refer mainly to the dissenting intellectuals in the academic and cultural circles of Turkey. Although my research focuses mainly on the scholars who were expelled from duty because of their dissent, the intellectual field that involves these academics does not comprise only of scholars but also writers, journalists, artists, and other cultural producers. Therefore, the academic field can be regarded as a subfield to the intellectual field in question. In this respect, following Büyükokutan (2010), while regarding intellectuals as “people who create, distribute, and apply culture”, I conceptualize dissenting intellectuals as “cultural producers who are unhappy enough with the cultural and

political status quo to take action against it” (p.8). The forms of action, in this sense, refer to petitions, declarations, and notices that were publicly announced. In the case of the two academic purges that are the main focus of this research, these forms of action refer to the “Petition of Intelligentsia” and the “Bread and Right Petition” signed by the prominent dissenting intellectuals in the 1980s and the petition titled “We will not be a party to this crime” declared in 2016 by prominent scholars who call themselves the Academics for Peace.

In this chapter, I will first briefly discuss the historical background of the two processes that started in 1980 and 2016 with respect to their distinct socio-political climates, petition processes and academic purges. Secondly, I will describe the two ‘alternative’ academic structures founded by the dissenting intellectuals in question, namely Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies, which will be examined further in the next chapter. I will explore these two cases separately in order to understand their unique contexts and processes to be able to compare and contrast them in the last section. Based upon this overview of the two contexts, I will discuss the distinguishing characteristics and backgrounds of the intellectuals involved to shed light on the transformation of the academic field as well as social movements in Turkey. I argue that comparing the profile of these two sets of intellectuals will demonstrate how the role of academics, especially, has undergone a radical change since the Ekin BİLAR case.

2.1 Being a dissenting intellectual in the 1980s in Turkey: The case of Ekin BİLAR

2.1.1 Liquidation and eradication of opposition: The social and political context after the military coup in 1980

The way I see it, it was like this: First of all, it was the darkest period of September 12 when it was even difficult to come side by side, in terms of

social organization I mean. BİLAR enabled this coming together in terms of intellectuals, reactions like the Petition of Intelligentsia are all part of the activities of BİLAR in that period. Against a coup like this, in the struggle against fascism, intellectuals had an important role in terms of activities like BİLAR. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017) (See Appendix, 4)

In the interview conducted by Hafıza Kaydı in July 2017, İrfan Kaygısız talks about the role of intellectuals in bringing people together and taking collective forms of action in the 1980s. The military coup on September 12, 1980 took place as a result of complex socio-political climate and left-right wing clashes in which university students participated. “The violence on the streets”, “total breakdown of consensus within the Parliament”, and crisis in the economy all became factors that lead to the military takeover “pledging to follow a centrist, Kemalist path” under the direction of the Chief of Staff General Kenan Evren and the establishment of the junta called the National Security Council (Necip, 1981). In line with the darkness that Kaygısız describes, the military coup and the ruling period of this junta regime paved the way for various human rights violations and abuses. During this time, 650,000 people were arrested, 1 million 683,000 people were profiled, 14 prisoners died during hunger strikes, 171 people died while under interrogation and subject to prison torture, and 49 people were executed according to the official numbers of the Ministry of Justice revealed by newspapers such as Birgün and T24 (Birgün, 2015; T24, 2015). Concurrently, oppositional movements, especially leftist organizations were dismantled while their leading cadres were put into prison or fled the country. As these revolutionary leftist organizations were an important part of the opposition against the governing power structures in Turkey since the 1970s, the eradication of these groups aimed to purge the society of dissenting elements that were perceived to pose a threat to the new regime.

The coup d'état of September 12, 1980 influenced not only the social and political spheres but also the academic circles and universities. It paved the way for the approval of the Higher Education Law No. 2547 on November 4, 1981 that officially started the era of the Higher Education Board (YÖK). The Higher Education Board, as a structure, was to be presided over by the president. With this transformation, the military junta government aimed to decrease academic autonomy and have control over the knowledge production and distribution in the country. New policies that were introduced by YÖK, such as the imposition of “uniformity” to the higher education system, “appointment of new cadre of rectors and deans with unprecedented executive powers” (Öncü, 1993, p.167), increase in the university admission quotas (p.168), and “incorporation of a series of institutions formerly attached to the Ministry of Education into the university system as faculties” resulted in the “devaluation of academic titles as a whole” (p.170). Öncü (1993) explains the influence of the decrease in universities’ corporate autonomy and YÖK regulations on the academics in Turkey as follows,

The 1980s were a period of receding powers and status as well as economic decline for Turkish academics as a whole. Having lost their cherished corporate autonomy and deprived of their role in the academic decision-making process in their own institutions, they found themselves much reduced in status. Increasing enrolments together with declining research activity and publications further served to undermine their standing, transforming them from academics to teachers. Last but not least, they suffered a dramatic decline in their economic position as state employees. (p.170)

In other words, this transformation in the university system of Turkey has largely dismantled the role of academics as critics. At the same time, it decreased their statuses in the society.

Despite this increase in control, these rearrangements in the university laws were not perceived as sufficient to provide tranquility in universities according to the

executors of the coup d'état in 1980 (Tekeli, 2010). The coupists deemed it necessary to suspend some of the scholars who were seen as the source of anarchy as well (p.228). For this purpose, the military government re-arranged the Martial Law No. 1402 which was originally issued on May 15, 1971 that gave the junta regime the power to discharge or suspend civil servants as they please (Özen, 2002, pp. 32-33). Before this alteration in the Law No. 1402, 1500 people were forcefully retired by a change in the Civil Servants Law after the coup d'état. The changes to the Law resulted in the dismissal of 9,400 civil servants including 3854 teachers and 120 academics (Öndül, 2017). While those who were expelled in the period after the 1980 coup d'état did not consist merely of scholars but also included other professionals in the public sector including teachers, doctors, engineers, and public workers; the purge of scholars aroused the strongest echo among the public. In the next section, I will look into detail the forms of actions that the expelled scholars became part of, which increased the visibility and memorability of their purges as well as the repercussions the purges gained on national and international level.

2.1.2 Taking a counter-action against the actions of the junta regime: The petitions and 'alternative' academy structure in the 1980s

The academic purges implemented through the Law No. 1402 in 1980 became known as the case of *1402likler* (1402ers). One of the most important reasons for the repercussion of this purge was *Aydınlar Dilekçesi* (the Petition of Intelligentsia) that was signed in 1984 under the title of "Observations and Requests Concerning the Democratic Order of Turkey." The main focus of the petition was to take an action against the conduct of the junta regime and the socio-political climate of the era. The petition was signed after the general election in 1983 by 1256 intellectuals that

included most of the scholars who were expelled by the Law No. 1402 as well as other academics, writers, and artists who were uncomfortable with the oppressive environment after the coup d'état in 1980 (Orman, 2005, p.23). Being a progressive and oppositional move against the rule of junta, the petition focused on several issues including democracy, right to live, justice, jurisdiction, torture, prison conditions, the rights to organize and participate, free press, education, and academic autonomy. Kenan Evren, the president after the coup d'état, declared the signatories as traitors while the traditional press regarded them as the "so-called intelligentsia" (p.32). The signatories were later sued by the state and the trials lasted for about one and a half years, although the lawsuits ended with acquittals.¹¹ As a follow up to this petition, another collective action was formed under the name of *Ekmek ve Hak Dilekçesi* (the Bread and Right Petition) in 1986. It focused on the problems and demands concerning the economic situation, while the former mostly consisted of problems related to democracy and human rights.

Around this time period, the same group of intellectuals were discussing creating a public space in order to bring people together and raise dissenting voices in the public sphere. The scholars expelled based on Law No. 1402 and other dissenting intellectuals in Turkey founded an 'alternative' academy institution called Ekin BİLAR in 1986. Taking place in this oppressive sociopolitical context, the founding of this 'alternative' academy was a significant move on the part of the intellectual community and it had broad repercussions in national and international press. The foundation and structure of the organization will be explained further in the next chapter, but here I will examine the characteristics and motives of the intellectuals involved with Ekin BİLAR and the petitions in the 1980s. On the

¹¹ For more information about the Petition of Intelligentsia and the defenses of prominent intellectuals who signed the petition see (Nesin, Göksel, & Gerger, 1986).

subject of the role of the petitions and Ekin BİLAR under the social and political conditions of 1980, Yıldırım Koç, a ‘leftist’ scholar expelled with the Law No. 1402, said:

So BİLAR came to fore during a period when most of the militant constituents were still in prison, under the conditions that doing something else was impossible... So in between 1987-1988 etc., under the conditions that the leading cadres of political movements were either in prison or escaped abroad, it was the effort of those who stayed and especially those who were expelled with [the Law No.] 1402 to fill the void. It was the least people could do, who did not surrender under those conditions and tried to protect their dignity. It was a matter of circumstances. (Yıldırım Koç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 5)

As Koç explains, the intellectuals who were involved with BİLAR and different forms of actions were people with a politically leftist background who wanted to express their dissent and opposition at a time when most of the oppositional movements were eradicated. Although these efforts did not intend to initiate great social transformations like the dismantled revolutionary movements before the 1980s, they aimed to raise dissenting voices in civil society when all forms of opposition were being silenced. In this respect, they adopted the role of ‘true intellectuals’ by opposing the prevailing norms and conformity in contrast to their counter-identities of traditional or insider intellectual who distance themselves from dissonance or conflict. Under these conditions, a group of dissenting intellectuals came together to build a democratic front against the oppressive regime of the period.

They [the group of intellectuals who were involved with the Petition of Intelligentsia and BİLAR] went through a serious leftist politicization before the coup d’etat, were harshly defeated, but despite that found the courage and hope to prepare themselves for the new era. I realize that they did this not only for themselves, but probably mostly for us, those who came after them. The topics of discussion in that period were no longer about the 1970s, but about the new Turkey of the period.... ..the environment, the climate was suitable for me and others to grow as feminists, even as socialist feminists. At the same time, the politics of human rights, environment, civil society in general, democracy perspective were imposed to us a lot or at least that’s

what I deduced from the discussions in that period. Democracy was a very powerful idea, coming out of everywhere. The democracy issue was at the root and it was mostly related to the freedom of speech and rights, about a new process of subjectivization. (Alev Özkazanç, Hafiza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 6)

In the interview conducted by Hafiza Kaydı in June 2017, Özkazanç states once more that the intellectuals who were part of the forms of actions like the Petition of Intelligentsia were people who remained active in the civil society after the eradication of the revolutionary leftist movements after the military coup in 1980. However, as Özkazanç indicates, the means and motives of the people who were involved with these organizations as well as the prevalent discourses around leftist circles changed in this transitional period. Throughout this process, by means of organizations like Ekin BİLAR and petitions, the remaining leftist actors brought together a more heterogeneous group under the banner of the concept of democracy against the oppressive regime of the era. Under these conditions, the idea of opposition was also transformed from revolutionary struggle into a democratic claim for human rights. In this respect, in a similar manner with the transformations in the social movements throughout the world in the 1980s and 90s, the discourses of human rights, freedom of speech, and subjectivization were incorporated into the academic and social circles of Turkey through organizations like Ekin BİLAR.¹² In the next section, I will first focus on the leading cadres that brought together these heterogeneous actors to build the democratic front in question and talk about their demographics and backgrounds as people who were important figures in this period of transition in the civil society of Turkey.

¹² I will discuss how this transformation was incorporated in the activities of Ekin BİLAR further in Chapter 3 and how it was reflected in knowledge production in Chapter 4.

2.1.3 Profile and resources of the intellectual field in the 1980s: The prominent figures of Ekin BİLAR

In the 1980s, a group of dissenting intellectuals decided that there was a need for counter-action against the repressive actions of the junta regime in the post-coup period. As explained in the earlier section, they brought people together under the discourse of democracy and raised oppositional voices in society calling for democratic rights and freedoms. Although the people who contributed to the organization and signed the petitions came from different backgrounds and united with the aim of raising voices against the atrocities and limitations experienced under the rule of the military government, the leading figures in these movements constituted a smaller group of people.

That was an environment that everyone was clinging to one another, an era that differences were pushed aside in order to survive and do something. I mean especially during the prison processes, people from very different segments ended up in the same commune. There were hunger strikes, there were many troubles. Mamak... its traces are still seen in many of us. In that process, no one had the luxury to bring the differences into forefront. It was a togetherness that was forced through life itself. This continued through BİLAR as well. The leading people at BİLAR were mostly Aziz Bey, the artists in his circle, and the 1402ers at first. (Yıldırım Koç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 7)

While talking about the differences between the dissenting intellectuals that came together for collective counter-actions such as the Petition of Intelligentsia and Ekin BİLAR, Yıldırım Koç describes the leading people in these movements as well-known writers, artists, and academics of the period. In this respect, despite their dissenting character, the leading figures in question were mostly prestigious men who were well respected in the society. Although not all of them had upper-class backgrounds, they all had high educational capitals which made them part of a

minority group in the society in that period.¹³ Among these figures, was Aziz Nesin, a well-known author and one of the main partners of Ekin BİLAR who was a prominent name in the organization and the petitions era; and Cevat Geray, another main partner of Ekin BİLAR who was the dean of the Faculty of Political Science at Ankara University before his expulsion through the Law No. 1402. Well-educated men like Aziz Nesin and Cevat Geray had high social and cultural capital which made the execution of the organization as well as the petition process much easier.¹⁴

With regards to BİLAR, the presence of Aziz Nesin at those times brought convenience of some sort. I was able to contact almost anyone and I contacted them through telephone. I think it is very important. Secondly, there were people who brought dignity and played key roles: one of them was Cevat Geray and the other was Aziz Nesin, of course. I could call the governor of Ankara and when I told him “I’m Aziz Nesin’s lawyer, I need to see you” I was able to see him. We could get an appointment, go see the governor, and ask him “Why did you forbid it?”. When we mentioned Cevat Geray’s name, the governor could say “He is my professor”, because of *Mülkiye* [Ankara University Faculty of Political Science]. (Mehmet Özşuca, Hafıza Kaydı, September 2017) (See Appendix, 8)

As the lawyer of Ekin BİLAR, Mehmet Özşuca explains that the intellectuals involved with these social movements had respect in the society that was valued by government officials like governors as well. Even though the organization faced various problems and prohibitions on its activities, the group had the opportunities to address these issues and would be heard by relevant government officers. I contend that this situation reflects the high value of the social capital that the intellectual field possessed in that era. In this respect, the time that Ekin BİLAR was founded in can be considered as a period of transition before the influence of the transformation in

¹³ As Öncü (1993) explains, before the increase in the university admission quotas as well as the founding of new universities during the YÖK administration since the 1980s, the number of people who had high educational backgrounds were low in Turkey. The dramatic increase of university students can be observed in the number of students enrolled in universities which was 41,574 in 1980, 193,665 in 1989 and 857,240 in 2018 (Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi, n.d.).

¹⁴ I will make note of the influence of their social and cultural capital on the organizational structure of Ekin BİLAR in Chapter 3.

the university system and the devaluation of academic titles since the 1980s started to be reflected in the society.

Another important aspect that has been influential in the status of intellectuals in the society is related to the historical particularities of the country. Vatansever (2018) argues that “the history of academia in Turkey is the history of paying lip service to the universal intellectual values and of trampling down on them. That history contains many major authoritarian steps on the part of the state to stamp out oppositional, regime-critical intellectuals and the like” (p.11). She claims that there has always been a “tense relationship between the state and the intellectuals in Turkey” (p.9) and describes “the development of late Ottoman and early Turkish intelligentsia as a state cadre” and later the role of intellectuals as the “vanguards of the state-led social engineering program” during the nation-state building (p.10). Nevertheless, she adds that “to a certain degree, the keenness of the secularist/modernist oligarchy to preserve a Western-oriented façade prevented a wholesale obliteration of academic standards and structures” (p.12). Based upon her arguments, I contend that the intellectuals still had a well-respected position in the society during the ruling period of the junta regime in the 1980s which was based on secularist/modernist Kemalist ideology. Although the dissenting intellectuals in this period had to face the post-coup repression and go through difficulties such as academic purges, their social, educational and cultural capital were still valued by the ruling political powers.

At the same time, the purged intellectuals were able to transform their educational and cultural capital into economic capital through activities like preparing encyclopedias.

My friends who left the university, I contributed to it more or less myself as well, were preparing encyclopedia. It was a period of encyclopedia.

Particularly, there was the establishment of a company called Ana Britannica. İletişim published various encyclopedias, such as the Encyclopedia of Turkey During the Republican Era. Making contributions to them or taking a part in that process had at least financial return, depending on your contribution. I think that it was a period of transition. A lot of things happen at the same time and a lot of names involved with these kind of things overlap. (Galip Yalman, Hafiza Kaydı, May 2017) (See Appendix, 9)

In this respect, intangible assets of the intellectual field could turn into tangible resources for the expelled scholars, as activities like publishing encyclopedias and translation became their source of living for a period.

Today, the situation is not the same for the Academics for Peace who got expelled from universities during the neoliberal era that brought along economic precarization of intellectual and academic labor. This change resulted in the transformation of the profiles of the intellectuals in the field as well.

In between those years that the changing world has also transformed academia, the class profile of academia has changed as well. I mean when we look back at that day [the 1980s], the scholars of that time were groups that came from, I don't know, at least from colleges, from high schools with intense language instruction...who were mostly urbanites and not only urban but [they came from] bigger, more metropolitan cities like Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir. I speak very roughly, of course. But today, it's not like that. Today, relatively throughout the world but definitely in Turkey [there has been a class transformation in academia]. I mean that is about the thing... lower wages for academics. It is still slightly better in the world, therefore there might be a different profile in terms of class. But it's not like that for Turkey. I mean, first of all the academic population has grown. The best example for this is that there is a considerable amount of women [in academia]. Because, as I have said, scholarship is not a desirable, well-paid profession. Therefore, all these [factors] have brought along the class transformation for us [in Turkey]. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 10)

As Betül Acar argues, there has been a decrease in the social, cultural and economic capital of the intellectual field since the 1980s, which is rooted not only in the increased number of scholars and the global crisis of academia in neoliberal times but also in the historical particularities of Turkey. I will dwell on this discussion

further in the next section while explaining the case of the Academics for Peace and solidarity academics.

2.2 Being an Academic for Peace today in Turkey: The case of solidarity academics

2.2.1 The Kurdish issue and the Academics for Peace: The social and political context since 2015

Who are we? Academics for peace, Academics for Peace [expelled] with decree laws. We are those who are suspended from their occupations with years of dedication, from their classrooms, laboratories, students; who face insults and threats; who are executed with extreme prejudice by being named in decree laws and sued in assize courts for using their most basic constitutional right, the freedom of speech, for behaving in accordance with the responsibility of being an intellectual... (Lordoğlu, 2018)

The role of intellectuals in dark periods of political rule became a topic of discussion once more in 2016 through the Academics for Peace. In the book titled

Akademisyenlerden KHK Öyküleri (Decree-Law Stories from the Academics), some scholars from the Academics for Peace share their stories and talk about the responsibility of intellectuals in difficult political times (Lordoğlu, 2018). In 2016, the difficulty of the period was related to the Kurdish issue which has been a prevalent problem in Turkey since the early days of the republic. The Kurdish issue has held a central position in the sociopolitical agenda of Turkish governments for the last thirty-five years, since the start of the armed conflict between PKK (*Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan* – Kurdistan Workers' Party) and the Turkish state in 1984.

Different governments over the course of this period, aimed to resolve the conflict but all attempts were unsuccessful. In the following, I focus on the most recent political events related to this issue prior to 2016 rather than providing an extended overview. The secretly held Oslo Process in 2009 bringing together the PKK and the Turkish National Intelligence Service (MİT) later resulted in the initiation of the

Peace Process in 2013.¹⁵ When this peace process called the Kurdish Opening, referring to the negotiations between the PKK and Justice and Development Party (AKP) government, ended after two years, the armed conflict began once again in July 2015. After the recommencement of the conflict, the state declared curfew in many Kurdish cities and districts in order to “capture the members of the organization [PKK]” and “provide safety of life and property for the public” (TİHV Akademi, 2019, p.3). The cities with curfew witnessed military operations, fighting in civilian neighborhoods, many civilian casualties and human rights violations. According to the report of the Human Rights Foundation of Turkey (HRFT, 2016), 1 million 377,000 civilians were affected by the curfews that were declared in nineteen districts in Diyarbakır, Şırnak, Mardin, Hakkâri, Muş, Elazığ, and Batman and that lasted at least 58 days. Within this period, there had been 198 civilian casualties (among them there were 39 children, 29 women, and 27 people over 60 years of age) and many civilians had no access to healthcare services during this period.¹⁶

The well-known petition titled “We will not be a party to this crime” signed by more than two thousand scholars who are known as the Academics for Peace was declared within this context in Turkey. At first, the petition included 1128 signatories. After this declaration, President Erdoğan made statements referring to the Academics for Peace as “so-called academics”, “traitors”, “dark rather than enlightened”, “cruel” and “despicable” people (Bianet, 2016a), while the mainstream national press launched a smear campaign against these academics, calling them “accomplices of PKK”, and spreading the labels adopted by the president (See Hürriyet, 2016; Yeni Akit, 2016; Yeni Şafak, 2016). In the face of this campaign,

¹⁵ For more information about the peace processes and the discussion of the Kurdish issue within the framework of transitional justice, see Alpay and Tahmaz (2015) and Aktas (2014).

¹⁶ Please see also OHCHR (2017), Human Rights Watch (2016a) and Human Rights Watch (2015) for more information about the curfew in the Kurdish districts.

various academics in and outside of Turkey, students, platforms, and organizations offered support for the scholars and more academics participated in the declaration after the issue had become mainstream.¹⁷ Therefore, when the declaration was presented to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on January 21, 2016, it included 2212 signatories in total. In this respect, the first group of signatories who declared the petition on January 11 are known as *birinci imzacılar* (first signatories) while the second group of academics who participated later on are called *ikinci imzacılar* (secondary signatories).

Along with the various pejorative labels used against the scholars who signed the petition, President Erdoğan also argued that the scholars “openly took the side of a terrorist organization [PKK]” and called upon state prosecutors to “do what is necessary against this criminal act of treason according to [the] law and constitution” (Evrensel, 2016). In this way, the process that paved the way for disciplinary and criminal proceedings, mobbings within institutions, suspensions, layoffs, and “civil death” for the Academics for Peace started (TİHV Akademi, 2019, p.12). The witch-hunt and “civil death” campaign launched against the Academics for Peace continues at the time of writing even though the July 15, 2016 coup attempt against the existing regime altered the course of events in certain ways. In response to the attempted coup d’état on July 20, the government declared a state of emergency in Turkey which it extended every three months. The state of emergency lasted a total of two years and ended on July 19, 2018. During the state of emergency, 37 legislative decrees were released that allowed the government to make permanent alterations in

¹⁷ Various academics (such as Judith Butler, Noam Chomsky, and David Graeber), politicians (such as US State Department Spokesperson John Kirby, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe Thorbjørn Jagland, and Co-President of the European Green Party Monica Frassoni), and institutions (such as EEAS, CfHR and IPSA) throughout the world declared their support for the Academics for Peace. For more information about the statements by these people and institutions see Academics for Peace (n.d.-d).

public institutions. In this respect, Higher Education Law No. 2547 which allowed university presidents to be selected through an election system within the universities was altered. With the transformations under the state of emergency, the Higher Education Board became the body in charge of selecting three candidates for the position of president in any public university and the president of the republic then makes the final decision on who will be appointed president of the university (HRFT Academy, 2018a, p.6). In this manner, the administrative autonomy of public universities was diminished and universities were strictly tied to the president's office. In addition to such permanent changes in public institutions, legislative decrees under the state of emergency also allowed the government to discharge people from public institutions, the army, and the press if they were regarded as "part of, linked to or in touch with terrorist organizations and any formations that pose a threat to the national security of the state according to the National Security Council" (Olağanüstü Hal Kapsamında Bazı Tedbirler Alınması, 2016)¹⁸. Within this context, 15 *vakıf üniversitesi* (private universities) were closed, while 6081 academics and 1481 administrative staff were laid off from universities (HRFT Academy, 2018a, p.3) At this time, 406 Academics for Peace from 64 institutions were dismissed from public services (TİHV Akademi, 2019, p.18). Even though these decisions were made through legislative decrees during the state of emergency, the decisions were made permanent preventing the expelled people from ever officially returning to their positions. In addition, their passports were rescinded to deprive them of their freedom to travel or leave Turkey. On December 05, 2017, lawsuits against the Academics for Peace started with the signatories accused of "making propaganda for

¹⁸ For more information about the details related to changes during the state of emergency in different sectors, see Amnesty International (2019), Akça et. al (2018), and Amnesty International (2017). For more information about its influence in higher education see HRFT Academy (2018a) and Human Rights Watch (2016b).

a terrorist organization” by signing the petition entitled “We will not be a party to this crime.” Even though the subject of crime is their collective participation in the same petition, the academics were sued individually. The first round of court cases was launched against 150 academics from different universities in Istanbul and more scholars were included in the process gradually (TİHV Akademi, 2019, p.21) with the lawsuits continuing at the time of writing. As of June 12, 2019, 742 Academics for Peace signatories are on trial.¹⁹ A total of 194 academics were sentenced of which 155 academics were suspended, 4 were deferred, and 35 sentenced to prison time.

The petition entitled “We will not be a party to this crime” signed by the Academics for Peace was initiated as a counter-action against the ongoing atrocities against Kurdish civilians during the period after the recommencement of the conflict in 2015. The petition had broad repercussions nationally and internationally paving the way for the repression of signatories. The failed coup attempt on July 15, 2016 and subsequent declaration of a state of emergency, opened the way for the state to purge dissenting elements from the public sectors.²⁰ Under these conditions, solidarity academies can be considered as the second counter-action of these dissenting scholars, this time in the face of the repression they faced. The academics who will be discussed in the following section, found ways to re-invent themselves to regain autonomy through solidarity academies and the further actions they took after 2016.

¹⁹ For the legal dimension and violations of right, see Altıparmak & Akdeniz (2017) and HRFT Academy (2018b), for the up to date information about the trials of Academics for Peace see (Akademics for Peace, n.d.-c) and hearing statistics see (Academics for Peace, n.d-b). The website of the Academics for Peace also includes further information about the news, announcements, and reports about the purge process.

²⁰ As remarked in the report by Amnesty International (2017) “The main target of the purge is people perceived to be followers of Fethullah Gülen, the head of the Gülen movement, whom the government holds responsible for the coup attempt, referring to them as the “Fetullahist Terrorist Organization” (FETÖ). However, it is clear that a much wider group of people have been targeted” (p.4).

2.2.2 Taking a counter-action against the academic purges and ‘civil death’:

Solidarity academies and declarations by the Academics for Peace since 2016

I mean, personally as an activist... as an activist at university for twenty years, I have signed a lot of declarations. Therefore, when this text came to me, that was not even a problem, of course we would sign. Our problem was that it would not work. But I assume that it worked. Because both the campaign... I mean, it became an agenda by way of the president. It also gained international attention in this way. I mean the things in Kurdish villages and Kurdish settlements have become more visible. That's why we can contend that it has been successful. ... I mean this petition process was not able to prevent the demolition of some Kurdish cities or the death of the Kurdish people, but at least as it has shown to many fragments in the society that universities have ceased to be universities, become shabby places in a short notice, so I believe that it had a positive side to it. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018) (See Appendix, 11)

As Arslan from the İzmir Solidarity Academy argues, the violence witnessed in the conflict in the Kurdish cities became more visible as the petition gained visibility on the national and international levels because of the attacks against the Academics for Peace. At the same time, it has become an opportunity for those who were discontented with the university structure to draw attention to the defects in the university system and the lack of academic autonomy. Within this context, some scholars from the Academics for Peace started a search for an ‘alternative’ academy. Two months after the petition was released, the signatories held a two-day meeting in Ankara to make an assessment of the situation, discuss how to handle common problems and form solidarity. For the afternoon session of the second day of the gathering, the academics arranged a meeting titled alternative academies which 93 people attended. The discussion focused on how universities had already degenerated throughout the world and especially in Turkey and if it was possible to turn this situation into an opportunity to build up something better. The meeting presented this group of scholars with an opportunity to discuss how it would be possible to further the academic life beyond the state institutions. The discussion centered around how it

would be possible to push the academic life of the expelled scholars, what common research projects could be prepared, what kind of collaborative scientific knowledge production could be undertaken, and how to reproduce the discourse of peace.

At this point in time, the majority of signatories in public universities were facing only disciplinary proceedings within their institutions while a few scholars in private universities were fired from their positions. Other than these pressures, signatories faced pressures within and outside of their institutions. In one case, an academic in Düzce University faced a lynching attempt and in some universities signatories found signs placed on the doors of their offices to stigmatize them and threaten them. Under these conditions, a representative group from the Academics for Peace held a press conference and declared that they will not “step back even under the threats against their lives and careers”, will “behave in accordance with the responsibility being an academic and researcher brings with” and “work with all their strength to provide free academy and permanent peace for the country” on March 10, 2016 (Bianet, 2016b). The representatives who read the declaration were selected randomly from the Academics for Peace group, and the group was unaware that these four scholars would later be arrested.²¹ After the arrest of these four scholars, all processes and plans about forming an ‘alternative’ academy had to be postponed as all the energy was spared to support the scholars in prison through watches and other forms of solidarity. As Zeynep Solmaz from Kampüssüzler contends, “Getting arrested was not something ordinary [in] that period as it is today. In that period, it was very extreme for a scholar to get arrested. I mean, it was too much,” therefore the arrest of these scholars aroused public and international attention (personal

²¹ Esra Mungan, Kıvanç Ersoy, Muzaffer Kaya and Meral Camcı were the representatives from the Academics for Peace who made the public declaration.

communication).²² The scholars were subsequently released after their first trial on April 22, 2016.

After the release, scholars in Eskişehir started a series of solidarity lectures on May 16, 2016. About the same time as the scholars in Eskişehir started their solidarity lectures, the Kampüssüzler began to work as a group focusing on “The Social History of Capitalism in the 19th Century” as a research topic through a reciprocal, relational, and dynamic work. In the Karaburun Science Congress that took place on August 31-September 4, 2016, they held a session to discuss this topic with participants as they hoped the session would serve as an example of their plans for an ‘alternative’ academy stemming from the Academics for Peace. The session also highlighted their search for a scientific method based on critical perspective and praxis (Kampüssüzler, n.d.-a).²³ Throughout this process, the scholars have embraced the idea of ‘alternative’ academies more and furthered their work on solidarity academies spreading into other cities. Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity was founded in September 2016, to be followed by other expelled scholars founding organizations. Thereby, there are twelve solidarity academies founded in ten cities (Kocaeli, Ankara, Eskişehir, Istanbul, Izmir, Dersim, Mersin, Antalya, Urfa, and Mardin).²⁴ There are also two initiatives that the Academics for Peace who are outside of the country have started, namely OFF-University and the Solidarity

²² O dönem tutuklamalar bugünkü gibi sıradan değildi. O dönem bir hoca tutuklaması çok ekstremdi. Yani, çok fazlaydı.

²³ While the session at the Karaburun Science Congress proved a milestone for the academics involved, it was overshadowed as it coincided with the first wave of academic purges through decree laws targeting signatories in Kocaeli. Since that day until the end of the state of emergency on July 18, 2018, signatories check to see if their names are on the lists of purged through decree laws and expulsion. As Güzin Çelik from Kampüssüzler said jokingly, it “has become a routine” for them.

²⁴ Some of these organizations (like Kültürhane in Mersin) are not identified as solidarity academies but are also founded by the expelled Academics for Peace. The organizational structure and differences between the solidarity academies in question will be explained further in Chapter 3.

Academy in Germany.²⁵ In the next section, I will focus on the demographics of the Academics for Peace as well as solidarity academies to understand the figures behind these counter-actions against the actions taken by the government since 2016.

2.2.3 Demographics and resources of the intellectual field today: The heterogeneous actors behind the Academics for Peace and solidarity academies

The first coming together of the Academics for Peace goes back to a few years before the well-known petition “We will not be a party to this crime”. According to the website of the Academics for Peace, the first declaration that brought a smaller group from among the peace signatories together was on November 2012 when the Kurdish prisoners started a hunger strike (Academics for Peace, n.d.-a). At the time, a group of 264 academics from over 50 universities across Turkey prepared a declaration in support of the peace request of the Kurdish prisoners. Since then, the same group organized several meetings and prepared declarations to raise the request for peace and contributed to the peace process by “producing knowledge and information on topics like processes of peace and conflict, practices of peace-making, women’s role in the peace process, education in native languages and the destruction of the environment through war” (Academics for Peace, n.d.-a). As such, the famous declaration rather than a starting point was actually a continuation of the activism and research of many scholars within the Academics for Peace who had already been involved in activism related to the Kurdish issue and the peace process.

Today, “Academic for Peace” has become an identity to represent a larger group of academics who signed the “We will not be a party to this crime” petition on

²⁵ Some Academics for Peace had the opportunity to get outside of the country before passport bans or through other means, and can be considered as ‘exiled academics’.

January 11, 2016. Yet, despite this collective identity, there are significant differences in terms of the demographics, backgrounds, and perspectives of the academics who signed the petition. Even though solidarity academies are founded by smaller group of scholars, the differences continue in most of the cases which reflect the heterogeneity of the scholars involved.

I mean when you say Academics for Peace, there are a lot of people. I surely know a part of it but there are a lot of people that I don't know. It is not possible to say something in common. When you say solidarity academies, it's again, how many...about 100-150 people, not even that many actually. Our political views etc. are so different, the things we say are so different. Maybe the common grounds that bind us together are related to the issues that I have mentioned earlier. Maybe I can say that we are all people who have a leftist perspective in life. They approach us Academics for Peace as an institution, but we are not. So we cannot say anything on behalf of an institution. I can only say things on behalf of KODA [Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity]. Even we are so different among us, we argue a lot. We don't accept what any of us says as it is, we question it. (Deniz Demir, personal communication, June 2018) (See Appendix, 12)

As Deniz Demir's comments highlight, it is difficult to find the common ground among the scholars who are part of Academics for Peace or even those who came together to found the solidarity academies in question. Unlike Ekin BİLAR which was predominantly led by few prominent male scholars who had prestige and reputation in the society, the solidarity academies are not represented by the names of specific people. Even in the cities where most of the work is carried out by a few scholars, solidarity academies are not identified with the names of those scholars and members emphasize the collective and common character of the academies. Moreover, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, the understanding of collectivity and how it is reflected in the organization of these 'alternative' academic structures show the heterogeneous nature of the group of scholars in question.

I mean we are a more crowded, more heterogeneous group. They [expelled scholars in 1980s] might also be heterogeneous, but I believe that they are more homogeneous, in comparison. I mean they were already together... we

are a much more crowded, heterogeneous group that has just met. Therefore, our decision-making processes are not that fast. Practically... things do not go as fast... (Didem Kahraman, personal communication, July 2018) (See Appendix, 13)

The heterogeneity of the Academics for Peace as well as the scholars who are part of solidarity academies were reflected upon multiple times during the different interviews I conducted with the scholars from these institutions. Didem Kahraman, from the İzmir Solidarity Academy, is a woman in her 20s who was expelled from her position as a research assistant and found herself entering a web of social relationships in İzmir after her expulsion even though she did not have such connections before. As she contends, even though most of the scholars who signed the petition would accept that they have a leftist perspective, the Academics for Peace is a large and diverse group with different backgrounds and political views. Although they have more in common as compared to the signatories of the petition, there are still many differences among the smaller group of scholars who spend time and energy in the solidarity academies. I had a chance to encounter this wide spectrum during my interviews as well, as I talked to an engineer in his 60s who was involved with certain leftist organizations and unions in the 1980s; a Kurdish research assistant in her early 30s who felt the urge to sign the petition after seeing that scholars were going to be targeted for standing against the violence happening in her own hometown; or a professor in her late 50s who has gone through a lot of trouble and problems to be an academic.

In addition to the differences in their backgrounds, the heterogeneity of scholars was also seen in their class positions, educational backgrounds, gender, and political affiliations. In various interviews, I observed that the Academics for Peace included scholars from working and lower middle class backgrounds some of whom had supported their families through their scholarships in university or worked in

several jobs while studying to manage. Correspondingly, not all of these scholars had graduated from prestigious universities. Moreover, the number of women involved with these forms of action has increased significantly in line with the growing number of women in the academic and intellectual field. Lastly, although most of the scholars who are part of these organizations have a ‘leftist perspective in life’ as Deniz Demir contends, their affiliations and backgrounds are very different that range with some describing themselves as liberal democrats to others describing themselves as revolutionaries.

...as you go back in time in Turkey, the intellectual public is narrowed down, turns into a thing composed of less people. For instance, after 1980 there was BİLAR but at the same time [there was] the Petition of Intelligentsia, Human Rights Foundation (İHD), etc. All these were handled by a small group of people, a small squad of almost about 40-50 people; everything was done by them. In the end, they created a pluralistic, nice environment. In the end, we have a more pluralistic environment today. It’s not about 40-50 people anymore. Themes, interests are diversified, movements have grown. There is not a very central intellectual public anymore. Maybe that’s a good thing, this proliferation, this diversification is a good thing. (Alev Özkazanç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 14)

As Özkazanç explains, the intellectual field in Turkey has grown in number, proliferated, and diversified over the years. This diversity is evidence of the increasing number of academics in Turkey and hence the transformation of the academic and intellectual field which relates to processes to commercialize and commodify higher education during the neoliberal era.²⁶ These processes in the academia influence the working conditions of scholars and the idea of being an intellectual as well. Gill (2009) describes the “increasing corporatization and privatization of the University” as follows:

...the importing of corporate models of management into University life; the reformulation of the very nature of education in instrumental terms connected to business and the economy; the transformation of students into 'consumers'; and the degradation of pay and working conditions for academics, as well as

²⁶ Increase in the number of scholars and students in universities is very related to the problems of commercialization and commodification, which will be further discussed in Chapter 4.

the increasing casualisation of employment, yet with little organized resistance from trade unions or other bodies. (pp.230-231)

While describing the difficulty of having a rational agency as an intellectual under these conditions, Vatansever (2018) makes note of the “global systemic erosion of academic ethics stemming from the structural conditions of the academic labor market” (p.8). She argues that there is an “erosion of critical subjectivity via deregulation and precarization” of academic and intellectual labor throughout the world (p.5), as “the existence of a huge reserve army of labour and the constant intimidation by the threat of unemployment make it unlikely for academics to organize as an occupational stratum unless they are valiant enough to pay for adherence to universal academic values with long terms of unemployment” (p.8). Under these precarious conditions, being a dissenting intellectual carries higher consequences in the neoliberal era. Umut Turhan, an expelled Academic for Peace from Kültürhane, exemplifies these differences quite clearly by talking about the case of two scholars from the same family who were expelled in 1940s and 80s, namely Pertev Naili and Korkut Boratav.

This is our main difference from September 12. This... we invited Korkut Boratav, as he was also a 1402er. To say, “Professor, tell us, we will be expelled, what will we do?” He started by telling about his father, Pertev Naili. He said, “My father went through the same thing. They were expelling him, but then taking him back as their hands were tied. I mean they send the guy into exile, then have him found the National Library. They appoint him to some place, then have him found the Languages and History [Ankara University Faculty of Languages, History, and Geography]”. Because there is no one else. I mean there is no one else who speaks different languages, who contemplates about these issues. But today, it’s not like that. Throw a rock in here and you’ll hit someone with PhD or masters. (Umut Turhan, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 15)

As seen in the case of Pertev Naili and Korkut Boratav, two generations who were expelled from universities through two different waves of academic purges in different time periods, the socio-political conditions and universities have always

been tightly connected to each other in Turkey. In this respect, dissident scholars in the intellectual field have always experienced problems like expulsion or pressure throughout the history of universities in the country. However, as Turhan argues, as the social context the scholars live in transforms, so does the conditions of academics after their purge. Unlike Pertev Naili Boratav who was asked to found one of the most important state institutions in the country shortly after his expulsion, the expelled scholars today are not even sure if they will be able to go back to their old jobs in the future. Despite his dissenting character Boratav was irreplaceable considering his educational and cultural accumulation; on the contrary, the conditions of the Academics for Peace are uncertain and precarious.

The decrease in the economic capital of the intellectual field in Turkey also has another dimension with regards to the historical particularities of the country. As discussed previously, despite the tense relationship between the state and the critical intellectuals since the foundation of the republic, “the secularist / modernist oligarchy” still valued the educational and cultural capital of the intellectuals in the country. However, the ideologies of the ruling powers in the country have also transformed during the last two decades.

The AKP, although descending from a counter-tradition and representing the historical ‘Other’ of the Republican elites, inherited the same authoritarian state tradition based on ethnic, cultural and religious homogenization. Thus, albeit in a different form under an openly anti-intellectualist government, the restrictive ordering essence of the state’s approach towards intellectual production persists. The memory of the long-term conflict between the old-established state-oriented intelligentsia and the ‘reactionary’ Muslim masses, now embodied in the AKP’s constituency, only adds a further vengefulness to the government’s overall attitude towards intellectuals, whose educational background leads the AKP to associate them mechanically with the modernist/ secularist lineage. (Vatansever, 2018, p.12)

Vatansever contends that during the AKP regime, “the historically conditioned anti-intellectualism of the ‘grand right-wing tradition’ in Turkey found itself a

particularly convenient venue during the neoliberalization process” (p.16).

Therefore, there has been a decrease not only in the economic capital stemming from the devaluation of academic and intellectual labor, but also in the social capital of the intellectual field. Being an intellectual has lost its valued position in the eyes of the government due to the increasing discourse of anti-intellectualism under the rule of the AKP regime.

Ünlü (2016) adds two other dimensions to the reasons for the “vengefulness of the government” towards the Academics for Peace. First, he makes note of the Turkishness contract that was sealed unofficially between the state and the society since the foundation of the republic that requires the latter to be Turkish or Turkified.²⁷ He argues that this contract also required the society to be silenced in matters such as the Kurdish issue. As the Turkishness contract was brought back to the table after the end of the Kurdish Opening and recommencement of the conflict between the PKK and the state, the Academics for Peace violated this contract by speaking ‘truth’ rather than keeping their silence. Secondly, Ünlü claims that the AKP regime has lost its legitimacy in the eyes of many people both within and outside of the country, which makes any intellectual who supports the government automatically lose his/her legitimacy as well. In this respect, as the traditional intellectuals lost their legitimacy as ‘true’ intellectuals in the eyes of the public, threat and violence that the AKP regime posed against the dissenting intellectuals were intensified.

²⁷ “Turkishness Contract” refers to the founding contract in the form of written and unwritten settlement between the state and the society in Turkey. Ünlü (2016) argues that during the years 1914 and 1922, the settlement was based on the “Muslimness Contract,” which required non-Muslim populations to be “cleansed” from the society and silence about the violations during these processes. With the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, the ruling powers added another dimension to this settlement, Turkification, which required the society to be both Muslim and Turkish while those who did not conform to these identities were punished. For more detailed information, please see Ünlü (2016).

Being expelled from their positions at universities within this context, the Academics for Peace were subjected to ‘civil death,’²⁸ stripping them of their constitutional rights.²⁹ Today, the expelled scholars find themselves in serious financial troubles that increased their searches for economic solidarity as it will be explained in Chapter 3. Moreover, even though they have close connections with other democratic organizations within their regions, they do not have the necessary tangible and intangible resources that would bring them prestige in the eyes of government officers or wider society. In the next section, I will examine this situation further while comparing the Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies in terms of the characteristics, motives, and resources of the intellectuals involved.

2.3 Conclusion

Both in the case of Ekin BİLAR and in the case of the Academics for Peace and solidarity academies, we observe the re-emerging discussion regarding the role and responsibility of intellectuals. In each case, academics and intellectuals identify their role as taking counter-actions against the government action in each of their particular eras. In both cases, there is a common ground in the motivations of each set of actors related to the idea of being an intellectual. In this respect, they aimed to raise opposing voices in the society against the repression or atrocities in their own contexts.

²⁸ Civil death refers to a citizen to lose his/her constitutional and civil rights due to a governmental conduct or as part of a penalty. For the case of this research, those who were expelled through decree laws not only lost their jobs as public workers but many were also rejected by the private sector and NGOs. As most of them also had a passport ban that prevented them from going abroad, they defined their condition as a civil death.

²⁹ Mehmet Fatih Traş, a young research assistant, was also an Academic for Peace who got expelled from his position at Çukurova University. After his expulsion, his job applications were constantly rejected from various universities for being a signatory of the petition. On February 24, 2017, Traş committed suicide. His death is considered by many as a political murder on behalf of the government and universities.

Idea of ‘speaking truth to power’, being ‘oppositional public intellectuals’, being part of the ‘formation of new movements’, ‘thinking and acting in terms of transforming the present unjust relations’, or not being ‘insiders without a sense of dissonance and dissent’, may be used to describe the actors of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies. The former aimed to ‘carve out a different democratic public space’ that would enable the oppositional forces to come together to build a democratic front. Scholars who are part of solidarity academies not only ‘spoke out for the suffering of’ the civilian Kurdish population as Academics for Peace but also became actors in the formation of public spaces that questioned the existing academic structures and raised dissonant voices. In this respect, the intellectuals of both cases cast themselves in the role of challenging the ubiquity of the ruling powers. They contrasted themselves to the degenerated institutions and academics of the country whom we may refer to as “traditional intellectuals” in Gramsci’s framework, and became dissenting intellectuals who do not conform and submit to the existing political powers.³⁰

On the other hand, the methods and resources of the actors in these two cases differ from each other. To be able to compare and contrast the two cases of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies, it is crucial to examine them in their specific social and political contexts. For this reason, I aimed to show the historical background and the important events that paved the way for the initiation of these two organizations. Based upon this comparison, I argue that the intellectual field, and as its sub-field academic field have changed significantly since the years passed between 1980 and

³⁰ However, it is crucial to underline that most of the intellectuals in both cases did or do not have great social transformations in mind. In this regard, many did not or do not believe that these organizations would revolutionize the society or lead to a radical social change. As explained earlier in this chapter, as a part of the transformations in the prevalent social movements since 1980s, the moves and motives of oppositional actors has been transformed from revolutionary struggles to a fight for democratic rights and claims. Yet, as I will discuss further in Chapter 4, these forms of counter-actions actually did have their reflections and influences in the society.

today. As there has been an increase in the number of people involved with academic profession and devaluation of academic and intellectual labor, scholars have become easily replaceable. Within this context, it has become easier to remove the dissenting elements from the university structure. At the same time, their lives outside of their profession has become more difficult as the economic capital of the intellectual field decreased along with the decrease in the value of their educational capital.³¹

Another important transformation in the intellectual field is with respect to its position within the field of power. I contend that due to the changing ideological discourses of the ruling political powers and the increasing tendency of “anti-intellectualism” during the AKP regime, the Academics for Peace found themselves in more precarious conditions compared to the dissenting intellectuals in the 1980s. In this respect, the value of their social and cultural capital was decreased in the eyes of the government, which intensified the vengefulness of the ruling political powers against their dissonant actions. However, their legitimacy in the eyes of many people both within and outside of the country is still valid, as traditional intellectuals do not have the same recognition as ‘true’ intellectuals.

In the next chapter, I will focus on how the changes in the intellectual field, decrease in their social and cultural capital, as well as the transformations in the ideas of social movements throughout this period has influenced the way these two ‘alternative’ academies were organized.

³¹ This required the scholars to look for other types of solidarities and ways to earn their living, which I will explain further in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

SURVIVAL AND RE-LEGITIMIZATION:

DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS IN EKIN BİLAR AND

SOLIDARITY ACADEMIES

We could do it like this: We could all get ourselves jobs, find our personal solutions and in the meantime, we'd have [these] academies. We decided not to do it like this. But can I turn this activity into a mainstream where I can also earn my living? At the same time, can we turn this into a means of social struggle? If not, solidarity academies are bound to come to an end. (Ayça Akbal, personal field notes, November 2017) (See Appendix, 16)

These questions were posed by Ayça Akbal from the Eskişehir School during the forum after the Solidarity Academies Workshop under the theme of “alternative academies” that took place on November 19, 2017 in Eskişehir. Her questions had been widely discussed in the forum along with other topics such as the need to form a common ground in the trial processes of the Academics for Peace, possible options to solve the expelled scholars’ financial crises, how to increase the number of people who participate in the solidarity academies, and the possibility of producing a common political discourse. The workshop, in which the forum took place, was one of many other Solidarity Academies Workshops that are organized on a regular basis with the participation of representatives from ‘alternative’ academies founded in the different cities of Turkey. The meet-up was also an opportunity for the executive committee of the solidarity academies to come together to discuss the inner dynamics of these establishments and form a common ground.

My participation in this workshop in Eskişehir was possible thanks to Güzin Çelik from Kampüssüzler who introduced me to the organization committee of the workshop and invited me to attend after they gave their consent to my participation. These workshops are usually closed to public but I was warmly welcomed to attend

the second day of the event. On the first day, the workshop committee discussed internal matters. The second day of the workshop included presentations about different pedagogical methodologies and examples of ‘alternative’ academy structures throughout the world, yet the whereabouts and future of solidarity academies were at the root of every discussion. In this respect, learning about the experiences of other ‘alternative’ structures was considered crucial to shed light on the possible actions and choices of the scholars who are part of solidarity academies. For the current solidarity academies, one of the most instructive experiences in this sense was that of Ekin BİLAR.

Our biggest problem was money. It was us against the money. It was the dollar which represented the pressure, the army, and the university. It was not something that could work with the contribution from our pockets. We had a trouble called earning money. I was unemployed, [yet] I was thinking about earning money for BİLAR. I was thinking that as I owned a house and my wife was working, I was living in some way or another, but how will BİLAR live? (Haluk Gerger, Hafiza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 17)

Haluk Gerger, a scholar who was expelled from Ankara University in 1982, discusses his experiences following the formation of Ekin BİLAR. As seen in his remarks, Ekin BİLAR also experienced similar problems to the current solidarity academies such as financial difficulties and uncertainty about the future. Even though the intellectuals who were part of the ‘alternative’ academy structure in 1980 had more financial stability and did not have to struggle as much as the current scholars in solidarity academies, the perpetuity of Ekin BİLAR required money as well. As a matter of fact, as I will explain in the conclusion, these problems had been part of the reasons for the closure of Ekin BİLAR. This end result makes taking note of their experiences even more vital for the current ‘alternative’ academies of Turkey to find the right methods to continue and prosper. For this reason, in this chapter, I will focus on these two time periods to compare and contrast the experiences of Ekin

BİLAR and solidarity academies in terms of their organizational structures, purposes, and activities. I will point out the distinguishing features that represent the characteristics of social movements in these time periods as well as the regional variations that characterizes the differences within each era.

3.1 Building a democratic front: The organizational model of Ekin BİLAR

3.1.1 Founding a company as a “cultural focus” for the society: The foundation and execution of Ekin BİLAR

The foundation [of BİLAR] first emerged out of an idea by Aziz Nesin. We were working together because of the Petition of Intelligentsia back then. Aziz Bey used to tell about the old coffee houses, cafés all the time. There used to be a reading room in the coffee houses before. People did not just play backgammon, it was a social meeting place. Why was Aziz Bey telling about these though? In a framework that social togetherness was forbidden, he had a concern to find a way to overcome it, form a cultural focus, establish a social bond in an era when culture has degenerated through the hands of the government. Under those circumstances, one can best bring the coffee houses into mind. A place where these needs could be answered to some extent, where the cursed can come together, read books, communicate... This is the birth of BİLAR: ‘What should we do, how should we do it?’ (Haluk Gerger, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 18)

Haluk Gerger, who was one of the five main partners of Ekin BİLAR, explains the idea behind Ekin BİLAR as a “cultural focus” that brings together the prominent dissenting intellectuals of the period. The Ekin Corporation was founded with the aim to “form the widest democratic front against the oppressive order and September 12 constitution” (Yıldırım Koç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017), “come together and express oneself in the heavy darkness with the sense of not feeling alone” (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017) and “do cultural and artistic activities, thus take a place in public opinion while also opening an education center to realize the educational efforts” (Cevat Geray, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017).

Founding such a public space was not easy under the oppressive socio-political climate after the military coup on September 12, 1980. In that context, forming cooperatives or foundations required special permissions under the state of siege and it was forbidden for civil servants to be members of any associations. While the government placed restrictions on associations, foundations, and cooperatives, Haluk Gerger argues that the establishment of new companies was supported by the government in order to “clear the way for the capital” (Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017). For this reason, the group decided to form a joint-stock company to overcome these limitations and provide a space to meet their purposes. Eventually Ekin Corporation, whose name came from a rarely used word for culture in Turkish, was announced to public on July 11, 1984 (Ulusoy, 2017). After the announcement, the group applied to the Ministry of Industry and Commerce on September 29, 1984. Yet the corporation was seen as “an extension of the Petition of Intelligentsia” by the national press and public, which was understandable considering that 33 out of 37 founding partners, 37 out of 75 shareholders, and the entire Board of Directors were signatories of the petition (Ulusoy, p.78). In this framework, the Ministry of Industry and Commerce prolonged the process and asked for certain regulations such as the removal of the word *ekin* as it both referred to cultural rather than commercial activities and was synonymous with a “leftist” magazine which was closed after September 12. After a process of application, adjustments, and reapplication by the Ekin Community, the ministry eventually denied the founding of Ekin Corporation.

Even so, the group found another way to establish the public space they wished for. Cevat Geray, a 1402er associate professor who was another main partner of Ekin BİLAR, explains how they resolved the issue as follows:

We understood that they will not give us permission. Indeed, they did not give us permission. This wrestle was going on but we made a counterclaim to

say “How come you won’t give us the permission to form an association?”, we made a counterclaim against the Ministry. In the meantime, Şükriye Hanım who was one of the former members of TİP [Workers Party of Turkey] approached us when she saw our pickle and told us, “Hey, why are you striving? We own a company, which is not even active. BİLAR, *Bilim Araştırma Şirketi* [Science Research Company], let’s hand it over to you”. It felt right to us and we bought it, so to say. They handed it over to us for no dime, they did not ask for money. (Cevat Geray, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 19)

In this way, the five main partners of the corporation, namely Aziz Nesin, Haluk Gerger, Cevat Geray, Yalçın Küçük, and Bilgesu Erenus took over this corporation called BİLAR Inc. in 1985. At the same time, another private company called Ekin Consultancy was founded under the name of Yalçın Küçük, to sustain the widely known name of ekin. The two companies, BİLAR Inc. and Ekin Consultancy were partner corporations for a while, which is why the name of the organization varies from Ekin BİLAR to BİLAR in different resources. The main partners of the company gave 1% share of the company to those who were going to be the executive directors in different periods on the principle the share was returned to the company after their involvement ended. The directors were thus able to sign documents and talk on behalf of the company legally and officially. Apart from the executive committee whose involvement and personal interests were reflected in the works of Ekin BİLAR, the most prominent name that shaped the foundation and execution of the company was Aziz Nesin, the well-known author who was one of the main founding partners of the organization.

Aziz Bey played a strategic role in that period, he almost dedicated his life [to BİLAR]. He was full of beans, thought about this issue 24 hours. One should definitely make note of this side of him. It would not happen without him. He was for sure prestigious, famous, a name that everyone has read and known since their childhood. This was so important but he also worked and made effort. He also had other talents. He was the engine power. He had a creative mind, he was a resistant and persistent person. Using these advantages, he carried on the work both in the Petition of Intelligentsia and BİLAR. (Haluk Gerger, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 20)

Indeed, Aziz Nesin played a significant role throughout the lifetime of Ekin BİLAR both in terms of bringing people together (from famous singers or actresses like Sezen Aksu and Türkan Şoray to political figures like Bülent Ecevit and Süleyman Demirel) and using all his means to make the execution of Ekin BİLAR easier and its activities more widespread. He also contributed to the company financially and directed the revenues from his book sales to the organization. Within the Ekin BİLAR community, he was well-respected and as Yıldırım Koç contends “had the final say” in many matters (Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017). Based upon this framework, it can be argued that Ekin BİLAR had a hierarchical organizational structure that ran like a company, which was ruled by several responsible intellectuals in the executive committee in different eras and main partners such as Aziz Nesin as the general company coordinators. Despite the corporate organization of Ekin BİLAR and the monetary issues of the company, it is necessary to underline that making profit were not the main motive in Ekin BİLAR’s choice of activities. The intellectuals rather focused on the public good and the benefits the activities could bring to the community and the public. In the next section, I will focus on the company’s activities and discuss Ekin BİLAR’s periodical program’s relation to the organizational structure of the company.

3.1.2 Organizational structure in the 1980s : The activities of Ekin BİLAR

As there were many academics who were expelled from universities with the Law No. 1402, Ekin BİLAR started by organizing seminars on the apartment/office space they hired in the Onur Office Block in Ankara. As an ‘alternative’ academy structure, they began giving certificates to those who completed the seminars and organized graduation ceremonies at the end of each term.

Indeed, our friends who were interested in constitution, political science started giving lectures, seminars almost every evening a week, after working hours, in the hours that workers and students could participate -after 5.00-5.30 pm-. In return, as for money, Aziz Bey made such a standard, “Let them come for cigarette money, and give us lectures.” At that time, one American cigarette costed about 2,5 lira or else, we started with the condition of making that much of a contribution. (Cevat Geray, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 21)

As explained by Cevat Geray, the scholars who gave lectures as part of BİLAR were paid a negligible fee while most of them even contributed to the expenses of the company from their own pockets. Contrary to market logic, Ekin BİLAR did not earn money and become a source of income for the expelled scholars or the partners and shareholders. The company barely stayed afloat to pay its rent and other expenses. Only the bureau officer, responsible for administrative work, running errands and handling the organizational and student-related issues was paid a salary. Regarding the company’s sources of income, student fees was one source, though negligible as for the amounts were very small and if the participants were not able to pay they were still welcomed. Most of the revenue was provided through festivals organized for various municipalities, in addition to the film festivals, trainings for unions, and publications in different time periods.³² İrfan Kaygısız, the bureau officer of Ekin BİLAR in Ankara who later became the general manager, explains the focus on various activities throughout the different eras of Ekin BİLAR as follows:

There were main executive and responsible people periodically. These people were also carrying on activities related to their own areas of interest. For example, Mahmut Tali Öngören knew about the world of cinema, which is why cinema festivals had been organized when he came [to charge] ... When Yıldırım Koç came [to charge], there were trainings in the union field or activities such as [publishing] a series of brochures. The main activity of the first term was educational seminars that were independent of the responsible person. It lasted for a term, but the practices that we mentioned started in a period when there was a feeling that the interest for the seminars was

³² See Hafıza Kaydı (n.d.-b) for primary resources such as the certificates of participation and invitations for the festivals, the programs of the union trainings and seminar series in different academic years of the company along with other documents such as letters and newspaper articles about Ekin BİLAR.

decreasing gradually. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017) (See Appendix, 22)

Ekin BİLAR offered various and different cultural activities from seminars to festivals or poetry recitations throughout its lifetime. The responsibility and main decisions about activities were dependent on certain individuals and their interests.

Once Ekin BİLAR was on track in Ankara, a group of scholars offered to open a branch office in Istanbul. As the offer was accepted by all, they rented an apartment in Tünel and turned its living room into a classroom to start organizing seminars and lectures. İrfan Kaygısız explains that the organization in Istanbul had an autonomous position (Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017), but there were weekly assessment meetings where the executive directors came together (Şöhret Baltaş, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017). Kaygısız contends that the branch focused on organizing different seminars, unlike Ekin BİLAR in Ankara that went towards different sorts of activities like festivals or union training. He describes the Istanbul branch as more political while the Ankara branch was more academic and argues that the people who were part of the branch in Istanbul had different political inclinations and motives than those in Ankara.

First of all, there were differences in terms of the political and ideological positions and approaches of the intellectuals who were involved with this work in Istanbul. I'm not saying this in a pejorative sense, I'd like to underline it.... People who were occupied with the activities in Istanbul were more political. They were interested in issues such as the convergence of the feminist movement with the left [leftist movement] in Turkey - I don't recall about the LGBTI issue but I don't mean that it was not done-. Therefore, they organized seminar series that were more political and on different subjects. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017) (See Appendix, 23)

As İrfan Kaygısız explains, there were differences between the two branches of Ekin BİLAR not only in terms of their choice of activities but also of the characteristics of the people involved with the organization. The seminars held in Istanbul were popular because the scholars involved provided different perspectives and topics in

their seminars such as human rights, politics, women studies, sexuality, and urban issues.³³ In this respect, the place became known for being a space where issues that could not have been discussed elsewhere were being discussed. As the organizational structure of Ekin BİLAR was dependent mostly on the people involved in the execution of the organization, the differences in the executive committees' perspectives in these branches were reflected in the activities and purposes of the public spaces they created.

As explained in the earlier chapter, there has been a transformation in the idea of social movements since the 1980s when the revolutionary organizations were mostly dismantled and the discourse of democracy took center stage. Founded in a transitional period, Ekin BİLAR still included a more hierarchical understanding in its organizational structure as it was run as a type of corporation while solidarity academies today represent a different understanding and structure. In the next section, I will describe the organizational structures and purposes of the solidarity academies and discuss how they are diversified from each other based on the regional needs and resources in different cities.

3.2 Creating spaces of commoning: The organizational models of different solidarity academies

In fact, each period produces its knowledge itself. I mean, for instance BİLAR was a very good idea. Later we had a chance to have a chat with the friends who were part of the foundation of BİLAR and all. It was a very serious idea. And for the need in that period... For instance they founded it as a joint-stock company, BİLAR Inc. Therefore, it feels so weird to us right now. Later, you know we have all these collectivist attitudes that are far away from the sense of a company, so coming together in forms more like associations or platforms or organizations that do not have any official connection to the state seems more rational to us, but for instance BİLAR was

³³ See the brochures for the seminar series in Istanbul for the 1987-88 academic year in the archive provided by Hafiza Kaydı (Hafiza Kaydı, n.d.-b).

such a good idea. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018) (See Appendix, 24)

Arslan from Izmir Solidarity Academy explained these differences between the current solidarity academies and BİLAR when I asked him about his thoughts on other experiences of ‘alternative’ academies. Charles Tilly (2006) argues that there are certain “repertoires of contestation” which refers to a set of means and methods for social movements in a specific time and frame. He adds that these repertoires vary according to time and place, however “on the whole, when people make collective claims they innovate within limits set by the repertoire already established for their place, time, and pair” (p.35). He distinguishes between three levels of repertoires for a social movement with a familiar event:

If past familiarity increases the likelihood of subsequent performance in a more or less linear manner, we are probably seeing the effects of learning, but not of strong preference; let us call that situation a “weak repertoire.” If familiar performances receive strong preference but some unfamiliar performances also occur in the form of innovations, we are dealing with a flexible repertoire, which we can also call “strong.” If nothing but very familiar performances ever appear despite changing circumstances, the repertoire is called “rigid”. (p.40)

For the cases of this research, there are certain innovations in the tools and actions of the solidarity academies in comparison to Ekin BİLAR. These innovations are caused by the changing sociopolitical contexts between the 1980s and today as well as the influences of similar movements throughout the world. In this regard, solidarity academies have a “strong repertoire” that causes resemblances in their forms of action, yet also offer some unfamiliar performances.

I have a feeling for a smaller-scaled, more localized forms of togetherness...but later for the emergence of maybe more like federative structures where these localized forms can come together...While we are practicing in our daily lives at a point that certain expectations and certain choices are crystallized, I think that rather than having everyone together in like a large frame, there should be certain, little focal points in that large frame... I mean rather than a null indicator that everyone is in common or can be in common, I think that there is a need to build something where

everyone stands close to the people they are in common with and later the working of these commons together in a more societal, more general line of politics. (Umut Turhan, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 25)

Umut Turhan explains how he perceives social movements and more specifically the collective actions taken by the expelled academics of Turkey since 2016. Turhan is a founding partner of Kültürhane, a public space that was founded by the expelled scholars in Mersin. Kültürhane functions as a library, cafe, and a meeting point for different sorts of cultural activities. Turhan's explanation is highly representative of the way the solidarity academies were founded and continued. Although being in a process of self-formation as well as going through an era of trial and error, each solidarity academy or similar types of organization founded in the different cities of Turkey aimed to establish a focal point that serves the needs of their city and community in the best way possible.

As Tilly (2006) argues, the variations in the means and methods of the acts of contestation is observed based on place coefficient well. The organizations founded by the Academics for Peace in Kocaeli, Ankara, Eskişehir, Istanbul, Izmir, Dersim, Mersin, Antalya, Urfa, and Mardin, are all different in terms of their organizational models and ways of working. The differences in their structures do not only stem from distinct political inclinations or the characteristics of the academics involved but are also influenced by the regional characteristics and social environment these organizations are founded in. In this section, I will compare and contrast three of the relatively more settled and unique organizations, namely Kültürhane, Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity, and Kampüssüzler in terms of their foundation processes, organizational structures, and regional characteristics.

3.2.1 Turning the city into a common: The case of Kültürhane

Kültürhane is first of all a melon field of science, academy. We spread seeds of academic production to Kültürhane to show that the purge has only deprived us of our offices and salaries but will not prevent us from doing our jobs. We will be there, our books will be there. The things that we used to do in our rooms and homes until April, we will keep doing in Kültürhane from now on... Academic garden is only one part of the melon field, there will also be a garden of public space in Kültürhane. As Mersin is a residential area that expands through a coastline, long and thin, and deprived of a dominant city center, it is possible for people from each fraction to live without noticing or contacting each other... We believe, maybe very naively, that Kültürhane carries the seeds of a public space that will allow these fractions to come across, meet, and consociate (Kültürhane, n.d.).

Even though it does not define itself as a solidarity academy, Kültürhane was one of the earliest forms of organizations founded by the expelled scholars in 2016. The purge of a group of academics in Mersin had started before the release of the decree laws during the state of emergency as the Mersin University's administration made the decision internally. The scholars of Mersin started by organizing solidarity lectures every two weeks, but they soon realized that this activity was insufficient for them to realize the understanding of solidarity they had envisioned. As many of the expelled scholars left piles of books behind before they fled the country prior to the passport ban, the idea of building a library came to mind. Umut Turhan explained how as scholars in the province they could not find the books they wanted in their universities or elsewhere in the city, which is why they accumulated lots and lots of books, waiting to be utilized in a place like Kültürhane. As explained on Kültürhane's website, the city lacked both a center and a good library, so the expelled scholars rented a place in an accessible location right after the decree laws which included their names were announced. Eventually, Kültürhane was founded as a limited company by three expelled scholars from Mersin University. As they believe in working together with people who share similar ideas and can get along

with, the organization does not include all the expelled scholars from Mersin; some of whom have never set foot in the place.

Being founded as a company like BİLAR, Kültürhane is distinguished in that it aimed for a more horizontal rather than hierarchical or corporate organizational structure. Founding Kültürhane as a company aimed at both decreasing the possibility of intervention by the state, as in the case of Ekin BİLAR, and earning money that could create a different kind of solidarity among the expelled scholars. Turhan does not deny the need for the expelled scholars to earn their livings and underlines the aspect of economic solidarity Kültürhane allowed them to have. Yet, being founded as a company, they do not put aside the role of Kültürhane as a public space and actively reflect this purpose in the forms of activities.

The scholars who founded the public space undertake their works in the public space collectively and chose not to introduce themselves based on statuses as academics. Umut Turhan defines himself as a craftsman who was expelled from one public work to another and describes his job as follows:

I'm not a lecturer there. I mean, yes, I am the patron, the worker. I serve tables, do the cleaning, receive money at the counter, and you know, try to connect. And I think this enriches me. Because the things we know, the translation activity of Stavrides... You know if I had told you the etymology of academy, the founding of academy I would be a lecturer. But from the moment I try to put the knowledge I have into practice, I suppose I am no longer an academic. (Umut Turhan, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 26)

As Turhan explains, the scholars who found Kültürhane pay attention to putting theory into practice and focus more on the praxis level associated with the idea of being an intellectual. "In more scholarly terms praxis is defined as the necessary conjoining of theory and practice, so that theory is seen as both arising within practice while simultaneously informing practice" (Brookfield, 2005, p. 505). The scholars in Kültürhane act based on the idea of using their knowledge to serve their

city and its needs which is a common characteristic for the other solidarity academies as well.

As a form of praxis, the intellectuals who are part of Kültürhane have the intention of turning the city of Mersin into a common. Stavrides (2016) defines “common spaces” as follows:

Understood as distinct from public as well as from private spaces, ‘common spaces’ emerge in the contemporary metropolis as sites open to public use in which, however, rules and forms of use do not depend upon and are not controlled by a prevailing authority. It is through practices of commoning, practices which define and produce goods and services to be shared, that certain city spaces are created as common spaces. (p.2)

Turhan explains that Kültürhane tries to enrich the four crucial aspects needed to build the city of Mersin into a common through their practices of commoning: attachment to the city, human contact, knowledge about the city, and the ability to be organized (personal notes, presentation at BUIM, November 8, 2018). For this reason, they organize activities that range from movie screenings to fairytale hours, from seminars about ecology to producing podcasts about the news of the city. Furthermore, they dedicate time and effort to establishing contacts with the local organizations and the media as well as the formation of new organizations like a food network or bicycle teams to bring people from different backgrounds together in the city that they live in.

Stavrides (2016) argues that,

For common space to remain as common there needs to be a mechanism that continuously processes the contribution of those who are invited to use common space. In other words, common space cannot be fixed in the form of a product (no matter how collectively it was produced) because it keeps on producing those who produce it. The production and uses of common space cannot be separated (p.260).

For this reason, Stavrides underlines the necessity of the “processes of opening” in common spaces which refer to the “opening the community of those who share

common worlds, opening the circles of sharing to include newcomers, opening the sharing relations to new possibilities through a rethinking of sharing rules and opening the boundaries that define the spaces of sharing” (p.3). In this respect, he distinguishes common space in terms of “overspilling the boundaries of any spatial taxonomy” which might be based on economic, legal or political criteria (p.261). Kültürhane adopts this idea in their formation of public space and tries to open its common space to people from different class and political backgrounds. Turhan shared stories that represents this opening for them, such as that of a former teacher who got expelled from her school after the attempted coup d’etat, accused of being a follower of the “Fetullahist Terrorist Organization” (FETÖ) (personal notes, presentation at BUIM, November 8, 2018). He explained that after going through a similar purge process and attending the activities of Kültürhane, the expelled teacher asked for the blessing of the Academics for Peace in Mersin for her prior misjudgments about them. In this regard, Kültürhane does not consider itself merely as an ‘alternative’ academy structure but aims to diffuse into the different segments of the society in Mersin through its role as a public space that brings them together. In the next section, I will focus on Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity and how it intends to serve its own city through different organizational structures and activities.

3.2.2 “We will not leave the city, we will come back”: The case of KODA and Hayat Bilgisi Okulu³⁴

Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity (KODA) is a brand new project founded around the “Academics for Peace” who were unrightly expelled from Kocaeli University through the Decree Law No. 672. The main purpose of the project is to create a symbiosis (coexistence) between scientific and intellectual practice and “real social life”. Because the members of the Kocaeli Academy

³⁴ *Hayat Bilgisi Okulu* can be translated as a “school of everyday knowledge,” however the translation does not really reflect the true essence of the word. For this reason, I will use the original name for the rest of the research.

for Solidarity think that this relationship has an empowering role both for a social life that is suitable for human dignity and for scientific and intellectual practices, but beyond that it is their condition for existence in the long term. (Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi, n.d.).

The Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity (KODA) was founded on September 28, 2016 right after the collective purge of the Academics for Peace from Kocaeli University on September 1 with the Decree Law No. 672. According to Vedat Durmaz, an expelled professor who started working in a factory as a consultant after his expulsion and takes Wednesdays off to spare time for KODA, the Academics for Peace in Kocaeli includes scholars who actually know each other from long before the petition process and the academic purges. Almost all of the expelled scholars in Kocaeli were part of the organization called *Nasıl Bir Üniversite* (What Kind of a University, NBU) where they came together periodically to organize activities to argue for the idea of an independent and democratic university. Their bond was strengthened when these scholars were arrested on January 15, three days after the announcement of the petition “We will not be a party to this crime”. According to Vedat Durmaz, the founding of the solidarity academy after the purges was not difficult because the group knew each other and had strong connections with the democratic organizations of the city:

We decided to come together, I mean we decided for our slogan “We will not leave this city, we will come back” already while we were clearing our rooms [in the university]. After that, as almost all those expelled are members of SES [the Trade Union of Public Employees in Health and Social Services] or Eğitim-Sen [Education and Science Workers' Union] ... Thanks to Eğitim-Sen, the Kocaeli branch looked after us so much. It gave us a room. We started meeting there... (Vedat Durmaz, personal communication, June 2018) (See Appendix, 27)

As Durmaz explains, the city and its democratic organizations influenced their movement as these factors were very crucial in the foundation of KODA. In this regard, *Eğitim-Sen* (the Education and Science Workers' Union) not only supported

the expelled scholars financially but also provided them with necessary resources such as a building for their lectures or events. As an important reason behind this close bond and collective struggle connecting democratic actors in Kocaeli together, it is crucial to reference the works and struggle around the case of Onur Hamzaoglu. Hamzaoglu, a public health doctor working at Kocaeli University, is known for his research on the negative influences of the industry on the environment and the health of Kocaeli's residents. He has faced multiple lawsuits and attacks since 1990s by power groups operating in the region³⁵ (Onur Hamzaoglu'na Özgürlük, n.d.). His struggle for the better public health and using his knowledge for social good as an intellectual was supported by the Turkish Medical Association – which he is a member of – as well as the different democratic actors in Kocaeli. These same actors came together to form a solidarity even before the case of the Academics for Peace. It is possible to argue that the new solidarity here builds on the experiences of solidarity with Hamzaoglu. In addition, most of the scholars from this solidarity academy were also already in close relationship with the unions and other organizations in the city, so the solidarity represented a continuity.

Within this context, Yılmaz Demirkol, an expelled associate professor from KODA, explained how the idea of founding a solidarity academy came into being. According to Demirkol, the expelled scholars maintained connections with their graduate students which started as one-on-one meetings and later turned into lectures in the cafes of Kocaeli. Based upon this interest by their students, the scholars of Kocaeli started organizing seminars every Wednesday with the support of the unions in the city. At the end of their first year, the scholars involved with the solidarity academy published a book about their experiences throughout the year along with the

³⁵ For more information about the research, lawsuits, and struggle of Onur Hamzaoglu see Terzi, Yuvayapan, & Başer (2013).

seminars they gave entitled *Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi'nin İlk Uzun Yılı* (The First Long Year of Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity) (Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi, 2017). In the book, KODA's purpose is defined as: legal and political struggle against the purges, academic and political struggle against the Higher Education Board and the political power, and founding an 'alternative' academy. As part of the academic and political struggle, they point out the struggle to get back to the academy, found an alternative and new academic organization, and the democratization of the country which is an integral political condition for the academic environment (Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi, 2017). As seen in the stated aims, the main motive of KODA's scholars is maintaining their existing relationships with their students and the democratic powers in the city as well as democratizing the academy within and outside of universities. Under these conditions, their slogan, "We will not leave the city, we will come back" best reflects the purposes and perspectives of the scholars in Kocaeli.

Today, Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity furthers its activities as an association, a status they received on October 30, 2017 after a long process of application and rejection since March 1, 2017. At the same time, as Yılmaz Demirkol contends, the scholars of KODA are aware that what they have been experiencing is also "in some way a struggle to survive", which is why economic solidarity was searched for throughout their struggle as well. With this aim of forming economic solidarity, a group of scholars from KODA applied to the European Commission in the summer of 2017 and received funding the following fall for their project called Hayat Bilgisi Okulu. With this funding, they managed to found a school and started offering various workshops that provide participants with certificates after they complete the program. The funding helped these scholars to create economic

solidarity in addition to the already existing support provided from Eğitim-Sen. In this respect, scholars of KODA used their existing social and cultural capital to apply for a project that benefited them the economic solidarity they needed. Yılmaz Demirkol underlines that applying for project funding was not something that he had done before but was a necessary step in order to maintain their autonomy (personal communication, June 2018). De Angelis (2017) argues that,

...the choice about how to take and hold the means to take things into one's hands, to do direct action on one's own life, involves contextualized options specified by the relation of forces on the ground, by tactical shrewdness and, especially, by strategic ambition. What is certain, however, is that regardless of the manner in which one gains and maintains access to the means for collective direct action, commoning autonomy requires the imagination of independence (p.234).

For the scholars of KODA, enhancing their economic solidarity through the means of funding was a choice they made with an intention for providing sustainability and an imagination of independence. Deniz Demir, an expelled scholar from KODA who also takes responsibility at the Hayat Bilgisi Okulu along with Yılmaz Demirkol, explained the monetary issues of the school as follows:

We run Hayat Bilgisi Okulu without receiving any money from the participants. But how do we do it? Well, we applied for funding and we received it. With that funding we pay for our rent and for our expenses, etc. So that we can do it for free. Yes, public education should be free but in reality it is not any more. It can only be possible if the public is seized by those who think like us... (Deniz Demir, personal communication, June 2018) (See Appendix, 28)

As Demir contends, Hayat Bilgisi Okulu and KODA emphasize not receiving any money from the students, as testament to actualizing their belief in free education and their opposition to the commercialization and corporatization of education.

Roggero (2011) argues that “corporatization is meant to signal that the university itself has become a corporation, which now, based on the calculation of costs and benefits, the profit logic, input and output, competes in the education and

knowledge market” (p.366). Against this infusion of market logic into education, scholars in Kocaeli pay attention to reflecting their ideas of how universities should be in their works as a solidarity academy, which will be explained further in Chapter 4, and in their organizational structures.

The governance of the organization of Hayat Bilgisi Okulu and KODA is taken up by few “hard working scholars” as Vedat Durmaz contends, yet the organizational structure is marked by a horizontal understanding whereby it does not depend only on certain prominent names. De Angelis (2017) explains the idea of “sharing resources” and governing them through “horizontal doing in common” (p.10) as follows:

Commons can reproduce through commoning, doing in common, which is a social process embedded in particular values that defines a sharing culture in a given time and context, through which they reproduce resources and the community that comprises them. Both commons and capital may employ high or low tech, make use of oil or not, have functions that require a certain level of authority. Commons are generated in so far as subjects become commoners, in so far as their social being is enacted with others, at different levels of social organisation, through a social practice, commoning, that is essentially horizontal and may embrace a variety of forms depending on circumstances (implying the broad typology), but ultimately is grounded on community sharing. (p.104)

The ideas of horizontal social organization and community sharing is tried to be adopted in the formation of KODA and Hayat Bilgisi Okulu as well. As a form of enhancing solidarity, Hayat Bilgisi Okulu involves other actors and not only the expelled scholars. Some of the scholars’ former students give time and effort towards the execution of the project. The scholars also maintain their relations with all the democratic actors in the city, including those who were not signatories of the petition “We will not be a party to this crime”.

Through its activities and organizational structure, scholars from Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity intend to continue their struggle for the right to the city and

preserve the close connections and struggle they have with the other democratic organizations of Kocaeli. The social relations embedded in their social space influence their means and methods for the solidarity academy they form and execute. Simultaneously, the school serves to question and challenge the problems of the university and provides an alternative for the scholars and students through its activities. In the next section, I will inquire how a solidarity academy that lacks the necessary connections with the city works as in the case of Kampüssüzler and discuss their methods and organizational structure within their own context.

3.2.3 Being a local focal point under an umbrella structure: The case of Kampüssüzler and BirAraDa Dernek

The first practices of Kampüssüzler in which they came together with the collectivism of working, solidarity, production, and transforming knowledge corresponds to May, 2016... At the core of this two [three] year effort with intense work, exhaustion, hope, resistance, and attempts for the production of scientific knowledge, there was the discussions of the Academics for Peace about “How can a different academy, a different scientific production be possible?” in the several meetings during the winter of 2015, in a period when the pressure and attacks on the university components increased gradually due to the Petition of Peace. (Kampüssüzler, n.d.-b).

Kampüssüzler is a group consisting of expelled scholars, academics who continue to work in universities, and graduate students who focus on the possibilities of using different pedagogical methods and developing a different sense of academic life in their work.³⁶ Even though they are a small group with a small scope of influence, the importance of these actors lies in their effort to bring together the solidarity academies under the umbrella of an association.

³⁶ As Kampüssüzler first came together as a study group, their organizational structure and working methods are different than other solidarity academies. Most of the members of Kampüssüzler are either still employed as lecturers or study as graduate students. At the moment, they do not have any outside resources to provide economic solidarity among the members unlike KODA and Kültürhane.

As explained before, Kampüssüzler is one of the first group of signatories who came together in order to use the academic purges and the visible problems in the university structure, to start their search for an alternative understanding of academy. The small group, who now call themselves Kampüssüzler, came together as a study group in May 2016 due to similarities in their working methods and ideas. After weeks of reading and discussing together, they started to share their ideas with the Academics for Peace in the Karaburun Science Congress and with other organizations that invited them. Later, they expanded their works into various topics and organized workshops in collaboration with other solidarity academies. They also organized a graduate study group where scholars and students came together every two weeks to discuss the dissertations of graduate students, a program that I also had a chance to participate in. With the help of this group, I was able to meet members of Kampüssüzler regularly to discuss my research and their ideas regarding solidarity academies along with the different topics that other graduate students in the group wanted to talk about.

Being a small group that got together due to the similarities in their perspectives in life and academia, the members of Kampüssüzler are a more homogenous group than the other groups formed due to the petition. As part of a voluntary group of about ten people, Betül Acar defines the common characteristics and purposes that brings Kampüssüzler together as follows:

I mean, I guess it's very important to work together in an experience. I mean standing together. ...I mean producing an experience together. Having worked together, toiling together. ...maybe it's the similarity of our perspective of scientific knowledge...irrespective of politics. Our imminence while dreaming about something alternative. We might not be able to describe it at the moment, but it's something like that. When you look at it like that, yes, [Kampüssüzler is] more homogenous, more together in the political sense. But still, as I told you earlier, even though we are a group that come from different political backgrounds or, I mean, that includes people who are not Marxists, there are similarities in our approaches while we read, our reactions

or critiques. That means that it is the affinity of our approaches and dreams about the production of scientific knowledge... (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2017) (See Appendix, 29)

Based upon ‘the affinity of their approaches and dreams about the production of scientific knowledge’, there is a harmony in the works of Kampüssüzler and in their relations with other solidarity academies. Although not all of them call themselves Marxists, they contend that they have a *Marxgil* (Marx-ian) perspective which is also reflected in their emphasis on their idea of praxis and other pedagogical formulations.³⁷

Unlike Kültürhane and Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity, Kampüssüzler has a very limited relationship with the city both because of the small size of their group and the impractical characteristics of Istanbul as a city. Taking advantage of the coincidence that most of the group lives around Kadıköy, Kampüssüzler focuses on its internal activities while trying to connect with other scholars in the solidarity academies in different cities.

Maybe this is what Istanbul needs, I mean like [organized] in little neighborhoods. We are sort of a thing of a neighborhood. There is that advantage of being a small group. But it’s not like the relationship that Eskişehir or Kocaeli has with the city...never, of course. I mean it’s not like that. We have a tiny influence on our environment ... Therefore, what you do, you do it for yourself in some sense. Anyway, we don’t have such big things. We don’t do big actions. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 30)

Being founded in the crowded and distracting city of Istanbul, Kampüssüzler have neither the opportunity to serve as a central public space in the city, as in the case of Kültürhane, nor the chance to work collectively with all the democratic organizations in the city, as in the case of KODA. Still, the group makes use of the advantageous coincidence that all the organization members live in Kadıköy to research and

³⁷ I will discuss the influence of their ideological perspectives on their idea of knowledge production and distribution in Chapter 4.

produce ideas collectively as a group within the scope of their neighborhood.³⁸

Stavrides (2016) claims that “Space is an active form of social relations, a constituent aspect of social relations and a set of relations itself. Space matters because it is not an inert container of social life but an integral part of its manifestations and its events. Space gives form to encounters because it is a structured system of relations” (p.260). As seen in the variations in the experiences of Kültürhane, KODA, and Kampüssüzler, space is a constituent factor for the organizational structure of the solidarity academies as it influences the tools and methods of the intellectuals involved with these organizations in different cities.

Although Kampüssüzler is a small group of people with common dreams and affinities, they are also very involved in the formation of contact and solidarity in between the solidarity academies founded in Turkey. The group was responsible for the idea and organization of the first Solidarity Academies Workshop that started on March 2017 where representatives from each solidarity academy came together to collaborate and connect. The workshops continued to be organized in different cities every 1,5-2 months and later evolved into an association called BirAraDa Dernek.³⁹ Despite the limitations of the city of Istanbul they live in, the intellectuals in Kampüssüzler extend beyond the boundaries of the neighborhood by playing an important role in the foundation of BirAraDa Dernek and Solidarity Academies Workshops, which serve as the structures that try to bind different solidarity academies together today.⁴⁰ The association now has an office in Kadıköy, Istanbul, but includes representatives from different solidarity academies in its executive

³⁸ In time, Kadıköy has become an “alternative” social space, which might be considered as a reason behind the coincidence that brought the members of Kampüssüzler together in the same neighborhood. For the integrity of this chapter a whole, I will not dwell on this discussion here.

³⁹ See BirAraDa Dernek (2019) for more information.

⁴⁰ This idea of expanding beyond the boundaries of university campuses and finding new forms of territorialization is even incorporated into the name of Kampüssüzler, i.e. “Academics with No Campus”⁴⁰.

committee. The association organizes common activities and projects for the solidarity academies such as the Labor Academy that aims to reach the working class or Traveling Academy that will go to different cities and towns in Turkey to work on different projects with locals or particular groups who invite them. Many of the association's projects are still in the planning process.⁴¹

In this respect, Kampüssüzler helped found the umbrella structure that brought together different local focal points that work in accordance with their regional needs and resources. Although the situation is not settled yet, the solidarity academies have started to work on bringing these different commons together under a more general framework, an idea which Umut Turhan defined as an important need for current social movements. The idea of localization and new forms of territorialization is one of the main differences between the 1980s and the solidarity academies. Founded in the capital Ankara, Ekin BİLAR served as a center and a 'cultural focus' for the dissenting intellectuals of the era. Even when they opened a branch, it was in Istanbul, Turkey's largest city and a central place for much of the cultural, academic, and social activities occurring in the country. On the other hand, the solidarity academies carry the idea of public space into Turkey's provinces and started their works in cities such as Kocaeli, Mersin or Dersim.

The common denominator of these two eras is the foundation of space and mechanisms for those whose contact with the university was cut to meet the public. In that era [1980s], it was under one roof. It was operating under the roof of a company. Now, the activities are continued in the streets, park, or closed locations in various cities. There is an effort to meet with the masses, public, and students. This effort is common, but the dynamics are different for sure. While there was a corporate mechanism at that time [1980s], now it's more informal. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017) (See Appendix, 31)

⁴¹ I will discuss these projects and their possible influences on the understanding of knowledge production and distribution in Chapter 4.

İrfan Kaygısız, witnessed both Ekin BİLAR and the current solidarity academies, and his discussion highlights the ways public space has been localized and even de-territorialized through the solidarity academies. In this respect the idea of localization that is part of the commons literature that inspire many social movements of 2000s are reflected in the forms of organization taken by solidarity academies as well. In this sense, while Ekin BİLAR represents the structural understanding of social movements in the 1970s and 80s, solidarity academies represent the horizontal and informal relationships that are found in the social movements of 2000s.⁴²

Raunig (2013) characterizes the social movements in the twenty-first century as follows:

They are all about appropriating real places, about a struggle against precarization, against extreme competition and against the drivenness of contemporary production, largely dispensing with representation and weaving a transnational concatenation of social movements. There are, however, three specific vectors, on which these activisms enter new territory: in their search for new forms of living, in their organizational forms of radical inclusion, and in their insistence on reappropriating time. (p.150)

Inspired by the social movements that Raunig speaks of, the solidarity academies are in search for new forms of living and organizational forms of radical inclusion as seen in the instances of Kültürhane, KODA, Kampüssüzler and BirAraDa Dernek. Erdem and Akin (2019) identify the practices of commoning at solidarity academies as follows: organizing academic life, participatory learning, academic guidance, affective labor, cooperation, and advocacy and activism (p.8-10). For their experimentation of new forms of living and organizational form of radical inclusion, the solidarity academies incorporate these different practices of commoning into the common spaces they form and execute. In terms of the re-appropriation of time, Raunig (2013) contends that “The occupiers take the space and time seriously that

⁴² This idea of localization and de-territorialization is also reflected in the activities of solidarity academies, which I will focus more on in Chapter 4.

they set up, striate, streak, taking time for long, patient discussions and taking time to stay in this place, developing a new everyday life, even if only for a short time” (p.158). Although the form of the solidarity academies is different than the acts of contestation such as the Occupy movements that characterize the 21th century movements, the solidarity academies have a different relation to time than the experiences of Ekin BİLAR as well. In this respect, they do take their time for decision-making and engage in long discussions that would provide consensus among the members of the organization. As explained previously by Didem Kahraman from Izmir Solidarity Academy, the decision-making processes do not go fast, an attribute that also reflects the heterogeneity of the actors in the organization. In the next section, I will discuss the differences between these different forms of organizations with regards to field framework.

3.3 Reclaiming the idea of being an intellectual: Legitimacy and institutionalization

While speaking of the field of art, Bourdieu (1996) explains the internal struggles within the field over the definition of the field as follows:

Internal struggles, notably those setting the proponents of ‘pure art’ against the proponents of ‘bourgeois art’ or ‘commercial art’ and leading the former to refuse regard the latter as writers, inevitably take the form of conflicts over *definition*, in the proper sense of the term. Each is trying to impose the *boundaries* of the field most favourable to its interests or – which amounts the same thing – the best definition of conditions of true membership of the field (or of titles conferring the right to the status of writer, artist or scholar) for justifying its existence as it stands. (p.223)

As part of the struggle over the definition of the “right of entry into the field”, artists in different position “wish to impose within the field as the legitimate view on the field, the fundamental law of the field, the principle of vision and division (*nomos*) defining the artistic field (etc.) *as such*, meaning as the site of art as art” (p.223). This idea of internal struggle within the field is very relevant for this research with regards

to the intellectual field and more specifically the academic field in Turkey. Being expelled from their positions within the university structure in the country, the dissenting intellectuals who are part of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies had to find ways to regain the legitimacy of their profession. As discussed in Chapter 2, faced with the depreciation of the social and cultural capital associated with the academic field within the university structure, these organizations enabled these actors to regain the validity of their profession or at least their roles as intellectuals. In this respect, they underlined that it is not necessary to be in university campuses and offices to be regarded as academics. Furthermore, the scholars involved, made use of these organizations to access the public and students, and even adopted them as part of their titles.

We have completed the 2017/18 period, 2016/17...two educational periods. We organized about ten conferences each term. And you know, like, maybe it's not wrong to say this... These were public conferences, conferences organized periodically every month with one or two speakers. In between, you know, there was the Refugee School. People, our expelled friends added Izmir Solidarity Academy right next to their names when they were invited to a number of meetings. These all started to turn into a habit. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018) (See Appendix, 32)

The habit that Alper Arslan from Izmir Solidarity Academy explained about is not specific to the scholars in Izmir but is practiced by many other academics who are part of solidarity academies. In fact, they use these titles not only in the seminars and meetings they attend but also in their post-expulsion publications. Including the title increased the validity of their professional contribution in the eyes of other institutions in the country or abroad given the negation of their roles as academics in public institutions.

Through organizations like Ekin BİLAR and the solidarity academies, the intellectuals involved had a chance to re-invent themselves and adapt to the new conditions in accordance with their own contexts. As the requirements and resources

changed depending on these specific contexts along with the moves and motives of the intellectuals involved, their answers for the question of organization and activities differ significantly. One of the most important differences in this framework is related to the question of institutionalization. Some of the organizations have aimed for more institutionalization to increase the validity of their profession while some went into the opposite direction.

As explained above, scholars who are part of Kültürhane refrain from using their titles as academics and underline the role of the café/library they founded as a public space. Yet, as Umut Turhan contended, they believe in the idea of incorporating their knowledge into their practices thus reclaiming their roles as intellectuals in that manner. Moreover, as Turhan explained to me jokingly, they are being invited to speak at even more conferences with their current titles as public workers in Kültürhane than when they worked at the university. In addition, they are applying to international organizations like Heinrich Böll Stiftung or Friedrich Ebert Stiftung to fund their plans and projects. At the same time, while working on their projects or as waiters, owners, and cashiers in the public space, they cannot find sufficient time to organize lectures and seminars to pursue their professions. In this respect, they prioritize the idea of bringing different segments of Mersin together as equal parties and turning the city into a common with Kültürhane as central meeting point over promoting their academic careers.

Scholars from the Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity, on the other hand, focus more on the educational aspect of the organization and its role as an ‘alternative’ academy institution. In fact, as they do not want to recognize the existing university structure with its deficiencies as the main academy institution, they tend to renounce the word “alternative” in their case. As part of an institution, Hayat Bilgisi Okulu

offers workshop participants certificates similar to Ekin BİLAR's initiative. The latter case took this concept of institutionalization one step further through its rituals of graduation ceremonies. It is necessary to repeat here that these choices are also dependent on the specific context, and the needs and resources available in the contexts. In this regard, both Ekin BİLAR and KODA have different levels of connections within their city and on the international level that, in Ekin BİLAR's case were and in KODA's case are influential in their approach towards institutionalization. On the contrary, being a coastal city with no city center, Mersin requires a more de-institutionalized organization to bring different segments of the society together.

As an umbrella structure that could bring these different solidarity academies together with the differences in their understandings and method, the foundation of BirAraDa Dernek becomes even more promising for the struggle of the dissenting intellectuals in these organizations over the legitimacy of their profession and their role as 'true' intellectuals. Although the association is still new and in the formation process at the time of this research, its role in creating a common ground able to host all solidarity academies is crucial. Even though Kültürhane does not consider itself as a solidarity academy nor is it part of the umbrella structure, by being open to this idea of bringing together different commons, the scholars from Mersin might also connect more with other organizations founded by expelled scholars in the future.

3.4 Conclusion

All the cases mentioned in this chapter share the fact that they were all founded as a response to a crisis in difficult times and as a form of survival. As counter-actions against repressive and isolating actions of the governments in power, in both cases

intellectuals tried (try) to find a solution to stand together, form solidarity, and reclaim their voices through these organizations. Despite the similarity between these public spaces that enabled the involved actors to reclaim their roles as intellectuals and academics, the differences in the socio-political contexts of Ekin BİLAR and the solidarity academies influenced their adaptations to the context. For this reason, the solidarity academies adopted strong ‘repertoires of contention’ in their choices of declarations and formation of ‘alternative’ academies, yet they have also made certain innovations influenced by their time and sociopolitical context.

As explained in the earlier chapter, there has been a change in the intellectual and academic field in Turkey which affected the social and cultural capital of the field in a negative sense. The influence of this transformation on the organizational difference has been with respect to the idea of solidarity. Solidarity is a heavy-loaded concept with an unstable definition that includes political or ideological togetherness to economic or emotional support. For the intellectuals of the 1980s, including the expelled scholars of the Law Number 1402, the main understanding of solidarity was based on a political and ideological togetherness to start a democratization process in the oppressive socio-political environment after the military coup on September 12. Although the expelled scholars of 1980s experienced hardships during this era, they were mostly able to earn their living and so they did not look for economic solidarity in Ekin BİLAR. Not only have the academic purges of today influenced a much larger group of academics compared to the 1980s, but also the impact has also been much more widespread. Furthermore, substitute or alternative temporary jobs to earn money to survive such as translation work, have witnessed increased supply and lower pay. Unlike the 1402ers, the Academics for Peace are prohibited from travelling abroad, so their chance of finding a solution outside of the country is

hindered as well. The expelled scholars have experienced “civil death” as they are left without any professional options in Turkey. In this context, “economic solidarity became a possibility to survive” for the expelled scholars in the solidarity academies (Umut Turhan, personal communication, November 2017). With this intention, scholars from solidarity academies not only discuss this matter very often, but also incorporate this need into their forms of organizations, so in the case of Kültürhane, opening a café/library or in the case of KODA applying for project funding from international bodies and foundations.⁴³

Secondly, the prevalent discourses of social movements in their era influenced the organizational structure, means and methods of these different organizations. In this respect, being founded in a period of transition that include both the democratization waves that started in the 1980s as well as the legacy of the preceding revolutionary movements, Ekin BİLAR represented a more hierarchical organizational understanding. On the other hand, the solidarity academies incorporated the discourses of the twenty-first century into their organization through a horizontal organizational structure and different practices of commoning. In this respect, the solidarity academies in different cities chose different tools and actions that fit best to their local contexts. At the same time, they tried to bring these different commons together under the umbrella structure of BirAraDa Dernek, which is still in the formation process. Even though each experience creates new solutions in accordance with their own conditions, the collective actions of intellectuals have a form of intervention into the society. In the next chapter, I will focus more on the

⁴³ It is necessary to underline that many democratic organizations have been supporting the Academics for Peace throughout the processes of academic purge as well. As mentioned earlier, Eğitim-Sen organized financial support for the expelled scholars, although the amount became much smaller as more people were added to the list. At the same time, there have been many lawyers who assisted the scholars in their trial processes; psychiatrists and psychologists who offered free therapy sessions; and publishers and media organizations who supported the scholars during this process. In this respect, solidarity was expanded through different aspects and actors today, even though its adequacy is still questionable by many actors and in many levels.

concept of intervention with regards to knowledge production and relations in academia.

CHAPTER 4

INTERVENTION AND POSSIBILITIES:

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF EKIN BİLAR AND THE PROMISES OF
SOLIDARITY ACADEMIES

Interviewer: In solidarity academies which are tried to be established today, equality may not have been totally provided just like everywhere else, but there is not really a hierarchy of title, age, etc. between the participants. Maybe, BİLAR played a part in this. Because right now, it is a bit easier for assistants and academics to stand side by side, have friendly relationships. These were more difficult things before BİLAR, probably it has been path-breaking to having done this together.

Funda Şenol Cantek: Very true. We don't owe it just to BİLAR, of course, but we owe it to BİLAR as well. Because it was a very important part of the academic tradition. The part of academia that was outside of the university system was very important and the main autonomous, independent academia was that academia outside of the university system. Now, we are going through the same thing. In Turkey, we actually keep going through the same bad experiences in certain intervals and always trying to move on by deducing something positive out of it. (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 33)

In the interview conducted by Hafıza Kaydı with Funda Şenol Cantek on June 15, 2017 about her experiences in BİLAR, the conversation touched on the influences the organization had on current academia and 'alternative' academy practices as seen in the quote mentioned above. As Cantek contends, the intellectual field in Turkey has repeatedly gone through similar processes since the foundation of the republic, hoping to learn from and grow out of each occurrence. Indeed, the dissenting intellectuals did learn from and grow out of the experiences of their predecessors, and the forms of actions such as Ekin BİLAR had long-standing reflections on knowledge production and the academia in the country. The influence of BİLAR is visible even though it did not live until today, the structure and characteristics of the intellectual field have changed significantly since the 1980s, and the understandings

of social movement and forms of organization have been transformed. Ekin BİLAR influenced academic tradition and knowledge production. As a realm that brought together expelled academics, dissenting intellectuals, and the public and a space where critical discussions took place, the ‘alternative’ academy institution enabled the flourishing of new ideas and the incorporation of shifting global discourses into academia and the intellectual field in Turkey. In a similar manner, the current solidarity academies may be considered as public arenas with similar purposes and possibilities. Accordingly, it is necessary to mention that many scholars who take part in these solidarity academies aim to use these newly founded organizations to explore and experiment with different perspectives on pedagogy and academia. They make use of the recent transformations in social movements in the form of organization formed as well as in their approaches to academy and knowledge production.

We are not scholars who make comments about society while sitting in our ivory towers. We have coalesced with the society, especially through these solidarity academies ... We are not only professors who came together through our declaration as Academics for Peace, we are people who were always already preoccupied with the question of how the university should be... We will return to the university, we will remove the wreck of what is left of the university, we will remove the wreck of anything that is unscientific or irrational ... What we foresee is not a sort of academic activity reduced to few slogans ... To make science in real terms requires struggle in today’s world... (from personal field notes, October 2017) (See Appendix, 34)

These sentences are drawn from the different speeches scholars made during the forum in the opening ceremony of the second academic year of Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity on October 4, 2017. The academics involved emphasis their role as dissenting intellectuals and highlight the change in conditions of academy and knowledge production, but their means and methods to achieve this aim are heterogeneous. Among the forum participants, some insisted on protecting their

positions within the existing university system whereas some underlined the importance of building something new through the opportunity that the solidarity academies offer, but all agreed that the university system should be changed for the sake of a scientific and emancipatory idea of education. During my interviews, I also received similar answers from different academics when discussing their views on higher education in Turkey. Most of them explained that the problems of the academy in Turkey were already discussed among them or that they were aware of the “degeneration” and “corruption” in the universities. As such, the solidarity academies actually did promise an ‘alternative’ space where critical thought can be exchanged and different forms of knowledge production can be pursued. Many believe that these ‘alternative’ academy structures can at least be considered as spheres in Turkey where opposing voices can be heard or the current educational system can be problematized and contested.

In this chapter, I will examine the experiences of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies in terms of their approaches on academia and knowledge production. I will address these organizations as public arenas that provided a realm for critical inquiry and flourishing of new ideas as opposed to the existing university structures of their periods. In this respect, I will make note of the innovations they brought or experimented on to find an answer to the problems in the academy of their era. Lastly, I will evaluate these efforts and practices with respect to the discussions in the academic literature on knowledge production and inquire the contributions and promises these ‘alternative’ structures brought to the academic world in Turkey.

4.1 Intervening into the university structure in the 1980s: The role of Ekin BİLAR in transforming the relations and fields of study in the academia

4.1.1 Purge of the dissenting and questioning elements: Problems in the university structure in the 1980s

When I started working at BİLAR, there were preparations for the seminars. At that time, there were many academics who were expelled through [the Law of] 1402, and BİLAR was actually a project planned for expelled professors to bring a breath of fresh air in the sterilized academic and intellectual environment after the 1980s. They were planning a place where everything that cannot be discussed in universities or outside can be discussed in, where students and teachers can have face-to-face interaction, where it would be possible to have independent scientific production. (Şöhret Baltaş, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 35)

Şöhret Baltaş, who was responsible for the administrative affairs of the Istanbul branch of Ekin BİLAR, makes note of the aim of the organization for bringing an alternative to the ‘sterilized academic and intellectual environment after the 1980s.’ As she contends, in the time period that Ekin BİLAR was founded in, the oppressive aftermath of the military coup had influences not only in social and political spheres but on the academic environment as well. Yet, the source of the problems in universities was not only the coup d’etat but had its roots in the existing academic tradition that was seen as limited and repressive by most of the dissenting intellectuals and students of the period. In the interview conducted by Hafıza Kaydı, Özgür Aydın spoke about the problems in the universities and academic status quo of the period from his/her perspective as a university student at the time and compared the situation with the ‘alternative’ academic environment of Ekin BİLAR:

At the university, the subjects were taught according to whatever textbook the class had, without ever going beyond its limits. In that sense, it [Ekin BİLAR] was very different. Turns out that the actual university was that. We were seeing it as a course but turns out that actual university professors were there. Maybe that was the reason for their expulsion ... Those professors, 1402ers, they were the best professors of the period. They were scholars who were well-known, notable, whose classes were very demanded. These professors are being expelled from universities and then they open their doors to you.

What would you do under that condition? You would like to attend in order to learn. (Özgür Aydın, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 36)

The university environment in the 1980s is described by Aydın as a limiting climate that deprives academy of its qualities as an open space for critical thinking and discussions. He distinguishes the scholars who were expelled with the Law No. 1402 for extending and crossing the boundaries of the existing academic structure for the sake of scientific knowledge production and increased accessibility. As a student in the 1980s who experienced both this ‘alternative’ academic environment and the universities in the aftermath of the Law No. 1402, Özgür Aydın explains that the purge of the 1402ers became an opportunity for the remaining scholars to advance in their academic careers, which can be regarded as the increased economic, cultural, and social capital of the traditional intellectuals as opposed to the dissenting intellectuals.

For instance, a professor from the Turkology department went abroad just when he was about to be expelled. There were also other dismissals along with him. Those who remained started receiving academic titles rapidly. I remember those who had become professors over a night. In the eyes of us, students, it was like that: “Yes, it says ‘professor’ on their doors but those scholars outside are more well-equipped scholars”. We were seeking to reach those well-equipped scholars. My other friends thought the same. (Özgür Aydın, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 37)

As seen in the comments of Aydın, even though the dissenting intellectuals were deprived of their academic status within the university structure, they still had a respected position in the society for representing ‘true’ intellectuals and academics.

Under such circumstances, Ekin BİLAR provided an ‘alternative’ academic environment for those scholars who the government at the time aimed to exclude from the academic field. Ekin BİLAR became a public realm which brought the expelled academics together with students in an independent environment that the existing university structure could not provide. The scholars who gave lectures at

Ekin BİLAR used this public space to regain the legitimacy of their profession and suggested different approaches for the definition of being an ‘academic’ and ‘intellectual’. In the next section, I will explain how this public space enabled the dissenting intellectuals to transform the understanding of academy in the ‘alternative’ academy structure offered by Ekin BİLAR.

4.1.2 BİLAR’s influence on the relations and fields of study in the academia

Serving as a public space enabling dissident voices to be heard, Ekin BİLAR helped the expelled academics find a classroom for themselves and use this space to extend the boundaries of the existing university system. In this respect, they transgressed the line that separated academics from students and transformed the hierarchical teacher-student relationship of the era. They used seminars to create a new form of relationship that allowed the students and educators to have discussions as equal parties, rather than the lecture style, one-way mode of educating, adopted in the university structure of the period.

...the last term of BİLAR was actually a challenge against the accumulation of knowledge by the previous generation and their struggle for academic power and authority. It was important in that sense. “We are there, we have things to say, and we are not losers in front of you, we are confident, we defend our idea to the end, and we actually believe in equality, we are more democratic.” (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 38)

Funda Şenol Cantek, who attended the seminars of the Istanbul branch of Ekin BİLAR in the 1990s, distinguishes the perspectives of the scholars who gave lectures at Ekin BİLAR from the approach followed in the universities of the era and describes the former as practicing democratic ideals and believing in equality between the components in the classroom. While explaining about the open space for critical discussion at Ekin BİLAR, Cantek also highlights the role of these scholars in

introducing new topics into academic discussion which were devalued in the academic circles of the era before.

They [the scholars who also give seminars in Ekin BİLAR] were allowing us to challenge them. Youth is like that, you try to prove yourself. There were these kinds of scholars in BİLAR too. When we discovered them, we said: “There is a different academy, there is a different world.” This group [of scholars] opened the doors of the other academy for us and as they moved on in their careers, as we started our academic career as a certain group, the academy has become much more rich and colorful. It has become more interdisciplinary. The honor of the fields of study that were looked down on, excluded was restored, such as women studies, gender, urban studies, everyday life, cultural studies. These were the fields of studies that were looked down on by the previous generation that I have mentioned, that were not respected, and those who worked on those fields were made fun of. I think that the honor of these fields was restored by these scholars. (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 39)

Cantek explains how these scholars introduced new fields of study into the academic culture in Turkey; fields which had not received much respect from the former generation of academics. It was especially the Istanbul branch of Ekin BİLAR that made these new topics relevant and significant for the next generation of academics. As these topics were not widespread among the earlier academic and cultural circles, the seminars of the branch gained much interest and had public repercussions. Cantek argues that this interest in the seminars took its source from the scholars, who for her represented a different school of thought than the traditional intellectuals.

The cultural climate that obliged the foundation [of BİLAR] has started to change, but the names I have mentioned increased the number of regulars there. Without them, only with older scholars, the place would not be as crowded. There was a huge interest [to Ekin BİLAR] in the 1990s, as people who represented a different climate, ecologie, and thought system were there. My student days were in a period that the mainstream in academia has started to be cracked. (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 40)

Indeed, the mainstream fields of study and pedagogical methods in academia has started to change with the help of these scholars and the students they had a chance to reach through public spheres like Ekin BİLAR. Some of the students who were

engaged in these discussions in this ‘alternative’ academy institution later became a part of the academic and intellectual field in Turkey extending the influence of Ekin BİLAR even after its closure. These spheres had been influential in reflecting the changes in the educational understandings and topics of discussion throughout the world into the academic field and environment of Turkey. The rising interest in fields of study such as women studies, gender studies, urban studies, everyday life and cultural studies influenced social movements’ changing discourses as well. As explained in the earlier chapter, the Istanbul branch of Ekin BİLAR, and the intellectuals involved in the branch, were considered as more political than the Ankara group. For this reason, the discussions taking place in their seminars were influential in increasing the visibility and expanding discussions about some of the social movements such as the feminist, ecological, or LGBTQI+ movements. At the same time, Ekin BİLAR was not the only public space that enabled these critical discussions to flourish or inspired the social movements that followed, yet it was one of the most prevalent spheres in civil society in this sense.

Ekin BİLAR, the company that operated through the 1980s and 1990s in Ankara and Istanbul, served as ‘alternative’ academy during an era that the existing university structure prevented the existence of academic autonomy, did not allow the presence of dissenting intellectuals, did not provide a suitable environment for independent education and discussion, and clamped down on any plurality in voices and fields of study. Under these conditions, I argue that Ekin BİLAR not only became the university of the expelled scholars of the Law of 1402, but also provided a “counter-public sphere” where global transformation in academia and social movements could be brought into Turkey’s intellectual scene. Despite being a local

and limited initiative, the organization had long lasting effects in terms of its influences on education, pedagogy, and social movements in Turkey.

The concept of public sphere conveys the aim of creating a space where critical discussions can take place between the different segments of the society. Public spheres can be considered as lying at the heart of democracy and the idea of building such a just realm where the public can enlighten itself has its roots in the works of Kant (1784). Habermas discusses this idea further and argues that “public sphere” should be a space of intermedium between the state and its citizens, in other words between government and civil society, as a place where private people can discuss public affairs (as cited in Dacheux, 2012, pp.16-19). Habermas’s idea of “public sphere” is criticized in various aspects: for considering this space only for privileged segments of the society, in other words the accessibility of this sphere for segments other than bourgeois white males (Fraser, 1990), serving the interest of the dominant groups (Holmwood, 2017), approaching civil society and government as two distinctly separate areas (Sennett, 1993), the impossibility of enabling a consensus based on international norms through discursive interaction (Dacheux, 2012), and absence of an “ideal sovereign and omnicompetent citizen” to realize this concept “without the delegation of authority to specialized, competent experts” (Lippmann as cited in Robbins, 1993, p.viii). Nevertheless, I contend that there is still possibility to use the concept while addressing the spaces formed by Ekin BİLAR and the solidarity academies. In this respect, the question Bruce Robbins (1993) offers is of important value to be able to rethink the term: “How then to open the avenue of great debates, accessible to the majority, while yet enriching the multiplicity and the quality of public discourses, of evaluating agencies, of ‘scenes’ or places of visibility?” (p.xii).

As Dacheux (2012) contends, even though “public sphere” refers to “conception normative” for expressing a substantial historical reality, it is actually a vague concept in terms of being realized differently in particular realities. Based upon this understanding, I find it relevant to discuss the idea by Negt and Kluge (1993) about alternative public spheres and counterpublics. They use this term especially with regards to the formation of a proletarian public sphere and were inspired by experiences such as the Paris Commune or the worker’s councils during the German Revolution. Nancy Fraser (1990) argues that these alternative public spheres actually existed since the beginning and contends that:

“the problem is not only that Habermas idealizes the liberal public sphere but also that he fails to examine other, non-liberal, non-bourgeois, competing public spaces... virtually contemporaneous with the bourgeois public there arose a host of competing counterpublics, including nationalist publics, elite women’s publics, and working class publics. Thus, there were competing publics from the start, not just from the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as Habermas implies.” (pp.60-61)

As open spaces for different segments of the society, why do not universities become part of this discussion? Holmwood (2017) points out that, “What is striking about a range of studies devoted to such topics, however, is that the university is largely absent from discussion, notwithstanding its status as the site of academic knowledge claims about the public sphere.” The case of ‘alternative’ academies in Turkey, become a part of this discussion by intertwining the idea of critical inquiry and discussion the academic environment brings with the idea of counter-public sphere. In the case of Ekin BİLAR, the concept of counter-public sphere was realized in a realm that both allowed the flourishing of novel ideas and critiques and the emergence of different forms of actions such as the Petition of Intelligentsia or Bread and Rights Petition. Based upon that, Ekin BİLAR provided as a space that was a

‘space of intermedium’ between dissenting intellectuals and the state as well as a ‘space of togetherness’ for the dissenting intellectuals and society.

Solidarity academies bear a similar role to Ekin BİLAR for opening up critical discussions regarding social movements and the idea of academy. As an addition to the previously mentioned emphasis on these public spaces and civil society, in this case, the public spaces under discussion go beyond civil society as they aim to contribute and promise to intervene into the existing relations, academic understanding, and social movements. In the next section, I will discuss the aims and efforts of the intellectuals involved with the solidarity academies to introduce ‘other’ modes of being and practicing into academic circles and social movements in the country.

4.2 Intervening into the university structure today: The experiments and promises of solidarity academies

4.2.1 Purge of the dissenting and questioning elements: Problems in the university structure today

In her panel presentation titled “*Türkiye’de ve Dünyada Alternatif Akademi Mücadeleleri Üzerine* (On the Struggles for Alternative Academy in Turkey and the World)” in the thirteenth Karaburun Science Congress on September 7, 2018, Aynur Özügürlü contended that there are two tendencies in scholarly circles for the discussions related to the present and future of universities. On the one hand, she said, there are intricate analyses that universities are in deep crisis or have completely collapsed both as institutions and as ideas. On the other hand, there are still scholars who are searching for a ‘university idea’ as well as those who aim to create their own theoretical line of ‘alternative’ university with the idea of ‘a

different society.’ Throughout my research, I have also encountered similar questions in between the scholars of the solidarity academies. Most of the scholars I interviewed, underlined that academies were always already corrupted and degenerated, especially those in Turkey, and not only because of or after the recent layoffs of the Academics for Peace. In this respect, some of the scholars even joked about how good the unemployment has actually been for them as they now had the opportunity to do ‘something different.’ For others, universities are important terrains of public space that should be transformed and used for the public good, which is why they were/are motivated to ‘going back’ or ‘not leaving’ the arena. There was also a group of scholars who did not accept the use of the term “alternative” to describe their search for a different understanding of the academy. These scholars argued that as they did not approve the norm, they aimed to change the idea of the university instead of creating an alternative or a sub-field to the existing.

At first I thought nothing was left to us in the wake of the expulsion of our professors. I was in complete despair. That’s why I was not even that upset when I was expelled too. Because it’s not important to be expelled from something that does not even exist. I mean because it really doesn’t exist. If science fails to speak the truth, if scholars cannot express what is real, then it’s not possible to speak of scientific activity at all ... If you get all the opposing voices out of the university and if you only express the things in your own education system, you will raise a society...like that. In fact, this is the purpose of founding solidarity academies ... Both through solidarity academies and through the networks of our professors or our different forms of organizing, like our unions, professional associations etc., we did not stand still as victims, I think. I can still say that. Even though there are restrictions, we keep on speaking. (Didem Kahraman, personal communication, July 2018) (See Appendix, 41)

Didem Kahraman, an expelled research assistant from Izmir Solidarity Academy, explained how she felt during the expulsion of her professors and later following her expulsion. She underlined her motive of not being ideal/staying silent/being cast as victims and continuing to raise dissenting voices which are absent in the current university structure after the expulsions. In this respect, the solidarity academies then

serve a role similar to Ekin BİLAR. These organizations served as a way of forming ideological, emotional, and economic solidarity between the expelled scholars, as explained in the previous chapter. These organizations have also been an arena to discuss and find alternative ways to approach the problems the expelled scholars see in the university structure in Turkey. Both during my observations of the activities of different solidarity academies and in my interviews with the academics from these organizations, many scholars underlined that there were many problems within the university structure even before the academic purges began in 2016.

Broadly speaking, the university model after '80s, I mean the university model that was built through the coup d'état in 1980, the Higher Education Law, the '82 Constitution was already ... To describe it plainly, they [universities] were not places where any kind of production of scientific knowledge was possible and as its prerequisite academic freedom described in any sense existed, or how can I say, allowed to be rooted ... I mean in accordance with the neoliberal adjustment policies, many mechanisms such as the cooperation between university and industry, etc. etc. were settled. I mean the scholar at the university started to see student as customer, and as the class she gives, you know. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018) (See Appendix, 42)

Although the idea that universities are part of the ideological state apparatus and reproduce dominant ideologies is not something novel (Althusser, 1971/2001), the autonomy of the academic professions has been even more reduced since the 1980s. Due to the fiscal crisis of welfare states in this period, neoliberal policies prepared for the public sector have intensified gradually increasing the government control over universities (Lorenz, 2013). Simultaneously, market relations have infused into different segments of the society, including the academic/scientific realm (Vatansever and Yalçın, 2016), which has entailed the commodification of knowledge and academic careerism (Özel, 2017). If universities have turned into centers of commerce or if scholars put their benefits and careers at forefront, as

argued by these authors, it is not possible to be engaged in “science for science’s sake” in the manner that Weber claimed a century ago (Weber, 1946).

Is it possible to be engaged in science for science’s or society’s sake without the existence of academic autonomy and freedom? Butler (2017) insists on the importance of academic freedom for the sake of research and modes of thought without the interference of the state or other external authorities. She points out the necessity of academic freedom for an informed public and its way of “opening up possibility of free and critical thought – questioning the status quo or the policies of government, and even the possibility of new political formations” (p.858). She contends that “universities, as ‘social institutions’ are obligated to promote, through teaching and research, the principles of freedom and justice, of human dignity and solidarity, and to develop mutually material and moral aid on an international level” (p.859). As Butler lines up these crucial aspects of academic freedom, she also argues for claiming these rights not only for one’s own university but for others as well. By giving example of the situation of Academics for Peace in Turkey, she calls for scholars to have a “radical and persistent solidarity” on international level (p.860).

Considering that academic freedom and autonomy is debated, especially in the context of Turkey, how is it possible to talk about doing science or being engaged in any academic activity? Can solidarity academies offer an alternative for the decadency mentioned by the expelled scholars of Academics for Peace? In the next section, I will discuss the possible contributions and promises solidarity academies hold for the understanding of academy in Turkey.

4.2.2 Localizing the academia: Territorialization and reterritorialization

As explained in the previous chapter, the current solidarity academies show a tendency for localization as reflected in their foundation in different provinces across Turkey. The same idea is observed in their choice of activities as well. For instance, one of the planned projects of BirAraDa Dernek is to found a traveling academy that would visit the inner cities of Turkey to engage in different projects according to the needs of the local communities. With this project, the association aim to include production as a part of their work and engage in the idea of praxis while at the same time localize the understanding of academy that has become centralized in big cities and fails to reach smaller or more marginal provinces.

In addition to the idea of localization, it is also crucial to speak of the concepts of re-territorialization and de-territorialization that are adopted by solidarity academy scholars. They position their work in the public arenas as a direct engagement with or manifestation of these concepts.

I mean something like this happened in Turkey. This is what we see in our friends who were expelled. The universities are not bad because we were expelled from them, they were already bad! I mean we are only one of the little piers among many. I mean for me, 50s created worse problems than my expulsion in the country. The legislation of the performance criterias...these are more rooted problems. You get expelled and then...these are only things at the surface of the university. I mean these are the things that you can find ways to overcome through your personal struggle. Right at this point, solidarity academies actually raise hope for this obsolete university system. First, we organize the very same thing within ourselves. What we call as university, what we call as science, what we call as sharing knowledge is not restricted to four buildings, one computer and one chair...or one lecture hall. Science can be made anywhere. Just as we can work in cafes, libraries, at home, our students and friends can take lessons there. I think it may be even more inspiring. There are successful examples for this. (Dilan Yıldız, personal communication, July 2018) (See Appendix, 43)

An expelled research assistant from the Ankara Solidarity Academy, Dilan Yıldız, explained her views on the academic environment in Turkey and her hopes of what the solidarity academies may bring. Yıldız argues that the problems in Turkey's

universities are more deeply rooted just being about the recent expulsions. Under these circumstances, for her, the solidarity academies represent a different understanding of academia that is not restricted to the classroom or the university campus. In this respect, *Sokak Akademisi* (Street Academy) in Ankara that was founded along with the Ankara Solidarity Academy serves as a novel experience that is explained by Dilan Yıldız as follows:

I mean, frankly it's important for showing the place where resistance will take place. I mean you say that...if you grudge the university, the campus to us, I will give my lecture on the street and giving that lecture is my resistance. I don't know that else to do anyway. I give lecture, shout slogans, protest, I mean that's all I'm capable of, that's how I grew up. Our strongest weapon is our words, knowledge, [intellectual] accumulation. Well, if you claim that you will leave us to social death, well, I'm on the street, you can't put me into home. You can't push me out of a place and put [me] into another one. To say "I don't accept that depression", in other words. I might get cold, but look, there are people listening to me. (Dilan Yıldız, personal communication, July 2018) (See Appendix, 44)

These ideas of territorialization and re-territorialization is examined by Raunig (2013) both in terms of understanding universities as new arenas of struggle and creating new forms of organizations beyond existing academic structures. Raunig does not disregard the problems within the academic context and approaches universities as perfect examples for the merging of the discipline and the control society, which he calls as "modulation" (p.46). He notes the problems related to the practices of exclusion and inclusion, standardization of students and scholars, and knowledge economy; however, he also argues that the struggles against the existing forms and norms should not only be perceived as reactive but also as productive and inventive. Raunig (2013) defines the university "not simply as site of a transfer of knowledge, but rather as a complex space of the overlapping of the most diverse forms of cognitive, affective, subservient labor" and claims that "what was once the factory is now the university" (p.24). For this reason, he calls for "struggle for

autonomous free spaces in the university” along with the “self-organization and auto-formation beyond existing institutions” (pp.48-49), which are useful to think with in the case of the solidarity academies for representing both their ideas of going back and reclaiming their positions in universities and searching for new forms of organizations through these ‘alternative’ academic structures. The solidarity academies breath fresh breath into the existing understanding of academia in Turkey by extending it outside of university campuses and spreading into different areas to allow new encounters with the society.

As Raunig (2013) looks at the issue from the perspective of social transformation, he grounds his arguments related to academy based on the ways universities can become possible answers in today’s search for new refrains of strike, occupation, and self-organization. While in the case of the Academics for Peace, scholars focus on more urgent issues such as legal support and creating emotional, ideological and financial solidarity, but the possible social transformation that may emerge cannot be ignored. The solidarity academies’ new approaches are not restricted to the idea of space but are also related to new pedagogical understandings of existing academy needs. In the next section, I will discuss experiments carried out by dissenting scholars of these organizations with respect to academia and knowledge production.

4.2.3 Solidarity academies and new pedagogical understandings

But of course, here there is an opportunity like this. I mean there is no such restriction. I mean, indeed, it’s like you won’t be able to stay as a communist while working in the Wall Street, here there is no such problem. This is not the Wall Street of anywhere, and actually this is nowhere! I mean here is a place with no authority, no rule maker. There are surely problematic sides to it, but yet we are so open...to try. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 45)

As Betül Acar contends, the greatest opportunity solidarity academies offer is the freedom from the restrictions in the university environment that allows them to go for new searches and experiments in the ‘alternative’ academic realm they created. Scholars who are involved with the solidarity academies do not all embrace the idea of social transformation through education or describe universities as the new terrains of strike and occupation, yet almost all are interested in finding new methods, creating spaces, and enacting ideas of education. As the scholars of these newly founded structures are already involved with the recent developments or possible reformist projects around the world because of their scientific or practical interests, these topics were also included in their daily conversations. For this reason, they organize workshops and seminars where they discuss alternative pedagogical understandings or compare and contrast different examples from the world.

The Solidarity Academies Workshop that I attended was convened in Eskişehir, with the participation of scholars from Istanbul, Ankara, Dersim, Kocaeli Academies for Solidarity, Kampüssüzler, and Eskişehir School on November 19, 2017. The main theme of the workshop was “alternative academy” and it included presentations about different pedagogical approaches such as “the theatre of oppressed” which offers a critical approach based on mutual dialogue that can be applied to education, and “feminist pedagogy” that suggests the necessity of deconstructing dualities and eliminating hierarchical structures in education. The scholar who made the latter presentation also raised questions focusing on discussing the ways to initiate social transformation starting from the personal or how these abstract notions can be realized in practice. Another presentation was about the “traveling ateliers of communication” that inspired the scholars to adopt the idea of the “traveling academy” as a project in BirAraDa Dernek. The idea was based on a

real-life project that was realized a few years ago involving a group of “experts” who work together with local organizations in different parts of Turkey with the aim of finding a practical solution to local problems. The workshop attendees intensely discussed these different methods and methodologies and some of them were later realized into different projects. The workshop helped me make sense of the efforts and discussions with relation to creating alternative structures within and outside the education system of Turkey.

This experience was actually something like this. Despite all the negative aspects, this experience also gave us opportunities. For instance, in Kocaeli University we have dual education, there are a lot of students... I mean it's not like your Boğaziçi University, etc. at all. We had a program that made a scholar give twenty hours of lecture willingly or against her will for about, I don't know, seventy-eighty thousand students. For that reason, we could not spend any time on pedagogical improvement or realize what we want to do. But when we established the institution we are in [Hayat Bilgisi Okulu], we became able to get into new pursuits. Well, from this building to the materials we use, from the architecture to our relations... For instance, we do not call it 'lecture' here, we call it 'workshop', we don't call it 'student' we call it 'participant', we don't call it 'lecturer', we call it 'workshop coordinator'. (Yılmaz Demirkol, personal communication, June 2018) (See Appendix, 46)

Yılmaz Demirkol from Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity, who is also responsible for the organization of the Hayat Bilgisi Okulu founded by the scholars from Kocaeli, described the academic structure at Kocaeli University and the alternative they aim to create during our interview in the office of the Hayat Bilgisi Okulu. He explained that they do not receive any money from workshop participants, which was a crucial issue raised by almost all the scholars that I interviewed. They all emphasized that providing workshops or lectures for free aims to avoid turning students into customers, a main complaint they voiced against traditional universities. While Demirkol showed me the wide conference room where the workshops took place, the offices, and the kitchen, he argued that it was not as easy, as everyone expects, to create something new and that they still faced problems with respect to participation

or the organizational structure. However, he was hopeful and argued that solidarity academies should be preserved whether or not the expelled scholars were reinstated to their positions at universities.

...removal of the teacher-learner hierarchy and this duality...practicing the experiences on both sides as far as possible. I mean succeeding to be both teacher and learner. Of course, this, for instance, is not an easy thing. Or that the topics, the material that will be learned should come from inside the life itself. That it should impose itself upon you, titles like that. For instance, this may not be an easy thing as well. Because, we, for instance, have gotten used to teaching certain things, some got used to listening to certain things in a certain style. It's not easy to break these things. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 47)

Betül Acar from Kampüssüzler explained about their pedagogical searches and experiments in detail. As a small group, Kampüssüzler are very much involved with the problems in current academic research and teaching methods as well as exploring possible alternatives to the current status quo.

I mean we really do believe in praxis. I mean it's not just about teaching a lesson. I mean [we believe that] teaching a lesson should also be done differently and that this interdisciplinarity [she means the contrary] should be overcome, the boundaries of the disciplines are one of the biggest obstacles ahead of us. Because we believe that it's very alienating, solidifying to have a micro area to focus on in one's field of study and that it is a seriously weakening factor for analytic, questioning, critical perspective. Therefore, we prioritize post-disciplinary, outside-disciplinary practical method. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 48)

As exemplified in these instances, scholars from solidarity academies aim to use the opportunity they have due to respect to freedom for finding new methods and forms academic research and education can be transformed into. The results of their experiments and inquiries are still in process since these are still ongoing projects, yet they bear the promise to present alternative understanding of universities.

Both Ekin BİLAR and the solidarity academies have (had) new insights into the idea of knowledge production in Turkey. Rather than aiming for great social transformations, the dissenting intellectuals who are part of these organizations

incorporate different pedagogical discussions into the counter-public spheres they form. The space they offer where critical discussions take place also inspire or may inspire social movements as well, as in the case of Ekin BİLAR. Aware of the processes of experimentation that these ‘alternative’ academies offer, I argue that these organizations can be regarded as “academies of possibilities” in their era where boundaries are (were) still being drawn and new possibilities are (were) sought.

4.3 Conclusion

Neither Ekin BİLAR nor solidarity academies were founded with the aim of great social transformations but as counter-responses in times of crises and as forms of survival as discussed in previous chapters. Yet, both sets of these organizations did and do serve as counter-public spaces that enable critical discussions to flourish and new experiments with methods and pedagogies to be carried out. In both cases, such experimentation was and is not possible within the university structure. Through the independent critical atmosphere, they provided and provide, they opened up (and open up) the possibility for global transformations in social movements and academia to be discussed, experimented, and incorporated.

Still, I would like to underline that my discussion on the comparisons and contrasts between the interventions of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies on knowledge production, academia, and the concept of intellectual is restricted to the level of ideas, thoughts, and wishes. I will conclude this contrast here as there is an inequality between the time courses of Ekin BİLAR and solidarity academies at the time of this research. In other words, is possible to discuss Ekin BİLAR from their foundation process, through its life course, and its emphasis on the academic and intellectual field; however, as solidarity academies are at the beginning of their life

courses it is neither possible to evaluate their activities and choices nor their future and possible impacts on the society. My use of the term “academies of possibilities” becomes even more relevant in this regard, as it represents the promises and uncertainties inherent to these organizations.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Intellectual is a heavy-loaded term with different implications. Its true meaning is contested among scholarly and cultural circles for a long period of time. In this research, I argued that the concept of “intellectual” does not refer to a homogeneous social unit, but should rather be regarded as a changing entity with various actors and multiple meanings. For this reason, I adopted the field framework and discussed the internal struggles between dissenting and traditional intellectuals over the definition and boundaries of the field. In the meantime, I underlined the importance of the position of the intellectual field within the field of power as well as the influence of external sanctions on the position of the intellectual field. My case studies of Ekin BİLAR and the solidarity academies provided insights about the trajectory of the intellectual field in Turkey since the 1980s. In this chapter, I will briefly recap my main arguments and more importantly focus on the closing process of Ekin BİLAR and pose further questions about the present and future of the solidarity academies, which could not be addressed in this research. In this manner, I aim to provide a historical record for both cases and open up discussions for further research that is needed.

First of all, I analyzed the cases of Ekin BİLAR and the solidarity academies within their contexts, which brought up discussions regarding the transformation of academia since the 1980s. In this regard, I made note of the devaluation of academic titles and the precarization of academic and intellectual labor in neoliberal era. At the same time, it was necessary to mention the historical particularities of Turkey for this change, in terms of the changing discourses of the political powers in the country. I

argued that economic, social, and cultural capital of the dissenting intellectuals, who are the subjects of this research, have decreased within this context. I examined how these transformations were reflected in their acts of contestation for the dissenting intellectuals to find new innovations to re-invent themselves and gain legitimacy as ‘true’ intellectuals. Secondly, I focused on the influence of the changing discourses in social movements on these organizations. For the case of Ekin BİLAR, I contended that its means and methods were influenced by the preceding revolutionary movements and the democratization waves in the period of transition it was founded in. For the case of solidarity academies, I made note of the influence of the social movements of the twenty-first century and the commons literature on the tools and actions of the organizations in different cities. Lastly, I argued that even though these ‘alternative’ academic structures do not aim for great social transformations, as counter-public spheres they entail (entailed) the possibility of intervention into the ideas of social movements and academia in Turkey. For this reason, I regarded them as “academies of possibilities”, for the promises that they bring (brought) to academic and cultural circles in the country.

5.1 End of an era: The closing process of Ekin BİLAR

While speaking of the promises and contributions of Ekin BİLAR and the solidarity academies, it is also necessary to discuss their limitations and problems to understand the reasons for Ekin BİLAR’s closure and open up discussions with regards to the future of the solidarity academies. As discussed in this research, Ekin BİLAR was founded in a period of transition when the revolutionary movements in the country were dismantled and the discourses of democratization began to be prevalent throughout the world. Within this context, the counter-public sphere

provided by Ekin BİLAR aimed to bring dissenting voices together to build a democratic front. When the repressive conditions that brought these actors together had changed, the need for the organization diminished gradually.

In that period, political activity in Turkey was liberalized from then on. Instead of an understanding of ‘There is only one place for us to take shelter in each other and work by being together’, everyone went to open their own shops, to be honest. After the political differences arose, the need for a structure like BİLAR disappeared, to be honest. Everyone started organizing something according to their own political line. (Yıldırım Koç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 49)

As Koç contends, there has been political disintegration in the 1990s that drew the dissenting intellectuals of Ekin BİLAR apart. At the same time, as providing an ‘alternative’ academia for the expelled scholars of the Law No. 1402 was one of the main reasons for the foundation of Ekin BİLAR, the future of the organization became at stake once these scholars were reinstated to their duties.

BİLAR was established on the foundation of expelled academics. Once the return to universities had begun, the situation put BİLAR into trouble ... I mean both human and financial resources had started to dry out. Time was up, it was not right to resist. Under the new conditions, it was necessary to look for new ways of struggle from then on. It could have been even restraining to persist on BİLAR. After all, it would have been a row against the tie, it would not work. (Haluk Gerger, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017) (See Appendix, 50)

Furthermore, Ekin BİLAR was not founded with the aim of providing economic solidarity among the dissenting intellectuals involved. The actors who were part of the organization even contributed to the expenses of the company as it barely stayed afloat. Without any outside resources to sustain Ekin BİLAR and with the decreasing need for its perpetuity, it became difficult to maintain the company. Under these conditions, Aziz Nesin sent a letter to the founders and partners of Ekin BİLAR and invited them for a meeting to discuss the future of the company. However, he passed away five days before the meeting, which was supposed to take place on July 11,

1995. The company was officially closed in 2014, yet had ceased to function since 1995.

As the solidarity academies were founded as local focal points serving the needs of their city rather than being central organizational structures, the problems and limitations of these organizations differ from that of Ekin BİLAR. Still, what would happen to the solidarity academies if the sociopolitical conditions had changed and expelled scholars were reinstated to their duties are still relevant questions to be asked. Moreover, formation of economic solidarity and providing its sustainability is very crucial for the future of the solidarity academies, as seen from the experiences of Ekin BİLAR. In the next section, I will dwell on the issues that are specific to the solidarity academies and make note of some of the problems inherent to these structures.

5.2 Looking into the future: Problems and limitations of solidarity academies

“We are living in a bad system. The universities had also been part of this bad system, even before our expulsion!”⁴⁴ said one of the scholars during his speech in a forum titled “What do we understand from science and struggle, and what can we do together?”, which was convened for the opening of the second year of the Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity in 2017 (from personal field notes, October 2017). “People can no longer continue to live in this system and they are looking for a way out”⁴⁵ he claimed as he gave examples from social movements such as the Occupy movements. He pointed out the increasing prevalence of the discourses of “localization” throughout the world and described how he imagined the solidarity academies will grow and become more attractive every day to replace the current

⁴⁴ Kötü bir sistem içerisinde yaşıyoruz. Üniversiteler de bu kötü sistemin bir parçasıydı, biz atılmadan da önce!

⁴⁵ Bu sistem içinde insanlar artık yaşamaya devam edemiyor ve bir çıkış yolu arıyor.

university structures in the future, maybe in twenty years. He finished his speech in the midst of applause and cheers, and invited everyone to realize that they are playing a part in the construction of the “academy of the future”. His speech was particularly significant for me to understand the promises and inspirations of the solidarity academies in Turkey, yet of course did not represent the ideas of all the people involved with these organizations.

First of all, during my research I observed that the future of the solidarity academies was not that clear for most of the dissenting intellectuals who are part of these organizations. Instead, the prevailing paradigm was that the present and future of the solidarity academies are under uncertain conditions.

I mean we are not in a country like that, to do something a day in a pace. We don't have such a luxury. There is no way. Therefore, you don't see tomorrow. I mean whatever you do, you don't do it by seeing tomorrow, yet you act like you have hundreds of years ahead of you. I mean, we do all our works as if we have an infinite amount of time, like we have a whole life...in a fiction that we construct as if we will not die, get old, fall down, but at the same time in a thing that...you cannot see anything, what is ahead of you. In a picture of heavy dystopia, I mean as if a black, dark, oily smoke repressed all of us, under it, without seeing anyone, you keep doing. It's sort of like that. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018) (See Appendix, 51)

The solidarity academies, in this sense, became a form of survival and enabled the expelled scholars to re-invent themselves under repressive conditions. Even though their practices and plans may have promising influences on the academia and social movements, they were not intended for great social transformations during the formation process.

Secondly, the prevailing discourses of social movements in the twenty-first century have certain limitations that should be discussed. Here, I do not intend to make a political discussion, but I will point out some aspects that are also being discussed by the dissenting intellectuals in the solidarity academies. The commons

literature proposes the aim of creating a “dual power” in the social sphere (Fırat 2018) through the formation of counter-institutions, relations, practices, and values. However, their practices of commoning have the risk of being micro-level experiences through the creation of secluded “islands” (Fırat 2018). As discussed, the solidarity academies were not founded with the aim of great social transformations, yet these discussions are still important to think for the future of these organizations.

Lastly, in this research I focused on three solidarity academies founded in different cities as they were comparatively well-established and reflected the variations among these organizations the best. Although the dissenting intellectuals who are part of these solidarity academies experienced several problems in their daily routines, they managed to find their tools and methods that fit best to their contexts. However, not all solidarity academies have been successful in this respect. Many of the solidarity academies in different cities failed to find resources to sustain themselves and their members gradually left due to conflicting schedules or lack of hope.⁴⁶ In the next section, I will conclude by pointing out the deficiencies of this research and posing questions for future research.

5.3 Remaining questions for future research

In this research, I focused on the dissenting intellectuals in the 1980s and today to understand the intellectual field and its transformation in Turkey. However, to be able to have a detailed analysis of the intellectual field in Turkey from a Bourdieusian field framework, it is necessary to make a research on the traditional

⁴⁶ For instance, Istanbul Solidarity Academy struggles to find a way to form an organization due to the complexity and limitations of the city as well as the heterogeneity of the academics in Istanbul. Some of the scholars who were part of my research told me how each meeting was held with different people due to these factors, which prevented them from being productive and effective. Kampüssüzler works better for the opportunities and problems of the city of Istanbul in this sense.

intellectuals who are on the side of the status quo as well. I think that an analysis as such would provide important discussions about the intellectual field and its transformation in Turkey. Secondly, a research on the everyday life of solidarity academies would reveal the discussions within and around these organizations, such as the existing hierarchies or power struggles that I have only mentioned briefly in this thesis. Third, due to time limitations, I was only able to choose certain solidarity academies while leaving solidarity academies in other cities and organizations like OFF-University and Solidarity Academy in Germany founded by the scholars in exile out of discussion. I think that a detailed comparative analysis of their activities and methods would expand the discussions I tried to open up in this research. Lastly, as the solidarity academies are still in their formation process, most of the discussions regarding their organizational structure, activities, and productions are still based on hopes, plans, and promises. It would be exciting to observe the execution of these organizations as well as see their contributions to academic and cultural circles, as well as to the cities they were founded in.

APPENDIX

ORIGINAL INTERVIEW QUOTES

1. Betül Acar: Yani Barış Akademisyenleri diyorsun ama her türlü insan var arkasında, aramızda. Yani siyasi görüşleri çok farklı, refleksleri çok farklı...

Zeynep Solmaz: İmza atarken ki refleksleri çok farklı...

Güzin Çelik: İmza atma sebepleri...

B: Yani şimdi şeyi hiç unutmamak gerekiyor. Belki, bilemiyorum, bu benim görüşüm... Yani 7 Haziran'dan sonra olan her şey ve sonbaharda hızlanan dozu... O kadar korkunç şeylerdi ki. Ben eminim mesela hepimizin aklında belli bir şey daha fazla yer etmiş ve şey yapmış olabilir... Hani şey oluyorsun aslında...insanlığın kaldırmıyor. Öyle bir şey bu, politik olmakla çok alakası olan bir şey de değil. Artık vicdanın, insan olma halinin kaldırmadığı bir şeydi. Yani sanıyorum birçok insanın imza verme şeyi aslında öyle oldu. Yani, şey de var tabii, bilmem ne kadar imza veriyorsun hiçbir şey olmuyor.

Z: Evet bazıları tesadüf eseri attı yani.

G: Bir sürü şey imzaladık, bir şey olmadı yani.

B: O da...onu da düşünmüyorsun yani. Bunun böyle büyük bir politik eylem falan olduğunu da düşünmüyorsun.

G: Hiçbir şey olduğunu düşünmüyorsun. Ne işe yarayacak ki... Gene bir imza diyerek böyle...şey yaparak hani...kahrederek falan...

Z: Ben üç dört gün bunu düşünmüştüm.

B: Kendimi hatırlıyorum mesela... Şurama kadar doluyum. Hani atıyorum ama hani bir şeyi yok aslında gibi bir şey. Yani adam bizi politikleştirdi, öyle bir şey oldu hakikaten yani. O öyle konuşup, öyle, o devlet öyle bir refleks verince biz birden politik bir şey olduk. Ve dolayısıyla aramızda aslında her türlü insanın olduğu bir grup. (Kampüssüzler, personal communication, November 2017, on pages 2-3 in the text)

2. ... 1402'lik arkadaşlarımız ayrıldılar. Her gün bir haber geliyor. Her gün bir sarı zarf geliyor. YÖK'ün sonraki yıllardaki etkisini de çok önemsiyorum. Ne kadar zor bir ortamda olduğumuzu, denetlendiğimizi, kontrol edildiğimizi hatırlıyorum. (Yıldız Ecevit, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017, on page 35 in the text)

3. Şubat KHK'sında atılmıştım, 686 No'lu KHK, en kalabalıklardan biriydi. Zaten, o döneme kadar...Eylül'de başlamıştı. Eylül'de, Ekim'de, yanılmıyorsam Aralık'ta, Ocak'ta ve en son biz. Yani süreci görüyorduk ve hatta şey diyorduk 'Arafta bırakmayın bizi, atacaksanız atın. Biz yorulduk her

KHK çıktı denildiğinde işi gücü bırakıp böyle yan yana gelip listelere bakmaktan, atılmaktan değil. Artık bir defa görelim o ismi de rahatlayalım!’ (Dilan Yıldız, personal communication, July 2018, on page 35 in the text)

4. Benim gördüğüm kadarıyla şöyle: Bir, 12 Eylül’ün en karanlık dönemleri ve yan yana gelmenin bile zor olduğu dönemler, toplumsal örgütlenme açısından söylüyorum. BİLAR aydınlar nezdinde bu yan yana gelişi sağladı, Aydınlar Dilekçesi gibi çıkışların hepsi BİLAR faaliyetinin parçalarıydı o dönem. Bu tür bir darbeye karşı, faşizme karşı verilecek bir mücadelede, BİLAR vb. faaliyetler açısından, aydınların önemli bir rolü vardı. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017, on pages 37-38 in the text)

5. Yani BİLAR, başka şey yapmanın mümkün olmadığı belirli koşullarda, militan unsurların çoğunun hala cezaevinde kaldığı bir dönemde gündeme geldi ... Yani 1987-1988’de filan siyasi hareketlerin önder kadrolarının cezaevinde olduğu ya da yurt dışına kaçmış olduğu koşullarda, kalanların ve özellikle 1402’yle atılmış olanların boşluğu doldurma çabasıydı. O günün koşullarında da teslim olmayan, namusunu korumaya çalışan insanların yapabildiklerinin azamisiydi. Şartlar onu gerektiriyordu. (Yıldırım Koç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 42 in the text)

6. Darbeden önce ciddi bir sol politikleşmenin içinden geçmiş, ağır bir yenilgiye uğramış ama buna rağmen yeni döneme hazırlanmak için kendilerinde bir cesaret, umut bulabilmişler. Ve bunu sadece kendileri için değil, belki de en çok bizim için, yeni gelenler için yaptıklarını fark ediyorum. O dönem konuşulanlar artık 1970’li yıllarla ilgili değil, o dönemin yeni Türkiye’si ile ilgili konulardı ... ortam, iklim, benim ve başkalarının bir feminist, hatta bir sosyalist feminist olarak yetişmemize uygundu... Aynı zamanda, insan hakları siyaseti, çevre siyaseti, genel olarak bir sivil toplum, demokrasi perspektifi çok aşılandı bize ya da ben o dönemki tartışmalardan bunu süzdüm. Demokrasi fikri çok güçlü bir fikirdi, her yerden o çıkıyordu, temelde bir demokrasi meselesi vardı ve bu da büyük ölçüde ifade özgürlüğü ve haklarla ilgiliydi, yeni bir tür özneleşme süreciyle ilgiliydi. (Alev Özkazanç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on pages 42-43 in the text)

7. Ortam herkesin birbirine sarıldığı, farklılıkların ikinci plana itilip hayatta kalınmaya ve bir şeyler yapılmaya çalışıldığı bir dönemdi. Yani özellikle cezaevi sürecinde çok farklı kesimlerden insanlar aynı komünde yer aldı. Açlık grevleri yaşandı, bir sürü sıkıntı yaşandı. Mamak... Hala izleri birçoğumuzda vardır. O süreçte kimsenin ayrılıkları ön plana çıkarma gibi bir lüksü yoktu. Hayatın zorladığı bir birliktelik söz konusuydu. O BİLAR’da da devam etti. BİLAR’da başı çekenler ağırlıklı olarak Aziz Bey ve onun çevresindeki sanatçılar ve 1402’liklerdi ilk başlarda. (Yıldırım Koç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 44 in the text)

8. BİLAR açısından Aziz Nesin’in varlığının ve o zamanların şöyle bir rahatlığı vardı. Hemen hemen herkese ulaşabiliyordum ben ve telefonla ulaşıyordum. Bu bence çok önemli. İkincisi, itibar katan ve anahtar rolü oynayan insanlar vardı, biri Cevat Geray, diğeri Aziz Nesin tabii. Ben Ankara Valisi’ni arayıp Aziz Nesin’in avukatıym görüşmem gerekiyor, dediğimde

görülebiliyordum. Randevu alıp valiye gidebiliyorduk, “Niye yasaklıyorsun?” diyebiliyorduk. Cevat Hoca’nın adı geçtiğinde Vali, “Benim hocamdır.” diyebiliyordu, Mülkiye’den dolayı. (Mehmet Özsuca, Hafıza Kaydı, September 2017, on page 45 in the text)

9. Üniversiteden ayrılan arkadaşlarım, ben de az çok katkıda bulundum, ansiklopedicilik yapıyorlardı. Ansiklopedicilik dönemi. Özellikle Ana Britannica diye bir şirket kuruldu. İletişim çeşitli ansiklopediler çıkardı, Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi gibi. Onlara da katkı yapmanın ya da o sürecin içinde rol almanın -yaptığınız katkıya bağlı olarak- az da olsa bir maddi getirisi falan olduğunu düşünmek mümkün. O bir geçiş dönemidir bence. Bir sürü şey bir arada ve birçok isim de örtüşür bu tür şeylerin içinde olan. (Galip Yalman, Hafıza Kaydı, May 2017, on pages 46-47 in the text)

10. Bu yıllar arasında değişen dünyanın akademiye de dönüştürdüğü bir yerde, akademinin sınıfsal profili de değişti. Yani o gün için bakacak olursak, o günün akademisyenleri daha işte ne bileyim en azından kolejlerde, işte daha hani dil bilgilerinin güçlü olduğu liselerden gelmiş... işte daha belki kentli ağırlıklı olarak ve daha sadece kentli değil, daha İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir gibi büyük, daha metropol kentlerden oluşan gruplardı diyebiliriz. Bunları çok kabaca söylüyorum tabii ki. Ama bugün öyle değil. Yani bugün bütün dünyada da, işte nisbi olarak ama Türkiye’de kesinlikle. Yani onun şeyle alakası var... düşük akademisyen ücretleriyle. Dünyada hala biraz daha iyi, dolayısıyla sınıfsal olarak başka bir profil veriyor olabiliyor. Ama Türkiye için öyle değil. Yani, bir kere hem akademisyen nüfusu büyüdü... Bunun en iyi örneği kadınların oranının da hatırı sayılır oranda olmasıdır. Çünkü işte dediğim gibi, çok makbul bir, geçindiren bir meslek değil akademisyenlik. Dolayısıyla hani bütün bunlar bizde sınıfsal olarak dönüşmeyi de beraberinde getirdi. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018, on page 47 in the text)

11. Hani, ben bir aktivist olarak...üniversitede 20 yıllık bir aktivist olarak birçok metni imzaladım. Bu metnin, dolayısıyla, geldiğinde, hatta herhangi bir sorun yok, tabii ki imzalayacağız. Ama bir şeye yaramayacak yine idi derdimiz. Ama yaradığını tahmin ediyorum. Çünkü hem kampanya... Yani, gündem oldu cumhurbaşkanı sayesinde. Hem de bu şekilde uluslararası ilgi de çekildi. Hani Kürt köylerindeki ve Kürt yerleşim yerlerindeki şeyler biraz daha görünür kılındı. O yüzden başarılı olduğuna hükmedebiliriz ... bu imza sürecinin, yani, birtakım Kürt kentlerinin yıkılmasını, Kürtlerin ölmesini engelleyemedi ama en azından üniversitenin pespaye yerler olduğunu çok hızlıca herkese gösterdiği için ben bu şeyin olumlu tarafının böyle olduğunu düşünüyorum. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018, on page 53 in the text)

12. Yani barış imzacıları deyince, çok fazla insan var. Ben bir kısmını tanıyorum tabii ki ama tanımadığım bir sürü kişi var. Ortak bir şey söylemem mümkün değil. Dayanışma Akademileri deyince de yine, kaç kişidir, 100-150, o kadar bile yoktur aslında. Politik görüşlerimiz vs. çok farklı, söylediğimiz şeyler çok farklı. Yine de belki aslında az önce bahsettiğim mevzularla alakası var bizi bağlayan ortak noktaların da. Hepimiz hayata

soldan bakan insanlar diyebilirim belki. Bize sanki bir kurummuşuz gibi yaklaşıyor Barış Akademisyenleri olarak ama değiliz. Öyle kurum adına gibi bir şeyler söyleyemeyiz bu yüzden. Ben en fazla KODA adına bir şeyler söyleyebilirim. Biz bile kendi içimizde çok farklıyız, çok tartışıyoruz. Birimizin söylediğini olduğu gibi kabul etmiyoruz, sorguluyoruz. (Deniz Demir, personal communication, June 2018, on page 57 in the text)

13. Yani, biz daha kalabalığız, daha heterojen bir grubuz. Onlar da heterojen bir grup olabilir ama bize nispeten ben daha homojen bir grup olduklarını düşünüyorum. Yani zaten bir arada olan.. biz yeni tanışan ve çok kalabalık, heterojen bir grubuz. Ve karar alma süreçlerimiz o kadar hızlı olmuyor dolayısıyla. Pratik olarak.. işler o kadar hızlı giden işler olmuyor. (Didem Kahraman, personal communication, July 2018, on pages 57-58 in the text)

14. Türkiye’de geriye doğru gidildikçe entelektüel kamu daralıyor, daha az sayıda insanın oluşturduğu bir şey haline geliyor. Mesela 1980 sonrasında BİLAR vardı ama aynı zamanda Aydınlar Dilekçesi, İnsan Hakları Derneği (İHD), vs. bunların hepsini kotaran az sayıda insan, neredeyse 40-50 kişilik küçük bir ekip vardı; her şeyi onlar yapmışlar. Sonuçta çoğulcu ve güzel bir ortam yaratmışlar. Sonuçta günümüzde çok daha çoğulcu bir ortam var. Öyle 40-50 kişi etrafında dönmüyor. Konular, ilgiler ayrılmış, hareketler büyümüş durumda. Çok merkezi bir entelektüel kamu yok. Belki bu iyi bir şey; bu çoğalma, çeşitlenme iyi bir şey. (Alev Özkazanç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 59 in the text)

15. 12 Eylül'den temel farkımız bu. Bunu... biz Korkut Boratav'ı çağırmıştık, o da 1402'lik olduğu için. “Hocam, bir anlatın, atılacağız biz, ne yapacağız?” diye. O, babasından anlatmaya başladı, Partiv Naili'den. Dedi ki, “Aynı şeyi babam yaşadı. Atıyorlardı, ama elleri mecbur geri alıyorlardı.” Yani adamı sürgüne gönderiyorlar, sonra Milli Kütüphane'yi kurduruyorlar. Atıyorlar bir yere, sonra Dil Tarih'i kurduruyorlar. Adam yok çünkü. Hani dil bilen, bu işe kafa yoran adam yok. Ama şimdi öyle değil. Yani şu anda elini sallasan doktoralıya, yüksek lisanslıya geliyorsun. (Umut Turhan, personal communication, November 2018, on page 60 in the text)

16. Şunu yapabiliriz: Hepimiz kendimize iş buluruz, kişisel çözümümüzü buluruz, bir yandan akademiler olur. Biz bunu yapmayalım dedik. Ama ben bu faaliyeti hayatımı da kazanabildiğim ana akım haline getirebilir miyim? Aynı zamanda bunu toplumsal mücadele aracı haline getirebilir miyiz? Yoksa dayanışma akademileri bitmeye mahkumdur. (Ayça Akbal, personal field notes, November 2017, on page 66 in the text)

17. En büyük sorunumuz paraydı. Bizim karşımızda da para vardı. Baskıyı, orduyu, üniversiteyi temsilen karşımızda dolar vardı. Cepten katkılarla yürüyecek bir iş değildi. Para kazanmak diye bir derdimiz oldu. Ben işsizdim, BİLAR için para kazanmayı düşünüyordum. Ben nasılsa evim var, karım çalışıyor diyor yaşıyordum ama BİLAR nasıl yaşayacak? (Haluk Gerger, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 67 in the text)

18. İlk kuruluşu Aziz Nesin'in bir düşüncesinden ortaya çıktı. O zamanlar Aydınlar Dilekçesi dolayısıyla birlikte çalışıyorduk. Aziz Bey hep eski kıraathaneleri, kahveleri anlatırdı. Eskiden kahvehanelerde okuma odası olurdu, insanlar sadece tavla oynamazdı, bir sosyal toplanma yeri idi. Tabi Aziz Bey bunu niye anlatıyordu? Bir sosyal birlikteliğin yasaklandığı bir çerçeve içinde onu aşmanın bir yolu, kültürün devlet eliyle yozlaştırıldığı bir dönemde bir kültürel odak oluşturma, bir sosyal bağ kurma kaygısı vardı. O koşullarda da bula bula kıraathaneler akla geliyordu. Bu ihtiyaçlara bir ölçüde cevap verebileceği, lanetlilerin bir araya gelebileceği, kitap okuyabileceği, söyleşebileceği bir yer... BİLAR'ın doğuşu bu: “Ne yapalım, nasıl yapalım?” (Haluk Gerger, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 68 in the text)

19. Anladık ki, bize izin vermeyecekler. Nitekim izin de vermediler. Bu uğraş devam ediyordu ama buna karşı bir de dava açmıştık, “Nasıl sen bize bir ortaklık kurma izni vermezsin?” diye Bakanlık’a karşı bir dava da açtık. Bu arada, bizim bu sıkıntılı durumumuzu görünce, eski TİP’li insanlardan Şükriye Hanım geldi ve dedi ki bize, “Yahu ne uğraşıyorsunuz, bizim şirketimiz var, faal de değil. BİLAR, Bilim Araştırma Şirketi, onu size devredelim.” Bu da uygun geldi bize ve güya satın almış olduk. On para vermeden bunlar bize devretmiş oldular, para almadılar. (Cevat Geray, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on pages 69-70 in the text)

20. Aziz Bey o dönemde çok stratejik bir rol oynadı, neredeyse yaşamını adadı. Yerinde durmuyordu, 24 saat bu meseleyi düşünüyordu. O’nun bu tarafını mutlaka not etmek lazım. O olmasaydı, olmazdı. Kuşkusuz prestijliydi, ünlüydü, herkesin çocukluktan beri okuyup tanıdığı bir isimdi. Bu çok önemliydi ama çalışıyor, emek veriyordu. Başka yetenekleri de vardı. Motor güç oydu. Yaratıcı bir zekası vardı, direngen inatçı bir insandı. Bütün bu avantajlarını kullanarak hem Aydınlar Dilekçesi’nde hem de BİLAR’da çalışmaları götürdü. (Haluk Gerger, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 70 in the text)

21. Gerçekten anayasayla ilgili, siyaset bilimiyle ilgili arkadaşlarımız haftada, hemen hemen her akşamüstü, iş çıkışında, işçilerin ve öğrencilerin katılabileceği saatlerde -saat beş, beş buçuktan sonra- seminerler, dersler vermeye başladılar. Bunun karşılığında para olarak, şöyle bir ölçü koydu Aziz Bey, “Bir sigara parasına gelsinler, bize ders anlatsınlar.” O zaman bir Amerikan sigarası aşağı yukarı 2,5 lira mıydı neydi, o kadar bir katkıda bulunma koşuluyla başladık. (Cevat Geray, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 72 in the text)

22. Asli sürdürücü ve sorumlu kişiler vardı dönemsel olarak. Bu kişiler kendi ilgi alanlarıyla ilgili olarak da faaliyet sürdürülüyordu. Örneğin Mahmut Tali Öngören sinema dünyasını biliyordu, dolayısıyla o geldiğinde sinema festivalleri yapılmaya başlandı ... Yıldırım Koç geldiğinde sendikal alana dönük eğitimler ya da broşür dizileri gibi faaliyetler yapılıyordu. İlk dönemin temel faaliyeti sorumlu kişiden bağımsız eğitim seminerleriydi, bir dönem sürdü ama giderek o seminerlere ilginin azaldığı hissedilen bir dönemde bahsettiğimiz çalışmalar başlamıştı. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017, on pages 72-73 in the text)

23. Birincisi, İstanbul'da bu işle uğraşan aydınların politik ve ideolojik konumları ve tutumlarıyla ilişkili olarak farklılıklar vardı. Olumsuz anlamda söylemiyorum bunu, altını çizeyim ... İstanbul'da daha politik arkadaşlar uğraşıyorlardı faaliyetlerle. Onlar da feminist hareketin Türkiye soluyla buluşması –LGBTİ konusunu şimdi tam hatırlamıyorum ama yapılmadığı anlamında söylemiyorum— gibi alanlarla ilgileniyorlardı. Dolayısıyla daha politik ve daha farklı alanlarda seminer dizileri yapıyorlardı. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017, on page 73 in the text)

24. Her dönem kendi bilgisini kendisi üretiyor aslında. Yani, BİLAR mesela çok iyi bir fikirmiş. Sonradan BİLAR'ın kuruluşunda yer alan arkadaşlarla da sohbet etme fırsatımız oldu falan. Çok ciddi bir fikirmiş. Ve o dönemki ihtiyacı... Anonim şirket olarak kurmuşlar mesela BİLAR A.Ş. Dolayısıyla çok acayip geliyor şimdi bize. Sonradan hani bizde bu kolektivist tavırlar hep şirket mantığından uzakta, daha dernek falan türünde oluşumlar ya da daha platform türü oluşumlar ya da devletle bir tür resmi bağı olmayan oluşumlar çerçevesinde bir araya gelmek daha rasyonel gözüküyor bize ama BİLAR mesela çok iyi bir fikirmiş. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018, on pages 74-75 in the text)

25. Daha küçük ölçekli, daha sınırlı birliktelikler... ama daha sonra bu sınırlı birlikteliklerin bir araya gelebildiği, daha belki federatif yapıların ortaya çıkması gerektiğine dair bir hissiyatım var benim ... Bizi gündelik hayatın içinde eylemler o artık belli beklentilerin, belli tercihlerin çok kristalleştiği bir noktada, herkesin böyle büyük bir çerçevede bir araya gelmesi değil, o büyük çerçevenin içinde belli küçük odakların olması gerektiğine dair bir düşüncem var ... Yani herkesin müşterek olduğu, herkesin müşterek olabileceği bir boş-gösteren'den ziyade, herkesin müşterek olduğu kişilerle daha yakın durduğu, daha sonra da onların birlikte hareket edebildiği daha toplumsal, daha genel bir siyaset hattının inşası gerektiğini düşünüyorum. (Umut Turhan, personal communication, November 2018, on pages 75-76 in the text)

26. Ben hoca değilim orada. Yani, evet, patronum, emekçiyim. Orada servis yapıyorum, temizlik yapıyorum, kasada hesap alıyorum ve hani bir temas etmeye çalışıyorum. Ve bunun da beni çok zenginleştirdiğini düşünüyorum. Çünkü bildiğimiz şeyleri, bu Stavrides'in çeviri faaliyeti... Hani şu anda ben sana akademinin etimolojisini, akademinin kuruluşunu anlatsam hoca olurum. Ama ben sahip olduğum bir bilgiyi hayata geçirmeye çalıştığım andan itibaren artık akademisyen değilim herhalde. (Umut Turhan, personal communication, November 2018, on page 78 in the text)

27. Biz bir araya gelelim dedik, işte, bu kendi sloganımızı zaten "Bu kenti terk etmeyeceğiz, geri döneceğiz" diye sloganımızı odalarımızı boşaltırken belirlemiştik. Onun üzerine, aşağı yukarı atılanların tamamı SES ya da Eğitim-Sen üyesi olduğu için ... Eğitim-Sen, sağolsun, Kocaeli şubesi bize çok sahip çıktı. Bize bir oda verdi. Orada toplanmaya başladık... (Vedat Durmaz, personal communication, June 2018, on page 81 in the text)

28. Biz Hayat Bilgisi Okulu'nu katılımcılardan hiç para almadan yürütüyoruz. Ama nasıl yürütüyoruz? İşte, bir fon kuruluşuna başvurduk ve

fon aldık. O fonla kiramızı ödüyoruz ve masrafları ödüyoruz, gibi. Böylece parasız yapabiliyoruz. Evet, kamusal eğitimin parasız olması gerekir ama öyle bir şeyin artık gerçekliği kalmadı. Ancak kamuyu bizim gibi düşünenler ele geçirirse böyle bir şey mümkün olabilir... (Deniz Demir, personal communication, June 2018, on page 84 in the text)

29. Yani, galiba birlikte deneyim içinde birlikte çalışmak çok önemli. Yani, yan yana durmak ... Yani birlikte deneyim üretmek. Birlikte çalışmış olmak, birlikte bir emek sarf etmek. ...belki o hani bilimsel bilgiye bakışımızın benzerliği aslında...hani siyasetlerden de bağımsız. Alternatif bir şey düşlerkenki yakınlığımız belki. Şimdi onu tam tarif edemiyor olabiliriz ama öyle bir şey. Öyle baktığında, evet, daha homojen, daha politik olarak bir arada. Ama, buna rağmen, işte dediğim gibi farklı siyasetlerden gelen, işte yani, Marksist olmayanların da olduğu bir grupken okuma yaptığımızda tepkilerimiz ya da eleştirilerimiz benzeşiyor mesela. O demek ki bilimsel bilgi üretimine ilişkin düşlerimizde ya da yaklaşımlarımızdaki yakınlık belki... (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2017, on pages 87-88 in the text)

30. Belki İstanbul'a böyle bir şey gerekiyor, hani küçük böyle mahallelerde falan gibi. Biz de hani bir mahallenin şeyi gibiyiz. Onun avantajı var, küçük grup olmanın. Ama bu, Eskişehir'in ya da Kocaeli'nin şehirle kurduğu ilişki... asla tabii ki. Yani, öyle bir şey değil. Bizim zaten küçücük bir cürmümüz var yani böyle etrafa ... Dolayısıyla ne yapsan kendi kendine yapıyorsun gibi bir şey var aslında. Zaten öyle büyük şeylerimiz de yok. Yani büyük hareketler de yapmıyoruz. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018, on page 88 in the text)

31. İki dönemin ortak paydası, üniversite ile bağı kesilenlerin toplumla buluşması için mekan ve mekanizmaların kuruluyor olması. O dönem, tek bir çatı altındaydı. Şirket adıyla bir çatı altında faaliyet sürdürüyordu. Şimdi, sokakta, parkta ya da kapalı mekanlarda çeşitli illerde sürdürülen bir faaliyet söz konusu. Bir kitleyle, halkla ve öğrencilerle buluşma çabası söz konusu. Bu çabanın kendisi ortak ama dinamikler farklı elbette. O zaman daha kurumsal bir mekanizma iken bu anlamda şimdi daha enformel. (İrfan Kaygısız, Hafıza Kaydı, July 2017, on page 90 in the text)

32. 2017-2018 dönemi yaptık, 2016-2017...iki eğitim dönemi. Yaklaşık onar konferans yaptık. Ve hani, şöyle, şuradan belki bahsetmek yanlış olmaz. Bunlar aylık periyodik konferanslardı birer ikişer konuşmacının olduğu, kamuya açık konferanslardı. Arada, işte, Mülteci Okulu yapıldı. İnsanlar, ihraç edilmiş olan arkadaşlarımız bir takım toplantılara davet edildiklerinde işte isimlerinin yanına İzmir Dayanışma Akademisi yazdırdılar. Bunların hepsi alışkanlık haline gelmeye başladı. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018, on page 93 in the text)

33. HK: Bugün kurulmaya çalışılan dayanışma akademilerinde de her yerde olduğu gibi tam bir eşitlik sağlanamıyor belki ama katılımcıların arasında unvan, yaş vs. hiyerarşisi pek yok. Belki bunda BİLAR'ın da bir rolü var. Çünkü şu anda bir asistan ve hocanın yan yana durması, arkadaşça ilişkiler

kurması sanki biraz daha rahat oluyor. BİLAR'dan önce daha zor şeylerdi bunlar, bunları birlikte yapıyor olmak muhtemelen ön açıcı da oldu.

Funda Şenol Cantek: Çok doğru. Bunu sadece BİLAR'a borçlu değiliz tabii ama BİLAR'a da borçluyuz. Çünkü o akademik geleneğin çok önemli bir parçasıydı. Akademinin üniversiteler sistemin dışında kalan kısmı çok önemliydi ve esas özerk, bağımsız akademi o üniversiteler sistemin dışında kalan akademiydi. Şimdi de aynı şeyi yaşıyoruz. Türkiye'de aslında belli periyotlarla hep aynı kötü deneyimleri yaşayıp, oradan hep olumlu bir sonuç çıkartarak ilerlemeye çalışıyoruz. (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 99 in the text)

34. Bizler fildişi kulelerinde halktan uzak bir şeyler üreten insanlar değiliz. Bizler, özellikle dayanışma akademileri sayesinde toplumla bütünleştik ... Bizler sadece barış bildirisi sayesinde bir araya gelmiş hocalar değiliz, bizler zaten üniversite nasıl olmalı diye önceden de kafa yürüten insanlardık ... Üniversiteye geri döneceğiz, üniversitenin enkazını kaldıracacağız, akıldışı, bilimdışı ne varsa enkazını kaldıracacağız ... Sloganlara indirgenmiş akademik faaliyet değil öngördüğümüz ... Gerçek anlamda bilim yapmak, günümüz dünyasında mücadeleyi gerektiriyor... (from personal field notes, October 2017, on page 100 in the text)

35. BİLAR, ben işe başladığımda seminer hazırlıkları yapıyordu. O dönem 1402 ile atılan birçok öğretim görevlisi vardı ve aslında BİLAR, üniversitelerden ayrılan hocaların 1980 sonrası kısırlaşan akademik ve entelektüel ortamına yeni bir soluk getirmeleri için düşünülmüş bir projeydi. Üniversitelerde ve dışarıda konuşulamayan her şeyin konuşulabileceği, öğrenci ile öğreticinin yüz yüze iletişim kurabileceği, özgürce bilim üretilebilecek bir yer planlıyorlardı. (Şöhret Baltaş, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 102 in the text)

36. Üniversitede ders kitabı neyse, onun sınırı dışına çıkılmadan konu işleniyordu. O anlamda çok farklıydı. Gerçek üniversite oymuş meğerse. Biz orayı kurs gibi görüyorduk ama gerçek üniversite hocaları oradaymış. Belki de ihraç edilmelerinin nedeni oydu ... O hocalar, 1402'likler, o dönemin iyi hocalarıydı. Tanınmış, ismi duyulan, derslerine talebin çok olduğu hocalardı. Bu hocalar üniversiteden ihraç ediliyor ve sizlere kapılarını açıyor. Öyle bir durumda ne yaparsınız, katılmak istersiniz öğrenmek amacıyla. (Özgür Aydın, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on pages 102-103 in the text)

37. Mesela bizim Türkoloji Bölümü'nde bir hoca ihraç edilmek üzereyken yurtdışına gitti, onla birlikte ihraç edilenler oldu. Kalanlar hızla akademik unvanlar aldılar. Bir gecede profesör olanları hatırlıyorum. Biz öğrencilerin gözünde de şöyle bir şey vardı, "Evet, onların kapısında profesör yazıyor ama dışarıdaki hocalar daha donanımlı hocalar.". O donanımlı hocalara ulaşma derdindeydik. Diğer arkadaşlarım da böyle düşünüyordu. (Özgür Aydın, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 103 in the text)

38. BİLAR'ın son dönemi, önceki kuşakların bilgi birikimi ve akademik vesayet-velayet kazanma mücadelesine karşı da bir meydan okumaydı

aslında. O açıdan da çok önemliydi. “Biz de varız, bizim de söyleyecek sözümüz var ve sizin karşınızda ezik değiliz, özgüvenliyiz, fikrimizi sonuna kadar savunuruz ve aslında eşitlik ilkesine inanıyoruz, daha demokratız.” (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 104 in the text)

39. Onlara meydan okumamıza izin veriyorlardı. Gençlik böyledir, biraz kendinizi kanıtlamaya çalışırsınız. Bu bahsettiğim ekibe benzer hocalar BİLAR’da da vardı. Onları da keşfedince dedik ki, “Başka bir akademi var, başka bir dünya var.” O ekip bize öteki akademinin kapısını açtı ve onlar kariyerlerinde ilerledikçe, biz de belli bir grup olarak akademik kariyere başladıktan sonra Türkiye’de akademi çok daha zengin ve renkli bir hale geldi. Çok daha disiplinler arası oldu. Küçümsenen, dışlanan çalışma alanları ve disiplinlere iade-i itibar söz konusu oldu. Mesela kadın çalışmaları, toplumsal cinsiyet, kent çalışmaları, gündelik hayat, kültürel çalışmalar. Bunlar, bahsettiğim bir önceki kuşak tarafından küçümsenen, pek de itibar görmeyen, bu alanlarda çalışan kişilerle dalga geçilen çalışma alanlarıydı. Bu hocalarla birlikte bu alanlara iade-i itibar olduğunu düşünüyorum. (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 105 in the text)

40. Kuruluşu zorunlu kılan kültürel iklim de değişmeye başlamıştı ama söylediğim isimler oranın müdavim sayısını artırıyordu. Onlar olmasa, bilindik eski hocalar olsa o kadar kalabalık olmayacaktı orası. Başka bir düşünce ikliminin, ekolünün, düşünce sisteminin temsilcisi olan insanlar orada olduğu için oraya çok büyük ilgi oluyordu 1990’larda. Akademideki ana akımlaşmanın artık bir şekilde kırılmaya başladığı bir dönemdi benim öğrenciliğim. (Funda Şenol Cantek, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 105 in the text)

41. Hocalarımız gittikten sonra bizim elimizde artık hiçbir şeyin kalmadığını düşünmüştüm. Çok büyük bir umutsuzluk halindeydim. O yüzden de atıldığımda o kadar üzülmedim yani. Çünkü zaten olmayan bir şeyden atılmak o kadar da önemli değil. Yok çünkü yani. Eğer bilim gerçekliği söyleyemiyorsa, akademisyenler gerçek olanı ifade edemiyorlarsa zaten orada herhangi bir bilimsel faaliyet yürütülmesi mümkün değil ... Bütün muhalif sesleri üniversitenin dışarısına çıkarırsan ve sadece kendi eğitim sisteminin içerisinde bir şeyleri anlatmaya çalışırsan o şekilde bir...toplum yetişecek. Oysa zaten bu amaçla bu dayanışma akademilerini kurduk ... Hem dayanışma akademileriyle birlikte hem dayanışma akademileri dışarısındaki hocalarımızın kendi networkleriyle veya farklı örgütlenme biçimlerimizle birlikte bizim meslek örgütlerimiz, sendikalarımız gibi, biz mağdur durmadık bence. Bunu hala söyleyebiliyorum. Kısıtlamalar ne kadar olsa da söylemeye devam ediyoruz. (Didem Kahraman, personal communication, July 2018, on page 110 in the text)

42. Kabaca hani, '80 sonrası üniversite modeli, yani '80 darbesiyle, YÖK kanunuyla, '82 anayasasıyla oluşmuş olan üniversite modeli ... Kabaca tarif etmek gerekirse, herhangi türden bir bilimsel bilginin üretilmesini ve bunun temel koşulu olan herhangi bir biçimde tanımlanmış akademik özgürlüğün olabildiği, ya da nasıl diyelim, yerleşmesine izin verilen yerler değildi ... Yani hem neoliberal uyum politikaları gereğince, işte üniversite-sanayi işbirliği, şu

bu vs. vs. gibi bir sürü mekanizmalar yerleşti. Hani üniversitedeki öğretim üyesi, öğrenciyi müşteri olarak ve girdiği ders ve şey olarak görmeye başladı. (Alper Arslan, personal communication, August 2018, on page 111 in the text)

43. Yani şimdi şöyle bir şey oldu Türkiye’de. Atılan bazı arkadaşlarımızda da bunu görüyoruz. Biz atıldığımız için üniversiteler kötü değildi, zaten üniversiteler kötüydü! Yani biz bunun küçük ayaklarından birisi olduk. Yani benim için ’50 de benim atılmamdan çok daha büyük bir sorundur bu ülkede. Performans kriterlerinin getirilmesi...bunlar çok daha köklü sorunlar. Atılırsınız, sonrasında...bunlar yine de üniversitenin kıyısında kalan şeyler. Yani bireysel mücadelenizle yol ve yöntem bulacağınız şeyler. Dayanışma akademileri tam da bu noktada, o köhnemiş üniversite düzenine dönük aslında bir umudu yeniden yeşertmeye çalışıyor. Bir, biz de yine aynı şeyi kendi içimizde örgütlüyoruz. Üniversite dediğimiz, bilim dediğimiz, bilgiyi paylaşmak dediğimiz şey dört binayla, bir bilgisayarla, bir sandalyeyle sınırlı değildi...bir amfiyle sınırlı değildi. Her yerde bilim üretilebilir. Nasılsa biz kafelerde, evimizde, kütüphanelerde çalışabiliyorsak bizim öğrencilerimiz de, arkadaşlarımız da ders alabilirler. Hatta daha teşvik edici de olabilir diye düşünüyorum. Bunun çok başarılı örnekleri var. (Dilan Yıldız, personal communication, July 2018, on page 113 in the text)

44. Yani açıkçası direnişin yapılacağı yeri göstermesi açısından önemli. Yani şunu diyorsunuz...üniversite, kampüsü bize çok görürseniz ben dersimi sokakta da anlatırım ve dersimi anlatmam zaten benim direnişimdir. Ben başka bir şey yapmayı bilmem ki. Ders anlatırım, slogan atarım, protesto ederim, yani elimden başka bir şey gelmez, böyle yetişmişimdir. En güçlü silahımız sözlerimiz, bilgimiz, birikimimiz. E madem sen bizi sosyal ölüme terk edeceğini iddia ediyorsun, e sokaktayım işte, beni evime tıkamazsın. Bir mekandan itip başka bir mekana atamazsın. “Ben o depresyonu kabul etmiyorum” demek biraz da. Soğuktan üşüyebilirim ama bak beni dinleyen insanlar var. (Dilan Yıldız, personal communication, July 2018, on page 114 in the text)

45. Ama tabii, burada şöyle bir imkan var. Yani böyle bir sınırlayıcı yok aslında. Yani, şey gibi bir şey, yani Wall Street’te çalışıp komünist kalamayacağın gibi bir şeyken burada öyle bir dert yok. Burası hiçbir yerin Wall Street’i değil ve hiçbir yer aslında burası! Yani bir otoritenin ya da kural koyucunun olmadığı bir yer. Bunun tabii belli sıkıntıları olabilmekle beraber yani burada şeye çok açığız...denemeye. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018, on page 115 in the text)

46. Ya aslında bu deneyim şöyle bir şeydi. Bütün negatifliklerine rağmen, bu deneyim bize fırsatlar da sundu. Örneğin, Kocaeli Üniversitesi’nde biz ikili eğitimi olan, öğrenci sayısı yüksek... Yani sizin Boğaziçi’ne falan hiç benzemez. Bizde, ne bileyim, yetmiş, seksen bin öğrencili, bir hocanın istese de istemese de haftada yirmi saat ders verdiği bir programımız vardı. Öyle olduğu için biz hiç pedagojik gelişime vakit ayıramıyorduk, yapmak istediklerimizi gerçekleştiremiyorduk. Ama bu içinde bulunduğumuz kurumu oluşturunca birtakım deneysel arayışlar içine girebildik. İşte, buna bu

binadan, işte kullandığımız malzemelere, mimarisinden tutun da ilişkilerimize kadar... Mesela burada işte ders demiyoruz atölye diyoruz, öğrenci demiyoruz katılımcı diyoruz, hoca demiyoruz atölye yürütücüsü diyoruz. (Yılmaz Demirkol, personal communication, June 2018, on page 117 in the text)

47. ...öğreten-öğrenen hiyerarşisinin kalkması ve mümkün olduğunca aslında bu her iki taraflılığın...her iki taraf tarafın da deneyimlerinin pratik edilmesi. Yani hem öğreten hem öğrenen olabilmeyi becerebilmek. Tabii bu mesela çok kolay bir şey değil ... Ya da konuların, öğrenilecek malzemelerin yaşamın kendi içinden gelmesi gerektiği. Bir ihtiyaç olarak kendini dayatmış olması gerektiği gibi başlıklar. Mesela bu da o kadar kolay olmayabiliyor. Çünkü, işte biz, mesela, belli şeyleri öğretmeye alışmışız, birileri belli şeyleri belli bir biçimde dinlemeye alışmış. Buraları kırmak da o kadar kolay olmuyor. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018, on page 118 in the text)

48. Yani, biz hani şeye gerçekten inanıyoruz, praxis. Yani olay sadece ders anlatmaktan ibaret değil. Yani ders anlatmayı da farklı yapmak gerektiğine ve bu disiplinlerarasılığın kırılması, aşılması gerektiğine, bu disiplinler sınırlamaların aslında önümüzdeki en büyük engellerden biri olduğuna. Çünkü sadece çalıştığı alanın içerisinde bir mikro bölgeye bakarak çalışmanın çok yabancılaştırıcı, yalnızlaştırıcı ve aslında hani analitik, sorgulayan, eleştiren bakışı da çok ciddi ölçüde zayıflatıcı olduğunu düşünüyoruz. O yüzden mümkün olduğu kadar disiplinlerdışı, -üstü bir çalışma pratiğini önceliyoruz. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018, on page 118 in the text)

49. O dönem artık Türkiye’de siyasi faaliyetin serbestleştiği bir dönemdi. Bir arada bulunarak, birbirimize sığınıp iş yapabileceğimiz tek yer var anlayışı yerine, herkes kendi dükkanını açmaya gitti açıkçası. Siyasi farklılıklar ortaya çıkınca da BİLAR diye bir yapının ihtiyacı ortadan kalktı açıkçası. Herkes kendi siyasi çizgisi doğrultusunda bir şeyler örgütlemeye başladı. (Yıldırım Koç, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 123 in the text)

50. BİLAR işsiz, atılmış akademisyenler üzerine kurulmuştu. Üniversitelere dönüş başlayınca, bu durum BİLAR’ı zorladı ... Yani hem insan hem maddi kaynaklarımız da yavaş yavaş kurumaya başladı. Zaman doldu, direnmek de doğru değildi. Yeni koşullarda başka mücadele yolları aramak lazımdı artık. BİLAR’da ısrar etmek belki engelleyici bile olurdu. Zaten akıntıya karşı kürek çekmek olurdu, olmazdı. (Haluk Gerger, Hafıza Kaydı, June 2017, on page 123 in the text)

51. Yani böyle bir ülkede değiliz, rahvan rahvan bir gün bir şey yapacak. Yani böyle bir lüksümüz yok bizim. İmkânı yok. Dolayısıyla yarını görmüyorsun. Yani yaptığın hiçbir şeyi yarını görerek yapmıyorsun ama sanki önünde yüzyıllar varmışçasına yapıyorsun. Yani sonsuz bir zaman önümüzdeymiş şeyiyle yapıyoruz yaptığımız bütün çalışmaları, hani bütün bir yaşam sanki...ölmeyecekmiş, yaşlanmayacakmış, düşmeyecekmiş gibisine kurguladığın bir şeyde yapıyorsun bir yandan...ama bir yandan da hani

aslında hiçbir şeyi, önünü görmediğin bir şeyde. Ağır distopya tablosu içinde, hani böyle kara, karanlık ve yağlı bir duman hepimizi böyle bastırmış gibi, onun içinde, hiç kimseyi görmezken yapmaya devam ediyorsun. Böyle bir şey aslında. (Betül Acar, personal communication, November 2018, on page 125 in the text)

REFERENCES

- Academics for Peace. (n.d.-a). Academics for Peace: About us. Retrieved from <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/1>
- Academics for Peace. (n.d.-b). Academics for Peace: Hearing statistics. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/u/2/d/e/2PACX-1vT05GTWUQMDot1iPfMsieJsWLGBoBbNlJyLP5IdtvJVEcKRw8C8qMxFXPighYZkz7pf2ENP2bXZ3DMo/pubhtml?gid=1873917137&chrome=false&wgdget=false>
- Academics for Peace. (n.d.-c). Academics for Peace: Lawsuits. Retrieved from <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/431>
- Academics for Peace. (n.d.-d). Academics for Peace: Solidarity. Retrieved from <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/Dayan%C4%B1%C5%9Fma>
- Acar, Y. G. & Coşkan, C. (2019). Solidarity platforms in Turkey and their impact on individual-level mobilization, sources of learning, and the future of academia in Turkey. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*. Revised and resubmitted.
- Akça, İ., Algül, S., Dinçer, H., Keleşoğlu, E. & Özden, B.A. (2018). *Olağanlaştan ohal: Khk'ların yasal mevzuat üzerindeki etkileri*. Retrieved from https://tr.boell.org/sites/default/files/ohal_rapor_web.pdf
- Aktaş, M. (2014). *Çatışma çözümleri ve barış*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Alpay, N., & Tahmaz, H. (2015). *Barış açısını savunmak*. İstanbul: Metis.
- Althusser, L. (2001). *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). New York: Monthly Review Press. (Original work published 1971).
- Altıparmak, K., & Akdeniz, Y. (2017). *Barış için akademisyenler: Olağanüstü zamanlarda akademiye savunmak*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Amin, A., & Howell, P. (2016). Thinking the commons. In Amin, A., & Howell, P. (Eds.), *Releasing the commons: Rethinking the futures of the commons* (pp. 1-17). London: Routledge.
- Amnesty International. (2017). *No end in sight: Purged public sector workers denied a future in Turkey*. Retrieved from <https://www.amnestyusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/No-End-In-Sight-ENG.pdf>
- Amnesty International. (2019). *Turkey: Amnesty International's brief on the human rights situation - Turkey's state of emergency ended but the crackdown on human rights continues*. Retrieved from <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/eur44/9747/2019/en/>

- Aras, N. K., Dölen, E., Bahadır, O. R., Çelik, T., Tekeli, I., & Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi. (2007). *Türkiye'de üniversite anlayışının gelişimi*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi.
- Archard, D. (2013). Dirty hands and the complicity of the democratic public. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 16(4), 777-790.
- Arendt, H. (2003). *Responsibility and judgment*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Arslan, A. (2011). *Türkiye'de üniversite ve siyaset*. İstanbul: Paraf Yayınları.
- Arthur, P. (2009). How "transitions" reshaped human rights: A conceptual history of transitional justice. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 31(2), 321-367.
- Aydın, Ö. (2017, June 29). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Aytaç, A. M., & Yılmaz, Z. (2008), Devlet-piyasa ikileminin ötesinde bir mücadele alanı olarak üniversite. In Akyol, S., Coşkun, M. K, Yılmaz, Z., Aydın, M. B., & Altınpolat, R. (Eds.), *Dönüştürülen üniversiteler ve eğitim sistemimiz* (pp. 409-424). Ankara: Eğitim Sen.
- Bakırezer, G., Demirer, D. K., & Yeşilyurt, A. (2018). In pursuit of an alternative academy: The case of Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity. *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society*, 16(1), 234-240.
- Baltaş, Ş. (2017, June 14). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Beerbohm, E. (2012). *In our name: The ethics of democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Benda, J. (1955). *The betrayal of the intellectuals: La trahison des clercs*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bianet. (2016a). Erdoğan'dan akademisyenlere: Ey aydın müsveddeleri. Retrieved from <https://bianet.org/bianet/toplum/171012-erdogan-dan-akademisyenlere-ey-aydin-musveddeleri>
- Bianet. (2016b). İstanbul'daki barış için akademisyenler: Barış talebinde ısrarcıyız. Retrieved from <https://bianet.org/bianet/ifade-ozgurlugu/172877-istanbul-daki-baris-icin-akademisyenler-baris-talebinde-istrarciyiz>
- BirAraDa Dernek. (2019). *BirAraDa kuruluş öyküsü*. Retrieved from <http://biraradadernek.org/en/index.php/2019/04/16/birarada-dernegi-kurulus-oykusu/>

- Birgün. (2015). 12 Eylül darbesinin korkunç bilançosu. Retrieved from <https://www.birgun.net/haber-detay/12-eylul-darbesinin-korkunc-bilancosu-78576.html>
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brisbane Free University. (n.d.). Brisbane Free University: About. Retrieved from <https://brisbanefreeuniversity.org/about/>
- Brookfield, S. D. (2005). Praxis. In L. M. English (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of adult education* (pp. 504-508). New York: Palgrave.
- Burbach, R. (2001). *Globalization and postmodern politics: From zapatistas to high-tech robber barons*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Butler, J. (2017). Academic freedom and the critical task of the university. *Globalizations*, 14(6), 857-861.
- Büyükokutan, B. (2010). "Autonomy from What?" Popular Taste, Universities, and the U.S. Poetry Field, 1910-1975. *Political Power and Social Theory*, 21, 3-48.
- Cantek, F. Ş. (2017, June 15). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Carlson, A., & Walker, B. (2018). Free universities and radical reading groups: learning to care in the here and now, *Continuum*, 32(6), 782-794.
- Çelik, M. (2008). *Üniversitede cadı avı: 1948 DTCTF tasfiyesi ve P.N.Boratav'ın müdafası*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Çetinkaya, Y. D. (Ed.). (2008). *Toplumsal hareketler: Tarih, teori ve deneyim*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Dacheux, E. (2012). *Kamusal alan* (H. Köse, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları. (Original work published 2008).
- De Angelis, M. (2017). *Omnia sunt communia*. London: Zed Books.
- De Wijze, S. (2014). Political accountability and moral pollution: Defending democratic dirty hands. *Biblioteca della libertà*, XLIX(209), 45-62.
- Dirlik, A. (2008). Pasifik perspektifinde toplumsal hareketler, çağdaş radikal siyasetin soyağacı üzerine düşünceler, tarih ve kuram arasında toplumsal hareketler. In Çetinkaya, Y. D. (Ed.), *Toplumsal hareketler: Tarih, teori ve deneyim* (pp.65-83). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Donatich, J. (2001, January 26). The future of the public intellectual: A forum. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <https://www.thenation.com/article/future-public-intellectual-forum/>
- Downie, R. S. (1969). Collective responsibility. *Philosophy*, 44(167), 66-69.
- Dölen, E. (2009). *Türkiye üniversite tarihi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Ecevit, Y. (2017, July 10). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Erdem, E., & Akın, K. (2019). Emergent repertoires of resistance and commoning in higher education. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 118(1), 145-163.
- Evrensel. (2016). Evren için 'hain', Erdoğan için 'karanlık' aydınlar. Retrieved from <https://www.evrensel.net/haber/269933/evren-icin-hain-erdogan-icin-karanlik-aydinlar>
- Eyal, G., & Buchholz, L. (2010). From the sociology of intellectuals to the sociology of interventions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36(1), 117-137.
- Firat, A., & Akkuzu, İ. (2015). The commodification process of higher education and the changing nature of academic labour in Turkey. *Critique: Journal of Socialist Theory*, 43(3-4), 375-393.
- Firat, B. Ö. (2018). *Küresel hareket döngüleri ve müşterekleştirme hareketleri*. Retrieved from <https://musterekler.sehak.org/2018/12/07/kuresel-hareket-donguleri-ve-mustereklestirme-hareketleri-begum-ozden-firat/>
- Foucault, M. (1984). Truth and power. In Rabinow, P. (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 51- 75). New York: Pantheon.
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere. *Social Text*, 8(3), 56-80.
- Fuller, S. (2004). Intellectuals: An endangered species in the 21st century? *Economy and Society*, 33(4), 463-483.
- Geray, C. (2017, June 14). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Gerger, H. (2017, June 3). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Gill, R. (2009). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neo-liberal academia. In Flood, R. & Gill, R. (Eds.), *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections* (pp. 228-244). London: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (2006). *The Giroux reader*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

- Gouldner, A. W. (1993). *Entelektüelin geleceği*. İstanbul: ETİ Kitapları.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers.
- Guilhot, N. (2002). The transition to the human world of democracy: Notes for a history of the concept of transition, from early marxism to 1989. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), 219-242.
- Hafıza Kaydı. (n.d.-a). BİLAR A.Ş. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/kapak>
- Hafıza Kaydı. (n.d.-b). BİLAR A.Ş: Arşiv (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/arsiv>
- Hafıza Kaydı. (n.d.-c). BİLAR A.Ş: Neden Hafıza Kaydı. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/hafiza-kaydi-101/hikaye>
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2009). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hatiboğlu, M. T. (1998). *Türkiye üniversite tarihi 1845-1997*. Ankara: Selvi Yayınevi.
- Hirsch, E. (1998). *Dünya üniversiteleri ve Türkiye'deki üniversitelerin gelişmeleri cilt II*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Holmwood, J. (2017). The university, democracy and the public sphere. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38(7), 927-942.
- HRFT. (2016). *Factsheet on declared curfews in Turkey between 11 December 2015 and 8 January 2016*. Retrieved from <http://en.tihv.org.tr/fact-sheet-on-declared-curfews-in-turkey-between-11-december-2015-8-january-2016/>.
- HRFT Academy. (2018a). Turkey's academy under the state of emergency. *Academics for Human Rights: Supporting Academics As A Human Rights Actor In A Challenging Context*, (2). Retrieved from <http://www.tihvakademi.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/HRFT-Academy-Newsletter-2.pdf>
- HRFT Academy. (2018b). Information note on the judicial proceedings against Turkey's Academics for Peace. *Academics for Human Rights: Supporting Academics As A Human Rights Actor In A Challenging Context*, (3). Retrieved from <http://www.tihvakademi.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/B%C3%9CLTEN03.2108ENG.pdf>
- Human Rights Watch. (2015). *Turkey: Mounting security operation deaths*. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2015/12/22/turkey-mounting-security-operation-deaths>
- Human Rights Watch. (2016a). *Turkey: Events of 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2017/country-chapters/turkey>

- Human Rights Watch. (2016b). *Turkey: Academics jailed for signing petition*. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/03/16/turkey-academics-jailed-signing-petition>
- Hürriyet. (2016). Cumhurbaşkanı Erdoğan'dan imza atan akademisyenlere: Terörün yanında saf tuttular. Retrieved from <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/cumhurbaskani-erdogandan-imza-atan-akademisyenlere-terorun-yaninda-saf-tuttular-40040614>
- Işıklı, A. (1987). Bilar bir dönemi kapattı. *Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi*, (88), 61-64.
- Kampüssüzler. (n.d.-a). Kampüssüzler: Manifesto. Retrieved from <https://www.kampussuzler.org/manifesto>
- Kampüssüzler. (n.d.-b). Kampüssüzler: Tarihçe. Retrieved from <https://www.kampussuzler.org/tarihce>
- Kant, I. (1784). *What is enlightenment?* Retrieved from <http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/CCREAD/etscc/kant.html>
- Kavili Arap, S. (2010). Türkiye yeni üniversitelerine kavuşurken: Türkiye’de yeni üniversiteler ve kuruluş gerekçeleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 65(1), 1-29.
- Kaygısız, İ. (2017, June 21). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi. (2017). *Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi’nin ilk uzun yılı*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi. (n.d.). Kocaeli Dayanışma Akademisi: Seminerlerimiz. Retrieved from <https://www.kocaelidayanisma.org/tr/seminerlerimiz/>
- Koç, Y. (2017, June 6). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Kurzman, C. (2008). *Democracy denied, 1905-1915*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kurzman, C., & Owens, L. (2002). The sociology of intellectuals. *Annual Review of Sociology*, (28), 63-90.
- Kültürhane. (n.d.). Kültürhane: Meramımız. Retrieved from <http://www.kulturhane.org/tr/bir-hane-bin-umut/meramimiz>
- Lelandais, G. E. (2009). Yeni toplumsal hareketler, sınıf mücadelesi ve ütopya. In Çoban, B. (Ed.), *Yeni toplumsal hareketler: Küreselleşme, direniş, ütopya: Küreselleşme çağında toplumsal muhalefet* (pp. 63-91). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.

- Lewis, H.D. (1948). Collective responsibility, *Philosophy*, 23(84), 3-18.
- Lordoğlu, K. (Ed.). (2018). *Akademisyenlerden KHK öyküleri*. İstanbul: Notabene Yayınları.
- Lorenz, C. (2013). If you're so smart, why are you under surveillance? Universiteiten, neoliberalisme en new public management. *De Uil van Minerva*, 26(3), 224-255.
- Mannheim, K. (1993). The sociology of intellectuals. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 10(3), 69-80.
- Mayo, P. (2015). *Hegemony and education under neoliberalism: Insights from Gramsci*. London: Routledge.
- Mazici, N. (1995). Öncesi ve sonrasıyla 1933 üniversite reformu. *Birikim*, (76), 56-70.
- Meister, R. (2011). *After evil: A politics of human rights*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). Role of the intellectual in public bureaucracy. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 23(4), 261-78.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (n.d.). *Üniversiteler kanunu*. Retrieved from <http://www.meb.gov.tr/meb/hasanali/egitimekatkileri/universiteler.htm>
- Neary, M., & Winn, J. (2017). The Social Science Centre, Lincoln: The theory and practice of a radical idea. *Roars Transactions: A Journal on Research Policy and Evaluation*, 5(1), 1-12.
- Necip, Y. (1981). The coup in Turkey. *Insurgent Sociologist*, 10(3), 81-82.
- Negt, O., & Kluge, A. (1993). *Public sphere and experience: Toward an analysis of the bourgeois and proletarian public sphere* (A. Oksiloff, P. Labanyi, & J. O. Daniel, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1972).
- Nesin, A., Göksel, H. A., & Gerger, H. (1986). *Aydınlar dilekçesi davası*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
- Neuman, W.L. (2006). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Toronto: Pearson.
- OFF-University. (n.d.). OFF-University. Retrieved from <http://off-university.com/>
- OHCHR. (2017). *Report on the human rights situation in south-east Turkey: July 2015 to december 2016*. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/TR/OHCHR_South-East_TurkeyReport_10March2017.pdf

- Olağanüstü Hal Kapsamında Bazı Tedbirler Alınması Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararname. (2016, October 29). *Resmi Gazete*, (29872). Retrieved from <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2016/10/20161029-4.htm>
- Onur Hamzaoglu'na Özgürlük. (n.d.). Onur Hamzaoglu'na Özgürlük. Retrieved from <http://onurhamzaoglunaozgurluk.org/>
- Orman, H. (Ed.). (2005). *Bindokuzyüzelli'den ikibinbeş'e: Aydınlar, bildirgeler, ilanlar*. İstanbul: Kolektif Yapım Yayın.
- Ouellet, M., & Martin, É. (2018). University transformations and the new knowledge production regime in informational capitalism. *Triplec*, 16(1), 78-96.
- Öncü, A. (1993). Academics: The west in the discourse of university reform. In Heper, M., Öncü, A., & Kramer, H. (Eds.), *Turkey and the west: Changing political and cultural identities* (pp. 142-176). London: I.B. Tauris.
- Öndül, H. (2017). *Geçmişle yüzleşme: 12 eylül travmasını aşmak*. Retrieved from <https://www.ihd.org.tr/gecmisle-yuzlesme-12-eylul-travmasini-asmak/>
- Özel, O. (2017). Üniversite ve "akademya": Hüzünlü bir yokoluş hikayesi. *Birikim*, (335), 52-61.
- Özen, H. (2002). *Entelektüelin dramı: 12 eylül'ün cadı kazanı*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Özkazanç, A. (2017, June 28). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Özşuca, M. (2017, September 22). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>
- Posner, R. A. (2003). *Public intellectuals*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Raunig, G. (2013). *Factories of knowledge, industries of creativity*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Robbins, B. (1993). *The phantom public sphere*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Roggero, G. (2011). *The production of living knowledge: The crisis of the university and the transformation of labor in Europe and North America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Said, E. (1994). *Representations of the intellectual*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sennett, R. (1993). *Authority*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Shils, E. (1972). *The intellectuals and the powers, and other essays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Smiley, M. (2017). Collective responsibility. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved May 2, 2019, from <https://plato.stanford.edu>
- Stavrides, S. (2016). *Common space: The city as commons*. London: Zed Books.
- Szeman, I. (2002). Introduction: Learning to learn from Seattle. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 24(1-2), 1-12.
- T24. (2015). İşte 12 eylül darbesinin korkunç bilançosu. Retrieved from <https://t24.com.tr/haber/iste-12-eylul-darbesinin-kanli-bilancosu,296166>
- Tekeli, I. (2010). *Tarihsel bağlam içinde Türkiye’de yükseköğretimin ve YÖK’ün tarihi*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Terzi, C., Yuwayapan, E., & Başer, E. (2013). *Kapitalizmin kısılcığında doğa, toplum ve bilim: Onur Hamzaoglu olayı*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.
- Thompsett, F. (2017). Pedagogies of resistance: Free universities and the radical re-imagination of study. *Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 24-41.
- TİHV Akademi. (2019). *Barış için akademisyenler vakasının kısa tarihi*. Retrieved from <http://www.tihvakademi.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Barisicinakademisyenlervakasi.pdf>
- Tilly, C. (2006). *Regimes and repertoires*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Timur, T. (2000). *Toplumsal değişme ve üniversiteler*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Ulusoy, Ö. (2017). 80’li yıllarda bir aydın girişiminin kuruluş serüveni: Ekin A.Ş.’den Bilar A.Ş.’ye. *Toplumsal Tarih*, (288), 76-84.
- Üniversiteler Kanunu, 4936. (1946, June 18). *Resmi Gazete*, (6336). Retrieved from <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/6336.pdf>
- Ünlü, B. (2016). *BAK bildirisi, entellektüellik ve akademik özgürlük*. Retrieved from ayrintidergi.com.tr/bak-bildirisi-entelektuellik-ve-akademik-ozgurluk/.
- Vatansever, A. (2018). Partners in crime: The anti-intellectual complicity between the state and the universities in Turkey. *The Journal of Interrupted Studies*, 1(1), 3-25.
- Vatansever, A. & Yalçın, M. (2016). *Ne ders olsa verimiz*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Weber, M. (1946). Science as a vocation. In C. W. Mills & H. H. Gerth (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (pp. 129-156). New York: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1919).
- Yalman, G. (2017, May 30). Interview by Hafıza Kaydı [Transcript]. BİLAR A.Ş: Tanıklıklar. Retrieved from <http://www.hafizakaydi.org/5subat/bilar/taniklik>

- Yeni Akit. (2016). İmzacılar aydın değil tam karanlık. Retrieved from <https://www.yeniakit.com.tr/haber/imzacilar-aydin-degil-tam-karanlik-120961.html>
- Yeni Şafak. (2016). PKK'nın suç ortakları: Hendekçi akademisyenler. Retrieved from <https://www.yenisafak.com/gundem/pkknin-suc-ortaklari-hendekci-akademisyenler-2387794>
- Young, I. M. (2011). *Responsibility for Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- YÖK. (n.d.). YÖK: Tarihçe. Retrieved February 6, 2019, from <http://www.yok.gov.tr/web/guest/tarihce>
- Yüce, T. T. (1971). *Üniversite ve özerklik : Üniversite özerkliği ve üniversitenin denetimi problemi üzerine araştırmalar ve çözüm yolu teklifleri*. Erzurum: Tur Yayınevi.
- Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi. (n.d.). *Yıllara Göre Başvuran Yerleşen ÖSYS İstatistikleri*. Retrieved from <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/>