HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL ENCOUNTERS WITH THE NONHUMAN:
HABITAT II, THE CRISIS OF COHABITATION,
AND THE WIT(H)NESSING DOGS

EDA TARAK

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2017

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL ENCOUNTERS WITH THE NONHUMAN:

HABITAT II, THE CRISIS OF COHABITATION,

AND THE *WIT(H)NESSING* DOGS

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

Eda Tarak

Boğaziçi University

2017

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Eda Tarak, 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 ....24.02.2017..

ABSTRACT

Historical and Political Encounters with the Nonhuman:

Habitat II, the Crisis of Cohabitation, and the Wit(h)nessing Dogs

This research addresses a set of questions regarding the agency of dogs, particularly the memory that the stray dogs of Istanbul may have historically performed during a specific episode of crisis and dislocation in the city — and how thinking of dogs as witnesses can help us in understanding wider social and political issues of displacement, inequality, exclusion and democracy. The thesis focuses on the weeks leading up to Habitat II: The Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, when the Istanbul local authorities, in preparation for the conference, decided to get rid of the stray dogs living on the European side of the city by poisoning them. The urge for national progress and the discourse of humanism that are manifested in the modernist interventions of Habitat II preparations are problematized. In the course of this research, I met participants from the conference organization who were involved in the ecological and political discussions surrounding it. I also looked at communities who were pushed out of the city center during the same period, including the "Saturday Mothers" and the transgender community. Human histories are always entangled with the histories of nonhumans. I tried to lay out a potentiality to think, recall, remember and *wit(h)ness* with the nonhuman. I argued that this potentiality for *wit(h)nessing* did already reverberate in the ways that we cohabit the Earth and dwell in neighborhoods. From this opening, I was able to frame the city space and its habitants differently in their plural relationality, in their ability to care and respond.

ÖZET

İnsan Olmayanla Tarihsel ve Politik Karşılaşmalar:

Habitat II, Ortak Yaşamın Krize Uğraması ve Tanıklık Eden Köpekler

Bu araştırma, İstanbul'daki sokak köpeklerinin kent içerisindeki belirli bir kriz ve yerinden edilme deneyimi sırasında yapmış oldukları tanıklığa ilişkin bir takım soruları ele alıyor; ve köpekleri tanık olarak düşünmenin yerinden edilme, eşitsizlik, dışlanma ve demokrasi gibi daha geniş sosyal ve siyasal konuları anlamamıza yardımcı olabileceğini savunuyor. Tez, Birleşmiş Milletler İnsan Yerleşimleri Konferansı Habitat II'nin hazırlık sürecinde yerel makamların kentin Avrupa yakasında yaşayan sokak köpeklerini zehirleyerek onlardan kurtulmaya karar verdikleri tarihe odaklanıyor. Buradan hareketle tez, Habitat II hazırlıklarının modernist müdahaleleriyle görünür olan ulusal ilerleme ve humanizm söylemini sorunsallaştırıyor. Tez, dönemin politik ve ekolojik tartışmalarına katkıda bulunmuş konferans katılımcıları ve yöneticileriyle yapılan görüşmeler aracılığıyla, köpeklerin zehirlenmesinin organizasyonun akışında ve demokratik işleyişinde bir krize yol açtığını savunuyor. Hazırlıklar sırasında zorla yerinden edilmiş diğer topluluklara, mahallelerinden zorla çıkarılmış trans kadınlara ve Cumartesi Anneleri'nin deneyimlerine yer vererek bu krizin içerisinden başka türlü bir tanıklık etme ve sorumluluk anlatısı kurmayı amaçlıyor. Burada insan olmayanla beraber düşünme, mesken tutma ve tanıklık etmenin imkanlarını göstermeye çalıştım. Tanıklık etmenin sunduğu açıklıktan bakarken, kent alanını ve bu alanda yaşayanları kendi farklılıkları içerisinde, ilişkilerinin çoğulluğunda ve birbirlerine bakıp cevap verme becerileriyle tasvir etmeye çalıştım.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Meltem Ahıska, for her indispensable guidance and support with regard to the writing of this thesis. Her contributions were vital for shaping the material and arguments of this thesis. I would also like to thank Ayfer Bartu Candan and Halide Velioğlu for their invaluable recommendations for ways to do the research, its wider meaning and significance. Halide Veloğlu's object ethnography class introduced me to the idea of writing and thinking with the nonhuman, which was critical for this thesis. Şevval Kılıç, Filiz Karakuş, Emel Yıldız, Korhan Gümüş and Yiğit Güloksüz shared their testimonies with me; these conversations helped me to form my arguments. Lastly, a part of this thesis has been funded by SALT Research Funds. I would like to thank them for their generous support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 The Anthropocene 12
1.2 Nonhuman agency 14
1.3 On thinking 20
1.4 Witness and wit(h)ness in mind 26
CHAPTER 2: HABITAT II 33
2.1 The national report 39
2.2 The municipality pamphlets, local and global concerns 42
2.3 The crisis of display 47
2.4 Violence and civility 52
2.5 Dogs of 1910 54
2.6 Map for the Congress Valley: A history of displacement 57
CHAPTER 3: REMEMBERING THE EVENT 66
3.1 The context 67
3.2 What to look for in an archive? 69
3.3 Crisis 74
3.4 Ülker Street 80
3.5 Disappearance 94
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION 109
REFERENCES 116

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This research addresses a set of questions regarding the agency of dogs, more particularly, the memory that the stray dogs of Istanbul may have historically performed during a specific episode of crisis and dislocation in the city; and how thinking of dogs as witnesses can help us in understanding wider social and political issues of migration, inequality, exclusion and democracy. The thesis focuses on the weeks leading up to Habitat II: The Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, when the Istanbul local authorities in preparation for the conference decided to get rid of the stray dogs living on the European side of the city by poisoning them.

In the spring of 1996, Istanbul was getting ready for Habitat II. The conference's main theme and purpose was officially announced as addressing two themes: "adequate shelter for all" and "sustainable human settlements development in an urbanizing world" (United Nations, n.d., para. 2). In the official conference announcement, it is specifically indicated that the conference puts human beings at the center of its concerns for sustainable development and sustainable human settlements. It is also indicated that those concerns are not separate from a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature (para. 2). Conference organizers and intellectuals in Turkey took it as an opportunity to address a moral stand in metropolitan settlements (Tekeli, 1996, p. 57). This moral stand was based on a universal and transcendental understanding of fundamental human rights for every nation to agree upon and contribute to. The authorities also took it as an opportunity to address issues about participatory democracy in a tense political environment

divided by the Islamist and secular representative frames. Non-governmental organizations and actors were invited to participate in meetings at many levels including preparations, information sharing, writing of the national report and implementation.

The days leading up to Habitat II were filled with a tense political environment, as I will be explaining in the second chapter. In Istanbul, there was an ideological controversy between the local authorities, the municipality, and the central government. Nevertheless, in the summer of 1996, preparations for the conference were hasty in Istanbul, especially in the neighboring streets and squares of the Conference Valley[1]. During the week of the event, there were massive security measures next to the amelioration works. In newspaper columns, writers reported seeing armored tanks passing through the street and buses full of police officers (Gülüm, 1996). Many roads were cordoned off and closed to traffic. In the same weeks, stray dogs in Istanbul were poisoned with strychnine-injected meatballs placed in parks and on street corners by the municipality. At first, the poison affected cats and pet dogs. Stray dogs came after them, but the extent of the poisoning was not limited to these.

In my thesis I will be problematizing the urge for national progress and the discourse of humanism that are manifested in the modernist interventions of the Habitat II preparations. I think of these interventions as reflections of the colonial logic of power that renders both humans and nonhumans controllable and manageable. When I say the "colonial logic of power", I refer to the implicit assumptions of European colonialism that remained mostly invisible in the

[1] Conference Valley, placed in between Maçka and Beyoğlu neighborhoods, was designed to enable conference tourism in Istanbul. The area includes an old sports center complex that was transformed into a congress hall and high-rise hotels to provide accommodation for the visitors. Existing university halls in the same area were also allocated to be used for the Habitat II conference.

representations of European modernity but contributed to the hegemony of particular forms of knowledge and practices of power discriminating against racial, gender, and species differences. This logic of power rests on the domination of nature and the people of non-European societies and has its continuing legacies in contemporary societies. I argue in my thesis that the interventions during the Habitat II preparations share a similar logic of such domination that has rendered certain communities and human and non-human animals as removable objects for the sake of constructing a pure and unified nationality to be displayed for the Western gaze of foreign participants of the UN conference. As I will be arguing in Chapter 2, this specific logic of power creates particular distinctions; and within these distinctions, the one who is supposedly close to the 'nature' becomes the object of extreme violence (Balibar, 2009, p. 15). In that respect, the singular events that disrupted the holistic frame of power were very important for this research. These singular events, either in the form of a crisis of the bodily functions, a crisis in organizational transact, or a crisis of the democratic ideals put forward by Habitat II reveal the incompetency of the human-centric frames that shape the conditions of dwelling and inhabiting. Instead, I embrace an understanding of "making worlds" through human-nonhuman "assemblages" in our dwelling habits (Tsing, 2015, p. viii).[2] My understanding of making a dwelling— "cohabitation", as I prefer to conceptualize it with reference to Judith Butler—is closely linked to memory and witnessing (Butler, 2012, p. 180). With regard to memory, I eschew from thinking of it in terms of a distinct past that is isolated from struggles of the present. On the contrary, I suggest a work of witnessing or *wit(h)nessing* that indicates the recognition of an other's[3] ordeal by a

[2] Anna Tsing (2015) conceptualizes "making worlds" and "assemblages" as entangled ways of human and nonhuman living that tangle with and sometimes interrupt each other in multidirectional histories (p. viii).
[3] *Other* as in terms of "the one over whom power is exercised" (Foucault, 1982, p. 220).

response and responsibility closely tied to—and happens in—the present. I borrow the term *wit(h)nessing* from Bracha Ettinger's conceptualization of witnessing the shared traces of shared trauma that happens in a shared space and shared living (Ettinger, 1999). It reverberates in the ways that we cohabit the Earth and dwell in our neighborhoods.

In the course of this research, I met participants from the conference organization who knew about the event and had actively participated in the ecological and political discussions surrounding it. I came across communities who were pushed out of the city center during the same period, including the "Saturday Mothers", and the transgender community was forcibly exiled to the outskirts of the city as part of the preparations for the conference. Thinking about the human communities who also have been pushed out of the city space as were the stray dogs opens up a theoretical and political space in which the question of whether these two species were able to witness or wit(h)ness each other's ordeal can be addressed. The violence affecting these communities contradicted the conference organizers' and local authorities' intentions to speak for a global audience with an urge to keep up with modern demands and a governmental arrogance to let live and let die. Such encounters and their ongoing impact in the early 2000s forced me to take a closer look at the stray animals' evacuation from the city within a broader perspective of displacement, violence and modernity as progress. I have found out that the catastrophe that took place in a field of commons for the two different species (human and dog) reveals a potential for cohabitation in the neighborhoods which were rendered uninhabitable for certain communities in Istanbul throughout its history of modernity.

Methodologically, I made use of daily newspaper archives to trace the public discussions about the poisoning of dogs prior to the UN convention. Essentially, I had to trace a catastrophe experienced by the nonhuman via a human-made archive; I think of it as a productive challenge to reflect upon the common spheres that human and nonhuman share and to reflect on the limitations and meaning of archives. When archival data became insufficient to refer the existing transactions of power, I turned to communities who have been pushed out of the city at the same time, or faced ecological destruction (as in the case of a group of people who attended the protest of Saturday Mothers, who also experienced village evacuations or other types of forced immigration) as a means of violence. In line with my experience with the displaced communities, I took it as a challenge to think of my interaction with the stray dogs in and on the outskirts of the city as an ethnographic realm and tried to gain a tactile gaze—an attention to the conditions in which bodies exist and perform in the city—in terms of understanding the bodies' dispersal, migration and dwelling.[4]

In 1994, Turkey's long-struggling Islamist movement was experiencing a major victory with the election of Erdoğan as the mayor of Istanbul, under the Refah Party. In 1996, the secularist DSP party was still running the central government and Habitat II—an important global event with a chance to promote Turkey—was a subject of dispute between the municipality and the central government. Habitat II appears as a scene in which two different understandings of modernity clash over the representation of Istanbul oriented towards the broader global public. In that tense environment, Habitat II was also seen as a chance for the organizers and certain participants to establish a democratic transaction between the government, local actors and the non-governmental organizations. In the following chapters, I will

[4] I borrow the term *tactility* from Michael Taussig (1991) as he refers to it as a form of "habitual knowledge" that comes from the "objectness of the object" in *Tactility and Distraction* (p. 150, 152).

argue that the quest for this modernist representation and the hunger for a democratic transaction did come to a halt when the information regarding the poisoned dogs emerged. I will argue that the poisoning of the dogs became a crisis in the Habitat II organization and it caused (bodily) distress in the higher offices.

Historically, it is important to keep in mind that this was neither the first nor the last attempt by the authorities to purge the city of stray animals and some human groups. In 1910, stray dogs in Istanbul were deported to an island in the Marmara Sea, as part of the Turkey's freshly adopted project of modernity. Just after five years, in 1915, the Armenian community was deported by force as a result of the same project of modernity as "purification", which ended up as a genocide. Myrna Douzjian (2010), in her review of Serge Avedikian's animation film *Chienne D'historie* (*Barking Island,* 2010) asserts that the 1910 dog massacre allegorically points out for 1915—the Armenian Genocide—in the film, drawing a metaphorical parallel between the progressive policies of the Turkish government (the massacre of the dogs) and a normative history writing that eradicates the information about 1915. In a similar vein, the installation work of Michael Rakowitz entitled *The Flesh Is Yours, The Bones Are Ours* titled (commissioned for the Fourteenth Istanbul Biennial and shown at the Galata Greek Primary School during the biennial) places Istanbul's architectural history, which was dominated by the presence of Armenian architects in the nineteenth century, within the historical narrative of the 1910 dog massacre. For this installation Rakowitz mixes dog bones with plaster used by Armenian architects and displays bones from Vakıflı—the only remaining Armenian village in Turkey—together with hand crafted plaster objects, next to each other (Christov-Bakargiev, 2015, p. 55). Rakowitz's installation forms a counter narrative approach to normative history writing by displaying dog bones and art nouveau motives used by the

Armenian architects next to each other, providing a space to witness an alliance of bodies.

Given the historical patterns of cohabitation and displacement of human and nonhuman, I am interested in the dog as an agent of memory and history. I introduce such agent as capable of revealing the political and material dynamics of an event. Such form of thought can be traced in political scientist Timothy Mitchell's (2002) work. In *Rule of Expert*'s first chapter *Can the Mosquito Speak?* Mitchell traces the colonial history of Egypt through the journey of a particular kind of mosquito—Anopheles Gambiae (p. 33). That particular species of mosquito travelled from sub-Saharan Africa to upper-Egypt by colonial shipment. Anopheles Gambiae was also the carrier of a certain kind of contagious disease. As an invader species, it caused even greater devastation compared to the destruction caused by colonial forces. (Mitchell, 2002, p. 33). In that manner, mosquito was an agent for that particular time and place, and at best, equal in force to the colonial settlers. But there is more to it; the mosquito is also an agent of history, political science and anthropology, as its journey through the Nile River beyond sub-Saharan Africa is revelatory of oppressive politics, economics and daily life in colonial Egypt. Mitchell's handling of colonial history through a nonhuman agent is an invitation to the idea of an interconnected history.

Theorizing interconnected histories is a prominent work for this research. In that vein, in *When Species Meet*, Haraway (2008) draws attention to practices of companionship that can happen without assimilating differences. She asks the question, "How might an ethics and politics committed to the flourishing on significant otherness be learned from taking dog-human relationships seriously?" and "How can the histories of these naturecultures be written?" (Haraway, 2008, p. 133,

290). Such a theoretical track that takes relationalities seriously in the writing of history is already apparent in Foucault's (1982) understanding of bio-politics, power and violence's governance on the body. In this thesis, I will explain that both Latour (1993) and Foucault present us with a certain methodology to conduct interconnected histories. With regard to writing of histories, I have also tackled trauma studies, and the spectrum this has opened up about language and narration in my research. Towards the end of this chapter, I will discuss what it may mean to witness a traumatic event, with reference to Nichanian's (2003) *Catastrophic Mourning*.

In the case of Turkey, Pinquet's (2009) *Les chiens d'Istanbul (Dogs of Istanbul)* provides a historical anthropology of the stray dog's exile to an island in the Marmara Sea, in 1910, as part of Turkey's project of following Western modernity. She elaborates on the roots of Ottoman relationship with stray dogs and explores similar histories of cleansing in European cities. She lays out the history of the development of animal rights. Most importantly, Pinquet regards these dogs as a significant figure through which we can grasp the political or ideological conflicts that appeared as a result of the freshly adopted modernist ideology by a group of nationalist bureaucrats in the Ottoman Empire. She lays out the logic in which stray dogs in Istanbul in 1910 turned into a symbol of the old-regime for the reformists, which necessitated their absolute annihilation, despite the discomfort it caused the mostly-Muslim community. Annihilation of the dogs caused discomfort in the Muslim community, as stray dogs were welcomed, even well-fed in Muslim neighborhoods because it was thought that the dogs were protecting the neighborhood against strangers. It is significant that Pinquet regards the dogs as the main figures of a conflict between the reformists and the supporters of the old regime in terms of Westernization and humanist and modern reforms.

As I have mentioned before, Avedikian's (2010) animated film *Chienne D'historie* narrates the same event, the deportation of dogs to an island (Sivriada, or Hayırsızada) in the Marmara Sea that eventually turned into a massacre. In the first scenes, we see dogs living with people in a Muslim neighborhood, in a mutual relationship (people feed the dogs, dogs keep an eye for the strangers). In later sequences, we see the Pashas Talat, Enver and Cemal ordering the stray dogs in the streets to be rounded up and exiled to Sivriada. The film takes stray dog relationships with the human residents seriously. We see that after the brutal interference, the residents of Istanbul are disturbed by the distant howling. They are almost haunted by it. More importantly, Avedikian points to the dog massacre as an event that foreshadows the events of the 1915 Armenian genocide. It is possible to think of Avedikian's handling of the ordeal of the dogs in the film as an allegory to the genocide. The dog appears as an allegorical figure for the ordeals of the Armenian community.

More recently, Sezai Ozan Zeybek (2014) positions stray dog populations at the peripheries of Istanbul—supposedly abandoned there by their previous owners or municipal organizations—as actors that blur the limits of the city space. In small towns near Istanbul, where they are gathered, these dogs became subjects of political discussions and local elections. In Zeybek's research area, during the days before the local elections, municipalities of neighboring towns started to blame each other for the recent rise in the population of stray dogs. A municipality blames the other for loading these dogs into trucks and disposing of them at night to influence the result of the coming elections. Here it is possible to say that Zeybek refers to the dogs as more of a vibrant figure rather than an inert victim, in their capability to blur the margins of the city space and become subject to political trickery.

Annika Eriksson's (2012) video installation work *I am the Dog that was Always Here* directs attention to stray dogs' dwelling at the outskirts of the city. It is a loop video that depicts a pack of dogs at the edges of the city, in a half-abandoned residential area in Istanbul, where the topography is in rapid change in various stages of destruction and reconstruction. The artwork deals with temporality as the artist positions the ways of the dwelling of stray dogs in Istanbul in relation to time and space. The video establishes itself through a loop, blurring the boundaries of the past, present, and future. This is an understanding of time that is repetitive and circular, instead of being linear and progressive. We can think of it as if the existence of the dog in the video calls for a looping of time as the dogs' dwelling is based on a repetition of similar deeds. Dogs, by nature, repeat. That links the dog to a time of transition, transition in the city, as the city is in great changes. If the discourse for progress explains that transition, the existence of the dog interrupts the linear flow of time that accumulates for the sake of change or progress, and bends it as if calling for a process of working through and transmitting the loss caused by progress. In that regard, the dog relates to witnessing.

Andrea Luka Zimmerman's (2013) documentary film *Taşkafa, Stories of the Street* also focuses on the dwelling of a stray dog in Istanbul named Taşkafa. Through interviews with the residents and shop owners who are in a daily relationship with the dog, she observes the mutuality of the relationships on the street. From here, Zimmerman follows various people who form a mutual relationship with street animals in different parts of the city. The film is narrated through John Berger's (1999) readings from his novel *King: A Street Story*, where a stray dog named King tells about his companionship with a homeless couple in a vacant city space.

Lastly, looking at the works that position the nonhuman as a witnessing force in space, we can cite Nazan Üstündağ's (2012) *A Travel Guide to Northern Kurdistan*, which provides a gaze that is able to recognize the landscape and buildings themselves as witnesses to a traumatic past of repression and disobedience. Going after the traces of violence left by the state, in a piece of land in a particular geographical space, the geographical and political memory of the space and the very materiality of the landforms itself lead Üstündağ's voice as the writer. Her narrative is fragmented. Her positions include narrator, tourist, guide, witness, daydreamer and sociologist. Those different positions are somehow capable of talking about the different kinds of truth that are uttered by the locals in varying ways but cannot always find place in the coherent language of academia. The perception of the tourist is the most striking to me in her way of relating with the nature (namely landforms) as a result of the tourist's dandy-like gaze. The tourist perceives the landscapes themselves as primary witnesses to the past. But not just the past: the geography itself talks back to the past struggles as well as to an idea of a collective future. As the tourist quotes from Tanpınar, mountains in fact shape a collective dream-sky:

> Even with their names alone, these mountains seem to have established some kind of a collective dream- sky for us living in this country. A dream-sky informed by the stories of those who have dwelled in this nature for centuries. That is why it is impossible for the traveler who meets these mountains for the first time, and who hears their names in the very landscape their strength and stability creates, not to be filled up with a sense of eternity and destiny, both of which give these mountains their identity. (Üstündağ, 2012, p. 96)

In Üstündağ's account, nature holds the witnessing to the past struggles, and being a witness to this nature invites one to utter the need for truth and justice that cannot be absorbed into the language of state, academia or law. This space of habitation laments with its sparse and burnt trees. The landscape becomes more transparent than any ideally perfect democracy, where law and governance is only a performance

in the mentioned geography (Üstündağ, 2012, p. 109). Truth manifests itself as a lament in the landscape and as an arrest of the bodily functions—human bodies that are undoubtedly a part of nature as the mountains themselves. In the same way, writing becomes an act of witnessing that is fragmented by the interruption of violence and the agency of the landscapes themselves.

For the rest of this introductory chapter, I will lay down the theoretical background of this research. But before starting to elaborate on my main themes, I need to address the recent rise of the study of the nonhuman[5] in social sciences, mostly under the rubric of Anthropocene discussions.

1.1 The Anthropocene

In 2000, chemist Paul J. Crutzen and marine science specialist Eugene F. Stoermer introduced the term Anthropocene to define the new geological age "in which humans act as a main determinant of the environment of the planet", in order to define the times when climate change emerged in the form of a crisis (Chakrabarty, 2009, p. 209). The term emphasizes the fact that humans have become a geological agent on the planet as a result of their high population, the burning of fossil fuel and abundant intervention (Chakrabarty, 2009, p. 209). The scientists suggested that the age of Anthropocene began in the latter part of the eighteenth century, the date that historically coincided with the design of the first steam engine. The term has been welcomed with intense and controversial debate by social and political scientists, along with historians. Dipesh Chakrabarty (2009), although a sceptic about the validity of the term Anthropocene, calls attention to the debates it has encouraged, to think of human history in relation with the natural and environmental history.

[5] Also referred as posthumanism or animal studies (Chrulew, 2016, p. 3).

According to Chakrabarty, the term Anthropocene "severely qualifies humanist histories", especially histories of modernity and globalization (Chakrabarty, 2009, p. 207). The Anthropocene debate is important in that it signifies that the human histories are entangled with nonhuman agents of natural history. Such a perspective invalidates the Cartesian assumption of the Enlightenment, which claimed that the human individual is liberated from its archaic bonds in nature as opposed to primitive or pre-modern societies. From the Cartesian perspective, human rationality was seen as the basis for modern civilization in its quest for progress and development. Similarly, the one who was seen as close to nature—indigenous, women, nonhuman animal—were to be mastered. The masculine male figure of the Enlightenment thought has coined a perspective of the human as the master of nature. From that perspective, nature "was a backdrop and resource for the moral intentionality of Man, which could tame and master Nature" (Tsing, 2015, p. vii). In a sense, nature was universal and transcendent, yet passive. It is possible to mention a double meaning of nature in the modernist understanding. As with the idea of wilderness, nature was also understood as beyond the reach and grasp of human; thus, it was nonsensical to ask sociological, political or ethical questions related to it. As a capitalist frontier, nature was understood to be passive and favored in the sense that it was cheap. "It was left to fabulists, including non-Western and non-civilizational storytellers, to remind us of the lively activities of all beings, human and not human" (Tsing, 2015, p. vii).

Although the term Anthropocene is under productive scrutiny in the social sciences,[6] it offers an important basis for this research. I cherish the idea that history should not serve only the human. Human histories are entangled with the histories of

[6] Donna Haraway, for example, considers *Capitolocene* as a better coinage to *Anthropocene* in her book *Staying with the Trouble* (Haraway, 2016, p. 135).

nonhumans. Then how can we think, recall, remember and witness with the nonhuman? In addition to that question, I take seriously the moment when a nonhuman stirs up a crisis in a supposedly human-centric environment, organization, institution or neighborhood. In moments of crisis, neatly drawn frames of the modern world cannot work properly. Crisis throws up the knowledge of the entangled histories. In Chapter 3, I will argue that, in moments of crisis, these entanglements become visible and the distinction between politics and nature collapses.

1.2 Nonhuman agency

In *We Have Never Been Modern*, Bruno Latour (1993) problematizes the binary conceptualization of modern versus pre-modern. He asks about the maneuvers that placed Western modernity as a distinct form of progress, development and democracy. But the problem is that the victorious progress of Western modernity is engendering crisis. It has brought about ecological crises as the modern ideal—and the ideals of modernity—worked to purify, to ignore the tie or relationship between "knowledge, interest, justice and power" (Latour, 1993, p. 3). In the process of purification, local issues have been separated from global ones, and human interest has been separated from nonhuman sciences. In that separation, the nonhuman animals are put aside either to be examined in natural sciences, put to work for production or owned as pets. Although there were hints of nonhuman animals carrying quite a significant political potential; until recently, they have not been considered as agents with impact. If not put to work or domesticated as pets, nonhuman animals either remained in the realm of the exact knowledge of the natural sciences or the wild, unthought or out of grasp aspects of the nature—as in the Romantic period's quest for nature. But nonhuman animals have continued to

mark the realms and politics of exercise of power by dwelling in the outskirts of the cities, working in the industrial farms or laboratories and intruding into houses. The treatment of animals in animal agriculture farms and laboratories are discussed within the frame of exercise of power (Chrulew, 2016, p. 2). The knowledge of their existence was closely tied to the exercise of power. Nonhuman's political potential was already present in human cultures.[7] The existence of nonhuman animals in human societies betrayed the distinct understanding of culture—a culture that is purely separated from the nature and its politics—and revealed the subjugated knowledges of natureculture s.[8] Latour argues that if modernity has been operating to make distinctions between nature and culture, this has only been possible in the form of a fictional fact. The separation between nature and culture was a forged separation. The separation has been treated as if it was the fact, but hybridization of these two realms was always continuing. Latour looks for ways to disrupt modernity's self-proclaimed power of purification. His assertion "we have never been modern", opens up a space for this research to recognize the entangled histories of human and nonhuman that was rendered invisible in modernist dichotomies. Within that space, I am able to argue that the dogs of Habitat II do possess an agency of memory revealed through a crisis, making an intervention to the "purifying" attempts of modernity and the transactions of democracy based on human centered principles.

[7] In his book *The Great Cat Massacre* (2009) Robert Darnton gives historical and anthropological account of a case where cats were murdered by a group of workers in Paris, in a carnivalesque kind of street theatre, as an act of rebellion against their boss. Darnton reads the event in terms of the complex political and cultural symbols that were put into work through cats. In a similar vein, Catherine Pinquet (2009) interprets 1910 dog massacre in Istanbul as a political symbol for the abolishment of the old regime by the reformists, as I mentioned earlier.

[8] Rather than making a distinctive definition between nature and culture, Latour (1993) and Haraway (2008) make use of the terms *nature-culture*, *nature-culture* or *naturecultures* instead of a distinctive definition of nature and culture. They both imply that nature is not exterior to culture and vice versa.

It has been important for this research to recognize and embrace what Latour (1993) has suggested as a certain way of doing research, rather than taking an overall political system or society. He offers to think in terms of networks of relationships between knowledge, interest, justice and power rather than holistic or discrete theories. In such interrelated thinking, the study of the nonhuman ceases to be the exceptional subject of natural sciences and gets to be discussed in terms of its involvement to social contexts. Along the same lines, while doing my research, I looked for ways of forming new arrangements between the treatment of nonhumans and social exclusion or destruction experienced by human communities. I avoided keeping nature, politics and discourse separate and intact in my narrative. I tried to see the intricacy of the relationships among them. I suggest that the poisoned dogs of Habitat II cross three subjects of study: studies of nature, politics, and discourse analysis. Thus, the dog demands an interdisciplinary approach, and it calls for co-working.

Nature, as the domain of facts and knowledge, cannot be separated from culture as the domain of construction and exercise of power. If culture is constructed, it is usually the case that different materials or objects are mobilized to construct it (Latour, 1993, p. 6). These materialities, in their very objectness and difference, are able to challenge the constructions of power. In that sense, they have agency as *actants*. Actant marks an efficacy that can do things and has sufficient coherence to make a difference, produce effects, and alter the course of events (Bennet, 2010, p. viii). Jane Bennet elaborates on Latours' definition by saying that the recognition of the force of the things is the result of an effort to think through things. This is a suggestion of thinking about the subject in terms of the object. Kathleen Stewart (2012) also thinks of agency as an energetics rather than a clear and intentional act of

a subject. Stewart asserts that, in the singular daily life moves, there lie frictions of power and knowledge. In that respect, violence and politics both happen in intensities of all kinds of energetics. Rather than the opposition of categories, she suggests studying "the pressure points of the compositionality of life in situations of all kinds" (Stewart, 2012, p. 518). Similarly, by following what happened to the dogs during Habitat II preparations, I try to get a hold of such moments of intensity where the intricate relations of human and nonhuman lie next to power and knowledge.[9]

Dog, here, is an actant of my study and an actant of history and memory that my study tries to comprehend. We cannot think of human experience as if it is separate from the nonhuman experience. Yet my aim in this thesis is not to give human attributes to the dog. I try to give space to the dog's agency as a dog, a living and vibrant being, not as a metaphor or sign. In that matter, following the footsteps of Jane Bennet (2010) and Donna Haraway (2008), I eschew thinking with the dog in terms of environmentalism. As Bennet argues, thinking about nonhuman in terms of its materiality and material agency enables us to refer to human and nonhuman on equal terms. This kind of thinking horizontalizes human and nonhuman relations. In the discourse of environmentalism regarded as a corrective to developmentalism, we are still stuck with the workings of human culture. Moreover, thinking in terms of vibrant materiality makes it relevant that nature is not here only to be consumed, but that it can create friction along the way of developmental policies (Bennet, 2010, p. 112). Things can get derailed. Nature sometimes strikes back and makes visible the intricacies or complications of naturecultures. In that manner, the dog is an actant

[9] Stephen Best (2004) in *Fugitive's Properties*, Georges Bataille (1991) in *The Accursed Share* and Karl Marx (1990) in *Capital Volume I"* —while discussing commodity fetishism—also provide accounts where nonhuman, mostly in terms of materiality, interrupts with what human culture established as geography, civilization, profit, law and history. Here, I do not delve into their theories as they provide analysis on the conditions of law and economics. But it would be useful to keep in mind that there are multiple layers to think in terms of materiality and material agency.

rather than a passive victim to be saved by environmental concerns. It "has efficacy" that "can do things" and "has sufficient coherence to make a difference, produce effects, alter the course of events" (Bennet, 2010, p. viii). It does not produce its effect through coherent actions of will; it does that in its habitation, its dwelling with the humans, sharing the neighborhood space.

Thinking in terms of materiality acknowledges that humans are also composed of materiality and almost equally vulnerable to harm. And because it is made up of multiple materialities—bacteria living in and out of the human body, for example—the human body is never exclusively human (Bennet, 2010, p. 112, 133). Thinking of a human as intact in its body and subjectivity is a remnant of the Enlightenment thought, the Cartesian man. By problematizing this intact human citizen, I want to refer to its vulnerabilities and its precarious position, which becomes more apparent when thought in connection to the vulnerabilities of the nonhuman.

What Latour (1993) suggests as methodology is not very different from Foucault's (1983) earlier work on power. In *Subject and Power*, Foucault introduces power as relationality rather than a holistic structure that can be captured in a theory of power. He asserts that power is founded in relationships themselves; relationships of production and signification within which the subject is placed, are equally relationships of power (Foucault, 1983, p. 209). Instead of a theoretical abstraction, he thinks of power in its bodily implementations and experience. Rejecting a theory of power that assumes a prior objectification of relations, his analytical work looks for power in the singularity of events in their different forms; in body parts and sentiments defining the modes of action. Foucault's analytical work necessitates an ongoing checking of prior conceptualizations of power, which he thinks of as putting

critical thinking into work. Within this constant checking, the historical conditions of the relationships of domination and exploitation in modernity are being dissected (p. 209). Rather than enforcing knowledge, he makes a quest for critical thinking by asking about the limits of ways of knowing (Butler, 2001, p. 5). In that way, Foucault's understanding of critical thinking happens in a domain of questioning at the limits of an epistemological border that is not yet assimilated by the established orders of knowing (Butler, 2001, p. 5).

Similar to his understanding of power, Foucault's (1977) work on history eschews meta-narratives. He looks for disparity in the designated origin of things by adopting the method of genealogy. Rather than an "inviolable identity of their origin", he finds "dissension of other things" (Foucault, 1977, p. 142). Rather than solid structures, the quest for things that resist regulation and order defines the methodology of his research. The dog is clearly an indicator of "the other" of the intact identity of the human. Yet in its disparity, it refers to a link between the treatment of other species and other human beings, based on the decision on who or what is to be let live and who or what is to let die.

Foucault defines genealogy as a meticulous documentation of intricate and confused fragments of history put in opposition to a linear and static writing of history:

> It must record the singularity of events outside of any monotonous finality; it must seek them in the most unpromising places, in what we tend to feel is without history—in sentiments, love, conscience, instincts; it must be sensitive to their recurrence, not in order to trace the gradual curve of their evolution, but to isolate the different scenes where they engaged in different roles. (Foucault, 1977, p. 139)

My methodology is also informed by Foucault's genealogy, his way of dissecting things and events into temperament, diets, dysfunctioning body parts and the nervous system. Foucault's attention to invasions, struggle and plundering, and the preference

for things that failed rather than were achieved in moral actions and wise decisions paves the way for the kind of study I am practicing. I study "committed errors" as Foucault would suggest (Foucault, 1977, p. 147). Genealogy, as methodology, makes use of multiple documentary pieces by giving a glimpse of the things rather than putting a linear and holistic historical sense into work. My regard for the singularity of the events comes from taking contingency, discontent and friction between human and nonhuman actors seriously.

1.3 On thinking

Writing about this research is an exercise in thinking and witnessing. Hannah Arendt's (2006) theories on thinking with one's plural self provide a guide in this respect. Here I will try to clarify where can we go with thinking with this plural self while making use of Judith Butler's (2012) reading of *Eichmann in Jerusalem* as a companion text to delve into Arendt's theories. In her re-reading of Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem,* Butler deliberately brings Arendt's demand for cohabitation to surface. According to Arendt, an inability to think is closely tied to an inability to exercise independent judgment. And the very process of thinking itself is committed to a certain understanding of cohabitation and plurality (Butler, 2012, p. 153). Butler describes thinking with "any action that should support the receptivity and audibility of the internal dialogue" (p. 170). Rather than thinking about oneself, Arendt's argumentation introduces thinking with oneself. This act of "thinking with" invokes the existence of a company, a plural *we* (Butler, 2012, p. 169). In the process of this internal dialogue, one has to split herself or himself into positions of self and the other (or self and the sociality). As long as it is a dialogue, even though internal, it always and can only happen with the supposed existence of the others. Thus, this

space of thinking is a space of vulnerability for the individual, as the event of thinking itself happens at a blurry space—and at the margins—where insides and outsides become transient. Definition of this space of thinking also bears a strong resemblance to a space of critical distance or unwillingness to obedience, and in fact in Arendt's thought it becomes a prerequisite for exercising judgment (Butler, 2012, p. 157). Similarly, the exercise of judgment is a plural undertaking that can be arrived in the precarious ground of sociality (Butler, 2012, p. 155, 168). The judgment becomes choice—a concerted action—in this performative space of thinking, a space conjoining the internal and the external. Even solitary thinking carries the traces of social company: "One becomes capable of having a dialogue with oneself only on the condition that one has already been engaged in dialogue by others" (Butler, 2012, p. 173). In order to have an internal dialogue, one has to forge a conjectured *we* within thinking. The trace of social company animates the utterance. I think this moment of animation is the moment where thinking becomes choice, the exercise of judgment, the action. This is our space with the dog, and also this is where the human exists with the dog, in the absence of language but with voices only. These voices have to be tactile, listened, watched, and traced without language. Witnessing an extremely violent event such as a pogrom or a forced disappearance automatically takes us out of the realm of language to the extent that we are unable to refer to its injustice directly. This animated realm of internal dialogue, where one thinks with the plural self, is also our realm with the dog. Dogs can be companions to our witnessing. Such dwelling carries the potentiality of thinking, choice and exercise of judgment.

What strikes me as powerful in Arendt's stream of thought is how much the dependency on cohabitation parallels an exilic condition (in Arendt's case, the exilic

condition of Jewishness). It is important that the notion of displacement goes hand in hand with the dependency for cohabitation on Earth. The exilic condition refers to an impossibility of return to a place of origin. Within that impossibility, what is left in remembrance had to refer to a messianic now in Benjamin's terms where an unveiling of the injustice can bring justice in the present (Butler, 2012, p. 124). Such revelation does not aim to recover the original loss but calls back the fragments from a lost dwelling, the loss of the collective experiences of the cohabitation. What Arendt argues is that the Benjaminian understanding of the emergent fragments from the sufferings of the past, indeed opens up a space in the present to interrupt the politics of present time.[10] Taking these fragments of past ordeal as part of a present call for justice, already disturbs the idea of a progressive understanding of history, thus the writing of a progressive national history and identity where the place of this linearly progressing nation, the idea of the land of the nation can be reoriented. As Butler (2012) reframes the ideas of Walter Benjamin: "... stepping forward has to be stopped if the history of the oppressed is to come to the fore" (p. 124). I offer thinking with the dog as a secession of the forward oriented construction of national ideals. Within this flashing, the ordeals of the past and a potentiality emerge to replace the monolithic understanding of the land of the nation by an understanding of a place of habitation for humans and nonhumans that can accommodate plurals. I understand our realm with the dog as a fragmented opening, at a state where any call for recognition of the loss has been left unanswered. Our realm of being with the other worlds enables an utterance of responsibility for cohabitation as we become witnesses with other humans and nonhumans. In the following chapters, I will

[10] Butler confirms that Arendt agrees with Benjamin's criticism of historical progress. However, she also notes that, while Benjamin's historical materialism is directed at capitalist systems of value, Arendt finds a more teleological foundation for political action in Benjamin's thought (Butler, 2012, p. 125).

elaborate on the conditions within which witnessing and a proposal for justice happens. For now, I would like to state that I find cohabitation—as a theoretical tool and an ethical ideal—very promising because finally it pushes us beyond a dyadic understanding of self and the other. The terminology of cohabitation renders such segregation invalid, and indeed motivates us to think of a relationship where ones—the modes of human singularities—engage with the many.

It is important to note here that Butler (2012) thinks of Arendt's definition of pluralism as an ongoing process of pluralization that makes it difficult to draw a line between what is external and what is internal to that plural community. Plurality here appears in a potentiality of a dynamic situation rather than a static condition. I suggest thinking of human-nonhuman relationships in this potentiality of the plurality of cohabitation as Butler suggests that thinking should involve the heterogeneity of human life:

> If to think, or at least to think well, involves thinking in such a way that we seek to preserve the heterogeneity of human life, then when we are thinking we are thinking heterogeneity. But here we are compelled to note that this heterogeneity is only thought within an anthropocentric horizon. After all, the life that is worth preserving, even when considered exclusively human, is connected to nonhuman life in essential ways; this follows from the idea of the human animal. Thus, if we are thinking well, and our thinking commits us to the preservation of life in some form, then the life to be preserved has bodily form. In turn, this means that the life of the body—its hunger, its need for shelter and protection from violence—would all become major issues of politics. (Butler, 2012, p. 174)

Now think of the stray dogs that the human regulatory acts are working very desperately to bring under control. Municipalities try to subjugate this unprofitable bunch to human dominance through the tools of chemicals, engines, and even hunger and thirst itself. The condition of exile, being scattered and the act of wandering itself call for thinking and judgment in the heterogeneity of populations. Because we cannot talk with the dog, we have to engage with the dog in a tactile way. Most of

the time this is a bodily engagement while playing with the dog, walking with or making voices to communicate with the dog. Our habitus for dwelling with the dog is a space for contemplation. We exercise a "well thinking" in this out-of-language realm, as Butler and Arendt would suggest; and then we enter into the realm of language with a judgment, with a choice for justice, pluralism and cohabitation. This judgment itself is an indication of plurality that knows no nation and cannot be bound by nationality.

It is also worth paying attention to the argument that the bodily presence of the animal is able to take us to a political zone where preservation of life in any form is political. As such, a dog in the neighborhood is political. Who feeds that dog, what to feed it with and under what conditions are equally political questions. If a low ranking officer from the municipality announces a tender to feed poison to these dogs in the shape of meatballs on the street corners, this also feeds into a "material interdependency", and it is equally genocidal. This material interdependence is defined as the condition of a mutually precarious life where "being a body at the mercy of another body can produce a great source of pleasure and/or a terrifying fear of death" (Butler, 2012, p.176). Because "as embodied creatures, we would have to think about questions of need, hunger, and shelter as crucial to plurality" (p. 176). Material interdependency arises from a bodily experience of need that creates a mutual precariousness as the foundation of plurality. The needs of the dog push the human discourse on politics to a limit position where normative boundaries of belonging, rights, private, and public becomes slippery. Butler (2012) believes that such slippery ground would reveal a shared condition of precarity (p. 174). There appears a tendency toward rejecting the ownership of a limited place, the home and the neighborhood. As Butler asserts, the memory of the exilic, rather than the nation

state, is the basis of politics; because with whom we cohabit the world is simply prior to choice, it is a given. This "given" quality is the sole basis of any social or political contract, as Butler explains:

> If Arendt is right, then it is not only that we may not choose with whom to cohabit, but that we must actively preserve the unchosen character of inclusive and plural cohabitation: we not only live with those we never chose and to whom we may feel no social sense of belonging, but we are also obligated to preserve their lives and the plurality of which they form a part. In this sense, concrete political norms and ethical prescriptions emerge from the unchosen character of these modes of cohabitation. (Butler, 2012, p. 151)

Putting cohabitation as the basis for any social contract means that "to cohabit the earth is prior to cohabit any possible community, a nation or a neighborhood" (Butler, 2012, p. 125). Cohabitation is prior to being a nation state as much as it is prior to form a community in a neighborhood. From here, I suggest that the scatteredness of the dog in the city, and the exilic condition of the dog at the outskirts of the city and at the city forests where they have rounded up from the streets in crowded neighborhoods, and put to hostility of hunger, and its memory is a political basis for cohabitation.

Thinking about cohabitation enables the question of how we detect the scope of the damage—the lost life. And how do we live with it—inhabit it? Here I think of the dog as a means to think with, that is, to re-think—think as Butler would suggest—and to contemplate. The dog, by lingering, living, and being exposed to violence and hunger at the edges of human development, calls for thinking, judgment and democracy. Because of their exilic condition, the diasporic position of the dog can become a basis for cohabitation. Such formulation confounds the idea that there are borders, that everything has its own place and belongs only to that place. Witnessing nature demands a common, collective habitus.

In our case, the crisis of the Habitat II organization opens up a lead for us where we can wit(h)ness the dog and many other disappeared bodies without a bodily hierarchy, without the classification of the sovereign. The crisis reveals to us the transaction of power in which we can see that there is more than neoliberalism or concerns for security, and morality is at stake. Through the most abject of these bodies, the dog, we can escape the existing realm of the unresponsive law—the absent documents—and utter justice for absent bodies. In the end, according to Arendt, what was Eichmann's major crime, if not failing in cohabiting the Earth?

1.4 Witness and *wit(h)ness* in mind

The trauma studies literature suggests that witnessing can only occur through the revival of the witness in mind (Agamben, 2008; Lanzman, 1995; Felman, 1992). In the absence of the factual and normative documents of the original loss, a fragmented revival makes it possible to refer to the truth of the catastrophe and demand justice. Below I will elaborate on the meaning of the revival of the witness in mind. I suggest looking at the dog on the outskirts of the city as an enactment of the revival of this witness inside, in mind. Revival happens through repetition and transference in the presence of, not through facts and documents of the past event. It is an act of reenactment in the present. Mark Nichanian (2003) in *Catastrophic Mourning* argues that testimony for a catastrophe cannot be pursued in a normative realm of language—in this case, the language of law or historicity. In his analysis of the Armenian testimonial narratives of massacres in years between 1885 and 1909, Nichanian evaluates those early texts as failed descriptions of the ungraspable violence and misery. Those texts that fail to be anything beyond the reverberations of victim's laments, briefly aimed to arouse shock and feelings of empathy. They were

mostly talking to the international audience for justice and sometimes for revenge (Nichanian, 2003, p. 99). Those texts, which are trying to be heard by law and justice, simply fail to mourn. There are also other texts that were written after 1909 that try to describe the catastrophe and survival in Adana back then; however, they also fail to be anything beyond calls for an unresponsive justice. Nevertheless, Nichanian makes a distinction of Zabel Essayan's *Among the Ruins*. He defines Essayan's book as the one and only narration back then that was able to mourn for the catastrophe of the Armenians in that century. That book that Essayan wrote after her visit to Adana in the summer of 1909 does not reverberate any call for justice or complaint. Nichanian names it mostly as the witness's struggle with her own language (Nichanian, 2003, p. 101). What she witnesses there is not about what happened at the time of massacre; it is more about the catastrophe itself as an unnameable event. In this sense, *Among the Ruins* does not reconstruct the event or talk about the remnants as a facticity to address any authority, historicity or law itself. She is not in a condition to negotiate with the Ottoman or Western states. What she tries to do is basically to write as a struggle against losing her mind in the face of what she saw. She is trying to name what she saw just before she falls out of the meaning and language altogether. In this way her writing is a confrontation with the "interdiction of mourning" (Nichanian, 2003, p. 101). Her avoidance from the meta-narrative of law, justice and historicity as facticity, enables her to refer to the catastrophe in its singularity, grasp its truth as the catastrophe and mourn for the loss of the meaning. The traumatic event here is the one from which meaning cannot be gathered out. In that sense catastrophe resists language. It resists language of law, history and human made culture. If there is anything that we can gather knowledge

and meaning, this is the act and process of transmitting, rememoration and working-through (Lanzman, 1995, p. 211).

If the loss caused by the violent event escapes the grasp of law in its singularity, I would like to follow that fugitive property of the catastrophic event, which is testimony, through a fugitive body as the dog's body and witnessing as the dog's witnessing as there is always an excess to the material beings that resist cultural norms as law, democracy, or history. I would like to see how the existence of the dog resists the facticity and the meta-narrative of history. Such witnessing sheds the fiction of the coherent self. The shattering of the fiction of the self is quite in line with what Judith Butler (2012) refers as pluralism moving from Hannah Arendt's demand for cohabitation. Butler concludes that there is no such thing as an intact self; self is also plural. Moreover, she suggests the lack of coherency in the self, as the basis for politics. Witnessing as the shattering of the coherent self-calls for responsibility in the realm of politics.

As Donna Haraway (2008) suggests, dogs are not only good to think with, but are also good to live with. "Animals may fuse, refuse, and confuse nature–culture categories and ontologies" (Kirksey & Helmreich, 2010, p. 553). I am looking for a relationship of witnessing that possibly emerges in this confused space of habitation, human and nonhuman cohabitation. We share a space of "mutual care and violence" with the other bodies (Haraway, 2008, p. 388). Besides looking for ways of wit(h)nessing, the following research tries to open up a space for cohabiting.

In this introductory first chapter I tried to lay down the theoretical background of my research. The works that I have cited here establish the theoretical and methodological framework of my research and thesis. In the following chapters

when I write about agency, materiality, crisis and cohabitation, these theoretical elaborations will provide the foundations of my argumentation.

I will begin Chapter 2 with the analysis of two official reports prepared at the end of the Habitat II meetings. One of them is the national report, while other is the United Nations report. The national report will enable me to grasp the main concerns of the national committee organizers. The UN report will show the more general and international concerns of the conference. The conference's main theme, purpose and the way that these were specified will provide me a basis to problematize the human centric developmental policies. Within these two reports' content and conceptualization, I will look for the clues where a universalizing humanist discourse and national temporality and space emerge and undergo a series of crises. Furthermore, I will lay down the politically intense environment in which the Habitat II event happened. In this case, I will make use of Alev Çınar's (2005) analysis of the distinct events in the same period, where she regards Habitat II as a scene in which two different ideologies of modernity came to a clash in a crisis of representation. Çınar's analysis will help me to elaborate on the problematic of modernist representative frame where national space, time and bodies are constructed. Here I am interested in the workings of the logic of power that casts human and nonhuman inert to be able to reconstruct them in accordance with a forged national identity. The problematization of modernist and humanist discourses will provide a space for me to discuss the colonial roots of these two ideologies. The colonial framework is important because it enables us to historically locate where the dichotomies of human versus nonhuman have been put to work before, and how the contemporary regimes of power—Western or not— learned from it. As a following to that history of domination, I will tell about Istanbul's 1910 dog deportation that turned into a

massacre when thousands of stray dogs were sent to an island in the Marmara Sea. Finally, I will try to geographically and sociologically define the area where the Habitat II preparations took place.

For the work presented in Chapter 2, I spent weeks in the municipal library scanning newspapers published between February 1996 and November 1996. I found that in the spring months, events related to Habitat II covered almost every front page of various newspapers. Variably, some were about the amelioration works such as the renewal of pavements, judging comments on the amount of money spent for it, genuine questions about the poorly understood purpose of the event, and finally, the displacement of homeless kids, the transgender community in Ülker Street, and poisoned dogs. Besides the news on Habitat II, there were remarks about the tense political environment of mid 90s in Turkey. These discussions formed a baseline for the arguments of this research for directing my attention to moments of tension.

For writing Chapter 3, I looked for an archival document as proof of the poisoning of the dogs. However, I found out this was not an officially documented event, or perhaps I did not have the means to reach a document that shows the condition in which the local authorities took the decision and realized the event. Therefore, I resorted to interviews. I conducted an interview with one of the organizers of Habitat II, Korhan Gümüş. With the help of his testimony, I found out that the poisoned bodies of the dogs caused a downfall—a bodily crisis—in one of the higher offices when the chief director of TOKİ (the Housing Development Administration) was confronted with the dead bodies of poisoned dogs. This chapter asserts the poisoned dogs as a haunting force in the archives that I have delved in. Lacking further information on the conditions under which dogs were poisoned, I follow the events around Habitat II through other communities who were also forced

to leave the neighborhood where Habitat II took place. On the same days, the transgender community of Ülker Street—who refused to leave their dogs on the streets when they departed—and the Mothers of the Disappeared (Saturday Mothers) who staged sit-in protests in front of Galatasaray High School, were both forced out by brute police force. The events are mainly referred as "Habitat cleansing", a "cleansing" that is done before the guests arrive. I attended a lecture by Şevval Kılıç, a then-resident of Ülker Street and conducted an interview with Filiz Karakuş, a feminist human rights activist who was among the first group who did the sit-in protests. I also tried to talk with storekeepers from Ülker Street, who simply said that there were no stray dogs around their neighborhood any more but only cats, and they shied away from talking about the Habitat II times. I got in touch with Emel Yıldız, a 1990s fiery animal rights advocate who ignited the crisis through which I am following the events. These encounters enabled me to refer to the problematic subject of modernity, the subject who is a morally intact neighbor and a patriotic citizen. Also, the knowledge of the displacement and disappearance that the Saturday Mothers brought to light opened a space for me to refer to the question of bodies rendered as movable objects by the state forces from a wider perspective. With regard to the Saturday Mothers act of politicizing witnessing and the transgender women's entangled relationships with the neighborhood and their animals, I will be addressing wit(h)nessing and cohabitation. In Chapter 3, I will try to lay down the conditions of wit(h)nessing, the ways in which we can become wit(h)nesses with the dog, while arguing that a catastrophe that took place in a field of commons for the two species reveals a potential for co-habitation and wit(h)nessing.

While writing this thesis, I literally took strolls with dogs on the outskirts of the city, in the semi-established urban and non-urban areas, in main roads with heavy

traffic and forest areas outside of the city space. These dogs helped me to think with. However, the dog does not talk memory, history or democracy to us. It is not possible to conduct oral-history interviews with the dog; it resists my urge to establish clear-cut data for my research. Thus, I tried to provide a space for this precarious body while forming my argumentation. Thinking with the dog enabled me to focus on relations of response, responsibility and care.

CHAPTER 2

HABITAT II

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. Achieving the aims of sustainable development was highlighted as a precondition for the correct management of human settlements. As a result, this meeting, commonly referred to as "the Earth Summit" came up with idea of a new UN conference on human settlements. Requests and recommendations on Turkey's readiness to host such a conference were welcomed by the participants. In December 1992, at the 47th session of the UN general assembly[11] the decision was made to hold the UN Human Settlements Second Conference Habitat II in Istanbul on 3-14 June 1996. In the summer of 1996, the stray dogs on the European side in Istanbul were poisoned a few weeks prior to Habitat II. As historian Catherine Pinguet (2009) reported in her book's last chapter about the recent condition of the stray dogs in Istanbul in 1996, according to the people residing in the neighborhoods, it was done by the municipality spreading meatballs containing a sufficient amount of strychnine on the streets (p. 109). Strychnine is a very toxic colorless crystalline alkaloid with an intense bitter taste. Within minutes of ingestion, it causes powerful muscle contractions, pulls the head back and arches the spine. Respiratory muscle spasms finally cause death. At first, the incident drew attention because strychnine affected cats and pet dogs as well. Stray dogs came after them, but the radius of the poisoning was not limited to these. It soon drew a rebuff from the public for it was

[11] The United Nations Human Settlements Program is the United Nations agency for human settlements. It was established in 1978 and has its headquarters at the UN office in Nairobi, Kenya. It is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to promote socially and environmentally sustainable towns and cities with the goal of providing adequate shelter for all. Its regional centers are called *United Nations Centre for Human Settlements* (Habitat)/(UNCHS), and are situated at Nairobi, Rio de Janeiro, and Fukuoka ("Report of the United Nations," 1997).

putting children at risk. Many homeless kids had to leave the area. The ones who were caught by the police were taken into custody and then deported to the outskirts of the city or provinces.

This was neither the first nor the last enterprise by the authorities to purge the city of stray animals. There had been similar attempts in the Gültepe neighborhood of Istanbul in February and in other cities, including Istanbul, in 1994. However, the Habitat cleansing was the most grandiose and effective one in recent history. According to my understanding, this date points to an appeal to speak to a global audience, an urge to keep up with modern demands and a governmental logic of the power to let live and let die. Also, it is an act that targeted the nonhuman, the analysis of which I consider as a challenge to the anthropocentric perspective of social sciences. The human-nonhuman relationship is a relatively less-studied field of social transformations (although it gained a burst of attention in recent years), and I see a revelatory potential in that. Thus, my research question can be formulated as follows: "How would a human-written history be affected and altered if we take account of a catastrophic event faced by nonhumans?"

Yet methodologically, looking at the nonhuman is a challenging act. As a semi-alien species to human, the dog resists the construction of a coherent narrative and argumentation regarding historicity, democracy or culture. The existence of the dog forces the research to stray at some points. Knowing the near impossibility of reaching a coherent narrative, I began to stroll around the incident of poisoning. For this, I started with an archival research at the Atatürk Municipal Library (Atatürk Kütüphanesi). Mostly I worked in the newspaper and periodicals section, scanning the news from the spring and summer of 1996. The intricacy of the political environment and the debates around them that sometimes foreshadowed and

sometimes directly introduced the Habitat II event, dazzled me. May 1996 sits in between the Gazi district riots (Gazi mahallesi olayları) and the Susurluk scandal. The Gazi riots broke out in March 1995 after the shooting of an Alevi community leader in the neighborhood. The next day, riots followed the funeral rites. Upon police firing rounds into the crowd, twenty-three people were dead. The Susurluk scandal was a car accident that revealed the close relationship between the Turkish government, the armed forces and organized crime in November 1996.[12] In between these two events was the news of various prominent events about the then-current friction in the air. On April 1996 DHKP-C (Revolutionary People's Liberation Party/Front) attacked the Sabancı Center,[13] killing three people from the holding company. Militants succeeded in running away after the attack. On May Day (the 1st of May celebrations) three people were killed and fifty were injured during a clash with police in the Kadıköy district. On 14 June, the Turkish Military Forces killed ninety PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party) members during an operation in Northern Iraq. During the same period, Urfa appeared as the shining star of the GAP Project (Southeastern Anatolia Project).[14] Also there was an emergent concern within the society regarding the "mad cow" disease. With this, the commodification and industrialization of the killing of animals started to become a topic of discussion. On the political front, there was a huge debate surrounding Tansu Çiller, then prime minister, with a claim that she had taken five-hundred billion liras from a

[12] A traffic accident in Susurluk, near the city of Balıkesir south of Istanbul, in which a former ultra-rightist militant wanted by police for multiple murders and drug trafficking and a senior police chief were killed; and a parliamentary deputy from the ruling party was injured. The accident created political uproar and charges that this incident highlighted the illegal relationship between security officials, state officials and the organized crime ("Domestic Review: Accident in Susurluk," December 2, 1996).

[13] A complex of skyscrapers in an Istanbul business center.

[14] The Southeastern Anatolia project, developed and initiated in 1989, consisted of the construction of 22 dams, 19 hydraulic power plants and irrigation networks in an area of 1.8 million hectares on the Euphrates-Tigris basins (GAP Regional Development Administration, n.d., para. 2). The projects have been criticized heavily for causing salination problems and displacing people whose agricultural land and villages were flooded following the construction of numerous dams (Kurt, 2013, p. 7).

discretionary fund and paid more than five billion dollars to a businessman. It had been over a year since the Gazi riots and on the first of July, hunger strikes of the Gazi resistance were continuing in various prisons. On 21 July, one of the strikers died in the Ümraniye prison. On 10 July, a telecommunication satellite named Turksat 1C was orbited from a French base station in South America.[15] On August, the body of Enver Paşa[16] was brought to Turkey and buried in Hürriyet Tepesi in Şişli. Istanbul's hosting Habitat II was perceived as a unique chance to promote democracy and civil partnership in that tense environment. In May 1996, Habitat II emerged as an opportunity to become a part of the global democratic community. This eagerness for participation is very visible in Turkey's Habitat II national report and action plan[17] and the various municipalities' informative meetings and reports.

The Habitat II national report and action plan presented a list of participants from government ministries, National Assembly commissions, public institutions and organizations, universities, local governmental organizations, workers unions, professional associations and trade chambers, housing cooperatives, construction companies, broadcasting corporations and NGOs. The national report insistently stresses that the publication had been prepared with a participatory motive. During preparatory meetings in 1995, forty-nine reports were presented to the national committee by the participatory institutions and organizations. These reports received feedback and reviews from 30 participant organizations of the national committee. The final report received 98 institutional reviews. In total, 244 organizations attended the final preparatory meeting in the last months of 1995. Its content also was

[15] Later in Turkey's Habitat II reports the launching of the satellite has been referred as a very important step in Turkey becoming part of the larger global world, a prominent progress.
[16] A member of Committee of Union and Progress, who was also effective in Armenian genocide in 1915.
[17] We see that in UN's report, developmental concerns are supported with concerns of democracy or world peace.

discussed on TV programs. Bureaucratic and organizational transactions seemed to be arduous. The amount of papers, gatherings, reports and feedback increased as part of its bureaucracy is immense.

There are two reports on which I have particularly focused for my research. One is the national report by Turkey that I mentioned above and on which I will elaborate further in the next section of this chapter. The other one is a United Nations report prepared after the conference. Unsurprisingly, both these reports reveal a visibly human centric viewpoint, demarcating the focus on human rights. In the national report, human rights are defined as a universal and historical concept with reference to the UN's World Conference on Human Rights (Turkish National Committee, 1996, p. 78). The national report states that according to the UN definition, human rights' universality does not stand on the universality of human rationality but defines a universalism that is based on social consensus. Thus, the prioritization of human rights is taken as a sign by the national committee of being part of a larger civilization, the global world as a universal ideal. This emphasis on human civilization also exists in the UN report, where cities are defined as centers of civilization: "... we recognize cities and towns as centers of civilization, generating economic development and social, cultural, spiritual and scientific advancement" (United Nations, 1996, p. 7). The UN report (1996) also states that Istanbul is the bearer of a symbolic function for the event being at the historical "crossroads of civilizations, of urban civilizations: "which over the centuries has seen and weathered so many of those storms and challenges that characterize the urban transformation" (p. 212).

In both reports, settlement appears as a very basic human rights concern in relation to one's right to adequate housing. The concern for settlement as an issue of

universal human rights was the main perspective of the Habitat II gathering. The human rights perspective readily reveals humans at the center of developmental concerns, as noted in the UN report and the national report a couple of times, with such comments such as, “human is at the center of our concerns”, “adequate housing as human rights” (United Nations, 1996, p. 17). The concern for the human also frames what is understood by “sustainable development” or “adequate shelter for all” in the UN report:

> The purpose of the second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) is framed to address two themes of equal global importance: “Adequate shelter for all” and “Sustainable human settlements development in an urbanizing world.” Human beings are at the center of concerns for sustainable development, including adequate shelter for all and sustainable human settlements, and they are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature. (United Nations, 1996, p. 12)

The concern for settlement and adequate housing in the UN report was also presented as a prerequisite for a “lasting peace” and the “fundamental freedom” of the communities that will be achieved with “solidarity and cooperation among countries”:

> There is a sense of great opportunity and hope that a new world can be built, in which economic development, social development and environmental protection as interdependent and mutually reinforcing components of sustainable development can be realized through solidarity and cooperation within and between countries and through effective partnerships at all levels. International cooperation and universal solidarity, guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and in a spirit of partnership, are crucial to improving the quality of life of the peoples of the world. (United Nations, 1996, p. 12)

World peace here is envisioned with solidarity and the cooperation of actors from different national affiliations, and it is for the elimination of human rights violations and inequalities. Development, as the main objective in both reports, is often linked to sustainability. The UN report defines sustainability in relation to an environmental and developmental trend:

> Human settlements problems are of a multidimensional nature. It is recognized that adequate shelter for all and sustainable human settlements development are not isolated from the broader social and economic development of countries and that they cannot be set apart from the need for favorable national and international frameworks for economic development, social development and environmental protection, which are indispensable and mutually reinforcing components of sustainable development. (United Nations, 1996, p. 16)

2.1 The national report

The National Report of Turkey raises similar concerns but with a reservation. Differing from the UN Report, the National Report does not state any focus on politics of peace. And the environmental and ecological conditions appear as accompanying the concerns of settlement rather than being the main concern. The National Report firmly argues that connecting sustainability to environmental issues is misleading, and the main concern in the Habitat II case is much more of a technical settlement issue. I take the National Committee's reservations about handling environment, politics and settlement issues separately as a sign that the National Committee took Habitat II as a solely development issue of infrastructure and did not foresee that environmental inequalities actually hinder possibilities of equity between the communities. I take it as a sign that the National Committee at that time, did not take environmental or ecological change as a prominent issue of political and social organization.[18]

[18] Later on, throughout the days approaching to Habitat II event, this relationship between settlement, environment and politics became more visible when participants of the foreign NGO's started discussing about not participating in the meetings because the Turkish state was supporting village evacuations and enforced displacement in Kurdish region, in the Southeastern Turkey. Lately in academia, these village evacuations are being understood as part of an ecological destruction in the region which carried out militaristic and political intentions. Mostly these evacuations have been seen as an attempt at dominating Kurdish mountains where Kurdish guerilla takes refuge from raids of the state and receive sustenance and support from the villages (Arslan, 2014, p. 62-66; Jongerden, 2009, p. 75-77).

The National Committee identifies the main subject of their work as "sustainable settlement for everyone" (Turkey National Committee, 1996, p. 15). Committee declares in the report that, they are determined to continue meetings in the aftermath of Habitat II, to be able to actualize its objects and generate civic engagement, enablement, governance with multiple actors instead of being content with passive observations. At this point local action plans appear as crucial for future works. In the report they identify their priority as creating solutions to existing settlement problems. Participants indicate that to be able to achieve a solution regarding settlement and housing, one should first analyze the change that Turkey is going through as "part of the world" (p. 15). A quest for progress forms the backbone of their understanding: There must be a continuous search for betterment, in the light of the changes concerning both the facts and perspectives in Turkey (p. 15). The report identifies the migration of rural populations to the cities as a post WWII phenomenon; trying to make sense of the local context in relation to the rest of the world and other developing countries (p. 15).

The national report chronologically lists the achievements of the last decades. The achievements range from 1960's modernization in agriculture, integration to liberal economy, intensified infrastructure of highways to 1980's neoliberal economy, infrastructure works focused on telecommunications, introduction of new institutions in accordance with global economy. Developments in telecommunication—launching of a new satellite for example—are perceived as becoming part of the world's cyberspace (Turkey National Committee, 1996, p. 22). The National Report's focus on progress is clear. However, it is also possible to see that such discourse on progress sometimes comes to a halt with the mentioning of

economic difficulties. For example, the high inflation rates caused by the public finance deficit—an economic crisis—seem to foreshadow the pace of the progress.

The National Report approaches the settlement problems mainly through the perspective of demographics. Decrease in the birth rates in the last decades is accepted as a sign of development (Turkey National Committee, 1996, p. 22).[19] Here, migration also becomes an issue of demographics and settlement. The committee explains the evacuation of fields in Northern Kurdistan[20] as due to "security reasons in Eastern Anatolia" and in the villages submerged under the dam water projects (GAP projects) (p. 23). There is also a tendency to explain the migration from a perspective of demographics, and relate it to the development in the cities as an index of urbanization, and the perspective focuses on the relationship between the distribution of capital and the settlement systems. Here they quote the much mentioned anxieties of Istanbul becoming a "megacity" and instead suggest that the city's expansion should be regarded as Istanbul's turning into a "world city". The notion of the "world city" here, highlights Istanbul's development and progress instead of a negative connotation of the uncontrollable megacity (p. 24). This concern for the promotion of Istanbul is also visible in *Istanbul World City* (Dünya Kenti İstanbul) exhibition prepared for the Habitat II visitors and the *Housing and Settlement in Anatolia: A Historical Perspective* publication by Tepe Holding and Bilkent University.

About the practical problems concerning settlement and the construction industry, the report prepared by the participation of multiple public organizations does mention the fact that in the last decade only one third of the buildings were constructed by engineers; thus the quality of the housing projects did not reach the

---

[19] Recently, we see that increase in birth rates have been encouraged by the state authorities.
[20] In the report it is referred as "Doğu Anadolu (Eastern Anatolia)" (p. 23).

world standards. However, it is mentioned that the construction industry in Turkey reached its peak in the last decade due to the abundance in housing projects. It is stated that such development paved the way for producers to be capable of producing in world standards. Thus the volume of the industry itself reached those global standards. However there is a doubt among the participants that the buildings themselves were not matching the high standards of the “modern world” that they were poor in terms of meeting the criterions of sustainability, livability and equity (Turkey National Committee, 1996, p. 27). It is clear that the growth of the industry was worth mentioning as part of financial development. However, there is a discrepancy between the financial development in the housing industry and the universal principles of the Habitat II meetings.

2.2 The municipality pamphlets, local and global concerns

The Municipalities Association of Turkey published an informative booklet on Habitat II meetings in February 1996. There is a conspicuous element of anxiety associated with Habitat II in the booklet. The anxiety stems from the issues regarding Istanbul’s representation to the broader international community, and from the local municipalities’ lack of information about the purpose of Habitat II. The introduction has been written by a former governor in a worried tone saying that the Habitat II meeting is a unique opportunity to present Istanbul’s natural and cultural wealth to the world. The governor’s opening statements voice some of these concerns:

> This opportunity must be used for the best; but the NGOs and local authorities failed at clearly grasping the goals of the Habitat II due to lack of information. The existing booklet aims to eliminate this lack of information when we reach to the end of these informatory meetings. There is enough news on Habitat II in the press that could accommodate a second pamphlet. However, there is no sufficient information in any of them. The media does not pay attention to the content of the conference. Yet the Habitat II meeting has managed to stir up action among the NGOs and local

> administrations. Despite all the problems, we wish Turkey success. We should remember that Habitat II's goals are not limited to the dates of the conference, but the process itself is important. Local administrations should have an essential role in this process. (Bilgin, Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, Konrad Adenauer Vakfı, & Birleşmiş Milletler İnsan Yerleşimleri Habitat, 1996, p. 5)

The National Reports, informatory meetings and pamphlets in general put forward Habitat II principles (sustainability, livability and equity) as guiding principles for reaching the "world standard" of settlement systems (Turkey National Committee, 1996, p. 27). But we see that progress has been defined mainly through financial development and sustainability of the projected systems. Human rights concerns or equity measures are also understood in reference to such development and progress. Apparently the participants of the municipal meetings have concerns for whether these goals can be reached, or receive a wider response from the public. It seems like those concerns mobilized a huge range of public and state actors, in the name of a motive for participation. Equally large amount of paper, reports, publications and work has been produced. In the next chapter I will argue that the poisoning of the dogs did interfere with such conduct and distribution of roles; but for now I would like to look at how Habitat II event was reverberated in the media, what kind of imageries or imaginaries were generated, and what this tells us about the urge for national progress.

In June 1996, the head of Habitat II *National Committee Advisory Board* Ilhan Tekeli, whose works focus on urban and regional planning and the theory of local governments, evaluated the conference in the aftermath of the Habitat II meetings in an opinion piece. Tekeli asserts that the principles of Habitat II represent a "moral stand" with regard to metropolitan settlements (Tekeli, 1996, p. 56). This moral stand is defined by a universal "good" for every nation to agree upon and contribute to (p. 56). Such "good" depends on fundamental human rights (p. 56).

Tekeli argues that Habitat II principles are aimed at giving the residents of a city the responsibility to participate and claim the city space. Such responsibility is supposed to render diverse actors as capable to act (Tekeli, 1996, p. 59). And these three principles aim pluralistic democracy.

Turkish National Committee takes pride in introducing the principle of "livability" to the UN Committee, as Tekeli reports (Tekeli, 1996, p. 60). He says that sustainability and equity were the foundational principles for Habitat II, and with the extra work and discussions presented by the National Committee, "livability" also accepted as a foundational principle (p. 60). He suggests "livability" as a sibling term to environmentalism, and as a cure to the crisis of representative democracies because it necessitates individual responsibility and participation by the citizens (p. 60). Those principles have been discussed with direct references to human rights through its universality and historicity, similar to the context of national committee report. Tekeli suggests to think about development in terms of a model for settlements rather than—or in addition to—the economic development. In Tekeli's perspective, the environmental concerns of Habitat II are more visible than it appears in the National Committee Report. Yet Tekeli's discussion of settlement is tightly framed through a developmental human rights perspective when he states that the right to housing meant human rights (Tekeli, 1996, p. 60).

Most of the reviews on Habitat II are stuck in the grandeur of the event and the last minute preparations. Eventually, people were excited to think of Istanbul in a close relationship with the "rest of the world" as a global city. Cüneyt Akalın's account of the opening night is a very good example in demonstrating the popular attraction of the conference:

> The opening night was a bit dull, but the closing ceremony—with the honoring visit of Fidel Castro and a generous amount of fireworks—was

> magnificent... The conference spot was perfect, thanks to Nurettin Sözen (The former Mayor of the Istanbul municipality). Who else would come up with such perfect location, the valley? … The urban planning and settlement of the conference valley was just successful… The old sports and exhibitions palace (Lütfi Kırdar Spor ve Sergi Salonu) crowned that valley… Thankfully, the UN police did not take over the security of the conference area and Istanbul police marked the borders of the Habitat valley… These pavement repairs were done at the last minute and Istiklal was covered with concrete again… Hotel owners were very excited about the "six million people visiting" but apparently they preferred staying at local houses… The biggest capital is human and our greatest wealth is our people. (Akalın, 1996, p. 69)

It is important to note here that more than the content of the conference, its presence as an almost touristic event attracted attention from the public.

In the 1 May issue of 1996, *Birikim* republished an essay of Yaşar Çabuklu that was written in 1992 in which the silenced history of the homeless is problematized. Ömer Laçiner (1996), in the same issue, writes that people who think that there is no place for them to live in this society, people who are unemployed and scared, took to the streets on 1 May. On that day, eight protesters died in Kadıköy when police fired at the crowd. In the same context, Necmi Bayram (1996) also criticizes that the control of our environment is given into the hands of the experts:

> City planners, architects, civil servants and bureaucrats organize the environment as manageable structures; business centers, "factory" cities, supermarkets, hypermarkets, "leisure" and "entertainment" centers, "rural" parks, unmanned streets. Physical obstacles appear on the way to completion of human activities. The ultimate goal of keeping the population together is to serve the business with profit… The streets are planned according to traffic, the traffic is regulated, because tramp and the idleness are not profitable. They are all things of parasites thus should be destroyed. The force is what is applied first. Those who deemed to be unprofitable are forced to exile, to the outskirts of the city. The next step is to prohibit them to enter some neighborhoods. The police come in. They terrorize the neighborhoods where they are not successful. The sovereign and their watchdogs. (Bayram, 1996, p. 52)

Çabuklu, Laçiner and Bayram's perspectives have something in common: they argue for the rejection of possession. Çabuklu and Laçiner both introduce a perspective towards rejecting the ownership of a limited place, the home and the neighborhood.

It can be said that both writers interpret the people's uprising on 1 May in Kadıköy as the rejection of the limitation upon the spaces of habitation. There is a caution against Habitat II's concerns for settlement and development. Bayram's account rejects both possession and progressive ideas of urban development. The one who is unprofitable gets to be exiled and displaced from his or her habitation. Thus there is a caution which says that the proper settlement envisioned by the municipalities and the state does have a cost when it is planned in favor of commodification. These relations of commodification and value limit dwelling spaces causes social exclusion and displacement.

In the same line, a university student, Ali Gülüm (1996), introduces the the poisoning of stray animals and the displacement of homeless kids as contradictions to Habitat II proceedings. Here, Gülüm suggests the displacement from the city center and the dominant existence of police forces in the city as a major contradiction to Habitat II itself:

> The attempts to remove homeless kids from Beyoğlu and the massacre of stray dogs and cats as preparations for the conference, were noted as the informal consequences of Habitat II, as human and animal rights violations. Another huge contradiction of democracy is the city turning into a police state, a city invaded by the police during the Habitat. It calls for discussion, if armored tanks passing the street, busses full of police and unnecessarily intercepted roads were really necessary. However, it is certain that the banning of protests and marches and the weekly sit-in protests of the relatives of the forcefully disappeared in front of the Galatasaray High School for the same period is anti-democratic without a question. This is another contradiction regarding the state's democracy rhetoric. (Gülüm, 1996, p. 73)

Ali Gülüm also shortly reports from the *Outsiders Forum* that has been formed as an alternative to Habitat II established out of concern for the village evacuations. According to his report, *İstanbul Yeşilleri* (Istanbul Greens), *Nükleer Karşıtı Platform* (The Platform Against Nuclear) and *Boğaziçi Yeşilleri* (Boğaziçi Greens) attended the meetings at the Marmara Hotel on 2 June. The participants discussed

issues of war, energy and settlement and presented a critique to Habitat II. Almost nobody conformed to the meeting's agenda. It was aimed at making an effect on Habitat II rather than being a mere criticism. It was an important experience for the NGOs.

2.3 The crisis of display

In 1994, Turkey's long struggling Islamist movement was experiencing its first major victory with the election of the Refah Party's candidate Erdoğan as the mayor of Istanbul.[21] In 1996, the secularist DSP party was still running the government and Habitat II—an important global event with a chance to promote Turkey—was a subject of dispute between the municipality and the government. The government put forward TOKİ, the General Residence Administration—an establishment that is an extension of the government rather than the municipality—to host Habitat II. Mayor Erdoğan disclaimed it as the government's strategy "to prevent the pro-Islamic Refah Party from playing a prominent role in this important international seminar" (Çınar, 2005, p. 120). In her book *Modernity, Islam and Secularism in Turkey*, Alev Çınar examines several prominent events from the mid-90s in Turkey where bodies, time and space got to be reconstructed in accordance with two different understandings of Turkish nationality. As one of the events described by Alev Çınar in this book, Habitat II appears as a scene in which two different understandings of modernity clash over the representation of Istanbul to the broader global public. Çınar characterizes it as a clash over describing the construction of a national space in Turkey's project of modernity (p. 119).

[21] In fact, Refah Party's first major victory was winning over the municipal elections in major cities of Anatolia, for example Konya, in 1992. However, their biggest victory is usually perceived as winning the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality because Istanbul has a symbolic meaning as the former capital of the Ottoman past and more visibility as a global city or a world city.

A nation state is established by inscribing itself to space through a symbolic order of representations and displays (statues, icons, monuments). Çınar (2005) regards the mid 90s Islamist politics as an alternative to the former republican project of constructing a unified nationhood. The alternative opened the former secularist and republican formation of nationhood to negotiation, dismantling its unquestionable dominance. Both understandings (the constructive and its alternative) depended on the idea of an institutionalized and unified nationhood that is a "finite community of people living on clearly demarcated land" (Çınar, 2005, p. 99). A "unified territory" was at stake here (p. 99). According to these modernist assumptions, the national land would just be a sum of disconnected and arbitrary places in the absence of a unified nation and its unified national space. A work of display and representation is necessary to cast these disconnected and arbitrary places as the national territory (p. 100).

When the Islamist Refah Party won against the secularists in the run for the mayor of Istanbul Metropolitan municipality, the question of display and representation over the city squares was a hot topic open to debate. "From the start, Habitat II was perceived as a perfect opportunity for a carefully packaged and prepared display of Turkish national identity for the global gaze by all parties involved" (Çınar, 2005, p. 119). TOKİ used the slogan "Six billion people from the world are coming to Istanbul" as representatives of foreign media, state officials, international business delegates, and members of various non-governmental organizations from all over the world were expected to visit (p. 119). A banner with the same slogan on it was placed on the Bosphorus Bridge, where the "East meets the West" cliché was staged. There was significant media attention on the premise that the world would be watching and visiting Istanbul rather than the content of the

conference. Habitat II was perceived as a scene for representation, either as a secular and civilized (Westernized) nation or an Islamic and authentic nation. The latter introduced an alternative set of norms, within hierarchical binaries just as the former did (p. 171). Dichotomies of East and West, primitive and modern, authentic and corrupt introduced a limit for the possibilities of knowledge and thinking. The clash for the display of Istanbul and the disagreement upon the authorized agent of that display reverberated as a "crisis of representation" in the media (p. 119). During the conference, the city administration organized parallel events to Habitat II and prepared publications, conferences and exhibitions supported by the municipality. Çınar states that municipality exhibitions aimed at making a display of Turkey's "own cultural resources," thus making a scene of the "real cultural identity" (p. 120). The exhibitions *Settlements of Anatolia* and *World City Istanbul*[22] showcased an idea of a historically grounded Istanbul that was the cradle of multiple civilizations. Here, Istanbul was being presented as an irrevocable part of the world settlements and urban history.

The city administration perceived itself as the agent to represent civil society, especially on housing and settlement, but the targeted audience was the global audience. The clash of display was for the sake of becoming a decent part of the rest of the "civilized" world. As Çınar (1996) cites from the municipality's Habitat II publication *Habitat Days*, the mayor insistently noted that Habitat II was "... an important opportunity to promote Istanbul and Turkey to the whole world… to show our traditional hospitality..." and thousands of foreign visitors should be

[22] *World City Istanbul* exhibition was organized by History Foundation (Tarih Vakfı) in 1996, as a parallel event to Habitat II. After eighteen years in 2016, History Foundation revisited the same exhibition under the name *Yine, Yeni: Dünya Kenti İstanbul (Once, Again: World City Istanbul)* this time to draw attention to large-scale, state sponsored current interventions in Istanbul. Additional seminar series discussed displacement in urban neighborhoods, and expropriation of forest land in Istanbul, next to its former subject of Istanbul's urban history.

accommodated in the best way possible, which led the municipality to prepare “with the thoroughness of a housewife” (p. 121). The quest for representation cast the city space and its materiality as passive to be “prepared”, “presented” and “watched” (p. 121).

People who lived in Istanbul at the time mostly remember the endless preparations by the municipality for the Habitat II event. Most people remember the renewal of the pavements in central areas, continuing for months, making it a challenge for the pedestrians. People who were kids at the time remember it with the summer holidays arriving early because the municipality shot down most of the main roads for infrastructural restoration. The officially designated conference site, now called Conference Valley, was under major construction. High-rises like Süzer Plaza[23] were being erected, hotels and tourism agents were getting ready for the great number of guests. The Valley’s adjacent Beyoğlu area also underwent ameliorations. Cobblestones, lampposts and sidewalks were renewed, wheelchair ramps were installed and trees were cut down. The municipality spent approximately 4 million dollars for the renewal of the pavements and other improvements, amelioration and development projects in Beyoğlu, in addition to the seminar and promotion expenses (Çınar, 2005). The desire to be properly prepared and represented became most violent when homeless kids, the transgender community and political activists (The Saturday Mothers) were displaced and stray dogs were poisoned. In that context, the concerns of displaying a civilized, clean and modern city space brought a drastic intervention on bodies as much as an intervention on place and time.

[23] In this period, the construction of Süzer Plaza led to public scrutiny on the grounds that Süzer family got a construction permit through corrupt relationships with politicians and the media. Columnist Perihan Mağden (1999) wrote about the protracted legal proceedings that took a span of more than ten years and the disruption of Istanbul’s urban fabric by this 134-meters 39-storey building. Süzer Plaza was erected on a public green area where the construction ban on this land dated back to the nineteenth Century Ottoman legislation (Mağden, 1999, p. 82).

Çınar draws attention to how modernist ideologies deem the present as deficient[24] and projects an ideal future to be contemplated and to be reached. That state to be reached talks to an idealized understanding of progress. In that sense, modernity becomes a forward movement, a "movement away from the present" (Çınar, 2005, p. 23).[25] According to Çınar, the events around Habitat II provide an example of such an intervention on national space and time. But their scope reaches far beyond the interventions in public space. Çınar's work sums up the domains of two different discourses of modernity in Turkey. She looks at the range of the clash on representation, a disagreement upon the agents of display. When Çınar raises the question of "who gets to represent the assumed national identity?" she opens a space for us to problematize the existence of a representative regime from the very start. From here, we can start to think about what transcends or disrupts the frame of the representative regime.

There is a space to look for multiple actors around the organization of Habitat II. If there was a competition to frame Habitat II as an event for display, I would like to ask when other forces, other than these two dominant ideologies with their actors, came into the play, challenging the order of the representative frame, This opens a space to question the human-centeredness of the defined agents and actors when these actors attempt at making the city, its materiality and the ones dwelling in that materiality inert by rendering them removable, discardable and passive (without resistance). The discussions on Habitat II, the ideals, reports and feedback produced for the sake of it, proudly put the human in the center with a universal personhood and civil progress in mind. The work of display and the representative frame

[24] Çınar (2005) exemplifies it as "backward, traditional, inefficient, irrational, primitive, corrupt, decomposed" (p. 23).
[25] We see examples of the understanding of a deficient present and an urge for future improvement clearly in the national report for Habitat II.

violently renders people, things and nonhuman animals in the city space inert as movable and manageable objects. The ideals of modernity create their own prey. Those preys are deemed underdeveloped, backward, not civilized and corrupt within the discourse of modernity. The idea of becoming part of the developed world and ensuring harmony with the rest of the world's (Western) universal ideals is fueled by the concerns of keeping up with modernity, development, process and technology. In fact, the solely human agent of this narrative of progress is the remainder of the colonial rule, the domination of nature and people.

2.4 Violence and civility

What Çınar (2005) frames as an urge to reach the Western modernity and civilization at its best does not cover the ways in which this European or Western model of civilization established itself in the first place by embracing the colonial logic of domination. As I referred to it earlier, by colonial domination I point to particular forms of knowledge and practices of power that have been produced by European colonialism, and have become integral to modern normativity through which the occupation and control of non-European lands have been justified, and the land of the modern nation has been defined on the basis of pure ethnicity, language, culture or religion. Reaching that Western level of civility and modernity entails entering into an economy of hunter vs. prey or the workings of a hunter (the conqueror) against the prey. In *Violence and Civility* Balibar (2009) argues that the colonial power creates a dualism of preys vs. hunters in relation to a definition of “extreme violence” (p. 12). According to his definition, extreme refers to a threshold in politics (a legal limit to politics), aesthetics and moral experiences. This marks a threshold to the very notion of the “*humanity*” when an “*element of inhumanity*” manifests itself

through the "*intolerable*" (p. 12). He gives the example of a violent death or the violence of a dead body when the "reduction of the conquered to the state of a powerless "thing" reveals the annihilation of the possibilities of resistance" (p. 12). The state of being transformed into almost an inert thing in the face of subordination comes to mark a threshold with regard to humanity. In that definition, human is defined as the one who possesses agency, the one who is capable to resist, to create friction. The passivity, the inertness and thingness, is what marks the threshold of that willful agent, as human; "extremity of violence annihilates the possibilities of resistance" (p. 13,14). Such annihilation does not contribute to any dialectics or exchange in the formation of communities. Extreme violence of the colony "... is placed in relation, on the one hand, to the annulment or annihilation of the existence of those dominated by colonization—which denies "the indigenous" any culture or sociability or even individuality (the "Arabs", the "Negroes", the "coolies" are indiscernible) —and on the other, to the obsession with *animality* that transforms the native into prey" (p. 15). Animality does create a state of objecthood that a position of an inert prey doomed to be hunted. The prey exists only to be hunted by definition or at least to be targeted for its life. In this regard, colonization processes put a clear example of how deeming a species less or nonhuman—or close to nonhuman—legitimizes the dispossession, displacement and annihilation. Colonization thus, for this research, is a backdrop where it shows the relationship between society and environment that is historically reproduced through discourses and practices of Western civilization and its modernist ideals. These modernist ideals of the Western civilization provided a model for "others". Focusing on colonialism enables us to identify the dichotomies of modernist thinking; dichotomies of nature vs. culture, human vs. nonhuman, progress vs. decadence. The dichotomies function in a way

that the friction, cooperation or the relationships between actors are ignored. Thus the dichotomies establish a hegemonic hierarchy, deciding which one is destructible, movable or vulnerable. Balibar's prey-hunter example showcases an instrument of domination enabled by Western modern ideals. The violent intervention—the intervention enabled by the dichotomies—renders nature and the one that is supposedly close to nature (native, women, animal) as passive. Therefore, the inert prey gets to be consumed in the colonial economy. When we talk about an urge to be modern—especially a Western modernization that depends on development and progress—more than an economy of representation is at stake. Beyond the need for amelioration and development in the representational level, and beyond the question of who will be the signifier of this representation; the moments that this representation enters into the real or reality by annihilating, hunting, naming or casting some bodies inert is at stake. Turning the city into an object of display means a violent intervention that renders certain humans and nonhumans within the city space inert. In our case, the ones who are rendered removable are people and animals who interject with the construction of a national, patriarchal, profitable and sanitized city space: a transgender community, African immigrants, homeless children, protesting Saturday Mothers and stray dogs. A work of display is able to turn the dwellers into removable objects without agency. Such a process of displacement is historically embedded in Istanbul and its past.

2.5 Dogs of 1910

In 1910, during the regime of the Young Turks in the aftermath of the abolishment of Abdülhamid II's Sultanate, stray dogs were massacred in Istanbul in the name of clearing up the city as a move towards a rapid modernization.

The proceedings were pretty messy. Up until that day, the stray dogs of Istanbul lived peacefully, mostly in Muslim neighborhoods, in a mutual relationship with the human residents. People had a habit of feeding the dogs; and it was believed that the dogs were looking after the neighborhoods. There are eighteenth and nineteenth century accounts of foreign travelers gawking at the existence of the stray dogs in Istanbul (Pinquet, 2009, p. 19). Those accounts hint at the dog's presence as an awkward instance that does not comply with the needs of a modernizing city.[26] It is rumored in those accounts that the new government's first discomfort with the stray dogs came to the surface when a foreign traveler was attacked by a pack of dogs in Pera, Beyoğlu, in the most international neighborhood of Istanbul at the time. Catherine Pinquet (2009) mentions in her book *İstanbul'un Köpekleri* (The Dogs of Istanbul) that it was said that the reason for deporting dogs to a distant island in the Marmara Sea was the sound of dogs barking at night. Dogs were waking the citizens who had to get up early and be at work on time in the newly industrializing city. There are also occasions where the Ottoman authorities sought advice from foreign allies to deal with the stray animals. At one point a German researcher suggested picking up the dogs from the streets to first annihilate them and then to use the excess material for the production of oil. The proposal did not find a solid response from the authorities; it simply did not work. On one occasion the dogs were expelled to the *Yedikule bostanları* (Yedikule Gardens) at the outer strip of land near the ancient walls of the city. But the stray dog population in the city did not decrease significantly. The government employed Roma people to do the job of catching the dogs. They put the dogs in wooden boxes and moved them to the gates of the city. However, according to Pinquet's account, after the first successful attempts, dogs

[26] Western cities also have a history of clearance from the stray animals.

became suspicious of their fellow's painful barks and started to resist. When they started to bite the capturers' hands, capturers started to use leather gloves, ropes and big hooks. Human residents of the city were growing anxious. It was impossible to endure the raged barks, howls and fights of the dogs that had been rounded up and deposited at the margins of the city. The captured dogs started to starve without care from humans. When the dogs were unable to find food, they started to get aggressive among each other. As a managerial option, the municipality decided to move the dogs to a deserted island across the Sea of Marmara, Sivriada.[27] Boats deported the dogs, and two guards were assigned to draw water and watch over them. The plan was to feed the dogs with loaves of bread that would reach to the island every day by rowboat. Conditions on the island were extremely harsh. There was very little shade, water was extremely scarce and the attendant who was supposed to feed the dogs was unable to reach the coast when the dogs got very aggressive. According to a foreign traveler's notes, continuously brawling dogs soon started to eat each other. It was too dangerous for guards to approach them to feed them. Soon the government stopped paying the attendant's wages. In a few months, it became impossible to get on the island as a result of the dead bodies on the bay, rotten by the sun. This was the result of what was for the government an enactment towards modernity, progress and productivity. Dogs were not suitable for a (to be) modern, industrial, working city. They were simply interfering with the order of things. The existence of the dogs did not comply with the image of a modernizing city. It was argued by the authorities that the dogs were blurring margins of the living spaces, rural areas and commercial urban centers. Their existence was understood as a roadblock to a sanitized, ordered and well managed potentially industrial city of the near future. Dogs initially had

[27] The island is also called *Hayırsız Ada* which translates as "Ominous Island".

relationships with humans and pursued a commonality. This common way of life that was pursued with the dogs in the Muslim neighborhoods was treated as an emblem of the corrupt old regime by a group of nationalist bureaucrats in the Ottoman Empire. Stray dogs became the main figures of a conflict of Western, humanist, modern reforms that enforced a Western gaze and Turkishness as a national ideal and upon its citizens.

The residents of the city could not digest the horrific event. There were rumors that the following disasters, a major fire and war came about because of the dog's ill fate. Over time, history repeated itself; in 1933 and 1934 the dogs of Istanbul were put to a sleep of death again (Pinquet, 2009). Later, I learned during an interview with Korhan Gümüş that some Armenian families in Istanbul, families who had survived the 1915 catastrophe, used to hang paintings of Istanbul's dogs in their homes, mourning their loss in a way.

2.6 Map for the Congress Valley: A history of displacement

Having shown features of a global city throughout the nineteenth century, Beyoğlu was an area which had the most international population in Istanbul; it was a space of financial speculation at that time. The area was modernized on a scale of the parcels, without the transformation of the whole city.[28] The Levantines and foreigners who settled there (with Greek and Jewish minority natives of the Empire), used to be the part of an international elite with the hold of a prominent real estate market, as the nineteenth century Beyoğlu went through an intense construction activity. This transformation on the scale of parcels ensured that the transformation caused by the bourgeois accumulation was confined to the streets of Beyoğlu, rendering Istanbul's

[28] Personal communication with urban historian Orhan Esen, December 17, 2014.

transformation partial and incomplete (Keyder, 1999, p. 5). This also meant that the allowed foreign forms of entertainment and habits of dwelling were confined to this area, in the service of "upwardly mobile non-Muslims," foreign bankers, merchants, visitors and refugees who came to live in Beyoğlu without penetrating the old city (p. 6). Beyoğlu's isolated transformation often reverberated as an attempt at subversion and undermining of the imperial ideology or "the political logic of the empire" with its autonomous prosperity and development supported by foreigners and reflected in a Western life style (Keyder, 1999, p. 6; Bartu Candan, 1999, p. 32). As for the Ottomans, Beyoğlu represented a Western form of civilization and the center of commerce and entertainment.

As Beyoğlu in the late nineteenth century took on the characteristics of a metropolitan global city with the flow of foreign investment, Beyoğlu in the aftermath of the First World War became an area of developmental erosion (Keyder, 1999, p. 7). The newly established republic of the Turkish nation state had a tendency to disdain Istanbul as the capital of the former sultanate and damaged city of the foreign occupation in the aftermath of the First World War. The Early Republican Era was marked by the assertion of nationalistic policies and acts. After the First World War, a population exchange in the form of forced migration took place between Turkish and Greek communities living in their nation states. Although Istanbul was not included in the official exchange of populations, many foreign people and most of the non-Muslim citizens had to leave Istanbul in the following years. Beyoğlu became a refuge for the Anatolian Armenians who had survived the genocide, the Greeks who were able to get an identity card[29] for themselves and the

[29] Before the population exchange Greek and Turkish communities co-existed both in Greece and Turkey. Only the established Greek population of Istanbul was exempt from the immigration. This pushed Anatolian Greeks to get an identity card stating that they were the established Greeks of

White Russians who had fled the Russian civil war in the 1930s. Until the 1920s, Beyoğlu was a global city, connected to the world. By contrast, however, Beyoğlu in 1930s and 40s became a ghetto, closed in itself. Its people were stuck there, and Beyoğlu was the last area where they could reside. Yet in the subsequent years, the Christian population significantly declined as a result of the nationalistic policies of the Turkish government. The Republic's nationalism was based on ethnicity and religion, but such coordinates were not stated in detail in the constitution. Thus, government policies to drive non-Muslims out were mostly based on ambiguous proceedings that handled the issue in indirect but violent ways. In 1942, the government of Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu forced a wealth levy in the name of a tax on war[30] profits on non-Muslim property owners, which worked as a punishment for the remaining non-Muslim community (Keyder, 1999, p. 180). In September 1955, during Adnan Menderes' third term as prime minister, a government instigated crowd destroyed the Greek property in neighborhoods like Laleli and Beyoğlu, where a significant number of the non-Muslim community still resided. The attacks were legitimized as a reaction to an attack on Atatürk's house in Salonica,[31] according to the official story (p. 175). The events came to be known as the events of September 6-7 and played an important role in forcing the non-Muslim natives of Istanbul to leave. In parallel, urban planning moves declared a more determined assault in densely populated Christian areas of the city through large-scale urban transformation projects. An ethnic cleansing was carried out in Beyoğlu over thirty years from 1942 to 1973. The Beyoğlu of the Early Republican Era was the last refuge before the ethnic cleansing caused by the nationalist policies, tax levy and the

Istanbul, to avoid the forced migration. The population exchange disrupted the heterogeneity of communities, cities and the region.

[30] Referring to the Second World War.

[31] A city in Greece from where Turkish migrants were deported as part of the population exchange in 1923.

events of September 6-7. The 1950s spelled the end of multiethnic and multi-religious coexistence. The end of coexistence can also be read as an effect of the turn towards a nation state from a multiethnic empire (Bartu Candan, 1999, p. 33). In the 1960s, government of the Prime Minister İsmet İnönü expelled Greek citizens who also held Greece citizenship. In 1974, when Bülent Ecevit was prime minister, upon Turkey's occupation of Northern Cyprus, still more Greeks had to leave Istanbul (Keyder, 1999, p. 180). The major decrease in population occurred after the non-Muslims were expelled. Their departure coincided with migration to Istanbul from the nearby Black Sea region. Properties owned by non-Muslims were lacking proper titles to regulate the property change. Some were abandoned or entrusted to relatives who later failed to defend the property rights. A property exchange took place between the expelled non-Muslim citizens and the new immigrants. There were also cases where property illegally changed hands as their ownership could not be defended by the expelled community. During this period, a massive property exchange took place as the ethnic cleansing continued until the 70s (p. 180).

After the 1950s, big cooperative complexes were built in northern part of Istanbul in neighborhoods such as Levent, Balmumcu, Barbaros Boulevard and Büyükdere Avenue, allowing for a homogenous settlement area dominated by middle and upper-middle class residents. As the northern part of the city became attractive for the middle class, who wanted to escape from the congested areas within the inner city, Beyoğlu turned into "a reserve for the poor" at the heart of the city from the 1960s onward (Keyder & Öncü, 1994, p. 410). This move away from the inner city area signaled that the residential area around Beyoğlu was becoming an undesirable part of the city for the middle class citizens to live in. It can be argued that the middle class still visited this place for entertainment and leisure activities but

did not prefer it as a residential neighborhood (O. Esen, personal communication, December 17, 2014). The ones left living there were immigrants from the countryside, with spoils of war at their hands acquired through the property exchange.[32] In the mid 1980s, Beyoğlu was treated as unclaimed territory for the new entrepreneurial restructuring by former businessman and then-mayor Bedrettin Dalan (p. 400). During Dalan's tenure, the office of the mayor was endowed with financial resources, administrative authority, and a political prominence, which turned the mayor into an "entrepreneurial public servant" in the style of Baron Haussmann (p. 401,405).[33] Dalan mainly worked on enhancing Istanbul's global image to turn the city into an attractive territory for investment. In that respect, the renovation of Beyoğlu became a popular topic again. Dalan's nationalist discourse with regard to the non-Muslim heritage of Beyoğlu—aggregated and legitimized by a nationalist discourse of claiming the land back from a Byzantine past—was put into work for economic progress. Dalan's revitalization plan included the transformation of Istiklal Avenue into a pedestrian road and opening a parallel boulevard, Tarlabaşı Boulevard, by razing the space between Beyoğlu and Tarlabaşı, to connect the car traffic from Taksim Square to the old city. Opening Tarlabaşı Boulevard required the demolition of a massive number of nineteenth century buildings in Beyoğlu—which had changed hands in the previous decades—and the relocation of the community currently living there (Bartu Candan, 1999, p. 34). Dalan himself stated that Beyoğlu was in need of rehabilitation, cleansing and demolition if necessary. Tarlabaşı Boulevard was presented as capable of solving the inner city traffic congestion,

[32] Roman people living in Beyoğlu and the immigrants from Anatolia also faced heavy social exclusion policies with the introduction of Tarlabaşı's gentrification project in 2000s.
[33] In addition to creating an overall powerful metropolitan municipality, the "district municipalities" were instituted to maintain repairs, surveillance, building control and building permits (Keyder & Öncü, 1994, p. 405).

illegal prostitution and drug traffic at the same time (Bartu Candan, 1999, p. 35). These were presented as issues that were detrimental to the joys of the middle class.

Once completed, Tarlabaşı Boulevard turned out to be a huge physical barrier for Beyoğlu. A serious, almost uncrossable border with only two level crossings and two underpasses, served to segregate people of the area in their mental map. In the mental map of the middle class people, the upper side of the boulevard became a neighborhood to be gentrified, and the lower side of it turned into a forgotten neighborhood. Istiklal Avenue was prioritized for investments and the segregation between Tarlabaşı and the other side of the Tarlabaşı Boulevard became clearer. In the old structure of Tarlabaşı, all streets used to be connected to Beyoğlu until the construction of the boulevard closed these vertical passes. Dalan's project was understood as a nationalist intervention upon the Ottoman's European past or Byzantine past, and was either praised or criticized for it by different groups.

Dalan aimed to clear a large piece of land from Taksim to Galata Bridge and turn it into a marketable empty land. The intention was to raise skyscrapers, hotels and plazas on it. There were three skyscrapers that had already been built. One was the Divan Hotel, another was the Marmara Hotel on Tepebaşı, and the third one was Odakule. To these three, Dalan added a fourth, the Park Hotel, and fifth, the Süzer Plaza (Gökkafes) buildings. All these buildings were named by Dalan himself (O. Esen, personal communication, December 17, 2014). Taksim was going to be used as an area of skyscrapers and offices—a central business area. In sum, Beyoğlu, as well as the rest of Istanbul's old neighborhoods, "emerged as the showcase for Turkey's new era of integration into the world scene" (Keyder & Öncü, 1994, p. 409). With the enforcement of global finance and nationalist imaginaries, Beyoğlu turned into a spectacle for commodification. In her essay *Vitrinde Yaşamak* (Living in a Shop

Window), Nurdan Gürbilek (2001) explains that Bedrettin Dalan aimed to turn Istanbul into something to be looked at, and a spectacle to be profited from. She says that "in Dalan's ever seeing gaze", a neighborhood could turn into a display of his point of view (Gurbilek, 2001, p. 29). And through implementations of his will, that representative display can become the reality. Thus, Dalan's ruling gaze becomes effective in casting the city space into a commodity to be consumed.

After Dalan's failed attempt to get re-elected, Beyoğlu's renovation project entered into a really slow phase. From 1989 to 1994 the Nurettin Sözen administration focused on more populist practices in the slum areas at the outer circle of the city. Large-scale inner city renovation plans did not constitute a priority for municipalities in Istanbul. However, by the spring of 1996, when Beyoğlu's adjacent Congress Valley became the designated area for Habitat II, Beyoğlu again became an area open to interventions. Although the Habitat II organization committee did not designate Beyoğlu as an area of large-scale transformation—official amelioration projects initiated here at the time were mostly limited with restoration of pavements and regulation of traffic lights and passages—certain communities living in the neighborhood went through systematic but what were actually arbitrary practices of displacement and dispossession through direct use of violence. In spring of 1996, while the city was getting ready for the arrival of the guests, stray dogs were poisoned, homeless kids were moved away and transgender residents of Ülker Street were "cleared out" (Alkan, 2014, p. 306). In the mid 1990s, property holders very quickly realized that the area's value was increasing, and the transsexuals actually had a negative effect on it. This led to a nationalistic campaign by the landowners and the police to expel the transsexual residents out of the city center. They came with flags, closed the roads, aimed their guns and cancelled the contracts. I will

elaborate on these in the next chapter, and will argue that the mostly referred frame of gentrification regarded as a transformation aimed at financial gain, provides a limited understanding of these and other kinds of displacement. But for now, it is important to keep these displacements in mind to locate the Congress Valley in our mental map in terms of its historical significance.

The Congress Valley where Habitat II meetings took place sits between the neighborhoods of Beyoğlu and Maçka. Historically, this valley was a picnic area during the Ottoman period. With Dolmabahçe Palace being the city center, this place began functioning as a central complex, just like the Palace's annex. In the early republican period, a Sport and Culture Park of the Republic was located in the valley. But when the Hilton Hotel was opened in 1953, the area's function as a public park changed. In the 1980s and 1990s, hotel buildings such as the second Hilton Hotel, the Intercontinental, the Swiss Hotel, the Hyatt Regency, the Ritz Carlton, and the Süzer Plaza were constructed. The park area had turned into a valley of hotels and put into the service of tourism (O. Esen, personal communication, December 17, 2014). What came to be known as Congress Valley became the designated area for Habitat II. Ten years after Habitat II, urban planner Erbatur Çavuşoğlu lamented the lost ideals of the conference, suggesting that the existence of these high-rises in the Congress Valley forms a monumental headstone for the loss:

> The Habitat II experience has been wiped off the agenda together with its memories as it was forgotten. After ten years, an evaluation and balance sheet analysis proposal did not receive any interest. Recent planning initiatives can only be interpreted as a silent lament for the principles and decisions of Habitat processes. However, if this lamentation is going to have a headstone, the symbolic minaret should not be any other thing than the Gökkafes or Süzer Plaza. (Çavuşoğlu, 2007)

In my personal conversations with conference organizers, I often came across similar kind of narrative that point to Habitat II principles as lost ideals that were never

maintained. Similarly, the Conference Valley has been referred to as a dead zone in the city, disconnected from the daily flow of people and traffic. Here, I wanted to draw a mental map for the valley and its neighboring area as a space of lost ideals as well as the violence inherited in these ideals. After all, Beyoğlu is still a place of habitation where the struggle for plural cohabitation endures.

CHAPTER 3

REMEMBERING THE EVENT

In this chapter, I will argue that the stray dogs of Istanbul can be seen as agents of memory for witnessing the displacement and loss, providing an archive opposed to a fixed and fetishized understanding of the modern, official archive, which is regarded as the guardian of origin and truth of the past. Lacking official documents registering many events of displacement and loss, including the poisoning of the stray dogs, I interviewed people who might possibly have memories of the particular period I am focusing on. First of all, I resorted to the oral narrative of one of the coordinators of the Habitat II event. Furthermore, I looked for ways of engaging with the dogs' displacement and poisoning, together with the displacement of the transgender women community of Ülker Street and the Mothers of the Disappeared (the Saturday Mothers of Galatasaray square) who were also pushed out of Beyoğlu area due to the Habitat II conference.

During my research I attended a seminar by Şevval Kılıç, who was among the transgender women who lived in Ülker Street from the early to mid 1990s. Şevval gave an insightful reading of their conditions of displacement. I also conducted an interview with Filiz Karakuş, a feminist human rights activist from among the Saturday Mothers, while also reading the Truth Justice Memory Center's[34] reports on displacement and the enforced disappearances in the Kurdish districts of Turkey in the 90s. Through a cross reading of mentioned testimonies and reports, I will argue that the poisoning of the stray dogs with the purpose of cleaning the space for an international event ironically for human settlements in May 1996 offers me a

[34] An independent human rights organization based in Turkey.

borderspace[35], a space of *transference* and a space of working through the transformation of trauma, enabling me to recognize the loss of multiple others. I will claim that the displaced, the forcefully disappeared or poisoned ones reveal a crisis in the state's regulatory control and discursive regime, opening up that transitory space to wit(h)ness an other's loss and demand. I will discuss the modern archive's connection to a bodily crisis and the transitory space opened by that crisis before starting to discuss the questions of cohabitation and plurality.

3.1 The context

Turkey's first legislation on animal protection came only in 2004. In 1996, there were no legal regulations regarding the living conditions of animals. In the absence of legal grounds, the way that the problem of the stray dogs was solved should have been almost traditional for the Istanbul municipality. Probably it was one low-ranking officer from the Parks and Gardens Section who thought that it would be good to clear the streets before the world-renowned event before the guests arrived. Probably a bureaucrat very swiftly prepared the technical specifications, and a local municipality gave it out for contract. Despite a totally technical and practical intervention, we can still point to a discursive regime within which it happened, a discourse that considers stray dogs as disposable. In an interview with the then-Istanbul City Council's Chief Veterinarian in 1996, a journalist asks about the stories regarding the poisoning of the dogs for the Habitat II event (Gorvett, 1996). The Chief Veterinarian, confirming that these are only stories—implying that the accusations are not based on facts—talks about the municipality's "fight against

[35] I borrow this term from Bracha Ettinger (2001) as used in *Wit(h)nessing Trauma and the Matrixial Gaze*. Ettinger defines such *borderspace* as a threshold for the subject to form alliances with other human subjects to create a possibility to recognize each other's pain and carry its burden. A threshold opened up with such *borderspace* can acknowledge the difference and gap between different beings, times and places while making each subject ethically vulnerable and responsible to the other's trauma.

rabies", associating stray dogs with a dangerous, infectious disease (Gorvett, 1996, para. 27).[36] The typically modern discourse posits dogs' existence on the streets as a problem of hygiene. It is important to see that, although a very contingent act— the poisoning of the stray dogs—is part of a governing discourse of hygiene and sanity that enabled the killing without any responsibility, the violent intervention. It is contingent and banal, as Arendt would call it, without an ethical choice for responsibility for the other species that we cohabit in our neighborhoods (Arendt, 2006).

There is no available official record regarding the poisoning of the dogs in 1996. The Chief Veterinarian seems to have every right to call what happened as just stories, in the absence of a legal proof of the act in the form of an official document. In an interview with Korhan Gümüş, an architect from among the coordinators of NGO's involved in Habitat II, I asked if the documents regarding the contract could still be in the archives of the municipality—imagining an archived official document. Gümüş answered that I could instead make use of a newspaper column from the following day: "Yiğit Gülöksüz, the Head of TOKİ and the general coordinator of Habitat II, is in hospital due to gastric bleeding" (İstanbul Haber Servisi, 1996; Ercan, 1996). In a paper from 2 June, 1996, we read about a seemingly irrelevant but a closely related incident: a gastric bleeding. Informed by the comments of Gümüş, I understood that this was due to stress resulting from the poisoning of the dogs. So we come upon the sentiments of the coordinator, as indications of stress and tension. I read this as a symptom of a crisis, and think that the information regarding the head officer's gastric bleeding can call forth the knowledge of an absent content that was

[36] A doctor Adrian Vos of Impfstoff Werk pharmaceuticals, interviewed in the office the Ministry of Agriculture, is being quoted in the same article saying "Walk down any street in a Turkish city and you will see one result -- the terrified screams of young pedestrians on sighting a passing hound", explains existence of stray dogs as a result of the disturbed settlement patterns, poverty, and poor sanitation due to uncontrolled urban growth (Gorvett, 1996, para. 8).

kept away from the official archive. To be able to comprehend the meaning of that particular information, first we need to understand how the modern archive works, and in which way a (bodily) crisis —or crisis in general with regard to the body— interrupts or relates to it.

3.2 What to look for in an archive?

The modern archive has been identified with regulatory control and hegemony within what may be termed as post structuralist thinking. These thinkers argue that from the beginning of the nineteenth century, modern archive began to exceed its legal function (Derrida, 1996; Foucault, 1989; Agamben, 2008). The archive came to be understood as an institution of historical research. The drift paralleled the modernist understanding of history. The historian was supposed to be the servant of the most original information regarding the past. Historians' utmost purpose became letting the authenticity of the document talk for itself. Derrida (1996) described it in his renowned critique, *The Archive Fever,* the archive getting hold of the stand as the guardian of the truth; not just the archival document itself, but archive as an historical institution and architectural entity. The modern archive's topographical order helped to secure a power position. In the archival grid, among its rows and lines, the archive was able to determine the truth of any document; defining its origin, purpose, and place. Only in such order and control, topographical modern archive came to be understood as the guarantee, origin and preservation place of the truth and facts. Such a privileged office of enunciation to utter the truth was calling forth the archive as an administrative force. Sven Spielker, in his book *The Big Archive*, sums up that historical transformation:

> Traditionally the records stored in archives fulfilled a legal function. However, over time archives changed from being legal depositories to being

> institutions of historical research. By the end of the nineteenth century, finally, the archive had morphed into a hybrid institution based in public administration and historical research alike… As they enter the archive, the papers of which offices rid themselves are resurrected as sources that historians consult in their efforts to write history. From the historian's point of view these papers stand as quasi-objective correlatives of the living past. (Spielker, 2006, p. 12)

Although the archive gained a solid position to refer to the facts, its out of use content had the capacity to blur the meanings gathered from it. An archive can only possess a material that is not in use; "paperwork that no longer circulates in the bureaucracy" and "paperwork that has lapsed and became garbage" (Spielker, 2006, p. 9). Bureaucratic document can become a part of the public, only when it is endowed with the status of the archival. That imaginary status (the archival) is able to refer to the social, on condition of the lack of the authority of an author[37] (Mbembé, 2002, p. 21). According to Mbembé, at the moment the document becomes an object of historical research, it is subjected to the intentions of the historian and history writing. In this socially constructed realm of the archival, the information is supposed to belong to everyone in the society; it is collectively owned and encapsulated in a symbol of a public institution, resulting in an "instituting imaginary" for the society: "The archive is, therefore, not a piece of data, but a status" (p. 19). The imaginary status, based upon a ritualistic co-ownership, politically deems everyone in the society heirs to a collective past, heirs to a time as Mbembé describes the society of the modern archive a community of time. The archive works to create an illusion of totality and continuity in regards to that time of the community.[38]

---

[37] Archival documents may contain the information of the author. What I understand from Mbembé's argumentation is that what disappears is not the name of the author on the document, but the author's authority or intentions on the content of the document.

[38] Mbembe further elaborates on what he means by that time of the community and its relation to archival work: "No archive can be the depository of the entire history of a society, of all that has happened in that society. Through archived documents, we are presented with pieces of time to be

If there is any materiality of the archival document which is free of this imaginary status, it is as debris, as a remnant. However, the debris is not completely inert either. It does not always speak in favor of the official history and does not always submit to the order of the archive. As an unyielding material force, it constitutes a potential threat for the archival grid. In this frame, Achilles Mbembé refers to the archive as a tomb, "something of the nature of a temple and cemetery", where commemoration is regulated by the certain rules of history writing or limited access to certain documents (Mbembé, 2002, p. 19). It is in this frame that documents are kept inert as fragments and pieces of time and lives; yet treated ritualistically in an arrangement of the rooms, corridors and files under a calculated lighting (p. 19, 24). An archive's almost ritualistic structure is the condition for documents to remain isolated from the present and as dead as possible. Only in that way can the threat of the debris be minimized. The documents in an archive should be kept mute, and labels are supposed to define what the object is and where it stands in relation to time and space. The classificatory structure forces archival material not to relate in any way to the present or future. Thus, the information gathered from archive could be detached from the struggles of the present, and the possibilities of future.

According to a post-structural understanding, an archive is never solely a function of remembering; an archive is primarily and simultaneously a spatial order of recording and administration (Derrida, 1996). More than being the source of the revival of a vivid past, an archive is a place, a spatial order. Formed with rows and

---

assembled, fragments of life to be placed in order, one after the other, in an attempt to formulate a story that acquires its coherence through the ability to craft links between the beginning and the end. A montage of fragments thus creates an illusion of totality and continuity. In this way, just like the architectural process, the time woven together by the archive is the product of a composition. This time has a political dimension resulting from the alchemy of the archive: it is supposed to belong to everyone. The community of time, the feeling according to which we would all be heirs to a time over which we might exercise the rights of collective ownership: this is the imaginary that the archive seeks to disseminate" (Mbembé, 2002, p. 21).

lines, the grid of the modern archive carries a tendency of inhibiting heterogeneity or difference. This is the only way that a coherent narrative can emerge through the modern archive (Spielker, 2006). The way that things have been displayed or catalogued shapes the utterance made out of them. This is how the traditional modern archive, as Spielker (2006) names it, becomes the guardian of the truth. An archive's formal trappings, strings, ropes, knots, written labels and lists primarily function to tame the heterogeneity of the archive by turning residual material into documents of an imagined culture and history (Spielker, 2006).

However, official archives in Turkey have a contradictory reputation. Rather than implying an excessive control over its material, archives here are struck with an absence that produces an ambiguity over its content. In Turkey, rumors and stories about the condition of official archives render archival material extremely vulnerable to the effects of nature or the passing of time, as archival documents in Turkey are strangely recalled as being missing, lost or damaged due to humidity, mold, fires or flood. But still, archives' uncertain condition should not mislead us in a way to think that archives are free of hegemony and control in Turkey. On the contrary, such an absence itself produces the control and hegemony over the information to be gathered from the archive (Ahıska, 2006).

When I looked for an archived document at the beginning of my research in order to know the means through which the dogs were poisoned, that was an inquiry to know about the legal means of the poisoning. I thought if I knew what made this practice of killing possible — the order of command, people and institutions responsible for it, the initiative behind it, and its implementation, I would know about the political transaction that is capable of creating this and many other forms of exclusion, displacement and destruction. I wanted to know if there was any

paperwork regarding the contract of poisoning through a company—a small or medium size enterprise—trying to grasp the means and apparatuses of the incident. I thought if I could find any document regarding such a legal contract, it would be possible to look into written words, formal trappings, strings, labels, ropes and knots and make that bureaucratic garbage part of a culture, writing of history and memory, in a subversive way.

Apparently the information regarding the poisoning of the dogs, for the sake of a globally acknowledged conference, was not able to be confined in an archive. It is as if such information had no place in the official state archives. It is possible that even though a documentation of a contract for the poisoning of the dogs existed, it did not get classified as an archivable document, it did not reach the status of the archival. Here, the lost document marks an absence.[39] However, when Korhan Gümüş suggested that I should look for some particular news from the newspaper from 2 June, 1996, I began to think that the lost information, that is, the official document to tell us that the dogs had been poisoned, is haunting another archive that I would delved into. In the news of Gülöksüz's stomach bleeding, I looked for the sentiments as an indication of crisis and tension in the organizational mechanism. The official archive—the newspaper's archive too—is normatively framing the data it encapsulates; but it is still possible to look for non-normative information in the form of sentiments and affect in such an archive.[40] I took this inferred data to show how the dogs' poisoning haunts the newspaper archive. Avery Gordon (2008) conceptualizes haunting as "a constitutive feature of social life" and as an opening to

[39] It reminds one of Spielker's comments on Freud's uncanny in relation to the archive: "What could be that *unheimlich* that fails to be possessed at the first place? One that does not have any place in an archive but still haunts the utterance made out of it" (Spielker, 2006).
[40] In a similar way, Ann Laura Stoler (2009) reads through a colonial archive to detect the discursive realm of sentiments and affect in addition to empirical data, in *Along The Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense.*

grasp the nature of a society through “other kinds of sociological information” (p. 24, 25). What Gordon discusses as affective and historical understanding of the haunting as a sociological information, and the “ghost” as a “social figure” that haunts existing institutions is what puts the institutions in crisis (p. 24). Such crisis can be revelatory of complex social relations of “power, knowledge and experience” (p. 25). Then, where did this tension in the Habitat II organization come from? How come the lost information haunts by opening a hole in the event’s democratic transaction, revealing the discrepancies in its regulatory control and even the discursive regime? What do we see through that opening?

3.3 Crisis

In spring 1996, in the days following the murder of the dogs, Emel Yıldız, an alleged animal rights activist in 90s and a former film star of 60s Turkish cinema, took to Taksim Square shouting and yelling. The following day, she was all over the evening news. She was called *Panter Emel* (Emel the Panther) due to her sensitivity to dying species. But this nickname—one that she is in fact does not complain about—was also to suggest and mock her brash attitude towards the people that she targeted. Her impulses were regarded as aggressive, for sure. But also, she was implicitly mocked and accused of being that outspokenly angry about some animal matter. People said that animal rights would be a just cause only if Emel was not an advocate for it. On the following days, on a prime time TV show, Emel got angry with members of the newly founded Liberation and Democracy Party (ÖDP) for talking so much about the issues of the working class and interrupted the man by saying “you’ve been talking about the problems of the workers for hours, why are you so defensive? Are you part of the proletariat?” The man answered back saying, “Madam are you a *Caretta-*

caretta, that you've been talking about these tortoises all night?" Obviously she was, because Emel spent all of her speech time talking very feverishly about the dying *Caretta-carettas* on the Aegean coast. This is a supposedly hilarious story that people tell about Emel. Most of the time this is how people remember her, which places she and her speech in an out of the common sense realm that is doomed to fail next to serious political issues. People who do not accuse her of being so feverish, at least commented on the fact that she was strange. This was a time when animal rights protests were perceived as devoid of any political connotation. The demands were not considered political, or even serious. Her extreme sensitivity to a dying species was not considered a just cause.

It was at a similar time when the Saturday Mothers were banished from the Taksim-Galatasaray area and the transgender residents of Ülker Street were thrown out of their apartments by brutal force that Emel and her friends were taking to the square and shouting out for the poisoned dogs. Korhan Gümüş says that police treatment was not the same for the Saturday Mothers and the animal rights protestors. Emel and her friends were able to shout because theirs was not considered to be a political issue— apparently political means "threatening" or "dangerous" for the 90s Turkey. They were not exposed to physical violence. The lack of attention somehow expanded the boundaries of what is sayable for Emel. According to Gümüş, the dogs poisoning was the government's weak spot, so animal rights protesters were able to criticize them as they wished. They could speak freely. But at the same time, when this was all televised, politicians were even able to ask Emel whether she was crazy. In the end, she was shouting and bragging about some animal issue or another. As a publicly shouting woman, she was considered impulsive and unlikeable. But also she was rendered all incomprehensible. Rendering Emel's

speech as nonsense may be understood as a hegemonic instrument to dismiss her and and the public's attention to the dogs.

Dismissing Emel as "mad" brings to mind the tactics implemented by the junta in Argentina when the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo took to the streets, abandoning their domestic roles and demanding to know the whereabouts of their forcefully disappeared children. With support from the junta, the media immediately called them the "madwomen of the Plaza de Mayo" (Taylor, 1997, p. 195). As Diana Taylor explains, the Mothers' public mourning was historically perceived as inappropriate and they were even labeled as madwomen in a patriarchal domain. "The Madres were in fact called "locas" (madwomen) by many, who considered that their public grieving was inappropriate" (p. 195). Taylor explains that " "public" women [...] are considered prostitutes or madwomen—that is, nonmothers, even antimothers," while "good mothers are invisible," because they stay home with their children (p. 195). However, the Madres carved for themselves a third position that broke this dichotomy. Their identity was based on their motherhood, but they could no longer restrict it to the private, lacking children for whom to stay home" (p. 195). At first, people did not want to share a physical space with them, did not even want to pass close to them on the street to not to be associated with their "mad" behavior. Labeling publicly grieving women—or in Emel's case publicly furious women—as mad is a way of dismissing what she utters, what she says. The Madres' case exemplifies very vividly that calling a publicly protesting women mad or not quite herself is a politically charged indictment that is produced by a discourse on social exclusion. In Emel's case, this was a normative dichotomy of crazy vs. normal, that

attempts at subjugating the knowledge of the dogs being poisoned when it was revealed and made public by Emel shouting in the square.[41]

I wanted to ask Emel about the extent to which she thinks of her activism in line with the animal rights struggle or the animal liberation movement today. However, during our conversation she said that she was too exhausted and deprived of hope to talk about these questions. For now, I am not sure if she thinks of her activism in relation to a political stance. Despite these questions, I find it significant that all that was heard from her by the majority in public was some loud blabber. Yet she was able to ignite a crisis with the dead bodies of the dogs. This is how Gümüş recaptures the event:

> The next day after the dogs' poisoning, it appeared in the newspapers that: "The president of TOKİ has suffered bleeding in stomach". That (the poisoning) genuinely disturbed him as he actually supported the participation of the NGOs. When that happened, he got basically stuck. This was so sudden and he was unprepared for such an incident. In fact, this was a totally unexpected crisis for him. For that animal rights came up in this way, when the whole agenda of the conference was on human rights! In such a way… But, when you think about it, some people among the animal rights supporters were also very… They were different from what we understand as protesters today. They were not like the Saturday Mothers at the time, also. Because this was not a political issue, and that they were not facing violence from the police; they were able to come out and shout as they wish. To speak more frankly, because this was the administration's weak spot in that regard they were able to speak up and criticise easily. And for this, they were quite the radicals. Emel was on TV everyday at that time. As much as I remember, the discussions on television—this was all televised—one of the politicians asked Emel something like "Are you nuts?" It was an insult, as he was identifying Emel and friends as "crazy". Something like "They worship the animals, why should they be taken seriously?" And Emel protested. After a while, I saw Emel in Sulukule[42] (among the protesters against the displacement of the Roman residents for an

[41] My intention here is not to draw a direct parallel between the Mother's of Plaza de Mayo and Emel Yıldız. As I mentioned earlier and will argue further, the content of Emel Yıldız's protests was not recognized as political neither by the public nor the authorities. On the other hand it is apparent that protests of the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo, in a way that is similar to political protests of Saturday Mothers in Turkey, had political demands of justice from the very beginning.

[42] An old Roma district in Istanbul, brutally transformed by urban renewal based state-led gentrification in 2008.

> urban renewal project)... I don't know maybe she was also from there but was performing a different public persona as a former film star. This is just my guess… (Korhan Gümüş, personal communication, January 22, 2015)

Gümüş's comments affirms that even the police forces did not much care for her because of her acts and what she uttered was out of the realm of the politics. Basically, some dogs being poisoned had not been considered political. Shouting about it on Taksim square was almost craziness. Emel's nonsensical positioning apparently expanded the boundaries of what is sayable; but there is more to the ignition of that crisis, which puts materiality of the dead bodies of the dogs at the center, and renders Emel's behavior even obscene. Months after our first meeting, when Gümüş realized that I was interested in the details of the crisis, he wanted to explain the igniting event which may have been far too obscene to be uttered in our first meeting. As the story goes, Emel asked for a room from the Habitat II organization, for a press conference to protest what happened to the dogs, the day after the poisoning. Gümüş and Güloksuz arrived early, just before the reading of the press release to meet Emel at the appointed room. Emel came in with big, black, plastic bags in her arms. Dead bodies of the poisoned dogs were inside them. She threw the bags on the table that Gümüş and Güloksuz were standing behind, the table for the press release. Emel said: "This is what you accomplished." Güloksuz was hospitalized the next day. When the dead bodies of the dogs were brought into the room, they brought a moment of crisis inside the Habitat II organization. This was something to make Güloksuz's stomach bleed out of stress and burden. The general director of TOKİ was always sympathetic to the idea of participation and partnership with non-governmental organizations. But the poisoning of the dogs hit abruptly and rendered the democratic transaction insufficient. As a government official, he

became inert. In Gümüş's words, "he was unprepared and was not able to respond to such an event" (Korhan Gümüş, personal communication, December 18, 2015).[43]

This was a totally unexpected crisis especially because it happened while the whole agenda of the conference had a huge emphasis on human rights, perhaps revealing the inadequacy of a human centered understanding of rights. Materiality of the nonhuman bodies, the bodies of the dogs, interrupted this political transaction. The materiality, thus the information of the poisoning which was rendered nonexistent, filtered out, in the official archive and a problem of sanity in the Chief Veterinarian's interview, showed itself through the organic encounter of the bodies—the body of the head of the organization and bodies of the dogs. Dogs' bodies here almost refused to be passive as to be removed and gotten rid of. The bodies became actants with an efficacy that can do things with sufficient coherence to make a difference and produce effects that can alter the course of events (Bennet, 2010, p. 8). Normative modern archives and the metalanguage of high offices fail at referring to the discrepancies in regulatory control and discursive regime. Thus, the crisis in the Habitat II organization was the crisis of a hegemonic language of human rights and a democratic transactions' incompatibility with a governmental power to decide who should live and who should be discarded. From the opening of such a crisis, other bodies, very political bodies indeed, become visible. As Reinhart Koselleck (1988) stated in *Critique and Crisis*, crisis has a potential to reveal the distribution

[43] On 19 December, 2016, I had a personal communication with Yiğit Güloksuz about the Habitat II preparations and outcomes. He specifically stated that Habitat II was a technical conference of settlements and infrastructure; yet his organization worked to transform it into a gathering about democracy and the participation among local and central actors. He stated that they took Habitat II as an opportunity to inform urban citizens and give them agency to participate in local governance. When I asked him about the poisoning of the dogs, he voiced his frustration saying that the poisoning and the attraction it gained from media harmed the achievements of Habitat II meetings. He argued that news about poisoning, foreshadowed the content of the conference and inhibited urban citizens from being informed about the democratic principles of the event. He voiced his frustration about Habitat II still being remembered with the poisoning of dogs, which their organization had no role in it, in the first place. His frustration in a way signaled that the crisis was still ongoing, as Habitat II's benefits rapidly disappeared after its implementation.

and transact of power. When the stray dogs' poisoning ignited a crisis, it revealed a bodily hierarchy that was concerned with deciding who was to live and who was to die; which of the bodies could be discarded, which could be exiled, made to disappear or killed. The crisis revealed that bodies of the public are segregated into hierarchical positions. Stray dogs, as the disposable ones for a human-centered modernizing society, transcended the intraspecies and interspecies segregation by generating crisis in the logic and implementation of power.

The crisis of the democratic transaction of Habitat II that revealed itself to us via the bodily crisis of a head officer and became an opening to witness several bodies that could not be absorbed by the general economy. One of them was the non-profitable body[44] of the stray dog, to be sure. The other ones were the transgender women of Ülker Street who at the same time refused to leave their pet dogs to the street while they were being evacuated from their houses for the occasion of the "Habitat cleansing". These women struggled to dismantle the patriarchal order of their neighborhood. The discriminatory violence that they were subjected to challenged the understanding of the displacement that is in general assumed to be limited to being a result of the neoliberal urban policies.

3.4 Ülker Street

Beyoğlu, a former wasteland with its excessive dogs, is burdened with the histories of displacement. Transgender women lived in Ülker Street between the years 1991-96. The Ülker Street pogrom also took place in the spring of 1996, a few weeks before Habitat II. In the 90s, the existing transphobia forced transgender women to

[44] Compared to the pet dogs, stray dogs do not have a commercial value. Most of the time stray dogs are perceived as excess on the streets of the urban space, or as a problem of hygiene that needs to be solved by the local authorities. On the other hand, there is a market for the wellbeing and care of pet animals.

live together as a community, both because they could convince only a certain number of landowners to rent apartments to them and also because they needed to check on each other to protect themselves. Living as an intact community is always favorable for transgender women. This is how Ülker Street came to be a ghetto in the 90s. However, such an obligation does not necessarily produce a victim. This common way of living—even a form of an alternative economy according to Şevval's reading—is in fact an inscription of the transgender women as the actors of their living conditions. The transgender women of Ülker Street in 1996 were both actors of a collective form of living and witnesses to multiple outbursts of violence in the same period.

Transgender women started to move into houses in Ülker Street around 1991. They were already living in the streets neighboring Ülker Street before the 90s, but they were forcefully evicted by the police. Any encounter with the police meant guaranteed assault. Police organizations had strong nationalist and conservative tendencies. Şevval's roommate was just out of prison when they moved to Ülker Street. She was charged for insulting Atatürk, the founder of the Republic; the police force was extremely nationalist at the time. During a police intervention, a police shouted "If Ataturk had seen you like this, he would have crumbled in his grave". When Demet reciprocated in the same way, saying "Atatürk would have crumbled in his grave if he had seen you like this", it resulted in her being detained and charged (Şevval Kılıç, seminar, December 25, 2014).

The years between 1991 and 94 were the "golden years"[45] of Ülker Street. It was the period when, in this relatively safe environment, trans women were able to take control of their own working conditions while continuing to have good

[45] In her seminar talk, Şevval Kılıç uses this phrase for the period between 1991 and 1994.

relationships with their neighbours living in the apartment houses. Every woman was a sex worker, but there was no third party who made a profit out of the women's work. There were no shifts that regulated their work time. Women did not share their income with anyone else, as they owned their own labor, but most of the time they shared their income among themselves, so they had a common cashier. They themselves decided when to work. Besides work, they were truly living there. The neighbourhood was where their social bonds lay. They had good relationships with the neighbours, and they were friends with some of them. At its most populated times, nearly a hundred trans women were living there. Ülker Street was a ghetto, but Şevval says that living in the ghetto was not an entirely demeaning situation. Although forcing a community to live in a ghetto is a fundamental rights violation, Şevval argued that in terms of their conditions, it provided trans women with a certain space for freedom, power and agency to look after each other and protect themselves. Richard Sennett (2014) also describes the fourteenth-fifteenth century ghettos in Venice, where foreigners and prostitutes were able to take refuge in a cosmopolitan city. Ghetto provided a safe environment for groups with a common identity.[46] Isolation and segregation caused groups in the ghetto to act cohesively and they "began to feel a bond amongst themselves"; "the space of repression became incorporated into their own sense of community" (Sennett, 2014, p. 231).

In Şevval's testimony, this space of freedom, their relationships with their indispensable pet dogs, and the routine police attacks follow each other. This is how she tells it:

> We were truly *living* on that street. It was our actual home. We were living and socializing there. We had really good relations with the neighbors. The time that we were most populated, 100 girls were

[46] This is a common past and ethnicity for the Jews, so it must be a common identification with gender for the transgender women in Ülker Street. Also in both cases the commonality of a financial conduct is at stake.

> living there. It was like a film setting of an Almodovar movie. Of course there are good and bad sides of being in a ghetto. We had our own way of living there. You could have seen a girl going to the grocery store with her makeup all over her face, in her nightgown, 10 in the morning. Everyone had a dog. 100 girls, each of them owned a dog. These dogs copulated with each other so much that we started to think that a whole new breed unique to Ülker Street was coming up. Like ülker terrier. All those strange breed dogs began to appear. And of course, police raids were continuing… And the way that police attacked! It was in such a way that you would think that it is not as if you are a thief or murderer or something. They attacked you with their full means. (Şevval Kılıç, seminar, December 25, 2014)

Police raids were somehow a routine. Especially when there was a change in the administration of the Beyoğlu police department, an entirely new wave of raids would start. It was referred to as an attack against illegal elements: drug dealers, thieves and the transgender sex workers of Ülker Street. Şevval says that she almost started to believe at some point that they were doing something seriously harmful in that place, because the means of the attacks were horrendous. Police broke into houses by taking off the doors and inflicting severe physical violence. Şevval remembers one day when police from the special task forces broke into her apartment on the third floor from her living room windows, climbing the emergency stairway in full gear. She says that they were not treated like thieves, murderers or any petty criminal; that it was something else. Then it came out that the Beyoğlu police department had asked permission from the counter-terrorism bureau claiming that suspicious men were visiting these apartments, and they got permission to break the doors. After that, transgender activists and residents organized a press conference saying that they were not terrorists, so there was no legal basis for breaking into houses by taking off the doors. Aslı Zengin (2007) defines the state's violent relationship to sex workers through Das and Poole's (2004) conceptualization of the "Margins of the State" where, in their understanding "... "the state" can no longer be conceptualized as a rationalized administrative form of political organization, but can

be comprehended as a sovereign power that continuously establishes a relationship between violence and its ordering functions", and thus the state's disciplinary practices and regulatory control come to define its political existence (Zengin, 2007, p. 2). This conceptualization explains the state's intimate relationship with the bodies that exist at its margins when it enters their houses or bruises their skin which makes it clear that "... occupying this margin means not only lacking many social and individual rights, but also to be constantly subject to violence which in turn contributes to the production of the places where women sex workers are as marginal" (p. 77). In relation to the production of places of violence, as Zengin quotes from Das and Poole, definition of the margins further talks to the idea of margins as in the case of exile, pushing a community to the margins of a spatial regime. In that case, the displacement of people aims to render communities passive by displacing them, by disrupting their social bonds that come from living together (p. 25). Accordingly, the streets where transgender women lived were defined as criminal areas in Beyoğlu in the 90s which enabled the arbitrary use of violence to be embedded in everyday life, making it arduous for transgender women to continue to live in that zone. Zengin argues that "the spaces of prostitution are ideologically manipulated towards different ends to produce their own sets of relations and subjects, and they embed power relations regarding the regulatory regimes of "the state"... The law in particular plays a major role in the spatial distribution of prostitution and several institutional actors are involved in (dis)placing women using legality as a criterion" (p. 108). Again, in Ülker Street, the transgender women's case had been transferred to the counter-terrorism bureau by claiming that some unidentified men were coming to visit. The police were already able to inflict violence arbitrarily upon women in Ülker Street, but the authority gained by a

counter-terrorism discourse opened the gates for unprecedented levels of violence and the power to inflict it. It is almost incomprehensible but yet very familiar that the state's regulatory control have been realized through both a claim for morality and also anti-terrorism, an asset of nationalism. Zengin thinks of the state's intimacy of the bodily interference with the women sex workers as the implementation of the state "as a sexualized body rather than a neutral one" as "the state" constructs its sexual margins as well as itself as a masculine body" (p. 96). Here we can add that the state's masculine body has also a claim for a heteronormative morality and a nationalist identity.

Şevval says that in the mid-90s Ülker Street and its adjacent Kazancı, Başkurt and Pürtelaş streets were in fact "criminal" areas, the police were not the only source of violence (Şevval Kılıç, seminar, December 25, 2014). It was difficult for women to walk on Kazancı Street after midnight. Yet they were strong and intact enough as a community to defend themselves. Protecting each other from abuse and malice was possible. It was also financially possible to live in Ülker Street. Rents were very cheap around Cihangir. The ones with money were even able to buy a house and financially secure the rest of their lives. As a result of the safe and eligible conditions, Ülker Street drew in transgender migrants. According to Şevval, at the time of Habitat II, Ülker Street was already overpopulated due to its relatively safe environment for them. Istanbul was attracting LGBT and transgender migrants. When the population increased, the residents started to hear rumors that the landowners who rented their apartments to transgender women were being threatened by other inhabitants of the neighborhood. And finally they saw attacks on other neighbors by the police, foretelling about the upcoming pogrom. Starting from the beginning of the 90s, they were living in Ülker Street with African migrants who

had started to come to Turkey from West, East and Central Africa due to financial or political reasons. These men and women and families with children that lived in Istanbul for diverse reasons such as asylum seeking, irregular migration[47] or transitory migration were in a legally ambiguous situation, as Turkey did not legally accept refugees from non-European countries and did not welcome migrants who did not have "Turkish roots" (Soykan, 2010, p. 220).[48] The lack of a clear-cut legal basis for their stay, "the weakness of asylum seekers' social networks" and the "the difficulty of getting into Europe prolonged the Africans' stay in Turkey, leading them to engage in a variety of survival strategies" that ended up in poor living conditions due to a "paucity of income earning opportunities since the beginning of the 1990s (Brewer & Yükseker, 2006, p. 6). Şevval says that the African migrants in Ülker Street were living there with their families, describing their relationship to their African neighbors as humane: "All men, women and children, they were living next to us. We had very humane relationships to each other." This humane bond established between the lawfully unacknowledged neighbors, neighbors of a ghetto, rather recalls a bond of abjecthood reflective of Kristeva's (1982) conceptualization of the abjection defines a state of being drawn from a domain, a subjecthood or a place that imposes itself "on the delineations of life, law, and order" to disturb

[47] Cavidan Soykan (2010) describes the status of irregular migrant as: "the migrants who cross borders without documents or the consent of authorities. Therefore, some of irregular migrants might be asylum seekers. Asylum seekers and refugees are both migrants in theory. However, it is important to note that they constitute a special group of migrants that needs protection in international human rights law" (Soykan, 2010, p. 209).

[48] "The decision to retain the optional geographical limitation to *the 1951 Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees* is the most prominent characteristic of the country's migration and asylum profile. According to this limitation, only European asylum seekers can apply for refugee status while non-Europeans can only receive temporary protection to be resettled in a third country by the UNHCR office (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) in Turkey… No single person is known to have be granted refugee status by the Turkish national authorities according to the 1994 Regulation, which is the only legislation in this field (Amnesty International 2009: 9)... The problem with the legislation is that even if an asylum seeker agrees to wait for a number of years to receive refugee status, there is no option of integration into Turkish society. The Turkish state does not want anyone who has no Turkish roots as either a refugee or an immigrant" (Soykan, 2010, p. 218- 220).

borders, positions and rules (Becker-Lecrone, 2005, p. 33). It obliterates meaning and resists making sense of metanarratives when it "persists and returns in flashes, at places of strain or moments of crisis within the symbolic system" (Becker-Lecrone, 2005, p. 20, 21, 30). Kristeva's conceptualization of the abject makes it clear to me why morally and legally unacknowledged ones and the nonhuman often cross paths in this research; as Kristeva offers an anti-identificatory critique of humanism in opposition to the idea of a willful and conscious subjectivity that is based on a Cartesian understanding that puts human in the center through "I think, therefore I am"—assuming that thinking is a solely humane capability.

Abjection does refer to a limit position for culture and the subject. Kristeva does not think of such margins or limits of the coherent subjectivity as separate from the margins of culture; and even geography and politics. She takes the existence of borderlines very seriously to "persistently describe this crisis as a matter of ambiguous borderlines and unmapped frontiers, of strays and exiles and outcasts" (Becker-Lecrone, 2005, p. 32). In describing abjection, Kristeva explicitly talks of a crisis of place. This crisis of place ("Where am I?") precipitates a crisis of meaning and identification (What is that? Is that me? What am I?)" (p. 32). Thus the existence of the stranger pushes the imaginatively coherent society to its abjection. The existence of stray dogs, transgender women sex workers and the African migrants enforce a state of non-normativity to the neighborhood, and even to the organizations such as the state. Their marginal existence at that limit threatens rational subjecthood, to a sovereign nation state and a unified neighborhood; their being as "ex-statically drawn from its proper domain to this "land of oblivion"" pose a threat to the socially constructed idea of hygiene, morality and nationality (Becker-Lecrone, 2005, p. 33). "Law, religion and morality seek to give order to horror (to

the one that does not comply in its borders) to push it to the margins of normative meaning and to keep it on the margins when it threatens to encroach… Prohibitions and punishments work to purify the abject. To make it nameable and totalizable" (Kristeva, 1982, p. 17). When the stranger is repulsed, be threatened or hit, only discourses of "double, fuzzy, heterogeneous, animal, metamorphosed, altered, abject" can talk to its truth (p. 17). In our case, the dog as the abject persists with its materiality to introduce a moment of crisis to the democratic transactions. Abject bodies of the transgender women and African migrants also flash into mid 90s history of democracy and exile. "The dynamics at the margins of self and culture significantly shape—indeed serve as the foundations for—their symbolic norms" (Becker-Lecrone, 2005, p. 30). Kristeva's notion of the abject posits a rupture for humanism as its "threatening otherness" that no longer can be assimilated in law, religion or culture as "the sacred" and there "emerges a different kind of discourse that responds to abjection" that is "'destined to survive the collapse of the historical forms'" (p. 39). In our case, the abject bodies point out to moments of crisis in an international event's democratic transaction and the state's regulatory control.

Kristeva's "anti-identificatory anti-humanism" —although it is a theory of the subjecthood—offers a position for the subject that both produces and produced by structures of meaning that are multiple, illogical (cannot enter into the realm of the rational language) and at odds, at the margins (Becker-Lecrone, 2005, p. 22). Subjectivity is not coherent; it is a locus of different forces. In that sense, Kristeva's understanding of the subject is also in line with Butler's description of a plural self, as I mentioned in the first chapter. From here, I will discuss the political space opened by different abject bodies in their way of relating to each other.

When Şevval continues to describe the mundane peculiarities of their relationship to their neighbors, a state of witnessing comes into prominence:

> We used to invite them (African neighbors) to our house for tea and pass the time of the day. We had relations of a neighbor. And, first, they were cleared out of their houses. First they, just before that habitat meeting, were kicked out of their apartments, pulled by their hairs, screaming. First we saw them, before our eyes. And all that they were doing there was to live. They were living there, inhabiting, cooking, drinking, and shopping there. (Şevval Kılıç, seminar, December 25, 2014)

Şevval's narrative is insightful. Transgender women witnessed their neighbors being dragged out of their homes. They witnessed and recognized the order of the conduct. The first ones to be cleared out were the Africans, and then the transgender women. And in their abject positioning they were able to witness the pain of others. At the same time, women witnessed the dogs being poisoned when they were about to leave. They became witnesses to each other's pogrom.

Şevval stated that in Turkey in the 1990s, sometimes the police would destroy the records verifying physical assault on transgender women on purpose. The existence of such records would have been important to have a legal basis to claim rights. In the lack of factual grounds for the recognition of such injustice, official archives can only be haunted by the missing information, so it cannot provide a basis for justice. But what happened here between the women, the African neighbors and the stray dogs calls for a witnessing that cannot be recorded by an archive. This situation may be more clearly understood through what Bracha Ettinger (1999) refers as *wit(h)nessing*. Ettinger's terminology calls for a witnessing that arises from a bond of intimacy of *being with*. Such being with can be read as an intimate bond that comes from sharing the same living space, passing the leisure time together or being friends. Ettinger's definition points out to the experience of a shared space between the victims and the ones who acknowledge their pain. Wit(h)nesing is a means of

being with and remembering for the other. Wit(h)nessing does not replace the word witnessing but it expands it. It inherits its moral and ethical legacy but is not limited to it. Wit(h)nessing can occur simultaneously to witnessing.[49] Then what kind of a body is that transgender body so that it can wit(h)ness? Şevval hints on that body and its relation to other bodies:

> As a society we do consist of animals, cats, dogs, human, people, children who bow down for the phallus. That's our patriarchal nirvana. This could be a woman, trans or gay individual who advocates patriarchy, it doesn't matter. It does not discriminate. I think misogyny lies at the heart of the hostility against trans women, the transphobia. Because trans women overthrow the sole ground of patriarchy from her body. By rejecting the phallus, she rejects patriarchy. She removes it from her body by paying money for it, she mocks it. In this way, you emptied out the whole basis of the man's ideology. (Şevval Kılıç, seminar, December 25, 2014)

Ettinger thinks of a phallus as definitive of the masculine position, as the phallus is correlated with the symbolic hegemony of the paternal name, one's relation to history, law or any hegemonic or definitive metanarrative. In that respect a "phallus represents the imposition of law" (Malone, 1997, p. 421). Thus, when transgender women remove the phallus from their body, they remove the representational basis for the imposition of law—any law of nature, heteronormativity, the idea of a coherent self in relation to a demanding Other—from their body. They displace themselves from the hegemony of the phallic order. Instead, they wit(h)ness with their willfully castrated body in its abjection with other abject bodies—bodies of the migrants, exiles, and nonhuman. Kristeva's conceptualization of abjection already provided a ground for the refusal of a sovereign subjecthood; from here, Ettinger suggests we move beyond the symbolic regime to enable a

---

[49] Ettinger does not, however, replace one word with another. She expands a word's conceptual range from the legal and testimonial meaning of bearing witness to the crime against the other, to *being with*, but not assimilated to, and to *being beside* the other in a gesture that is much more than mere ethical solidarity.

space of *carrience* (being able to carry an other's trauma's burden) between a matrix (alliance) of bodies.[50]

Then what happens to that body? Or, how does that body live and in which condition inhabit a neighborhood?

> Transwomen's struggle should be seen as a class struggle too. They have no social security. They cannot be retired… If you say that you want no trans people in your neighborhood, it is possible that everybody will support you, except the trans one. Capitalism cannot explain such behavior. If you only mention prostitution and people living with their families and kids, the deed is done… What happened here cannot be compressed directly under the title of urban transformation. There was no large capital accumulation directed here for bigger profit at the time. It wasn't like Sulukule or Tarlabaşı. Neighborhoods like Ülker Street already have their own control mechanisms. An opportunist individual can mobilize an entire neighborhood… you can be discarded easily… What's more, trans women cannot be integrated into the system, in any way. Primarily they cannot attach to it via fertility or procreation. Most of them are sex workers, thus they do not need to work at your factories, companies; basically they do not need your money. You have no capital volume or value as the pink money also, as gay and lesbians do. Gay and Lesbians can still be employed or can be employers; trans' do not. You don't offer much as a transgender person. You only reproduce and consume with your own. Because of this, in the end, nobody cares. It has no use if you exist or not. Thus, you can be discarded easily. (Şevval Kılıç, seminar, December 25, 2014)

Şevval's analysis elaborately defines the condition in which a body to be rendered disposable. It is exempt of a market value, not compatible with the normative morality of the landowners, and poses a threat to the masculine existence of the state forces. It is at the margins of a coherent, moral, legally tamed subjecthood, neighborhood and a rightful citizenship. In that way it constantly relates to mixed breed dogs and legally unacknowledged migrants as fellow neighbors. These bodies'

[50] Ettinger does not entirely agree with Kristeva. According to Ettinger, Kristeva still talks of a realm within the phallic regime. According to her, Kristeva does not offer an alternative to symbolic or phallic regime when it comes to the issue of formation of subjectivity; but tackles with what appears at the margins of that regime of the sovereign subject. Ettinger instead, thinks of feminine subjectivity as an alternative to the phallic regime. According to Ettinger, feminine womb is an original hub for the relations of caring and encounter with another body; not because every women has carried another in her womb, but because everyone is essentially have been carried in another's womb. Rather than taking the response to a phallic order as the roots of subject formation, she thinks of a relationship of encounter and carrying that starts at the womb, as the model for human subjectivizing process.

existence at the margins of a state and at the margins of a neighborhood is a constant threat to a legitimate coherency. The Africans', the transgender women's, and the dogs' displacement reverberated as a clearance. This man from the police—*Hortum Süleyman* (Süleyman the Hose), who was infamous for dragging the women out of Başkurt Street with a hose in his hand in 1991—was "imported" back to Beyoğlu police department once again in 1996 to clear Ülker Street of its unprofitable perversion, and make it ready for the Habitat II, although the foreign participants of the conference strongly opposed and protested the wrongdoing. Hortum Süleyman received this nickname as he was using a hose to torture trans women under custody. He became a prominent figure in displacing transgender women from Ülker Street. He was known to organize young males in the neighborhood and mobilize taxi drivers in the surrounding neighborhoods to frighten and molest transgender women. When Hortum Süleyman was called back by the authorities to work in Ülker Street in 1996, the motive was well understood by everyone who was familiar with Süleyman's deeds. Hortum Süleyman had collaborators for his crimes among the residents and landowners. After the transgender women were taken out, one of the landowners had even affixed a sign on her apartment wall reading: "this building has been cleared out of the transvestites and prostitution". In Ülker Street, a clearance for morality happened that fits with any typical excuse for gentrification. But Şevval argues that gentrification would be an easy explanation in understanding what happened in Ülker Street in that the frame of neoliberal urban policies does not talk to the bare cruelty of single individuals or the overall ignorance of the neighborhood. Gentrification explains the displacement of people from specific neighborhoods with a market-oriented restructuring that becomes possible with an alliance between the regulatory state forces and the capitalist enterprise; rendering the existing inhabitants

of the neighborhood with a fixed victimhood of the immigrants, minorities and people living in poverty. Such definition dismisses the complexity of everyday relations in the neighborhood. It misses that there were friendships, flirts and sometimes bonds of trust established between the neighbors. It misses that transgender women in Ülker Street were capable of paying higher amounts of rent when compared to an average middle class family, that they were not just vulnerable tenants; some women among them owned—sometimes more than one—houses in the neighborhood, but their rights to property could not protect them either. The micro stories that Şevval tells exceed the dynamics of gentrification as a concept. Especially because Şevval insists that there was something else than an eagerness to make money and gain prestige, something more about the cruelty of the landlords and the police. She resists a clear cut representational or structural explanation. After Ülker Street had been evacuated, thirty-five transgender women who had to live outside were killed. Some women could only survive in that particular neighborhood. There were women who did not abide by the normative expectations of the society but yet they could earn a living in Ülker Street. When Şevval was talking about these women who were not able survive, she came to a point where landowner's eagerness to make money failed to explain what happened. She says, "I think there is something more than money involved in this. I think there is something darker in it." It is difficult to put its name and call it for what it is. Once she said during her talk that it was something "primitive" in perpetrators, adding that "we do not use that word in fact", because it is not politically correct. Arendt's *banality of evil* would be an appropriate translation for what Şevval tries to describe as "something darker" that went beyond mere eagerness to profit from the transformation of the urban texture. Arendt describes banality of evil as a passive state of thoughtlessness, lack

of willpower, abiding by the common order of things without a radical act of responsibility. Şevval's narrative reveals such banality that is beyond an eagerness to make money or to get a better reputation in the neighborhood; rather she describes a state of indifference to the violent evacuation. It is beyond, because it is more about making an ethical choice and taking responsibility for a common dwelling space. It is also about a given condition about time and space, about people complying with the existing rule of conduct for that specific time and that specific neighborhood, street.

3.5 Disappearance

Next to human and nonhuman bodies of exile and destruction, I suggest considering a political practice of witnessing for a body of absence. I think that some other work of witnessing—or wit(h)nessing—was going on, on a spot approximately 900 meters away from Ülker Street when the dogs were being poisoned during the Habitat II preparations and the unprofitable residents of the neighborhoods were being displaced. In Galatasaray square of the district of Beyoğlu, every Saturday noon since 1995, Saturday Mothers (or Saturday People, including the human rights activists) commemorated and asked the whereabouts of their relatives who had been forcefully disappeared in the mid-90s. The Saturday Mothers' call for the lost bodies is pointing out a crisis in the nation state's regulatory control[51] and regime of truth. During the spring of 1995, the relatives of people who had disappeared—now, the Saturday Mothers or people—began to meet in front of Galatasaray High School on

[51] Again, also in the case of The Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo, "The Madres' public demonstration of loss belied the military's assurance that everything was under control, that their fight was "clean" fight and that punishment only came to the those who deserved it" (Taylor, 1997, p. 219). While military tried to assure the governmental crude to decide for whom to live and establish a bodily hierarchy between those who deserve and not deserve to live; mothers 'mad' behavior transgressed such behavior by calling for the disappeared to be returned alive.

a central street in Beyoğlu, after the discovery of the tortured body of Hasan Ocak. Hasan Ocak had forcefully disappeared and his body was found two months later in a common graveyard in Istanbul. The date also coincides with the March 1995 Gazi Quarter Riots, where demonstrations sparked by the drive-by shooting of an elderly Alevi community leader in Gazi were brutally dispersed by the police and gendarmerie. Twenty-three people were killed, and the video footage shows police firing rounds into the crowd.[52] After Ocak's body had been found, a group of women, human rights activists, inspired by Argentina's Mothers of Plaza de Mayo, decided on silently sitting in Galatasaray Square each Saturday as a means of protest, demanding that those missing under custody must be found, that those responsible must be tried and that the crimes must not be repeated.

Initially, there were the Mothers, relatives of the disappeared and a small group of women activists sitting at the square in silence. There were only two posters in their hands for two people who had forcefully disappeared in police custody. One of them read: "Hasan Ocak disappeared and his body was found in a common grave. Where are the perpetrators?" There were 30 or 35 activists, with 5 relatives among them, carrying the photographs of the disappeared relative. Seven weeks later, the police intervened in the silent protest and the group decided to read a press release to demonstrate their right to speech. Filiz Karakuş, a human rights activist who was among the first group who took to Galatasaray square on 27 May 1995, says that

---

[52] Gazi is a neighborhood where a large population of Alevis live in Istanbul. The neighborhood is the site of frequent protests that often descend into intense clashes between left-wing groups and police. Alevi community is a minority group in Turkey, practicing a distinct form of Islam, a culture and belief system that runs heterodox to the Sunni identity of the Turkish state. Alevis have suffered systematic discrimination and massacres since the early republican period. In 1937, in Dersim province, 13,000 Alevis were killed after the Turkish military suppressed a rebellion. In 1978 an Islamist-nationalist group killed more than hundred Alevi civilians by explosives and gunfire and set two-hundred Alevi houses on fire by claiming that Alevis were communists threatening the nation's Sunni religion. In 1993, Islamist extremists set fire to a hotel hosting a literary conference in Sivas, killing 35 of the participants. The events that came to be called Madımak massacre, became subject of public scrutiny as the police forces failed to intervene that day (Osterlund, 2015).

they were calling themselves the Saturday People at the time; mothers had not given their names to the demonstrations yet (Filiz Karakuş, personal communication, December 27, 2014). According to Filiz, this was human rights activism at first and the press gave it the name of Saturday Mothers, as the Mothers' presence attracted attention. The news was mostly about the Mothers' and women's presence in the demonstrations. In the following weeks, demonstrators began to tell the stories of the forcefully disappeared in addition to their press release. The stories were followed by a relative's testimony. These testimonies, naturally, found more audience. Over time, the public space in front of the Galatasaray High School was transformed into a space of mourning for people who had lost their loved ones, mostly under police custody, who were never heard from again nor could not their whereabouts be determined. Filiz says: "I do not want to call it a graveyard but a space for commemoration in the absence of a grave". Each week new relatives attended the meetings and at their 15th week, there were already 20 relatives of the disappeared.

They did not face any other intervention until the spring of 1996. That spring of Habitat II came with a series of raids by the police. Before that, they saw some parts of the streets being closed off because of construction, preventing them from entering the square, but they did not think of it as a serious security measure or an intentional put back by the police. The raids continued through the summer. They were prevented from entering the square for eight weeks. Filiz says that at that time they only thought that the attacks were just to prevent them from protesting, that they did not come to think of it as an ideological measure to erase the political potential belonging to that certain part of the public space. Now, she says, with regard to the events of last few years, including the Gezi Park resistance and its violent break up, it is more clear that Beyoğlu is a highly politicized public space. Being in Beyoğlu is

not only about being able to be heard and seen from that part of the city. Protesting in Beyoğlu takes your act to the realm of the political. Filiz says that in the mid 90s Saturday Mothers' protests played a significant role in politicizing Beyoğlu as a public space. It was not only the protests, there were offices of various associations, ethnic/cultural foundations and their hangouts next to people who were present in Istiklal Avenue for various reasons. Beyoğlu was unique in that way. Thus, she says, the state wanted to obstruct such encounters, even intended to "clear Beyoğlu of such presence", although it did not succeed. In that sense, Beyoğlu is already a politically charged space in terms of its visibility, next to its history of displacements.

When the relatives and human rights activists met in Galatasaray Square with inspiration from Mothers of Plaza de Mayo, silently demanding to know the whereabouts of the forcefully disappeared or telling their stories, it was the first time that the systematic disappearances both in Istanbul and in Kurdish cities became visible to the public eye. Some time around the 13th week, relatives of the people who had disappeared in Kurdish districts joined the Mothers. When these 20 or 25 women arrived, they opened the conversation for the *faili meçhul* ("perpetrator unknown") cases in Northern Kurdistan during the years of 1992 and 1993. Their way of relating bridged the experiences of different cities and made it visible that the state attacks not only the silence of the opposition but also denies the existence of the political potential of a movement. Galatasaray became a center for revealing how a strategy was enforced to make people disappear and for the state to negate the Kurdish issue. Filiz says that when the police interfere to demonstrations, it interferes to obstruct such rationality:

> It (state) lets you say whatever you want in Kazlıcesme, in a far off piece of the city space. Just don't relate with people. Our demonstrations were immensely publicized in those 38 weeks. We were on the news while being pulled by the arm or just throwing carnations to the air to commemorate the

> "disappeared". It is different there. Being anywhere on the street and being in a certain public space are not the same things. We should not think those two as the same things. It is different. Sometimes police had to make a human chain to prevent people from seeing or hearing us. Because when they do, it can sparkle a doubt in people's mind to ask "why are they sitting here?" Those mothers' pain, and their existence in that space is so real, they speak with their very lives.[53] This is why they (the police) try to disrupt it. Their silent sit-in in that square, affects people and they become obliged to look at them. There is a pain, and it finds a respectful response, a state of listening. (Filiz Karakuş, personal communication)

I think this state of response opens up a very important discussion in relation with a state of wit(h)nessing. I will discuss what that response means and how it works at the end of this chapter. But before that, I want to explain the conditions that enforced disappearances implemented, as it reveals what truth is responded to or wit(h)nessed here.

Enforced disappearance refers to the use of force; it makes it clear that the enforced disappearance does not only happen by being taken officially under custody. The Truth Justice and Memory Center's report (2013) describes enforced disappearance via the United Nations' definition in the *International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance*:

> According to the United Nations' International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (ICCPED) the term "enforced disappearance" expresses "(...) the arrest, detention, abduction or any other form of deprivation of liberty by agents of the state or by persons or groups of persons acting with the authorization, support or acquiescence of the state, followed by a refusal to acknowledge the deprivation of liberty or by the concealment of the fate or whereabouts of the disappeared person, which place such a person outside the protection of the law." The convention defines not only the acts of "agents of the state" but also that of "persons or groups of persons acting with the authorization, support or acquiescence of the state" as enforced disappearance. In view of the fact that such acts are frequently carried out by paramilitary forces, or agents of the counter-guerrilla apparatus, it becomes clear how functional such a broad definition is. Another organic part of the definition is the refusal of the perpetrators to acknowledge their deed, or their concealment of the fate or whereabouts of the disappeared person, an aspect we could call a typical constituent of

[53] She does not specifically refer to Agamben's conceptualization of the 'bare life', she says 'canları' which could also be translated as their hearts, but I preferred to translate is as their life, even bare lives, meaning their sole existence.

> enforced disappearances. This can take place by a refusal to provide information, or by providing wrong information. (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 11)

In Turkey, enforced disappearances are almost systematic and apparently strategic for the suppression of the collective struggle of the Kurds, the Kurdish resistance, since the 1980 coup. The Truth Justice Memory Center, a human rights organization focused on state violence in Turkey, takes the 1980 coup as a starting point for the study of enforced disappearances, as the disappearances were carried out as a widespread practice at the time (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 13). From the 1980s onwards, enforced disappearances were gradually made possible by the compatible tactics of the state. Tactics such as making use of local conflicts in the face of a guerilla movement with a mass support from Kurdish community was the result of an administrative—at the same time military and political—transformation in provinces that were declared to be in a state of emergency (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 16). Localization of the violence meant the instrumentalization of the enmities between local tribes and other groups. State forces used such enmities to create groups of people of village guards with the support of the state whilst the ones who refused to work for the state automatically fell into the category of the enemies of the state (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 18,19). Village guardsmanship was among the most widespread and irregular warfare instruments. According to the Truth Justice Memory Center's publication, "both the implementation of village guardsmanship and other irregular warfare techniques were in essence, policies designed to separate "loyal citizens" from the others, apparently the most critical issue in an environment of inner conflict" (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 19). Such differentiation between the locals enabled the disposal of the ones who were perceived as enemies. As Ahıska (2014) argues, such differentiation made it possible

to treat certain people as removable objects, thus irredeemably rendering their bodies to a passive object position. "Evacuation of certain settlements, restricted and suspended entry and exits of both people and things (food, animal fodder, communication tools) manifested extreme uses of state power and control in "exceptional zones" (Ahıska, 2014, p. 167; Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 16). Ahıska states that such control resonates with the continuum of a traumatic past of ethnic engineering (traumatic, as Kurds were both perpetrators and victims of it at different dates) that deemed "control of the movement of people and objects within the designated region" imperative (Ahıska, 2014, p. 167). This is how the state historically established its existence in districts under a state of emergency.

Paramilitary or counter-guerilla forces constituted yet another irregular warfare technique. Irregular forces of the state implemented some sort of arbitrary violence. Enforced disappearances, extrajudicial and summary executions or death by torture were carried out by those formations. Although they were not officially a part of the state forces, it is important that those formations had organic relations with the state (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 19). This added to the ambiguous status of the forcefully disappeared in the absence of generally accepted criteria to define the disappearance (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 19). It is also intriguing that arbitrary actions by those irregular formations were in fact the intended result of a restructuring act by the state. The ambiguity and the irregularity were paradoxically intentional and systematic throughout the 90s. Resulting arbitrariness expanded the scope of violence and enmity between different local forces: "... the systematic use of enforced disappearances was introduced precisely during such an environment of conflict" (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 22). From 1980 to 1990, 33 people disappeared. The numbers gradually escalated through mid 90s; in 1994 the number

was recorded as 518, in 1995 was recorded as 232 and 170 in 1996 from the provinces of Diyarbakır, Şırnak Mardin, Batman, Hakkari, Tunceli, Şanlıurfa, Adana, Bitlis and Istanbul (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 24, 25).

Without a legal basis to demand to know the conditions of the disappearance, relatives' bearing the photographs of the disappeared loved ones that came to Galatasaray square revealed that "there is another reality to disappearances, the knowledge of which is not possible by merely demanding 'rights' and exposing facts and numbers" (Ahıska, 2014, p. 170). Ahıska argues that mothers with photographs of the disappeared in their hands were able to "enter through another door", "the door of the uncanny" in a case where the state "shut all the doors" for the demands of justice and recognition (Ahıska, 2014, p. 170). That other door, which refers to the visibility of the disappeared in a photograph in the hands of a relative, in a way revealed the ambiguous and almost arbitrary condition of the forced disappearance, yet through systematic violence. That haunting visibility gained a political meaning as the relatives demanded that the disappeared be found and the responsible parties be tried (Ahıska, 2014, p. 170). The women's demand for the disappeared to be found transgressed the boundaries of the fantasy and reality (the facticity) because, rather than burying and forgetting, it meant "a dynamic reintegration of the dead and disappeared into contemporaneity" (Ahıska, 2014, p. 170; Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 52). The protests did reintegrate with the struggles of the present time and space.

Most of the relatives of the missing silently sitting in the square with photos in their laps were part of the population that has been displaced upon refusing to take side with the paramilitary. Saturday meetings were the only means for solidarity and a sense of community for most of them in a strange and foreign city (Göral, Işık, & Kaya, 2013, p. 73). I think of the silent protests as the relatives' means to inhabit the

city space where they have been sent to exile. Thus when the relatives, as women in exile, made a call for justice, their *exilic* condition—the fact that they were the people who had to leave their towns and villages that turned into exceptional zones—interfered with the normalcy of a busy street in Istanbul: “transforming the space of normality bridging it to the “exceptional zone” (Ahıska, 2014, p. 171). Furthermore, they did not only refer to their own families' condition of being displaced or their own relatives being forcefully disappeared; in 2011 they carried the photos of the perpetrators to a monument in Galatasaray square, and in 2012 they carried photographs of 220 Armenian intellectuals who disappeared on 24 April 1915. Or, when asked in an interview, they claimed, “We will be here even if a thousand years pass” for the perpetrators to be found (Ahıska, 2014, p. 172). Ahıska reads it as the Mothers' carrying their demands for justice to struggles of other times, past and future, creating a rupture in the linearity and contemporaneity of national time, rather than merely making a demand for rights in a liberal democracy framework (Ahıska, 2014, p. 172). Ahıska argues that: “The Saturday Mothers showed practically that caring for the other has political meaning” (Ahıska, 2014, p.171). I have been trying to open up the scope of such caring for my own research. When the poisoned dogs created a crisis in the organization, it was not recognized as related to other—namely political—forms of ecological destruction that was happening in Northern Kurdistan in the mid 90s, which also caused an outrage of international attendees but found only silence as response. Gümüş says that the crisis of dogs being poisoned has not been understood as having any connection with a serious problem of the politics, as the Kurdish issue while we were talking about the NGO's participation:

> ... and what would it mean for muncipality to come up with a space for participation? The most important thing that the NGO's demanded from *Habitat* was a form of civic participation. Indeed, it could have been a success for the muncipality too. At least they would have the chance to know what people are really thinking about the dogs' issue. And because this is not a burning topic for politics—such as the Kurdish issue for example—nobody would even accuse the officers for being a traitor to the nation etc. (Korhan Gümüş, personal communication, January 22, 2015)

However, do we really have to think of these two issues as completely separate from each other? The killing of the dogs was not the only event that had been received with a rebuff from the public. In fact, it was a huge issue that a government, which was responsible for the burning down of villages in Kurdish regions was holding a UN conference on human settlements in Istanbul. It was not only the poisoning of the dogs that made foreign NGOs hesitant about taking part in Habitat II. They were quite sensitive to what was happening in Kurdish villages, fields and forests. On 9 June, foreign delegates lying down on the renewed pavements in Beyoğlu with black bandages on their eyes protested the Turkish state's violation of human rights, especially emphasizing that the state had planned it with forced disappearances in mind (Kılıç, 1996). Rather than the delegates' demands, the low levels of police violence in the Congress Valley seemed worthy of attention as police violently suppressed KESK (Confederation of Public Laborers' Unions) protests a few weeks before in Galatasaray. The Green Party of Germany and collaborating NGOs from Turkey and abroad formed an alternative organization to Habitat II, the Outsiders Forum, stating in their reports and releases handed down to European parliaments that it was completely unreasonable for the Turkish state to hold a conference on human settlements in the face of ecological and political destruction in Kurdish

districts (Kayar & Uz, 1996). The political space opened by the Saturday Mothers carried the information that humans, nonhuman animals and things are in the odds to be reduced to that removable object position for the past, present and the future. The dogs' poisoning ignited a crisis in the organization because it found a response from people living in the neighborhood. Not only Emel, but people living nearby reacted to the incident. There were people testifying in newspaper columns from residents living in Beyoğlu writing to journalists about the poisoning (Heper, 1996; Ural, 1996). A woman tells that she saw dead dog bodies in a garbage bin. Another news column narrates that children living in the neighborhood marked the stray dogs with yellow straps to be able to protect them from the poisoning. People did sentimentally react to the poisoning of the dogs. But they did not react in the same way when African migrants, transgender women and Saturday Mothers were dragged out of their neighborhood around the time. Members of the foreign NGOs were able to see the connection between the burned down villages, forest lands and meadows in Kurdistan and a UN conference on human settlements in Istanbul. But the neighborhood did not recognize that proximity between the burned down villages and poisoned dogs. Yet recognizing that proximity of time and space was exactly what the Mothers were practicing in that busiest spot of Beyoğlu. They were simply revealing that people, things and nonhuman animals can be degraded to the position of inert objects in the face of systematic yet arbitrary violence. They wit(h)nessed to the fact that it happened before, and can happen again if the space and possibility for justice do not open. Quoting from Ahıska (2014), "... the appearance of the Saturday Mothers within the space they

created demonstrates that the national space is haunted not only by the particular memories of the disappeared but also by the past and future threats to dislocate people under the guise of "contemporary" development" (p. 172). They had already turned that busy spot to a matrixial sphere as space of encounters, where the participatory witnessing—wit(h)nessing that is traumatic recognition but also transgression of the trauma of the other—can happen (Ettinger, 2001, p. 90), as the matrixial refers to an absence in origin, located in a non-place where the unexpected transmission, recognition of the pain can occur (Ettinger, 1999, p. 89). Thus, Beyoğlu became a politicized space of unexpected encounters for the exilic dogs, humans, migrants, Mothers, relatives and transgender women. When the Mothers carried the photographs, the images did not represent solely the disappeared, but carried an event which was not experienced by the passersby. (Ettinger, 2001, p. 109). Such *carriance* moved the loss to a matrixial web of relations between human and nonhuman inhabitants of a neighborhood, as the matrixial web points out for the partiality and multiple forms of subjectivity, fragmented and multiplied by the loss of the origin. Ettinger's description of the *matrixial space* has its roots in Lyotards' matrix-figure as the space where "the original absence" becomes an "absence of origin", a traumatic state where the subject is unable to locate the place of the loss (Ettinger, 1999, p. 89). According to Ettinger, this space of absence (non-place of donation) carries the potentiality of unexpected encounters. The matrixial space is a potentiality where encounters with the other may be born (p. 89). Ettinger highlights that the feminine womb is the primary meaning of the word *matrix*. Unlike Kristeva and Lyotard, Ettinger eschews thinking of the womb as a state of passivity

that is prior to formation of a supposedly coherent subjectivity. She introduces the womb or matrix as a place of intimate encounter with another body, in a space where the not-yet-formed subjectivity is partial and plural and is able to respond to the other at the moment of encounter (Ettinger, 2005, p. 40).

When Ahıska (2014) argues that "the Saturday Mothers showed practically that caring for the other has political meaning", it speaks to the idea that Ettinger forms in relation to caring and trusting to enable wit(h)nessing as a partial human subject (p. 171):

> I add *carriance* to *com-passion* and *wit(h)nessing,* to think the passage from transubjective com-passion-and-wit(h)nessing to subjective witnessing and compassion and the passage from non-life to life in the human via the matrixial-maternal-feminine Eros of borderlinking-borderspacing… My idea of *carriance* allows for a different ethical proposition. Not only we are all born, and every new beginning involves birth but also we have all been carried. I suggest to rethink *subject*, *human* and *trust* through the sublimation into culture of the real of a matrixial-maternal-female body-psyche, that by trusting-carrying allowed the emergent human subject to nest, co-inhabit(u)ate, co-emerge and nestle in transubjective time-space with-in and with-out-side. (Ettinger, 2014)

In a space of intimacy that is shared with a stranger to the self, subjectivity is an encounter in which partial subjects (subjects that are shattered by the original loss of the trauma) co-emerge through transformations of the relations of trust, care and responsibility (Ettinger, 2005, p. 39). The *matrixal* space of intimacy is a space for assemblages or "a zone of encounter of a particular kind" (p. 40). Because of its prioritization of the encounters, the idea of the matrixial space invites us to think about relationships of care and response between different partial subjects. This relationality hinders the idea of a one-sided passive subject who receives the information of trauma but does not get to be transformed through it. In such space of meeting, difference does not get to be assimilated but responded.

After the pogrom, the departing transgender women asked their trusted neighbours to look after their dogs. They thought if they were kicked onto the street like themselves, they would be poisoned too, like the dogs living outside, in the street (Selek, 2007). Abject bodies can be “a keeper of historical memory for the injured other” if “the site for a novel trans-subjective and transhistorical process that is simultaneously witness and wit(h)ness” can be created (Pollock, 2010, p. 831). If the violent event is an indication of trauma, Ettinger suggests a transformation of trauma through transference and working through. I think that the poisoning of the dogs created such a space for transference. This is a space where we can demand the consideration of the trauma of the other: other people, other times, other histories, namely, what is not already mine, familiar and my own. The dog, as the nonhuman other, easily marks that there are limits to the degree to which the Other’s trauma can be shared. But opening a crisis allows us a space for enunciation for the pain of multiple others. This is a space where we can form alliances, not just alliances of a shared condition of being human and vulnerable, but also a shared condition of being vulnerable that is not limited to the human. Looking at the dog for witnessing is the threshold, the *borderspace*, the limit position of the trauma that should be carried in an alliance. Wit(h)nessing as a conceptualization works, especially because it does not call for a collective conscience. The crisis stroke by the poisoning of the dogs shows that such violence reverberated in common sense. It is important not to read such an alliance between the human and nonhuman as the voicing of collective conscience. What creates a tension between people witnessing the event and the organization hosting the event is not conscience. The idea of conscience already reproduces the hierarchical positioning between the human and nonhuman, between the self and the other. It is important to understand people’s reaction to dogs being

poisoned not as being sympathetic or making empathy with other's pain (Pollock, 2010, p. 838). This is not also about being a better correspondent or a better person. Making sense of such an alliance calls for a form of encounter, which can create that space of alliance. Looking at the dog can create that way of doing things to form the space of encounter. I prefer describing people's reaction to the poisoning as *responsibility* rather than conscience, as Ettinger splits the word *responsibility* as a conceptualization, in a way to refer to a capacity to be able to respond: *response-ability.* She speaks of it as "the ability to respond to the humanness of the other, to her vulnerability, and to any risk of the threat to humanness compromised by the cruelty of violence" (Pollock, 2010, p. 838). Here Ettinger defines "a body that can witness" (p. 838). I suggest establishing a way of looking which can transcend the breach between the humanness and nonhumanness of the body that can witness in a space of cohabitation. Cohabitation depends on the plurality of living forms; it necessitates the existence of plurality of the living forms. The mutual state of co-dependence comes from the recognition of the difference, as much as the recognition of mutual bodily necessities and vulnerabilities. In neighborhoods, we experience that plurality with human and nonhuman bodies; thus, I argued that the wit(h)nessing of that co-dependence should include wit(h)nessing with and through the nonhuman body.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

In this study, I explored a crisis ignited by the poisoning of stray dogs in Istanbul during the preparations for an international conference, Habitat II. I argued that the poisoned dogs intervened with the organizational transaction and disrupted the humanist ideology manifested by the conference. In the same vein, I addressed the stray dogs of Istanbul as having an agency of memory, as potential actants enabling a space for witnessing, responsibility and care. I argued that the crisis of humanist ideals enables us to recognize the transgender, disappeared and the dog without a bodily hierarchy, without the classification of the sovereign. The crisis of the organization revealed the transaction of power in which we can see what is at stake is morality not just neoliberalism or concerns for security.

I problematized the representative framework of Habitat II as a display that objectifies the city and the people living in it to project Istanbul as a fair member of the modern civilization, to be recognized by a global audience. I tried to illustrate how the organizations involved in Habitat II posed the questions of settlement, environment and human rights. I posed universalizing humanist ideals represented and voiced by the participants as a question of human-centered representative frame. Here, I problematized the modernist framework of representation with reference to Istanbul's history of displacement and dispossession that cast nationalized space, time and bodies inert or removable.

The line of argument in this research is fed by the idea that history cannot serve only the human. Human histories are always entangled with the histories of nonhumans. I tried to lay out a potentiality to think, recall, remember and witness

with the nonhuman. In parallel, I took it seriously when a nonhuman interrupted a human-centric environment, organization, institution or a neighborhood. Thus, the singular events that disrupted the holistic frame of power became very important for this research. These singular events—in the form of a crisis of the bodily functions, crisis in organizational transact and a crisis of the democratic ideals put forward by Habitat II—revealed the incompetency of the human-centric frames that shape the conditions of dwelling and inhabiting. I offered a work of witnessing and wit(h)nessing that indicates the recognition of an other's ordeal by a response and responsibility closely tied to the present. I argued that this potentiality for wit(h)nessing already reverberates in the ways that we cohabit the Earth and dwell in neighborhoods.

I focused on looking at the information that had escaped the hold of the official archive. I argued that Habitat II's universalizing humanism and construction of national ideals underwent a crisis by the destruction of a nonhuman population—namely the stray dogs—in the city. From here, I asserted that the stray dogs performed an agency of memory, enabling me to refer to multiple instances of migration, inequality and exclusion that took place around the event of Habitat II. I argued that the poisoned bodies of the dogs ignited a crisis in the organizational operation of Habitat II, almost bringing the event into a halt. I also argued that from the opening of such a crisis, we were able to detect a possibility of wit(h)nessing and cohabitation put forward by Saturday Mothers, transgender women of Ülker Street, their dogs and the dogs on the street. Through the theories of Kristeva and Ettinger I problematized the intact subject of humanist and nationalist ideals. Bracha Ettinger's term wit(h)nessing enabled me to refer to a bond of intimacy between the transgender women, the African neighbors and the stray dogs. I argued that this

physical proximity of sharing a living space, becoming friends and companions, enabled a work of transference that cannot be recorded by an archive. Wit(h)nesing became a means of being with and remembering for the other.

The Habitat II conference introduced a humanist frame for governmental politics, settlement regulation and for city administration in Turkey. I argued that the poisoned dogs and the events reverberating around the poisoning opened up the crises of this humanist frame, its discourses and their practices. From this opening, I was able to frame the city space and its habitants differently in their plural relationality, in their ability to care and respond. If Habitat II was suggestive of a humanist perspective, then we were able to look through the crisis of this humanist frame's vantage points. We saw that the poisoning of the stray dogs in Beyoğlu and the surrounding neighbourhoods was revelatory of the crises that emerged out of such a humanist framing. From the opening of this crisis, I was able to detect contingent yet co-dependent relationalities within the city space. The crisis was revelatory of these relationalities between various actors and disposable ones. As I mentioned in Chapter 3, in 1996 Turkey had no law for the protection of stray animals. There were legislative efforts for the well-being of livestock, struggles with epidemics and the duties of veterinarians. But even these efforts were limited to the "offenses against property" (Alkan, 2016, p. 6). Turkey's legislation for the protection of animals was prepared in 2004. This Act on Animal Protection (No. 5199, 24.06.2004) states that municipalities are responsible for the care and health of the stray animals by building animal shelters and monitoring sterilization. Most importantly, the act strictly outlaws the killing of stray animals:

> The aim of the Law is, "to ensure that animals are afforded a comfortable life and receive good and proper treatment, to protect them in the best manner possible from the infliction of pain, suffering and torture, and to prevent all types of cruel treatment." (art.1). Article 13 directly forbids "killing animals

> unless there are legal exceptions or in case of a medical or scientific necessity; and when there is no food purpose or threat to humans or the environment, pregnant, nursing, and birthing animals may not be killed." The Law imposes severe administrative fines on people treating animals inconveniently, including the act of killing. The fine is heavier if the breach is committed by administrative organizations (art. 28). (Alkan, 2016, p. 7).

Alkan (2016) interprets the content of the law as a well-designed legislative ahead of its Western counterparts (p. 7). Twenty years after Habitat II, we are in the realm of a different order of power, a legal order, in terms of the treatment of the stray animals. The legal order presents us with a more developed discourse on animal protection. With reference to that legal frame, treatment of stray animals is embedded within a discourse of care for the victimized animals and municipal service. However, this seemingly more developed discourse does also facilitate new technologies to utilize animal care in favor of the logic of power. Animal rights and animal freedom activists assert that local governments' policies of killing and displacing stray animals—especially dogs—have continued since 2004 and have even accelerated upon Istanbul's being announced as the cultural capital of Europe in 2010 (Yıldırım, January 2015, para. 3). Very similar to what happened during the Habitat II preparations in Istanbul, this announcement enabled state-sponsored urban transformation projects, which displaced inner-city communities for the sake of more "presentable" and profitable urban landscape. With the initiation of the cultural capital of Europe 2010 projects, stray dogs have been mostly removed from the designated areas of "mega projects": on the European side of Istanbul the area between Beyoğlu and Bakırköy and a circle around Bağcılar, and on the Anatolian side the area between Ümraniye, Maltepe and Kartal were "cleaned" (Yıldırım, January 2015, para. 14). It is important to note that Habitat II interventions did have a continuity, although the legal frame has seemingly changed. In 2015, the construction of a large-scale animal shelter in the Kısırkaya district of Istanbul, a

metropolitan city administration project, incited widespread discussion and a call to action and protest among activists. What appeared to be unique about the Kısırkaya animal shelter was that its construction was subject to four different regulations and laws: the law on urban transformation, the regulation on natural disasters, the law on changes in the development plan (which regulates the use of coastal areas and the forests) and the law on the protection of animals. Kısırkaya, on the coastal shore of Sarıyer, which was subject to discussions on unlawful occupation of the shore line, brought to the fore the question of animal rights. Discussions around Kısırkaya were focused on the fact that the care and protection of stray animals was in fact being utilized to expropriate a potentially very profitable coastal land to legalize construction on it. In that sense, Kısırkaya has been discussed with relation to various forms of social exclusion that criminalize and displace poorer communities of immigrants from the city center in order to turn the inner city land into an even more profitable parcel. Here, activists worked to make visible the relationship between the laws of urban transformation, the development plan and the role of stray animals for the implementation of such a law. Kısırkaya differed from small-scale animal shelters built in inner city neighborhoods in terms of its administration, as it is planned to be run by metropolitan city administration rather than the local municipalities. The size of it is understood as a sign for the absolutism of the verdict to dump animals out of the city space. (Yıldırım, January 2015, para. 4). Given that the administration of Kısırkaya is planned to be left to the metropolitan administration, and it is predicted that it will be difficult for neighborhood-based animal and environment organizations to intervene. Yıldırım (2015) argues that when we examine the legal background of the project more closely, we can see that these practices of removal of the animals will be effective in the totality of the city, that it

is part of a comprehensive operation to radically transform the city forests in Istanbul, districts and neighbourhoods designated as disaster areas and the coastal shore (para. 5).

Construction of Kısırkaya is within the legal frame of Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs, the Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning, TOKİ, and the Disaster and Emergency Management Department. When looked at this way, it is striking to see that the dogs of Istanbul are not managed unlawfully; on the contrary, the dog population is under the rule of multiple administrations and regulated by more than one law and regulation. We see that after twenty years, in 2015, the humanist frame that was implemented at the time of Habitat II was replaced with a legal order that encompasses the rule and regulation of nonhumans. The proceedings that incited a crisis in 1996 were assimilated into a discourse on legality—a legislation for animal protection and the expropriation of coastal land. The legal order introduces new technologies to contain the stray animal population in a frame that is seemingly more developed. This new order introduces new technologies of power and new areas for the sovereignty to reign. Within this legal frame, human-centered discourse is reproduced with the care and protection of the animals and municipal service for the human citizens. Their displacement is not able to incite a crisis any more, as these practices are part of the legal conduct. Stray animals in Istanbul probably became profitable for the transaction of power for the first time.

As these happen, new questions emerge with regard to law and in which ways the nonhumans are included or excluded with regard to the law. In a legal frame that makes possible the assimilation of animal rights, what kind of a struggle can be ignited by animal freedom or animal rights activists? I studied a massacre, a destruction of dwellings and a crisis ignited by that destruction. For further research,

it is necessary to examine legality that is in relation with such displacement and destruction. It is important at this point to go beyond the duality of law and non-law and look at the violence created within the relations of these finite bodies and the law. It will be very important to continue by looking at the animal rights discourse and examining the ways in which that legality deals with finite bodies and materialities of nonhumans.

REFERENCES

Agamben, G. (2008). *Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the archive*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Ahıska, M. (2006). Occidentalism and registers of truth: The politics of archives in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey, 34*, 9-29. doi:10.1017/s0896634600004350

Ahıska, M. (2014). Counter-Movement, space and politics: How the Saturday Mothers of Turkey make enforced disappearances visible. In E. Schindel, & P. Colombo (Eds.), *Space and the memories of violence: Landscapes of erasure, disappearance and exception* (pp. 162-175). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Akalın, C. (1996). Habitat II'nin ardından. *Sosyal Demokrat Değişim Dergisi*, *3*(96), 67-72.

Alkan, A. (2014). Sunuş: Ikiliklerin ötesi [Introduction: Beyond dualities]. In A. B. Candan, C. Özbay, E. Can, & S. Sökmen (Eds.), *Yeni İstanbul çalışmaları: Sınırlar, mücadeleler, açılımlar [New Istanbul studies: Limits, challenges, openings]* (pp. 303-308). Istanbul: Metis.

Alkan, A. (2016). Deportation as an urban stray dogs management policy: Forest dogs of Istanbul. *Lex Localis – Journal Of Local Self-Government, 14*(3), 613-635. Doi:10.4335/14.3.613-635(2016)

Arendt, H. (2006). *Eichmann and the Holocaust*. New York: Penguin Books.

Arslan, S. (2014). Kürdistan'da doğa/ekoloji katliyamı [Destruction of nature/ecologies in Kurdistan]. *Toplum ve Kuram*, 9, 62-66.

Balibar, E. (2009). Violence and civility: On the limits of political anthropology. *Differences, 20*(2-3), 9-35. Doi:10.1215/10407391-2009-002

Bartu Candan, A. (1999). Who owns the old quarters? Rewriting histories in a global era. In C. Keyder (Ed.), *Istanbul: Between the global and the local* (pp. 31-42). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bataille, G. (1991). *The accursed share*. New York: Zone Books.

Bayram, N. (1996). Özgürlük Sokaktadır [The Freedom is on the Street]. *Birikim, 86*(87), 48-54.

Becker-Leckrone, M. (2005). *Julia Kristeva and literary theory*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Berger, J. (1999). *King: A street story*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Best, S. M. (2004). *The fugitive's properties: Law and the poetics of possession*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bilgin, N., Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, Konrad Adenauer Vakfı, & Birleşmiş Milletler İnsan Yerleşimleri Habitat. (1996). *Yerel yönetimler ve Habitat II*. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği.

Brewer, K. T., & Yükseker, H. D. (2006). *A survey on African migrants and asylum seekers in Istanbul*. Istanbul: Migration Research Program at the Koç University.

Butler, J. (2001). *What is critique? An essay on Foucault's virtue*. Retrieved from https://keats.kcl.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/1606350/mod_folder/content/0/Butler%20-%202001%20-%20What%20is%20Critique.pdf?forcedownload=1

Butler, J. (2012). *Parting ways: Jewishness and the critique of Zionism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Çavuşoğlu, E. (2007). *Habitat II'nin 10. yıl mevlütü* [Habitat II's 10th year mevlut]. Retrieved from: http://v3.arkitera.com/k153-habitat-ii-nin-10-yil-mevlutu.html

Chakrabarty, D. (2009). The climate of history: Four theses. *Critical Inquiry, 35*(2), 197-222. doi:10.1086/596640

Chrulew, M. (2016). *Foucault and animals*. Leiden: Boston: Brill.

Cinar, A. (2005). *Modernity, Islam, and secularism in Turkey: Bodies, places, and time*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cristov-Bakargiev, C. (Eds.). (2015). Saltwater: A theory of thought Forms. *14th Istanbul Biennial: SALTWATER* (43). Istanbul: İstanbul Kültür Sanat Vakfı.

Çabuklu, Y. (1996). Sokak ve ev [Streets and the home]. *Birikim, 86*, 94-95.

Darnton, R. (2009). *The great cat massacre: And other episodes in French cultural history*. New York: Basic Books.

Das, V., & Poole, D. (2004). *Anthropology in the margins of the state.* Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Derrida, J., & Prenowitz, E. (1996). *Archive fever: A Freudian impression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Domestic review: Accident in Susurluk reveals links between politicians, police and mobster. (1996, February 12). *Hurriyet Daily News*. Retrieved from http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/domestic-review-accident-in-susurluk-reveals-links-between-politicians-police-and-mobster.aspx?pageID=438&n=domestic-review-accident-in-susurluk-reveals-links-between-politicians-police-and-mobster-1996-12-02

Douzjian, M. (2010). Notes on three films screened at the 2010 ARPA Film Festival: Exploring the modes of representation in Barking Island, The Third Rider, and Aghet: A Genocide. *Critics' Forum*. Retrieved from http://www.criticsforum.org/pdf/1288747858.pdf

Ercan, Ö. (1996, June 9). "Hayatım krizlerle geçti" ["I spent my life in crisis"]. *Milliyet ve Pazar*, p. 1.

Eriksson, A. (Director). (2012). *I am the Dog That was Always Here* [Motion Picture]. Belgium: KIOSK Gallery.

Felman, S. (1992). The return of the voice: Claude Lanzmann's Shoah. In S. Felman & D. Laub (Eds.), *Testimony: crises of witnessing in literature, psychoanalysis, and history* (p. 204-283). New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In D. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (139-164). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus, P. Rabinow, & M. Foucault (Eds.), *Michel Foucault, beyond structuralism and hermeneutics (p. 208-228)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1989). *The Archeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

GAP Regional Development Administration (n.d.). What is GAP. Retrieved from http://gap.gov.tr/en

Göral, Ö. S., Işık, A., & Kaya, Ö. (2013). *Unspoken truth: Enforced disappearances.* Truth Justice Memory Center. Istanbul: Truth Justice Memory Center.

Gordon, A. (2008). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gorvett, J. (1996, December 7). *The fight against rabies in Istanbul*. Retrieved from Hurriyet Daily News: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/the-fight-against-rabies-in-istanbul.aspx?pageID=438&n=the-fight-against-rabies-in-istanbul-1996-07-12

Gülüm, A. (1996). Habitat II: Çelişkiler ve düşünceler. *Sosyal Demokrat Değişim Dergisi, 3*(96), 73-75.

Gürbilek, N. (2001). *Vitrinde yaşamak: 1980'lerin kültürel iklimi* (The new cultural climate of Turkey: Living in a shop window). Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Haraway, D. J. (2008). *When species meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Heper, T. (1996, May 6). Mantı hazırladım [I prepared pasta]. *Milliyet* , p. 32.

İstanbul Haber Servisi (1996, June 2). Toplu konut idaresi başkanı ve HABITAT genel koordinatörü Yiğit Gülöksüz, dün mide kanaması geçirmesi nedeniyle Amerikan Hastanesi'ne kaldınldı [Yiğit Gulöksüz, head of public housing administration and general coordinator of HABITAT, was taken to the American Hospital yesterday due to the stomach bleeding]. Istanbul: Cumhuriyet, p. 4.

Jongerden, J. (2009) Türkiye Kürdistanı'nda kontrgerilla stratejisi olarak çevre tahribatı [Ecological destruction as a strategy againts counter guerilla in Turkey's Kurdistan]. *Toplum Kuram,* 1, 75-77.

Kayar, A., & Uz, K. (1996, June 3). Muhalif Claudia yine işbaşında. *Hürriyet*, p. 32.

Keyder, Ç, & Öncü, A. (1994). Globalization of a third-world metropolis: Istanbul in the 1980's. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center), 17*(3), 383-421. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40241297

Keyder, C. (1999). *Istanbul: Between the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kirksey, S. E. & Helmreich, S. (2010). The emergence of multispecies ethnography. *Cultural Anthropology, 25*, 545-576.

Kılıç, M. (1996, June 10). Polise protesto [Protest against the police]. *Milliyet* , p. 13.

Koselleck, R. (1988). *Critique and crisis: Enlightenment and the pathogenesis of modern society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kristeva, J., & Roudiez, L. S. (1982). *Powers of horror: An essay on abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kurt, Ç. (2013). *The impact of the Southeast Anatolia Project (GAP) on displaced families: Household livelihoods and gender relations* (Doctoral thesis, Newcastle University, United Kingdom). Retrieved from https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/dspace/bitstream/10443/2223/1/Kurt,%20C.%2013.pdf

Laçiner, Ö. (1996). 1 Mayıs 1996: Yol ayrımı [May Day: Parting of the ways]. *Birikim,* 85, 3-7.

Lanzmann, C. (1995). The Obscenity of understanding: An evening with Claude Lanzmann. In C. Caruth (Ed.), *Trauma: Explorations in memory* (p. 200-20). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Latour, B., & Porter, C. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lichtenberg-Ettinger, B. (1999). Traumatic wit(h)ness-thing and matrixial co/in-habit(u)ating 1. *Parallax, 5*(1), 89-98. doi:10.1080/135346499249911

Lichtenberg-Ettinger, B. (2001). *Wit(h)nessing trauma and the matrixial gaze: From phantasm to trauma, from phallic structure to matrixial sphere*. Leeds: Centre for Cultural Studies, Department of Fine Art, University of Leeds.

Lichtenberg-Ettinger, B. (2005). The becoming threshold of matrixial borderlines. In G. Robertson, M. Mash, L. Tickner, J. Bird, B. Curtis, & T. Putnam (Eds.), *Travellers' tales* (p. 36-60). New York: Routledge.

Lichtenberg-Ettinger, B. (2014, October 9). *Abstract for masterclass*. Retrieved from Subrealism:

https://subrealismtheworkofbrachalichtenbergettinger.wordpress.com/bracha-lichtenberg-ettinger-abstract-for-masterclass

Mağden, P. (1999). *Fakat ne yazık ki sokak boştu* [But unfortunately the street was empty]. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Malone, K. R. (1997, 01). Working through the question of the phallus to the other side: Commentary on Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger's paper. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 7*(3), 407-422. doi:10.1080/10481889709539192

Marx, K. (1990). *Capital volume 1: A critique of political economy* . London: Penguin Books.

Mbembé, A. (2002). The power of the archive and its limits. In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (pp. 19-26). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Mitchell, T. (2002). Can the mosquito speak? In T. Mitchell, *Rule of experts: Egypt, techno-politics, modernity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nichanian, M. (2003). Catastrophic mourning. In D. L. Eng & D. Kazanjian (Eds.), *Loss: The politics of mourning* (p. 99-124). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Osterlund, P. B. (2015, May 1). Turkey's Alevis 'under the shadow of military tanks' Retrieved from http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/04/turkey-alevis-shadow-military-tanks-150419112330850.html

Pinguet, C. (2009). İstanbul'un Köpekleri [Dogs of Istanbul] (S. Özen, Trans.). Istanbul: YKY.

Pollock, G. (2010). Aesthetic wit(h)nessing in the era of trauma. *EurAmerica: A Journal of European and American Studies, 40*, 829 - 886.

Raffles, H. (2010). *Insectopedia*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Selek, P. (2007). *Maskeler süvariler gacılar: Ülker Sokak: Bir alt kültürün dışlanma mekânı*. Istanbul: Ayizi Kitap.

Sennett, R. (2014). *Yabancı: Sürgün üzerine iki deneme [The Foreigner: Two essays on exile]*. Istanbul: Metis.

Soykan, C. (2010). The Impact of Common European Union Immigration Policy in Turkey. *Ethnologia Balkanica*, *14*, 207-225.

Spielker, S. (2006). *The big archive: Art from bureaucracy*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Stewart, K. (2012, 08). Precarity's forms. *Cultural Anthropology, 27*(3), 518-525. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1360.2012.01157.x

Stoler, A. L. (2009). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Taussig, M. (1991). Tactility and distraction. *Cultural Anthropology, 6*(2), 147-153. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/656411

Taylor, D. (1997). *Disappearing acts: Spectacles of gender and nationalism in Argentina's "dirty war"*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Tekeli, İ. (1996). Habitat II İstanbul konferansı'nı yeni bir kent yönetimi ahlakı olarak değerlendirmek. *Sosyal Demokrat Değişim, 3*, 55-61.

Tsing, A. L. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Türkiye Ulusal Komitesi [Turkish National Committee]. (1996). HABITAT II*: Türkiye ulusal raporu ve eylem planı* [HABITAT II: Turkey national report and action plan]. İstanbul: Türkiye Ulusal Komitesi.

United Nations. (1996). *Report of the United Nations conference on human settlements (Habitat II): Istanbul, 3-14 June 1996*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. (n.d.). *Outcomes on human settlements*. Retrieved from un.org: http://www.un.org/en/development/devagenda/habitat.shtml

Ural, Y. (1996, June 9). Cihangir'in sarı tasmalı köpekleri [Yellow-leased dogs of Cihangir]. *Milliyet Çocuk*, p. 4.

Üstündağ, N. (2012). A travel guide to northern Kurdistan. In S. Kanafani, M. Khayyat, R. Salti, & L. Al-Zubaidi (Eds.), *Anywhere But Now* (pp. 95-114). Beirut: Heinrich Böll Foundation.

Yıldırım, M. (1996, December 7). *Dört ayaklı şehrin imhasında son durak: İBB, Kısırkaya hayvan tecrit ve itlaf merkezi [Final stop for the destruction of the four-legged city: İBB, Kısırkaya center for animal destruction and isolation]*. Retrieved from Hurriyet Daily News: http://www.birikimdergisi.com/guncel-yazilar/1162/dort-ayakli-sehrin-imhasinda-son-durak-ibb-kisirkaya-hayvan-tecrit-ve-itlaf-merkezi#.WINzrrZ97Zt

Zengin, A. (2007). *Sexual margins: A study on an ethnography of "the State" and women Sex workers in Istanbul (Master's thesis, Boğaziçi University). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=-Z0vbSUgrhM9fXoGkRe6Q8pMrIX3SsHACAfQBRLjgMtuIv4WjWfqkgSq-_1zxVAY*

Zeybek, S. O. (2014). İstanbul'un yuttukları ve kustukları: Köpekler ve nesneler üzerinden İstanbul tahlili [What Istanbul digests and throws up: An examination of Istanbul through dogs and objects]. In A. B. Candan, C. Özbay, E. Can, & S. Sökmen, *Yeni İstanbul çalışmaları: Sınırlar, mücadeleler, açılımlar [New Istanbul Studies: limits, challenges, openings].* Istanbul: Metis.

Zimmerman, A. L. (Director). (2013). *Taşkafa, stories of the street* [Motion Picture]. Turkey: Yalan Dunya Film.