

BETWEEN ANXIETY AND HOPE:
THE EBB AND FLOW OF PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS
AFTER GEZI PROTESTS

FAHİR YUMUK

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2022

BETWEEN ANXIETY AND HOPE:
THE EBB AND FLOW OF PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS
AFTER GEZI PROTESTS

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

Political Science and International Relations

by

Fahir Yumuk

Boğaziçi University

2022

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Fahir Yumuk, 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

ABSTRACT

Between Anxiety and Hope:

The Ebb and Flow of Prefigurative Politics After Gezi Protests

This thesis traces one of the enduring legacies of the Gezi Protests, prefigurative politics. Defined as a set of political actions that seeks to realize now the social relations that are aspired to be experienced in the future, the concept has come to be one of the defining characteristics of the global mass mobilizations in the twenty first century. Although it is possible to point out various remarkable prefigurative political actions throughout the 2000s, it was only after Gezi Protests that prefigurative politics received broader reception and propagation in Turkey. Based on in-depth interviews conducted with various prefigurative politics in Istanbul, this research focuses on the affective micro-dynamics behind the prefigurative experiences within the park and their multiplication into different sites. I argue that prefigurative practices provide certain mechanisms for the production and reproduction of a set of shared feelings that arose in the park, emboldening activists to undertake and sustain their political actions. While these mechanisms have been influential in terms of the initial drive for the proliferation of prefigurative politics right after Gezi Protests, I imply that their effects may have also been important for their sustenance despite the limitations related to the increasing authoritarianism. In that regard, in the last chapter, I focus on a specific case, Kadıköy Cooperative, to discuss how this initial drive has developed into an enduring institutional legacy. After all, I argue that this legacy indicates an emergent subjectivity that developed around the fundamental tenets of prefiguration, self-reflection, and solidarity that seeks to settle itself through a horizontal constitutional order.

ÖZET

Kaygı ile Umut Arasında:

Gezi Protestoları Sonrası Prefigüratif Siyasetlerin Gelgitleri

Bu tez, Gezi Protestolarının kalıcı miraslarından biri olan prefigüratif siyasetlerin izini sürüyor. Gelecekte deneyimlenmesi arzulanan toplumsal ilişkilerin şimdiden somutlaştırılmaya çalışılmasına yönelik bir dizi siyasi eylem olarak tanımlanabilecek bu kavram, 21. yüzyıldaki küresel eylemliliklerin belirleyici özelliklerinden biri haline gelmiştir. Türkiye’de 2000’li yıllar boyunca çeşitli dikkat çekici örneklerden bahsetmek mümkün olsa da prefigüratif siyasetin daha geniş bir kabul ve yaygınlık kazanması ancak Gezi’den sonra mümkün olmuştur. İstanbul’da yer alan çeşitli gruplarla gerçekleştirilen derinlemesine mülakatlara dayanan bu araştırma, park içerisindeki prefigüratif deneyimlerin ve bunların farklı alanlara yayılmasının ardında yatan duygusal mikro dinamiklere odaklanıyor. Bu pratiklerin parkta ortaya çıkan bir dizi ortak duygunun üretimi ve yeniden üretimi için belirli mekanizmalar sağlayarak eylemcileri çeşitli siyasi eylemlere kalkışmak ve sürdürmek açısından cesaretlendirdiğini iddia ediyorum. Bu mekanizmaların Gezi’den hemen sonraki süreçte prefigüratif siyasetlerin yaygınlaşmasına yönelik ilksel bir momentum oluşturmaya ek olarak, uyandırdıkları etkinin artan otoriterleşmenin getirdiği kısıtlamalara rağmen bu siyasetlerin sürdürülebilmesi açısından da önemli olabileceğini düşünüyorum. Bu bağlamda, bu ilksel itkinin nasıl kurucu bir mirasa dönüşebildiğini tartışmak için son bölümde Kadıköy Kooperatifi örneğine odaklanıyorum. Neticede, bu mirasın prefigüratiflik, öz-düşünümsellik ve dayanışma temel ilkeleri etrafında ortaya çıkan ve yatay bir hukuki düzen aracılığıyla yerleşikleşmeye çalışan yeni bir özneliğe işaret ettiğini öne sürüyorum.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis could not have been finalized without the outstanding collective effort, care, and support of those who have been accompanying me throughout this process. Even if I cannot mention all of these names, they all retain a unique space at the bottom of my heart. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Burak Ceylan, Emir Aydođan and Bulut for their incessant efforts. They opened their home and hearts for all my sorrow, distress and excitement and supported me by caring for me and sharing their invaluable knowledge with me. Everything would be different without them. Similarly, I am grateful to Oktay Özkan, Nevzat Çelik and Elif Sabırlı for sharing our most elating and challenging times with a great companionship, understanding, tolerance, support and joy. I am also thankful to Sibel Kırılmaz and Pelin Yıldız, who did not only contribute to this thesis with their comments and suggestions but who also have been bringing me back to life with their wise, loving and companionate attitude whenever I needed it the most. The solidarity I felt from Lütfü Dođan’s calming and weighty friendship will never-to-be-forgotten as well.

I would like to express my genuine thankfulness to my advisor Assist. Prof. Mert Arslanalp for sharing his credence, experiences, and continuous efforts to provide a free space for thinking from the very first moments onwards. His guidance has been crucial for me to achieve a level of encouragement and empowerment for this achievement. I am also thankful to Assist. Prof. Gaye İlhan Demiryol for her inspiringly caring and critical attitude in academia in its most difficult times as well as for taking part in my thesis committee with her valuable comments. Along with her, I would like to express my special gratitude to Prof. Kürşad Ertuđrul whose assistance and discussions have been influential for the initial development of my

intellectual engagement with prefigurative politics. This initial motivation, on the other hand, could not be possible without the life-affirming and compassionate presence of Assist. Prof. Recep Cemali Akgün's in my life with his thought-provoking and intuitive insights as well as his continuous support. I want to sincerely appreciate Sercan Çınar and Cemile Gizem Dinçer's precious comments and emancipatory way of thinking in this regard as well. Selcen Boztepe's encouragements were also invaluable in this respect, and I will never cease to appreciate her great care in relating to the life and to me.

Besides, I owe many thanks to Assoc. Prof. Alexandros Kioupiolis for hosting me as a visiting researcher at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki; and to thank Utrecht Network by providing me with Young Researchers Grant for this opportunity. I also feel extremely fortunate to be met by the warm companionship and hospitality of Engin Canakan and Apostolia Katsouni during my stay there.

I am indebted to Barış Özkaya for his extraordinary support to put the language of the text in a better shape, and for cultivating beautiful tunes in my ear and to Sinan Salman, with whom we have had many fruitful discussions while we have been sharing the same painful and exciting processes.

I cannot leave without mentioning Abdullah, Ahmet Seydi, Anıl, Aybeniz, Burak Yıldız, Cemil, Deniz Mine, Diego, Fidan Önen, Gizem, Gözde, Güneş, Halil Can, İrem, Mazlum, Melisa, Merve, Necla, Onur Neşedenyana, Onur Duman, Selma, Senem, Seyit, Umut, Yiğit, Yusuf and Zeynel, whose emotional and intellectual labor have been indispensable for the making of this work in its different phases.

Lastly, I feel blessed to have the understanding, generous-hearted, suggestive and lovable efforts of my family. I am deeply thankful for their continual support and credence for me that kept me alive and made this thesis possible.

*To the inspiring memories of Alper Sapan and Ali Kitapçı;
with grief, indignation and hope...*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research questions and theoretical framework.....	7
1.2 Methodology and case selection	32
CHAPTER 2: HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT: FROM PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS TO PREFIGURATIVE POLITICAL ACTIONS.....	43
2.1 Prefiguration in Christianity: Strengthening the will to hurry the advent	43
2.2 Prefigurative politics as a non-instrumentalist movement strategy	46
2.3 Strategic role of prefigurative politics in developing collective identity	54
2.4 Strategic prefigurative practices in the global wave of mobilizations: Synchronizing the movement means with ends	58
2.5 Strategic prefigurative practices in the global wave of mobilizations: Beyond the consonance of the means with ends	64
2.6 Vagueness of prefigurative politics.....	70
2.7 Prefigurative political actions as prefigurative direct actions	73
CHAPTER 3: A GLANCE AT THE HISTORY OF PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS IN TURKEY	80
CHAPTER 4: THE FLOW TIDE: PROLIFERATION OF PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS AFTER GEZI	101
4.1 Emotional climate in and after Gezi.....	115
4.2 Confrontation with the intersecting dominant authority structures.....	125
4.3 Strategic importance of prefigurative political actions: flexibility and experimentality	135
4.4 Prefigurative politics vis-à-vis instrumentalism, once again	139
CHAPTER 5: THE EBB TIDE: PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS IN A TIME WHERE WORDS FAIL	149
5.1 Where words fail	152
5.2 The current emotional climate.....	154

5.3 Finding hope when ‘I see no future’	160
5.4 Oscillating hopes	162
CHAPTER 6: SEDIMENTS OF THE TIDE: KADIKÖY COOPERATIVE AS A COUNTER-CONDUCT	165
6.1 In search of autonomy	165
6.2 Prefiguration.....	175
6.3 Self-reflection.....	180
6.4 Solidarity	184
6.5 Anxious constitution of hope	190
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION.....	201
APPENDIX: ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL.....	216
REFERENCES.....	217

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At the end of May 2013, Turkey was shocked by the unanticipated eruption of mass mobilizations in Istanbul to keep Gezi Park alive. Initially started with an encamped protest on May 28 to oppose the Justice and Development Party (AKP) government's attempt to demolish a part of the park to build a shopping mall in the shape of Ottoman military barracks in its place as a part of the urban plan; protests soon escalated on May 31, following the violent intervention of the police to the encampment of protestors. As much as the plan was a part of a broader attempt to gentrify one of the historical centers of Istanbul, Taksim Square, protestors' opposition also had gone beyond this initial impetus, towards chanting their will to not be governed in this way. In a flash, protests reached to a point where hundreds of thousands of people were mobilized around the park, as well as in many other cities, to assert this opposition. As the police forces stepped back, protestors restored the encampment by occupying the park; enabling protests to be sustained during all daytime which lasted until its violent eviction on June 15. Thereby, protestors vivified a different daily life experience to be forged around the park, enabling them to express their indignation not only through protesting but also by prefiguring the ways in which they aspire to organize their social life. The park turned into a place where people could express their desires, ideals, values, and tastes by directly instantiating these through concrete exemplars and relations. These practices included but were not limited to the encamped accommodation itself; direct democratic public assemblies (forums); an urban garden; self-organized initiatives to distribute different materials including food, protective equipment, and hygiene

products; a collectively conducted infirmary, café, library, and kindergarten; independent media and art collectives; or everyday solidarity practices... These experiences seem to have provided nodal points where egalitarian relations between individuals were established, solidarity ties invigorated, new tactics experimented with, and new organizational practices developed. In this sense, the park was resembling a different experience of social life. In the face of authoritarian interventions into the everyday life of the people, the series of these political practices sowed the seeds of hope that people may live freely and in concert.

Without a doubt, such a massive, surprising and emotionally intense event had manifold implications for the politics in Turkey, some of which have still been lingering until today. It served as a turning point for many political actors, for it has brought about the emergence of some of the new as well as strengthened some of the already existing ones. As the unanticipatedly mass character of the protests imbricated with a unique daily life experience that awakened senses of a commune, utopia, revolution, or carnival, these senses seem to have produced substantial implications, especially for the participant individuals and social movements themselves. These senses have been so engraved in participants' emotions, memories, future prospects, ideas, and values that it has had their repercussions until now. Within the scope of this research, I traced one such implication of and for, namely, prefigurative politics.

Albeit the term 'prefigurative politics' was first coined by certain New Left thinkers (Boggs, 1977a; Rowbotham, Segal & Wainwright, 1981; Breines, 1980, 1989) to discuss grassroots social movements in the aftermath of 1968, it was only with the turn of the century it has gained more popular attention among social movement scholars. Defined as "the deliberate experimental implementation of

desired future social relations and practices in the here-and-now” (Raekstad & Gradin, 2020, p. 10), prefigurative politics has come to be one of the identifying characteristics of certain global mass mobilizations in the twenty-first century. Various scholars emphasized the strategic importance of prefigurative politics, while they focused on how alter-globalization movements’ goals had been reflected in their means. (Graeber, 2002; Day, 2004, 2005; Sitrin, 2004, 2006; Maeckelbergh, 2009, 2011). Building on this enterprise, the interest in the concept as well as prefigurative practices has grown bigger as the world witnessed another wave of global mass mobilizations starting from 2010: Occupy! in the US; Indignados in Spain; Direct Democracy Now! in Greece; Arab Spring; and Gezi Protests in Turkey... It has been observed that prefigurative political ideas and practices have been characterizing all of these mobilizations (van de Sande, 2013, 2015; Sitrin & Azzellini, 2014; Dixon, 2015; Hammond, 2015). As these incidents have bolstered the interest in prefigurative political practices, scholars sought to elaborate on various individual, organizational, and collective mobilization aspects of prefigurative politics (Haenfler, Johnson & Jones, 2012; Dixon, 2014; Yates, 2015; Eleftheriadis, 2015; Naegler, 2018; Ishkanian & Saavedra, 2019; Raekstad & Gradin, 2020). In parallel with this growing interest, multileveled aspects of prefigurative politics led scholars to call for reflections on the conceptualization of ‘prefigurative politics’ (Yates, 2015; Cooper, 2017; Swain, 2017; Gordon, 2018; Franks, 2019; van de Sande, 2019; Raekstad & Gradin, 2020). Attentive to the different modalities of prefigurative political practices and the call for a reflection on its conceptualization, this research focuses on the prefigurative politics in Istanbul that emerged successive to the Gezi Protests.

Right after the eviction of the occupation in Gezi, directly democratic assemblies (forums) within the park continued their operation by spreading in many different parks and neighborhoods all around Istanbul and other cities (Akçalı, 2018). Some of these forums served as hubs where new ideas and practices developed, turning into more sustained efforts through the establishment of neighborhood solidarities, initiatives, urban gardens, cooperatives, or squats. Independent media collectives that were developed in the park have also grown their operation. Different collectives, affinity groups, or political organizations have emerged, while certain issue-specific defense networks were to be founded. Solidarity networks have extended, whereas certain affective and ideational commonalities have been developed among the people and eventually defined as the ‘Gezi Spirit.’ Some of those experiences have become enduring throughout the subsequent phases, while the repercussions of such an ‘eventful event’ have come to be engrained in the memories and further political practices of the people, extending to the present moment.

Yet, on the other hand, the course of the government policies was also not exempted from the implications of Gezi¹, whose authoritarian measures were already causing certain anxieties. From this moment onwards, as the repercussions of the protests were echoing with the subsequent mass mobilizations and increasing discontent, the government widened repressive measures in this following period. This was to be followed by attempts to extend its control over different institutions of the state, as well as civil society and media. In this sense, the subsequent years were to be marked by the AKP government’s attempts to consolidate its authoritarian rule. Besides, the government also sought to elevate and promote a particular lifestyle to a

¹ Hereafter, the set of political practices pertaining to the Gezi Protests will be referred as ‘Gezi’ similar to its common daily use.

place where it enjoys enhanced access to the political and social powers, whereas the civil rights and liberties of the remaining are continuously violated. Certain political Islamist, nationalist, patriarchal, and heterosexist values, ideals, and practices have come to be more and more promoted and reinforced within the society through the media, civil society organizations, religious communities, and state institutions themselves. Furthermore, neoliberal policies have gone further in restructuring the welfare regime as well as labor markets, increasing the precarity of the workers and deteriorating the universal rights-based relation of the state with its citizens. While it arose many concerns about the health, education, and social security systems, it also hastened the destruction of different ecosystems as well as gentrification processes and urban transformations in cities. Along with these, a rise in nationalist and racist discourses has followed these developments. The foreign policy of the government regarding Syria, where the civil war was at its peak, has had significant implications, especially for the Kurdish movement and the increasing migration crisis within the country. The government turned to a hostile attitude towards the Kurdish political movement and refugees fleeing Syria, which ultimately ended up in violent interventions against the Kurdish people as well as refugees. These all have been accompanied by increased security measures and repression against various social movements at different levels. Within this context, when it came to 2015, the spiral of violence has grown, and social movements have become one of its targets.

In June 2015, two bombs were exploded at a rally of the People's Democratic Party (HDP), which was a part of its campaign for the elections that is to be held in the same month. A month after the general elections, in which the AKP failed to achieve a majority in the parliament, the peace process between the government and the Kurdish movement has come to an end. Right after this event, a suicide bomb

attack targeted the press release of a campaign to express solidarity with people in Kobani, Syria, which was recently liberated from the ISIS invasion. At the event, there were more than a hundred attendees, mostly young, coming from many different social movement organizations including socialists, anarchists, ecologists, feminists, and LGBTQ+s. This event has significantly affected the general mood of the activists engaged in radical politics. Its effect was doubled for those activists when ISIS carried out another bomb attack targeting the “Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally” in October 2015. A series of other bomb attacks and an armed conflict between the state and the Kurdish movement was happening concomitant to those events. Those who stood against the civil rights violations of the state during the conflict were strictly condemned and the government draw a strict demarcation line to repress the political struggles of the Kurdish people as well as its supporters, some of whom were the participants of the abovementioned radical social movements. Within this context, a faction within the military staged an unsuccessful coup attempt in July 2016. Following the attempt, the government declared a state of emergency that was to last until 2018 and it has come to the forefront as an important turning point for the consolidation of the authoritarian regime. While it has created leverage for the government to restructure the political institutions, it also reinforced its increasing control within the society as well as propagation of certain ideals, values, and discourses.

As the authoritarian regime proceeded to consolidate itself, activists faced more and more repressive measures and have come to be marginalized from the public fora, be it from organizing protest marches or sustaining their own free spaces. This was also the continuation of the government’s deliberate attempts to marginalize radical politics in daily life, which has been a process escalating since

the Gezi Protests. It also caused activists to lose contact with a broader public and the outcome led most of the activists to a deadlock, where they can undertake lesser collective actions in public places and have difficulty reaching broader audiences to recruit new members and sustain their actions. This deadlock was being reinforced by certain internal organizational tensions such as activists splitting up from their organizations either because of burn-out, having to face severe legal processes, financial problems, internal conflicts, and the impact of dominant power relations within their collectivities. As many different activist groups have been facing similar limitations, chances to cooperate and emotionally foster each other has also gotten weakened. In this sense, the intensive effect of the Gezi on the activists was accompanied by the implications of these increasing repressions and dispiriting affections throughout the subsequent processes. After all, the course of prefigurative politics was to be processed within such a political environment.

1.1 Research questions and theoretical framework

In this part, I will try to provide a theoretical framework through which we can discuss why prefigurative politics had an upsurge after the Gezi Protests and how these political practices are sustained within the current political context of growing authoritarianism in Turkey. Although these questions might provide an insight to explain why Gezi Protests happened, by no means do they seek to explain the underlying reasons behind the series of these mass mobilizations. Rather, they seek to elaborate on the conditions that drive certain activists to engage in prefigurative political actions in the aftermath of Gezi. To the extent that the impact of authoritarianism started to be felt in the period right after Gezi – as with the impact of Gezi can be felt around today – questions may unfold in an intermingled way. Yet,

it is not to argue that the implications of authoritarianism were the same all along the way. These questions proceed with the designation that there has been a considerable change in the emotional climate in parallel with the development of the authoritarian regime, so the questions rather focus on and seek answers with reference to the characteristics of these different contexts, respectively. Yet, although we can identify certain turning points for the changes in the prior emotional climate that is forged with the effect of Gezi, I do not think of a clear line of demarcation between these two. It can be argued that feelings pertaining to these different emotional climates may coexist at times. In this sense, the questions do not only focus on chronologically different periods but also qualitatively different time experiences, which may coexist along with each other. This can be related to the ‘restless’ nature of Gezi as a historic event, whose memories can be “multiple, reiterated and situated” over time (Wagner-Pacifici, 2010, p. 1366).

1.1.1 Temporality of the Gezi Protests

A recent strand within social movement studies points out the importance of considering temporality to explain and make sense of the collective actions of social movements and their trajectories. This strand comes to emphasize that the questions of temporality have often been overlooked, as a vast number of works focused on the linear succession of events in an ordinary procession of time. These studies consider social movements as a part of ‘normal’ politics rather than ‘exceptional’ cases that disrupt quotidian practices and political actions. As della Porta (2018, p. 31) contends, the “narrative of normalization corresponded to some trends at the time as, in stable democracies, protest was no longer unconventional and social movements were becoming accepted actors in the mobilization and representation of collective

interests.” In line with these considerations, the untimely eruption of the Gezi Protests, as well as the “unstable” character of the political regime in Turkey indicates that Gezi Protests may require further attentiveness to its temporality.

When it comes to the twenty-first century, rapid transformations often interfered with the quotidian functioning of daily life and confronted the world with crises including economic, migration, climate, pandemics, or war. In relation to that, unanticipated eruptions of global waves of protests such as alter-globalization, anti-austerity and Arab Spring have come to be identified as being diverged from the normal functioning of politics and time, incurring a sense of exceptionality and uniqueness. Besides, subsequent mobilizations of right-wing movements, climate change activists, and reactions related to the COVID-19 pandemic seem to have given countenance to this identification. To the extent that occasional disruptions in the orderly linear cavalcade of time are expected, scholars call for a revived sensitivity to the temporality that considers such disruptions resulting in different time experiences while studying social movements. As Gillan & Edwards (2020) contends:

Past advances in social movement scholarship sometimes read as a series of additions – resources, organization, ideas, culture, identities, emotions and so on come, one-by-one, into generalised accounts of what is important to understanding movements. We do not believe that the issue of temporality and time is amenable to that additive treatment. Rather, it undergirds social explanation in general and, as we have seen, multiple temporalities affect many aspects of lived experience. (p. 511)

Gillan (2018) sets forth that there are two dominant approaches to the temporalities of collective action within social movement studies. The first is concerning the sequence of the increase and decreases in the movement activity in protest events, either as waves (Koopmans, 2004) or cycles (Tarrow, 1998). Gillan (2018) and Gillan & Edwards (2020) state that these approaches rather focus on sequences on a

macro level, leaving out the importance of micro-level dynamics. As the second focuses on the sequences of strategic interactions (McAdam, Tarrow & Tilly, 2001; Tilly & Tarrow, 2007), they capture different mechanisms at play in this regard; however, Gillan (2018) contends that they single out these micro-level dynamics rather independent of the social and political context. In this sense, this growing strand in the literature is not only concerned with the ways in which the existing scholarly work approaches the sequences but also concerned with the fact that they focus exclusively on the temporality of the sequence itself. Gillan & Edwards (2020) suggest that we should “further our understanding of sequences in which movements are active on a variety of timescales and speeds” (p. 507) as well as focus on different aspects of temporality. Proceeding from these designations, the authors suggest that we extend the investigation with reference to three domains: “historical times, eventfulness and sequences” (Gillan & Edwards, 2020, p. 501).

In this research, I proceed with a theoretical outlook that is sensitive to the abovementioned temporal characteristics to make sense of the course of prefigurative politics in the aftermath of Gezi. It can be argued that Gezi Protests have been such an unanticipated eruption, as with those mentioned above, that disrupts the quotidian experience of time and politics. Apart from the abrupt mass mobilizations revolving around Gezi Park, accompanying prefigurative practices within the park – as well as their subsequent repercussions – require such sensitivity to temporality. While the abrupt character of the protests indicates a different time experience, this time experience seems to have been reinforced by the temporality of prefigurative political actions which is pertaining to a different time experience that seeks to bind the future and the present in different ways.

In this regard, Gezi's exceptional character and its interrupting effect on the quotidian operation of politics have been acknowledged by various works. For instance, Sofos (2018) argues that "Gezi should be located outside the linear time and conventional topography of Turkish politics and interpreted as a brief, powerful moment of rupture in a political system" (p. 83). According to him, this rupture embodied a transformative power where "individuals, free from the constraints and rules of dailiness can experiment and articulate, even temporarily, their subjectivity" (Sofos, 2018, p. 90). Although he acknowledges that the expression of this subjectivity can be sustained afterward, with political actions in neighborhood assemblies or through the internet, Sofos (2018) rather emphasizes the temporary character of this disruption: it is a "fleeting moment of collective action, a temporary laboratory of meaning creation" (p. 86).

However, certain other scholars stressed the continuance of this transformative power through newly forged subjectivities. İlhan Demiryol (2018, pp. 9-10) identifies Gezi as a turning point where new citizenship practices started to be realized and singles out their "exercise and re-enactment" of certain protest events in the aftermath of Gezi. Zihnioğlu (2019) extends this claim as she argues the legacy of Gezi can be traced to the successive mass mobilizations, newly formed civic organizations, and practices of community support. Karakayalı & Yaka (2014) also points out the formation of "new subjectivities and social practices, and eventually to the emergence of new norms" (p. 118). They indicate that: "Many people felt they were transformed by their experience of protest through the political action and interaction and through subjective and intersubjective processes that took place within the intensified temporality of the uprising" (Karakayalı & Yaka, 2014, p. 128).

Gürcan & Peker (2015) and della Porta & Atak (2017) add on the connection of this intensified temporality with these subsequent protest events and emphasize that the possibilities arising out of Gezi may produce more enduring effects. They approach Gezi Protests as an ‘eventful protest’ that serves as a ‘critical juncture’ whose transformative power can have abiding effects by producing path-dependencies, even though its degree is to be contingent on the subsequent developments. One such effect can be traced through the development of new political subjectivities (della Porta & Atak, 2017). These subjectivities are being made possible by various conditions: “Unusual but revealing encounters with violent state apparatuses, with the other and unknown dissidents on the street as well as experimentations with alternative imaginaries of politics such as neighborhood assemblies empowered people, broke routines, and let the previously unthinkable emerge” (della Porta & Atak, 2017, p. 55). However, they conclude that these “new subjectivities, if any, are at best in the making or in a process of becoming” (della Porta & Atak, 2017, p. 55) and, therefore, “the potential for the consolidation of the Gezi spirit needs time to be assessed” (della Porta & Atak, 2017, p. 54).

In his recent work, Baran Alp Uncu (2022) retakes this assessment and reasserts that these subjectivities can be sustained even until now. As he states:

. . . even though the Gezi protest itself phased out, the new subjectivity and politicized identities have not vanished, but rather become embodied in the post-Gezi protests and practices of everyday life, such as food collectives, city gardens, citizen initiatives and issue-specific movement networks. (2022, p. 48)

For him, prefigurative political practices during and after the protests have been of considerable importance in the enactment of this political subjectivity that rests upon the principles of heterogeneity and horizontalism:

Through intensified and condensed collective identity processes carried out in this free space, the Gezi protesters engaged in the work of turning themselves

into a politicized collectivity, prefiguring alternative ways of living that diffused into the practices of everyday life and mobilizations in the aftermath of the Gezi protest encampment. (Uncu, 2022, p. 56)

These explications provide insights into the enduring legacies of Gezi and the conditions that set the ground for its sustenance. However, as Uncu (2022) also admits, the sustainability of this legacy depends on the developments related to the impacts of growing authoritarianism. Thus, he points out that “further research is required to understand the chances of sustainability of the cultural and political transformation from below in the face of rising de-democratization and right-wing populism” (Uncu, 2022, p. 66).

As with these abovementioned works, I proceed with identifying Gezi as a moment of rupture in the ordinary functioning of time, and thereof politics, that creates a variety of new possibilities for engaging with political actions. I seek to extend the investigation of the endurance of this legacy that creates new subjectivities engaging in prefigurative politics (Uncu, 2022), while acknowledging the continuing making and re-making of it (della Porta, 2017; İlhan Demiryol, 2018; Sofos, 2018). In this sense, I attempt to take on the research direction Uncu (2022) points out and elaborate on the dynamics of this sustainability in the face of growing authoritarianism. In this regard, we need to go beyond the very moments of the Gezi Protests and the encampments within the park, extending our exploration into the subsequent events following that moment of rupture.

1.1.2 Gezi as a critical juncture

As I have already emphasized, these unordinary events require conceptual lenses that are sensitive to their temporality in order to make sense of these very moments as well as their legacies. Donatella della Porta’s (2018) enterprise to refine

conceptualizations of ‘eventful protests’ that prompt ‘critical junctures’ is in line with this call, paying regard to the “historical times, eventfulness and sequences” (Gillan & Edwards, 2020). In this sense, it offers us possibilities to build on Gürcan & Peker (2015) and della Porta & Atak’s (2017) approach to Gezi as a critical juncture and enables us to follow up on the sequences after this rupture.

According to della Porta (2018), certain protest events are of exclusive importance because of their ability to evoke a transformation within a compressed time and space. Drawing on William Sewell’s concept of ‘eventful temporality,’ she identifies such events as ‘eventful protests’ “to indicate moments in which actions change structures rather than being constrained by them” (della Porta, 2018, p. 5). Eventful protests incur a special temporality that can instantiate an abrupt transformation in people’s ideas, values, habits, and accustomed political practices. They open up a space for these new changing and emerging elements to be expressed, “significantly disrupting, altering, or violating the taken-for-granted assumptions governing routine political and social relations” (McAdam & Sewell, 2001, p. 110). In this sense, in line with certain other works’ emphasis (McAdam & Sewell, 2001; Meyer & Kimeldorf, 2015; Wood, Staggenborg, Stalker & Kutz-Flamenbaum, 2017; Gillan, 2018; Palacios-Valladares, 2020) on the causal significance of these events in instigating social change in different scales, della Porta (2018) specifically emphasizes ‘eventful protests’ “as capable of transforming relations within social movements and between movements and their contexts” (p. 6). She states that:

Eventful protests thus reproduce, rather than just consuming, resources of solidarity and collective identification, fueling positive emotions of empowerment. During eventful protests, participants experiment with new tactics, send and receive signals about the possibility of collective action, and create and experience feelings of belonging as occasions for interactions

multiply. In fact, the perception of time accelerates, as what had seemed impossible now appears possible. (della Porta, 2018, p. 6)

In this sense, it seems plausible to take a closer look at the dynamics of eventful protests to explain these newly emerging political practices and their sustenance. As has been implied above, these dynamics may have emotional, ideological, strategical, and relational dimensions. Although these necessarily find expressions in relation to the antecedent conditions and structures, there seems to be a different temporal experience underlying these dimensions, correlating with these in an intensifying way. This can be related to a certain dissociation with the quotidian functioning of daily life and, thereof, implies steering away from the limitations and possibilities of dominant social and political structures for a certain amount of accelerated time. It opens up a space where new possibilities and limitations emerge depending on the actions of individuals in this period until the ordinary functioning of time re-establishes itself. In this sense, the specific quality of time experience that is enmeshed with along with the emotional, strategic and relational dimensions seem to be important factors that contribute to shaping the character of emerging political practices.

This is, also, to say that the transformations initiated by these events are by no means random, nor fully disconnected from the impact of dominant social structures. They are rather interruptive, and the course of this interruption depends on the subsequent interplay between these different dynamics. Then, the scale and continuity of the social change that is expected from these eventful protests become contingent on this sequential development. In this regard, della Porta (2018) argues that “some eventful protests trigger critical junctures, producing abrupt changes which develop contingently and become path dependent” (p. 4). As Collier & Munck (2017) describes: “A critical juncture is (1) a major episode of institutional

innovation, (2) occurring in distinct ways, (3) and generating an enduring legacy” (p. 2). Banding ‘eventful protest’ together with ‘critical juncture,’ della Porta (2018) traces the implications of these events by focusing on “a sequence of processes of cracking, as the production of sudden ruptures; vibrating, as contingently reproducing those ruptures; and sedimenting, as the stabilization of the legacy of the rupture” (p. 4). Identifying Gezi as an eventful protest that triggers critical junctures, I will rely on this framework to explain why prefigurative politics had an upsurge within the cracking and vibrating processes following Gezi Protests and how these political practices can be sedimented despite the growing authoritarianism.

Initially, the sudden eruption of these events as well as the remodeling of daily life within the park through prefigurative practices seem to have created different social relations with time and space. As I have emphasized above, this experience pertaining to a different temporality disrupts the quotidian life by the acceleration or compression of time. In this way, it opens up a new sequence of time that provides different possibilities (and limitations) than people ordinarily face in their relation to dominant social and political structures. Within this cracking², new and intense affections may arise; individual grievances may turn into ‘mobilizing grievances’ through new interpretations of the social surrounding and possibilities of collective action; new strategies and tactics may be experimented with, and new subjectivities may be forged. I think that the proliferation of prefigurative politics, in the first place, is grounded on such crack created by this time experience and its

² This term can be thought in parallel with John Holloway’s (2010) conceptualization of ‘crack’ as well. Holloway (2010) argues that: “The story of the cracks is the story of a doing that does not fit into a world dominated by labour. The cracks are mis-fittings, mis-doings. To say that cracks are quite ordinary rebellions is to say that the misfit is not someone or something that belongs to the margins of society, but is at its very centre. To mis-fit is a central part of everyday experience. We start from there because it is this failure or refusal to fit in to an oppressive society that is the basis for hoping that we can change it. If we look through the eyes of domination or start from the analysis of capital, these misfittings simply do not exist. To put cracks at the centre gives us a different vantage point: we start from that which does not fit in, that which overflows, that which is not contained, that which exists not only in but also against-and-beyond” (p. 85).

affective and strategic implications for the protesters. In this sense, by incarnating a cracking, this event itself engenders a transformative power that enables the emergence of new political enterprises. This transformative event may:

. . . serve to dramatically ratchet up . . . the shared sense of uncertainty (with its partisan variants, “threat” and “opportunity”) on which all broad episodes of contention depend. By increasing this sense of uncertainty, such events also fuel a dramatic escalation in the mobilization of emotion by all parties to the conflict. The increase in perceived threat typically heightens fear and anger on the part of movement opponents, while “rising expectations” expands hope and anger among insurgents. (McAdam & Sewell, 2001, p. 110)

Yet, the crack that is creating a vast of opportunities can only be understood and identified as a critical juncture ex-post, by considering its sequence. For an eventful protest to be a critical juncture, we should be able to identify the enduring legacies it produces and sustains. As della Porta (2018) and Wood et al. (2017) emphasize, this can be unveiled by considering the emotional, cognitive, and relational dynamics of the individuals, organizations, and movements within the subsequent phases after the crack, via vibration and sedimentation processes mentioned above. In this research, I will also pay attention to these phases in order to make sense of how a certain new subjectivity, as a legacy of the critical juncture engendered by Gezi, is being sustained despite increasing authoritarianism.

In a consecutive relationship with the emergence of a crack, the process of vibration refers to the process where strategic interactions between different actors occur following this structural opening. In this process, these strategic encounters are to be fueled by opportunities (or threats), while the initial shock proceeds to settle down. On the one hand, the dissociation from the antecedent structural constraints provides newly emerging opportunities or buttresses already existing ones. Activists, thereof, may have relatively more substantial freedom to undertake new political practices or to reinforce already existing ideas, values, practices, or affections. On

the other hand, as the initial shock proceeds to calm down, the re-alignment of different social and political actors as well as structures vis-à-vis this structural opening may bring about different challenges. In this sense, the agency of the actors and their interaction between themselves (and with other actors) gain considerable importance in shaping the conditions of this process. Della Porta (2018, p. 8) emphasizes that this process advances contingent upon these interactions: “different actors’ responses to specific challenges tend to reconstitute relations” and imply different consequences for the actors. For movements and activists, this process may produce plentiful outcomes, as “contingency affects the given structures by fueling mechanisms of social change: organizational networks develop; frames are bridged; personal links foster reciprocal trust” (della Porta, 2018, p. 9). In this sense, it provides a certain basis for the emergence and settlement of new subjectivities, values, and norms.

The further sustenance of these outcomes in the vibration intertwines with the sedimentation process, where these newly emerging aspects are about to be stabilized as concretized enduring legacies. Whereas these aspects are to be produced by different mechanisms in the cascade of crack and vibration, these aspects may find persistent ways to be reproduced during this phase. As a result, some of those achieve an organizational persistence in which these new strategies, values, particular forms of action, and new subjectivities are embedded. That is to say, these critical junctures now produce institutional legacies “through mechanisms of legislation, with the creation of laws and regulations (particularly on the issues that are central for the movements), as well as through legitimation (recognition of particular actors and forms of action)” (della Porta, 2018, p. 12).

Furthermore, eventful protests do not only affect the course of future movements by leaving an institutional legacy, but also by creating memories and solidifying them in the process. As della Porta (2018, p. 12) states: “Memories seem particularly relevant in unsettled times, as they can work to reestablish solidarities but also to challenge existing ones.” By seeking to establish a resonance with these memories through different symbols, values, and ideas, movements may be able to vivify their solidarity ties, as well as produce different resources. Besides, these memories may become prominent again during times of further shocks or crises. During the sedimentation phase, the initial critical juncture cannot effectively produce significant transformations, but rather reproduce the characteristics of the ongoing transformations; yet, as new ruptures or disruptive events interfere with this process, the memories of the initial event may resonate and accompany new collective actions and organizational practices.

1.1.3 Emotions in mobilization

Building on the empowering effects of mass mobilizations, prefigurative political practices in the park contributed to the creation of an emotional atmosphere in and around the park with feelings of joy, solidarity, a sense of belongingness, and hope. This was also accompanied by anxiety reflexes to secure the conditions in the park. The atmosphere characterized by these feelings has come to turn into an enduring ‘emotional climate’ (Barbalet, 1998; Pearlman, 2013), as these feelings have come to be reproduced in the vibration phase by the subsequent mass mobilizations, solidarity networks, and prefigurative political practices following the eviction of the park. In this sense, I argue that these feelings have created an emboldening environment for people to experiment with prefigurative politics in different spaces, reaching outside

the confines of the park and penetrating the daily lives of the people. Besides, the accompanying anxieties have led certain activists to search for ways to develop more persistent organizational structures and cultures. It can be argued that this emotional climate has been influential in the maintenance of certain hope for people to engage in prefigurative politics. This hope has been embodied through certain affective commitments, moods, and moral emotions (Jasper, 2011) that were arisen from different sets of prefigurative practices. Besides, as these have been interacting with certain anxiety reflexes, these interactions may have served as an ‘emotional battery’ at times (Jasper, 2011), strengthening activists’ will to cultivate different ways to cling to this hope. While I elaborate on the relation between these emotions and these different sets of practices further in chapter four, I bring together different theoretical perspectives on social movements. Correspondingly, I argue that this emotional climate with a hopeful mood has been integral for the ‘emotional-cognitive liberation’ of the activists (Flam, 2005), turning their individual grievances into ‘mobilizing grievances’ (Snow, 2013; Simmons, 2014), mitigating the impact of strategic disincentives and enabling activists to find ways to cope with the dispiriting affects (Pearlman, 2013). To the extent that activists could animate the emboldening affections pertaining to this climate, within and around their group, prefigurative groups seem to have kept taking the advantage of the abovementioned strategic implications in their subsequent interactions. Besides, I also single out in this chapter how memories and affections of this climate can be put into action especially after new disruptive events, enabling activists to engage in new prefigurative political actions or to revivify their solidarity ties.

As the initial cracking had started to give its place to the vibration phase, the unordinary acceleration produced by the initial shock evaporated in a way and, at

that point, strategic considerations and encounters became more operative. In this phase, political actors, be it those who emblaze different grievances or who stand up against these, start to realign themselves to these new conditions whilst they bid to carry on with the new advances brought by this shock. Although strategic considerations of these different actors were variant depending on the course of their interactions, it is possible to observe certain commonalities in terms of their strategic resort to prefigurative politics. These commonalities indicate certain opportunities pertaining to the specific character of prefigurative tactics and strategies that is experimental (van de Sande, 2019) and, also, activists' need to deal with the conditions of the new political context. In this sense, these can also be asserted as other reasons why activists were drawn into prefigurative politics. On the one hand, prefigurative practices enable activists to cope with the anxieties and limitations that are stimulated as a result of this realignment by developing solidarity practices and a pluralist field of interaction where people feel certain belongingness while they can retain their own lifestyles, tastes, and political views. Intricated with these, they find flexible and creative strategic possibilities in these practices so as to avoid these limitations, while, at the same time, these practices offer ways to act against their grievances that stem from multiple sources and are intersecting. I argue that these strategic considerations also give countenance to activists' taste in prefigurative politics. This taste can be better understood by looking at their contempt for instrumentalist strategic orientations of the socialist organizations and the feelings aroused by them. In this regard, I scrutinize further in the chapter on these strategic and affective deliberations to explain why these activists were driven into prefigurative politics.

If the course of this vibration phase was not uniform for these groups, there was one significant shared development that disrupted these differing courses. While the cracking prompted by Gezi brought about vast political opportunities for the activists, the realignment of the government towards the consolidation of an authoritarian regime was concomitant to this condition. As the government proceeded in this direction, a new emotional climate for the activists has come to be settled. This emotional climate has rather brought about dispiriting emotions that led many activists to a drawback. Although the line of demarcation between these emotional climates cannot be strictly drawn and these two have coexisted at times – indicating a certain amorphousness (Pearlman, 2013) – this new development can be asserted as one of the most important limiting disruptions that activists faced. In the fifth chapter, as I move towards discussing how prefigurative politics sustain itself despite this closure, I identify the characteristics of this emotional climate that has come to be settled until now, within which prefigurative politics sustain their activities.

1.1.4 Anxious hope

The preceding climate that has been forged in and after Gezi Protests has come to be significantly changed especially after 2015, as the authoritarian character of the regime has gained a new character and momentum. Although it is still possible to trace repercussions and memories of the feelings aroused by Gezi, the consolidation of the authoritarian regime has awakened feelings of anxiety, insecurity, fear, and loneliness that override the hopeful mood that arose with the effect of the protests. Even though these feelings become more overwhelming for activists, it can be said that activists seek to cling to feelings of solidarity, a sense of belongingness, and

hope within their own groups, which enables them to sustain their actions despite these overwhelming feelings. In this sense, it can be argued that the emotional climate now is rather characterized by rather feelings of anxiety, insecurity, loneliness, and fear, but still accompanied by a sense of hope that activists seek to keep alive with their prefigurative practices. In this sense, a sense of hope and relief that activists could find in their groups' practices strives for opening up a space for hope so that they can sustain their activities. I argue that this search seems to occur through different senses that are oscillating between 'active' and 'dormant' forms of hope.

In this sense, chapter five as well as the preceding one, rely on a recent strand in the social movement theory that emphasizes the importance of emotions in different social movement activities (Jasper, 1998, 2011; Pearlman, 2013; Goodwin, Jasper & Polletta, 2001, 2004). The central emphasis of this strand has been to go beyond theoretical perspectives that associate emotions with irrationality and give more weight to exploring cognitive processes as the only rational considerations of strategic practices within movements. Instead, they argue that these considerations point out to complex moral, cognitive, and affective understandings, where thinking and feeling should be thought of as parallelly occurring processes that are in interaction. The fourth chapter proceeds attentive to these emphases in several terms. In order to bring emotions' importance in the subjective dynamics of participation, it resorts to Flam's (2005) 'emotional-cognitive liberation' that diverges from views that take on McAdam's (1997) 'cognitive liberation' by merely focusing on instrumental calculations. This understanding puts the importance of different emotions in inter- and intra-organizational interactions as well as the affective impacts of the structural preconditions for movements to reframe reality for

mobilization. Therefore, I proceed with certain scholars' (Simmons, 2014; Jasper, 1998, 2011) stress on the interaction between affective and cognitive mechanisms in terms of transforming 'individual grievances' into 'mobilizing grievances' (Snow, 2013; Bray, Shriver & Adams, 2018). Within this framework, I discuss the effect of 'emotional climate' (Barbalet 1998; Pearlman, 2013) created by Gezi and political actions within and outside activists' organizational terrain in terms of feeding these interactions. On the other hand, I mention the strategic importance of prefigurative repertoires vis-à-vis instrumentalist strategic orientations. Throughout this explication, I seek to reflect on how these strategic considerations were enmeshed with different types of emotions. In this sense, I have also been attentive to another emphasis put by this recent strand of social movement theories. This emphasis basically points out that how emotions are felt differs. They last for different time periods, are felt in different intensities, and carry on with different weights. Having said that, I single out different forms of emotions such as affective commitments, moods, moral emotions, and reflex emotions (Jasper, 2011), while I attach special importance to hope in terms of its emboldening effect on engaging in and sustaining political actions. In the fifth chapter, I expand on this exploration by focusing on the specific character and political importance of this hope within the dispiriting emotional climate created as a result of the consolidation of authoritarianism. I think that this further specification may also allow us to differentiate activists' specific ideological positioning vis-à-vis the others.

Taken together, these two chapters exhibit characteristics of two emotional climates for prefigurative activists that are still in action today. Although the consolidation of the authoritarian regime brought about the preeminence of dispiriting emotions, I seek to show how certain characteristics of the preceding

emboldening climate can be still followed. Repercussions of these new developments have led many prefigurative groups to dissolve or have led activists into despair. Nevertheless, by no means they could seal down the possible ways of undertaking political actions. As I have already mentioned, to the extent that subsequent disruptive events enable activists to reanimate memories of the preceding emotional climate, it may even pave the way for the development of new prefigurative groups. On the other hand, activists' continuing efforts have also been able to develop ways to sustain their political actions within this environment. Above, I indicated how activists follow ways to sustain certain hopes, though within a certain oscillation as the experience of hope is to be accompanied by the dispiriting amounts that is brought by the new political context. I think that this oscillation pertains to the interactions between the dominant emotional climate today and the remnants of the preceding one. In this sense, the legacies of this interaction have been important in giving shape to the enduring institutional outcomes of the Gezi Protests as we move towards the sedimentation of the initial cracking.

In the sixth chapter, I identify the intermingling outcomes of these legacies by focusing on the case of Kadıköy Cooperative, whose development has been initiated with the effect of the Gezi and the subsequent political efforts in neighborhood forums and solidarities. I argue that one of the enduring legacies of Gezi has been an emergence of subjectivity, as with a radically horizontal constitutional order of the cooperative, that has developed around three fundamental tenets that are strategical, ethical, and political; respectively, prefiguration, self-reflectivity, and solidarity. While I seek to explicate the character of these tenets, I aim to locate this subjectivity within the context of the abovementioned interaction. In this sense, I argue that how activists have been interacting with their political environment around these

fundamental tenets amounts to the embodiment of a flexible and horizontal, prefigurative, constitutional order (Kinna, Prichard & Swann, 2019). Focusing on this embodiment may provide insights to make sense of how and why activists can sustain their political activities despite the dispiriting effects of the current emotional climate with an anxious experience of hope that pertains to the abovementioned oscillation.

1.1.5 Counter-conducts

Above, I have already emphasized the integrality of emotional and ideational deliberations and the possibility of this consideration to make sense of the specific ethical and political dispositions of the activists. I think that this further specification to identify the characteristics of the emotional terrain of activists may provide insights regarding the expression of their political subjectivities. Henceforth, chapter six proceeds in concordance with this framework by unfolding the fundamental bases of this subjectivity with reference to the affectional expressions and considerations they encapsulate. Here, I discuss whether we can observe a complex interplay pertaining to the dormant hopes for autonomy, active hopes for solidarity, and anxieties stemming from self-reflections on the possibilities, and limitations of the political practices amount to the construction of an experience of ‘anxious hope.’

Until now, I signaled how this subjectivity has been forged as an accumulative result of the cracking, vibration, and sedimentation processes. As the radically egalitarian constitutional order developed by the cooperative would indicate, the institutional order and the related political subjectivity now can be identified as enduring legacies of the critical juncture sparked by Gezi. It can be expected that this subjectivity retains certain initial characteristics of the cracking

while it has been developing over time. Although my specific focus in this chapter is on the interactions of this subjectivity within and outside the organizational sphere of the cooperative in the current political context, it may also provide insights to make sense of the political significance of the actions and subjects that were in Gezi. For this regard, I rely on Michel Foucault's conceptualization of 'counter-conduct' which marks the characteristics of the set of political actions that are in effect both in the Gezi and cooperative.

Taking up on Kürşad Ertuğrul's interpretation of Foucauldian theory of power as an "action-based critical social theory," I adopt this "perspective to analyze social and political struggles in terms of the mutual incitation between power as conduct of conduct and autonomy politics as counter-conduct" (Ertuğrul, 2022, p. 2). Foucault (1982) points out what 'conduct' entails in terms of the exercise of power relations:

Perhaps the equivocal nature of the term conduct is one of the best aids for coming to terms with the specificity of power relations. For to "conduct" is at the same time to "lead" others (according to mechanisms of coercion which are, to varying degrees, strict) and a way of behaving with a more or less open field of possibilities. The exercise of power consists in guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order the possible outcome. (pp. 220-221)

The exercise of power relations via dominant authority structures can be understood as conducting the conduct of the subjects (conduct upon conduct) which tends to put the possible outcomes of one's actions in order. If one part of this process comes from rather certain leading mechanisms, it also operates through subjects' actions while conducting themselves. Basically, individuals are not only subjected to but also are subjects of these orderings. In this sense, power is not imposed upon subjects from an outer source but is exercised as an interplay between these two. While individuals can be subjects of producing or reproducing these dominant power

relations, this framework concedes that there may be other possibilities arising out of this “more or less open” field of possibilities.

For Foucault, one such possibility indicates ‘counter-conducts.’ According to Davidson (2011, p. 27), counter-conducts “are movements characterized by wanting to be conducted differently, whose objective is a different type of conduction, and that also attempt to indicate an area in which individual can conduct himself, the domain of one’s own conduct or behavior.” Simply put, it constitutes a twofold counter-action – and twofold conduct in a way. First, it is an expression of the will that one does not want to be governed by the conduct of a certain set of conducting actions, so it is an action against a specific ‘conduct of conduct.’ Second, it incurs developing possible ways of action to conduct oneself independent from the impositions of being conducted itself. That is to say, it indicates a space where subjects undertake actions with a certain autonomy, i.e., a space where they have possibilities to conduct themselves autonomously. In this sense, counter-conduct incurs a negation and a creation at the same time. While it seeks to negate knowledge, values, affections, and practices of a certain set of dominant power relations, concurrently, it creates new ones instead. As this creation always occurs through the actions of the individuals who are already subjected to dominant power relations, this creation seems to be realized through a contestation between these dominant and new forms of being: a negotiation between conduct and counter-conduct. On the other hand, to the extent that this creation constitutes – even though it is countering – yet another conduct, it also brings its peculiar limitations in front of the individual’s search for autonomy. Hence, it implies that counter-conducts do not present a field of interaction where power relations are erased once and for all, even though they undermine dominant power relations and create a space for the

autonomy of the individuals. Rather, they constitute a field of interaction where the operation of dominant power relations is now organized in different ways and different forms of power relations may emerge. Repercussions of this reorganization and creation can be better understood by taking a look at the ways in which power relations are put into action by the counter-conducts.

A recent strand in the literature takes on an enterprise to study different social movement activities. These works take their cue from Carl Death's (2010) attempt to develop a 'counter-conducts approach' to analyze certain protest events:

A counter-conducts approach focuses on practices and mentalities of resistance, rather than movements, and also seeks to show how power and resistance, government and dissent, are mutually constitutive. The form protests take are closely linked to the regimes of power against which they are opposed – and simultaneously practices of government themselves are shaped by the manner in which they are resisted. (p. 240)

For this regard, he suggests that we can study protests through four dimensions of counter-conducts: “the fields of visibility it creates and the ends to which it aims; the forms of knowledge it relies upon; the particular technologies and apparatuses it mobilizes; and the subjectivities or identities it produces” (Death, 2010, p. 240). Drawing on this approach and its reworking, Death (2010, 2016), Pourmokhtari (2017) and Çabuk Kaya & Ural (2018) analyzes certain protest events as counter-conducts. In a similar vein, Nişancioğlu & Pal (2016), Rossdale & Stierl (2016) and Ertuğrul (2022) single out embodiments of certain protest events as counter-conducts that are comprised of prefigurative political actions. The merits of this approach in studying protest events are twofold, which are also relevant to this research:

First, it approaches protests and contentious politics not from an actor-centric perspective, but rather orientates itself toward specific practices and rationalities of protest, which themselves work to constitute particular identities and subjectivities through the performance of dissent. Secondly, by destabilizing conventional binaries between power and resistance, government and freedom, an analytics of protest is specifically designed to show how protest and government are mutually constitutive, and thus how

forms of resistance have the potential to reinforce and bolster, as well as and at the same time as, undermining and challenging dominant forms of global governance. (Death, 2010, p.236).

While I proceed from the views that identify Gezi Protests as counter-conduct in terms of constituting particular subjectivities (Ertuğrul, 2022; Çabuk Kaya & Ural, 2018), I expand on these explications by underscoring certain aspects of ‘counter-conduct’ that might have been overlooked by the abovementioned literature.

Although I agree with the political significance of counter-conducts in terms of producing new subjectivities of dissent, I think that the abovementioned analyses of protests do not trace the extent to which these counter-conducting subjectivities can be enduring. Yet, the conditions of this endurance amount to a significant aspect of ‘counter-conducts.’ Above, I have already emphasized how political repercussions of these processes can be understood as certain – so to say – negotiations between conducts and counter-conducts. If this is to bring certain reorganization and creation of a field of interaction where subjects may find autonomous ways of being, this autonomy can be made possible by a particular ethical stance within this course. This ethical stance refers to a critical attitude – for and – of a ‘self-care.’ Namely, a continual criticism of the ways in which different actions make oneself as the subjects of and subjected to power relations (in either case of conducts or counter-conducts). This continual criticism incorporates self-denial through which autonomous ways of inventing oneself can be made possible. As Foucault (1982, p. 216) puts forward:

Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get rid of this kind of political “double bind,” which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of modern power structures. The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state, and from the state’s institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualization which is linked to the state. We have to promote

new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries.

This attitude of ‘self-care’ points out by what means power relations can be transposed so as to promote these new subjectivities, an ethical stance that involves three components according to Davidson (2011, p. 30):

A general attitude with respect to oneself, to others and to the world; a form of attention turned towards oneself; a series of practices or techniques of the self . . . Attitude, attention and practices of the self are all features of the ethical sense of conduct.

After all, it can be argued that these components imply a set of permanent activities for the self on oneself. In this sense, counter-conducts should be thought of as an enduring set of actions undertaken by subjectivities that are in the process of continual criticism. Davidson (2011, pp. 37-38) describes these points further as the following:

This double refusal and promotion is the domain of counter-conduct, a sphere of revolt that incites a process of productivity . . . Moreover, Foucault explicitly links this domain to his definition of the ‘critical attitude’, a political and moral attitude, a manner of thinking, that is a critique of the way in which our conduct is governed, a ‘partner and adversary’ of the arts of governing . . . This critical attitude is part of a philosophical *ethos*, and no such *ethos* is effective without a permanent exercise of counter-conduct.

I think it is in this sense important to focus on the set of activities, within and after the Gezi Protests, through which counter-conducting subjectivities are made enduring and are proceeding within the current political context. Along with Ertuğrul (2022) and Çabuk Kaya & Ural (2018) who singled out social and political practices in Gezi Protests that make a counter-conduct possible, I argue that Gezi as a counter-conduct has made counter-conduct of the Kadıköy Cooperative possible. In this sense, I complement them in several regards. While Çabuk Kaya & Ural (2018) discuss Gezi as specifically young people’s counter-conduct, I rather tend to agree with Ertuğrul (2022, p. 5) as he identifies it “as a complex counter-action process

involving a multiplicity of actors outflowing their given categorizations and becoming part of series of performances in which a sense of self-transformation was common.” Furthermore, I take up on Ertuğrul’s (2022) point that locates the importance of prefigurative political practices in reflecting the ethical stance in developing a counter-conduct within the site of Gezi. I further expand on this view by focusing on vibration and sedimentation phases, where this ethical stance has been multiplied into different sites by the further deployment and counter-institutionalization of prefigurative political practices. As I come to conclude that the initial cracking produced by the counter-conduct of Gezi has been sedimented through the counter-institutionalization of ethical, political, and affective practices of Kadıköy Cooperative, I argue that the cooperative proceeds, in the current political context, as a field of interaction for autonomy-seeking subjectivities. I think that the implications of this identification for the scope of this research are twofold. While it seeks to provide an insight into the question of why prefigurative politics had an upsurge following the Gezi Protests by describing it as aggregating a permanent exercise of counter-conduct, it also responds to the question of how a prefigurative politics is sustained within the current environment by identifying the characteristics of political subjectivities undertaking prefigurative political actions. As a corollary, it also speaks to the body of work that focuses on the political significance of practices that assembled and sustained the political power of the Gezi (Özdüzen, 2019; Çıdam, 2017; Gambetti, 2014).

1.2 Methodology and case selection

Within this scope, I conducted fifteen in-depth interviews with activists from a variety of groups between June 2021 and April 2022 in Istanbul. Nine of the activists

participated in Gezi Protests in Istanbul, while three of them participated in protests in support of Gezi in different cities. Although I specifically focused on their experiences in a specific group with each of the interviewees throughout my interviews, some of the activists had experience in multiple groups that engage with prefigurative politics. If to sort out all of these groups with which activists had experience, there would be four main titles for groups that were established: preceding Gezi, in the earlier phases of the vibration (right after the protests), in the later phases of vibration and the sedimentation process with the effect of other disruptive events, such as mass layoffs and pandemic. Only a few of the interviewees had knowledge and experience of prefigurative political practices preceding Gezi, while most of them were currently actively participating in a prefigurative group. Among all groups that were mentioned during the interviews: Imece (Society Urbanism Movement), Ecology Collective, Commons, Migrant Solidarity Network, Bandista, Ahali Newspaper, and Collective 26A were already existing preceding Gezi; Istanbul Anarchy Initiative, Food Not Bombs, Northern Forests Defence, Yoğurtçu Park Forum, Abbasağa Park Forum, and Koşuyolu Park Forum were established right after the protests; whereas Kadıköy Cooperative, Istanbul Zapatista Coffee Coordination, infiAl, Karaburun Collective were in the later phases of vibration process. Besides, Association for Science, Art, Education, Research and Solidarity (BİRARADA), Kadıköy Solidarity Network, and Barber for Everybody (*Herkese Berber*) were rather special cases, as these groups were formed with the effect of new disruptive events.

Among such variety, I specifically outline the experiences of activists from six groups that correspond to the abovementioned categories in order to explain why they chose to take part in prefigurative politics and how they feel about the current

emotional climate: Collective 26A, Food Not Bombs, Kadıköy Cooperative, BİRARADA, Barber for Everybody and Kadıköy Solidarity Network. As I uncover their experiences, throughout the fourth and fifth chapters, I seek to be reflective of a certain endurance so as to shed light on the legacies of Gezi. In this specific regard, following the experiences of activists in the abovementioned groups, in the sixth chapter, I focus on the case of Kadıköy Cooperative to discuss how the group sustains its political actions in the face of increasing authoritarianism. Besides, these groups vary in terms of their prefigurative political orientation, i.e., adoption of prefiguration as a movement strategy, collective actions, organizational practices, or individual actions. This variance has also been crucial for my discussion, in the second chapter, on the conceptualization of prefigurative politics in terms of different modalities of prefigurative political actions. Furthermore, I rely on the experiences of activists who were engaged with prefigurative politics preceding Gezi in order to provide a glance at the history of prefigurative politics in Turkey in the third chapter.

In this framework, among the groups under scrutiny, Collective 26A was an anarchist-communist café collective that was established in Taksim in 2009, and later on, opened new branches in Kadıköy and Kartal. The café was collectively owned by its volunteers, which were also affiliated with an anarchist political organization called Revolutionary Anarchist Action. In this sense, the café can also be seen as a strategic collective prefigurative action of this organization. The café claimed to be democratically operated without managers or bosses and to distribute the profit according to the volunteer's needs, in line with the motto of communism – 'from each according to one's ability, to each according to one's needs.' The volunteers of the café claimed to develop a culture of solidarity in accordance with these principles and to enable its volunteers to earn their lives without needing to work without

resorting to capitalist social relations. On the other hand, volunteers of the collective undertake different solidarity actions to support different struggles against capitalism, heterosexism, patriarchy, and domination of nature. In this way, volunteers of the café claimed to develop a life experience that seeks to be independent of capitalist social relations. Although the collective expressed, in its public manifestations, that these experiences were reflective of their anarchist ideals, a recent declaration by the ex-volunteers of the collective has shown that the social relations within the collective were discrepant with these public manifestations. The declaration exposed that some of the members of the organization enjoyed a hierarchically superior position in fact. In this sense, it revealed that these members were using physical and psychological violence against some other volunteers, whereas the profits of the café were unjustly distributed to them. Besides, ex-volunteers stated that the social relations within the collective were dominated by patriarchal relations. That is to say, this prefigurative experience was interfered with by different power relations, although it has claimed to implement its future ideals here-and-now. After this declaration, which was published during the time of my fieldwork, the political organization, and the collective was disbanded by some of its members. This incident left me thinking if I should dump this case within the scope of this research. However, I chose to keep it, by referring to this incident, as it can be reflective of some of my points. I resort to their statements, in the fourth chapter, so as to show how prefigurative experiences may create a different sense of life experience, and this experience itself can be influential for activists to join movements. In the fifth chapter, I call upon their statements to outline characteristics of the changing emotional climate. In this sense, although I rely on the experiences regarding this case, I was attentive throughout my explication of their experiences in

order not to be overridden by the difference between their public manifestations and claims and lived experience. Furthermore, in the sixth chapter, I discuss how prefigurative politics are always expressed through dominant power relations and can create their own power hierarchies. I think that the experience of Collective 26A was also highly representative of this point, even though I did not focus on the operation of these power relations in the collective within the scope of this research.

Food Not Bombs was a food collective that was established in December 2013, centered around Taksim. Although the group was more populated in the very beginning as with the atmosphere after Gezi, the group incrementally receded until its dissolution in 2017. In the meantime, another Food Not Bombs collective was initiated in Kadıköy and, in this sense, it can be said that the group has multiplied its operation sites during the vibration phase. I specifically focus on the earlier collective that is known as Food Not Bombs Istanbul. The main concern of the group was to draw attention to the capitalist relations of consumption and production that causes global poverty and exploitation of nature. Questioning the consumption habits in society, the group gathered foods and items that are considered waste because they do not look bright, fresh, or unused, so are about to be dumped. Instead, the group recycled such items by cooking meals and distributing these meals in different public places for free; or presenting other items in swap markets to reintroduce their use. Underlying these actions, there is a broader questioning of different forms of dominant authority structures, as the collective was organized around three basic principles: horizontalism, anti-oppression, and veganism. In this sense, in addition to their focus on changing capitalist relations of consumption, the group also sought to confront the oppression of animals as well as other different identities.

Kadıköy Cooperative was the most enduring group that roots back in the impact of the Gezi Protests, reaching out until now. Although the cooperative shop was opened in November 2016, the initial steps of the cooperative were taken right after Gezi with the series of discussions in the Yoğurtçu Park Forum and neighborhood solidarities emerging out of this assembly. These initial steps include a series of discussions, workshops, and first distributions that took place from December 2013 to November 2014. After the cooperative initiative has come to settle its relations with different producers, it took a further step as preparatory work for the establishment of a cooperative shop and distributed packages of goods from these producers in the neighborhood between March 2015 and June 2016. After these preparatory steps, the cooperative was legally established, and the cooperative shop was opened in November 2016. Since then, the cooperative is now still active in its shop in Kadıköy. Within this context, I conducted five in-depth interviews with the volunteers of the cooperative. The interviewees participated in the cooperative in different phases in the abovementioned timeline, starting from the very earlier steps in Yoğurtçu Park Forum and reaching out until the very recent time.

The cooperative's explicit aim is to transform production and consumption relations towards a more democratic way, based on the principle of 'food sovereignty.' The basic intention behind food sovereignty is to provide equal right to say for both producers and consumers to decide how, by whom, for whom, and how much food is to be produced, and how these products are going to be distributed. For that purpose, the cooperative establishes connections between producers and consumers without resorting to any mediator company and tries to provide room for consumers and producers to communicate. This communication aims to ensure that the food is produced in a just way, i.e., by using ecological methods or without

resorting to the exploitation of child labor or women. On the other hand, the cooperative seeks to establish solidarity with the producers in need, or with producers that are excluded on the basis of gender or sexual orientation. For instance, the cooperative undertakes different solidarity actions to support different struggles, such as that of women-only cooperatives, labors on strike, LGBTQ+ community, and other production cooperatives. In this sense, the cooperative does not only seek to transform dominant production, consumption, and distribution relations but also seeks to confront different dominant power relations by engaging in solidarity and developing more egalitarian social relations. This attitude is also reflected in their organizational structure and culture. The group also seeks to prefigure egalitarian social relations within the cooperative itself. In relation to that, as a result of their long efforts rooting back to Gezi, the group also incorporates a constitutional order that is based on three central tenets: prefiguration, self-reflectivity, and solidarity, which I will come to identify as a legacy of Gezi.

Apart from these, I resort to the experiences in three special cases which emerged after subsequent disruptive events throughout the process. Association for Science, Art, Education, Research and Solidarity (BİRARADA) was constituted by academicians, publicly known as Academics for Peace, who are expelled from their jobs after they signed the Peace Petition in January 2016 to withstand the state's human rights violations against Kurdish people in Southeastern Turkey. After the petition, they had to face various oppressive measures and rights violations including detention, dismissal, administrative and judicial investigations, retirement and resignation by force, passport restrictions, smear campaigns in media, and threats and harassment by racist groups. As a response, expelled academicians started to develop collective practices of solidarity to seek ways to earn their living and prefigurative

actions to pursue their intellectual endeavors outside the dominant social relations within the academia. In this regard, they developed a variety of solidarity academies, where they seek to produce knowledge by offering different courses and conducting projects to intervene in social inequalities within and outside the academia. Solidarity academies also provided bases for academicians to materially and emotionally support each other to soothe the repressive measures they have been facing. I think that their resort to prefigurative practices as they faced another disruption in their quotidian daily life connotes revivification of the memories and the knowledge from Gezi, as I have observed throughout my interviews.

Apart from these collective experiences, Barber for Everybody rather represents an individual prefigurative political action. The personal trajectory of the interviewee contains important parallels in terms of her political experience right after Gezi with her experience right after the outbreak of the pandemic. It is, in this sense, reflective of how Gezi did not only alter the daily life of the people within the space of the park but also had such repercussions outside the confines of the park through its memories and affections. The interviewee states that she decided to quit her job, which was in a women's hairdresser shop where she was already facing mobbing, insecure working conditions, and racist discourses, as she came to be very enthusiastic about the eruption of Gezi. At that time, she was part of a political organization and decided to commit her energy and time to their activities within the park. As she started to work again in the subsequent period, she continuously had individual grievances related to her work, facing precarious working conditions, i.e. mobbing, illegal dismissals, or forced unpaid leaves, while she exposed that these have always been intricated with the fact that she is a woman. Yet, the interviewee has had a strong desire to continue being a hairdresser but without having to face

such conditions. When she shared such concerns with her political organization throughout this phase, she did not receive proper feedback in the form of actions or knowledge, with which she can change her immediate conditions. In relation to that, she came to conclude that the political practices of this political organization are oriented toward certain instrumentalism that precludes her immediate concerns and desires; and eventually, she quit. With another disruption in her daily life with the pandemic outbreak, her grievances have gotten reinforced and once again she lost her job. This time, adding to her experiences after Gezi, she undertook a prefigurative political action by opening a barbershop where everybody is welcomed without regard to their gender identity and orientation, ethnicity, or any other status. Apart from being open to everybody in terms of customers, she seeks to promote gender equality by helping women and queer barbers to gain experience in the occupation and operate collectively, without a boss. In this sense, the interviewee explicitly states that she instantiated her own utopia through this shop.

Kadıköy Solidarity Network is yet another example that was established following the eruption of the pandemic. As the pandemic broke out, grievances related to the already existing social inequalities started to be felt reinforced. In response, activists organized solidarity networks in different neighborhoods of Istanbul to cope with the immediate needs of the people resulting from the spread of the pandemic. Kadıköy Solidarity Network was also one such example. Right after the outbreak of the pandemic, they produced face masks and shields to distribute to hospitals or people who are in need; cooked meals to be distributed in public places, especially to homeless people, and delivered food packages to people in need; provided computers and tablets for students so that they can attend online courses and so on. Apart from their focus on procuring immediate needs, the network soon

extended its solidarity actions to different areas, reminiscent of the neighborhood solidarities that emerged from the neighborhood forum that proliferated after Gezi. The network explicitly set forth that what they do is a political solidarity action, differentiating from mere charity work. In this sense, they sought to defer a hierarchical relationship between the parties of solidarity, emphasizing the autonomy and the mutuality of each party contributing to the solidarity relationship. With this intention, they aimed to become a solidarity network beyond coping with the effects of the pandemic, where they may direct these political solidarity actions against the oppression of the government as well as different dominant authority structures. In this regard, they cultivated urban gardens; organized campaigns against certain construction plans; undertook solidarity actions with laborers who had to work in the conditions of the pandemic; supported protests for gender equality, and against authoritarian penetration in the universities... Although activists seem to aim at prefiguring a certain solidaristic community, they also self-reflect on the effectiveness of their actions and admit that it had limitations in establishing such a mutual solidarity relationship as they always had to make effort to provide for certain immediate needs. In this sense, they also question the extent to which their actions can develop a political solidarity relationship among people that may confront different authority structures.

Within this scope, the second chapter discusses different conceptualizations of ‘prefigurative politics’ in the literature until now and suggests that we approach it as certain compounds of the individual or collective ‘prefigurative political actions.’ Following this approach, the third chapter provides several examples from the history of prefigurative political actions in Turkey. The fourth chapter focuses on certain affective, ideological/strategic, and relational dynamics in the processes of

crack and vibration that gave rise to the prefigurative politics in the aftermath of Gezi. The fifth chapter describes the interferences in the vibration process with reference to the changing emotional climate in conjunction with the increasing authoritarianism, which extends until the present time. Concomitant to those, the sixth chapter singles out the sediments of this process as a legacy of Gezi, by identifying the characteristics of an emergent subjectivity and how it is sustained within the current political context.

CHAPTER 2
HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT:
FROM PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS
TO PREFIGURATIVE POLITICAL ACTIONS

This chapter aims to expound on various usages of the concept ‘prefigurative politics’ so as to disclose different modes of prefigurative political actions. Although the term has recently become prominent to discuss organizational and ideational bases of the global waves of mobilization starting from the very beginning of the twenty-first century onwards, its historical roots way back. The roots of the concept take hold of a variety of sources ranging from Christianity to the prefigurative socialist strategy of the New Left, and from nineteenth-century anarchism to the characteristics of the feminist movement. Considering diverse bases that embody various conceptualizations and implementations of prefigurative politics, there lies a significant task to differentiate its modalities in order to provide a better understanding of current modes of prefigurative politics. For this task, I will seek to unfold a specific approach to prefigurative political actions throughout the chapter.

2.1 Prefiguration in Christianity: Strengthening the will to hurry the advent

The word prefiguration (or to prefigure) dates way back compared to the concept of prefigurative politics, having its roots in early Christian theology (Gordon, 2018). However, the “early theological concept of prefiguration still resonates with its contemporary, radical use” (van de Sande, 2019, p. 228). In this sense, a glance at the earliest usages of prefiguration might be plausible to start making sense of the

contemporary modes of prefigurative politics.³ Uri Gordon (2018) in his article where he exposes the conceptual genealogy of ‘prefigurative politics’ sheds light on the earliest usage of the term prefiguration:

The earliest usage I could find of the specific term *prefigure* is in the Latin translation of *Against Heresis* by Irenaeus . . . Here, he writes . . . that ‘the first testament . . . exhibited a type . . . of heavenly things . . . prefiguring . . . the images of those things which exist in the Church’ (Harvey, 1857: v. 2, 255). Soon after, St. Jerome . . . would centre his 53rd Epistle . . . on how Christ is ‘predestined and prefigured . . . in the Law and the Prophets.’ (p. 524)

These usages indicate a retrospective point of view, where the past events are said to be signaling something or somebody to come. In a sense, it implies that events in history are to fulfill a course that is already destined. This destination becomes more apparent with the further development of the idea of prefiguration in theological terminology. Its further development reveals that prefiguration also expresses a prospective foreshadowing. As cited in Gordon (2018), philologist Erich Auerbach exemplifies that this idea was further developed by St. Augustine. Scholl (2016) summarizes that Augustine:

proposed that Christianity involved an awareness that two worlds – distinct but overlapping – existed within this one. Although Christians could not remain aloof to earthly affairs, it was necessary for them to stay alert to the work of providence that animated them. Whereas the actualization of the divine was projected into the future, some glimpses could – through devotion – be lived in the present. In this way, Augustine bound the conception of prefiguration to the messianic promise. (p. 321)

According to this view, the actualization of the divine appears as the final point in the future, whose characteristics are already extant, although incomplete, in the present. Each of these characteristics is bounded with their “final fulfillment and completion in the Second Coming” (Gordon, 2018, p. 525). Hence, this

³ Benjamin Franks (2018) is at odds with these intentions, as he argues: “Uri Gordon (2015) has traced the term’s wider political meaning back to early Christian theology, but there is the risk of the genetic fallacy in concentrating on this feature of prefiguration, as there is little indication that any anarchist activist or theorist looked to these sources as a guide. It would be mistaken to base its modern and contemporary meanings on a largely unconnected origin.” (pp. 40-41)

understanding brings prefiguration forward as having an eternal character. As cited in Auerbach (1984), Augustine writes “For what is knowledge but knowledge of the future? But what is future to God who transcends all time? If God’s knowledge contains these things, they are not future to Him but present; therefore it can be termed not foreknowledge, but simply knowledge” (p. 43). In this sense, certain present events seem to be the prefigurations of the divine as well as to be the divine itself. It implies that the distance between what is to be prefigured and its prefiguration becomes blurred. What is present appears as the divine (so, is eternal), for it will ultimately serve to the fulfillment and completion of the divine in the future.

Gordon (2018) discusses this form of prefiguration as “a *recursive* temporal framing in which events at one time are interpreted as a *figure* pointing to its fulfillment in later events, with the figure cast in the model of the fulfillment” (p. 525). As the final destination of the future is already very well-defined, prefiguration becomes nothing but to bless that very destination. There appears to be no qualitative difference between the present act and its future destination. It is in this sense that it is rather recursive: it does not generate a novel vision of the future. Rather, it reiterates what will be and what has already been there. Gürer (2019), similarly, states that “in this temporal structure, time has a predetermined culmination point and current experiences gain significance with reference to the anticipation of the inevitable end” (pp. 41-42). Thereof, conceptions of the term alike might connote as “a means of strengthening the will to hurry the advent of the planned future” (Koselleck, 2004, as cited in Gordon, 2018).

Turning back to the beginning, it can be observed that subsequent usages of the theological conception of the term may still resonate in its contemporary uses.

While these resonations sometimes can be traced in rhetorical expressions regarding prefiguration, it can also be argued that it also surfaces in the very principles guiding actions of a movement. For instance, as was exemplified by van de Sande (2019), the slogan “we are an image from the future” that was chanted in mass mobilizations that took place in Greece in 2008 might connote such conception. David Graeber (2013) also comments on this slogan as referring to a “sphere in which action itself becomes a prophecy” (p. 233). In this sense, this use seems to develop a rhetorical display that celebrates the advent of an already known future. Another example provided by Gordon (2018) indicates how one of the earliest usages of prefiguration in a social movement context by Andre Gorz, resembles the abovementioned theological conception. As we move towards the development of the concept ‘prefigurative politics’ and how it has been transmitted to its current uses by the New Left thinkers, it can be meaningful to glance at Andre Gorz’s reference to prefiguration.

2.2 Prefigurative politics as a non-instrumentalist movement strategy

Although the current uses of ‘prefigurative politics’ were inherited by the New Left thinkers of the 1970s, Andre Gorz (1968) is known to be the earliest thinker who referred to prefiguration in a social movement context. Gorz (1968) attests a prefigurative mission to the political leadership role of the revolutionary party when discussing revolutionary strategy. He argues that the party should seek to catalyze local demands and turn them into a force to reach the intermediary objectives that would pave the way for the ultimate revolutionary transformation. According to Gorz, these intermediary objectives may vary in accordance with the aspirations of the masses, yet these should inevitably end up with the development of a proletarian

State, which would bring the way towards the revolution. The prefigurative role of the party in this regard:

is to incarnate the permanence of the struggle and its objectives even in periods when the tide of revolution is on the ebb. It prefigures the proletarian State, and reflects for the working class its capacity to be a ruling class . . . Yet, if it is to be able to carry out these functions, the party must aspire to being at once the memory and the prefiguration of struggles more advanced than those which are possible at a given moment. It must appear to every worker as the guarantee that all that can be done will be done, in all circumstances, to break the enemy front and emancipate the working class. (1968)

As with the abovementioned recursive temporal framings, this understanding entails that the party should be a figure foreshadowing that the final destination will inevitably be fulfilled through the development of the proletarian State to invoke revolutionary transformation. Once again, it appears as “a means of strengthening the will to hurry the advent of the planned future” (Koselleck, 2004, as cited in Gordon, 2018).

Even though Gorz used the term with reference to a discussion on social movement strategy, it can be argued that this usage did not go beyond its lexical meaning. He, in fact, did not intend to develop a concept of prefigurative politics. It was only after the 1970s, that prefigurative politics started to be developed as a concept to discuss social movement activities, converging to its current uses. New Left thinkers Carl Boggs, Sheila Rowbotham, and Wini Breines were influential in this regard (Scholl, 2016; Gordon, 2018; Swain, 2017; Franks, 2018; Yates, 2020).

It was Carl Boggs (1977a) who came up with a clear formulation of the concept ‘prefigurative politics.’⁴ In this article, he discusses the failure of Marxism in general, and Leninism and structural reformism in particular, “to produce a theory of state and political action that could furnish the basis of a democratic and non-

⁴ Although Boggs’ works appear as the earliest published text on ‘prefigurative politics,’ it should be noted that the term was already extant in the debates (especially with reference to prefigurative socialism/communism and feminism) around the circle (Scholl, 2016; Yates, 2020).

authoritarian revolutionary process” (1977a, p. 3). In search of an antidote, he seeks to democratize Leninist vanguard strategy; so, he resorts to, what he calls, the “prefigurative tradition” in order to discuss a revolutionary strategy that would base itself on an amalgam of these two.⁵ He states that “the prefigurative tradition . . . begins with the nineteenth-century anarchists and includes the syndicalists, council communists, and the New Left,” where the ‘prefigurative’ refers to “the embodiment, within the ongoing political practice of a movement, of those forms of social relations, decision-making, culture and human experience that are the ultimate goal” (p. 4). According to Gordon (2018, p. 7):

Boggs’ definition above may be called a *formal* definition, limited to the very correspondence between ultimate goal and ongoing practice, while remaining silent on their content . . . The formal definition leaves prefigurative politics open to association with widely varied practices . . . Even the cultural practices of white nationalist groups allow members to participate in relationships that “prefigure” Aryan dominance’ (Futrell & Simi, 2004, p.16).

This very sentence may entail a formal definition without regard to the specific content of the ultimate ends of a movement. Nonetheless, Boggs also (1977b) discusses prefigurative strategy with reference to a *substantive* definition, as Gordon (2018) would call it. These substantive definitions pair prefigurative politics with specific normative content. In this regard, Boggs approaches prefigurative politics as a strategy that is embedded in ‘prefigurative tradition’ that is constituted by certain common political principles and attitudes. According to him, this tradition is not only oriented toward the eradication of capitalist social relations but also of all modes of domination. Imbued by this normative content, prefigurative strategy develops around three fundamental concerns:

⁵ Boggs shows that there have been a tension between “instrumentalism of bureaucratic power struggles” and “the prefigurative dimension of revolutionary politics.” He exemplifies reflection of this tension in several historical examples and throughout this explication, he basically shows that the prefigurative tradition was not opposed to the strategy but to a certain instrumentalism. In this sense, he discusses possibilities of what he calls “prefigurative strategy.” A similar perspective will later on inherited by Wini Breines.

(1.) fear of reproducing hierarchical authority relations under a new ideological rationale: (2.) criticism of political parties and trade unions because their centralized forms reproduce the old power relations in a way that undermines revolutionary struggles; and (3.) commitment to democratization through local, collective structures that anticipate the future liberated society. (Boggs, 1977a, p. 7)

Boggs's attempt, in this regard, was to fuse strategies of this prefigurative tradition with that of Marxist movements thus far into a different political orientation that can be named under prefigurative politics. This attempt seems to have been floating in the contemporary conceptualizations of prefigurative politics until now.

In a similar vein, Rowbotham et al. (1981) address the possibilities of prefigurative strategy vis-à-vis such instrumentalism in terms of bringing about political and social change. Rowbotham et al. (1981) discuss how revolutionary (especially Leninist) and social democratic organizations, as well as Eurocommunism,⁶ fell short of acknowledging the impact of different sources of oppression within their organizations and society, so they could not effectively fight against inequalities arising out of these sources. Their organizational principles, fixated on the seizure or retainment of the central political power of the state, also could not appreciate the power of autonomous movements of “workers, black people, women, gay people” to bring social and political change. In this sense, the authors seek to overcome the limitations of these organizational principles by appealing to the political experiences – including prefigurative practices – of these autonomous movements, with a specific focus on the women’s liberation movement. After sorting out the anarchist, syndicalist, and feminist roots of prefigurative politics, Sheila Rowbotham (1981) reflects on its contemporary repercussions:

Feminism has also been the main organizational form through which the idea of prefigurative politics has begun to influence the contemporary left.

⁶ Rowbotham (1981) explicates that: “There seems to be little explicit recognition within Eurocommunism, either of the nature of sex-gender relations or of the need to challenge the forms of relationships within the Party as a central part of the process towards the transition to socialism.”

Consciousness raising, therapy and self-help will imply that we want change now. They are involved in making something which might become a means of making something more. They do not assume that we will one day in the future suddenly come to control how we produce, distribute and divide goods and services and that this will rapidly and simply make us new human beings. They see the struggle for survival and control as part of the here and now. They can thus contribute towards the process of continually making ourselves anew in the movement towards making socialism. (p. 140)

Lynne Segal (1981) concretizes this endeavor of ‘making oneself anew’ by sharing her personal experiences about her involvement in the socialist and feminist movements in London since 1972. This experience was also reflective of the concerns around which “ex-student libertarian left” proceeded after 1968:

You've got 'to live your politics.' We argued that our social relations now must reflect or 'prefigure' the social relations we want to create after the revolution. We said that the desire to change your own life and the world about you now is an important part of building for socialism in the future. So we opposed the Leninist position that you couldn't change anything under capitalism, you could only build an organization to overthrow it. We thought that there would be little reason for people to join a revolutionary movement unless it brought an immediate improvement in the quality of their lives, as against those who believed that you could make a split between public politics and private life. We were critical of those who might participate in some form of socialist politics and yet remain authoritarian and uncritical of their relation to their wives or their children at home, or to others in their work situation. We had in mind, for instance, the male militant who left his wife at home to mind the children while he did his 'political' work. We wanted our political activity to make room for those with children, and also to include the children. (p. 161)

These statements seem of considerable significance to me, as Segal appears as the earliest I could find, referring to one’s individual political actions as prefigurative. Thinking of prefigurative politics in light of the motto ‘the personal is political,’ she sets forth that prefigurative politics may not only be pertaining to a movement strategy, nor expressed solely within the public, but also may be a personal political intervention. In this sense, she reveals the possibility of individual prefigurative political actions.⁷ This also hints at a corollary to conceptually identify an action as

⁷ Later on, Haenfler et al. (2012) and Portwood-Stacer (2013) would discuss individual prefigurative political actions with reference to lifestyle movements.

prefigurative: one's own subjective experiences, and therefore senses regarding the political action at hand, are important in entitling a political action as prefigurative.

Following these works, the concept started to receive greater popular attention in the 1980s, especially through Wini Breines' works (Swain, 2017). Expanding on Boggs' discussion on discrepancies between instrumentalism of the revolutionary vanguard strategy vis-à-vis prefigurative strategy⁸, Breines (1980, 1989) traces repercussions of this, so to say, agonism in political practices and discussions of the New Left in the 1960s. According to her, most accounts of the new left "indicated that the new left was shaped by the ongoing tension within it between a spontaneous, grassroots social movement committed to participatory democracy and hostile to the formal organization and the perceived need for formal, even centralized, organization capable of implementing political change," (Breines, 1980, p. 419). These accounts suggested that the movement was more of characterized by prefigurative politics and that was seen in contradiction with the latter, "strategic politics." However, for Breines, the movement was rather characterized by both, even though the tension was apparent and already being acknowledged by the movement itself (1980, p. 422). In this sense, opposing the views that associate prefigurative politics with being apolitical, anti-organizational, and nonstrategic, Breines highlighted the strategic significance of prefigurative politics, following Boggs.

In this direction, she interprets Boggs' discussion of prefigurative politics by stressing a counter-institutional moment in the new left that seeks to form a certain 'community.' Adding on to his definition, she posits prefigurative politics as indispensable with the notion of community, embodying one of the fundamental

⁸ Another example is John L. Hammond's (1984) 'The Portuguese Revolution: Two Models of Socialist Transition.' Hammond also utilizes Boggs' definition of prefigurative politics but does not seek to elaborate the concept as Breines.

characteristics of the movement: “Prefigurative politics attempted to develop the seeds of liberation and the new society (prior to and in the process of revolution) through notions of participatory democracy grounded in counter-institutions; this meant building community” (Breines, 1980, p. 421).⁹ In relation to that, she discusses essential characteristics of this orientation under two main themes, “means & ends” and “participatory democracy,” with reference to various sources that was in circulation around that time. The first theme expresses the understanding that the political means of the movement should be consonant with, or reflective of, the political ends of a movement. That is to say, if the movement seeks to develop a future society, i.e. where the ends are “characterized by participatory democracy, anti-authoritarianism, and liberation, the political means of achieving these goals had to be consonant” (Breines, 1989, p. 53). By attempting to “realize in the present those social relationships and values which will be the basis of the future society” (p. 54), prefigurative politics seek to negate dominant social relations characterized by ‘instrumental rationality’ within society as well as within the movement contexts. Overall, Breines suggests that as this disposition questions “the instrumental rationality of bureaucracy at the expense of individual freedom and autonomy” (p. 50), it seeks to create a movement that “was viewed as an avenue of freedom, a way to express oneself and decide with others on political strategy” (p. 51). In this sense, it also questions social movement strategies where instrumental rationality appears dominant at the expense of creativity, self-determination, and different forms of

⁹ For Breines, “community refers to a set of relationships, experiences and institutions that have been (and continue to be) destroyed by the development of capitalism and which consequently became relevant in the late nineteenth century and remain so to the present (Hearn, 1975; 1978; 270 ff.). The search for and/or struggle to defend community (both the “sense” of community and actual community institutions) become political in the context of the changes capitalism has brought in the everyday life of the individual – changes characterized by lack of control at work, school and play, impersonality and competition in all areas of life” (1980, p. 421) In this sense, it refers “not only to the desire to create a sense of wholeness and communication in social relationships, but to the effort to create noncapitalist and communitarian institutions that embodied such relationships (for example, counter-institutions)” (p. 421).

social oppression present in the organizations. This means that the consonance between means and ends is not non-strategic or apolitical but rather strategic and political different terms:

The ease with which hegemonic institutions appear to transform movements into formal bureaucratic institutions with reformist (in contrast to radical) goals suggest that prefigurative politics may be seen not only as a strategic last resort, but as a determined attempt to avoid co-optation and oligarchic transformation as well as the mantle of legitimacy accorded those who cooperate. (Breines, 1980, p. 427)

Within this framework, Breines puts participatory democracy forward as a central vehicle for prefigurative politics, by which values and relationships of a future society would be reflected or embodied while struggling to avoid the limitations stemming from the dominant social relations. Here, participatory democracy does not only refer to the decision-making processes of a political organization but also to the development of the counter-institutions and parallel structures around the values embedded in direct democracy. In this sense, prefigurative politics is, first, expressed through a set of political actions that is confronting the centers of political power outside the movement organization by developing counter-institutions as a rejection of these powers; and second, expressed through a set of political actions within the organizational mechanisms and procedures themselves, seeking to avoid penetration of the dominant values that reinforce hierarchies within their communities. This implies a twofold mode of prefigurative political actions: the first, in a sense, refers to a collective mobilization to develop counter-institutions; and the second, conducting egalitarian values and practices, individually or collectively, within the context of organizations, or the 'community.' As was signaled above, these appear as strategic considerations in different terms, as they do not only seek to confront a central political authority but also different forms of social authorities stemming from the dominance of instrumental rationality.

2.3 Strategic role of prefigurative politics in developing collective identity

In the 1990s, following Breines' works, the concept started to be utilized to study various aspects of social movement activities. This was also concomitant with its introduction to the social movement theories and literature. In this context, Barbara Epstein (1993) set forth prefigurative politics as an approach to politics that rather deferred the questions of strategy and focused on its community-building aspect, understood as "politics of living out one's values" (p. 59). William Gamson (1992) emphasized the central place of prefigurative politics in promoting social support processes, such as building commitment and solidarity, within the movement. Similarly, Erik Olin Wright (1994) highlighted prefigurative forms of gender equality expressed in certain individual actions or solidarity practices of women in their everyday life. Fransesca Polletta (1999) discussed prefigurative associative structures as a type of 'free spaces.'¹⁰ In general, it can be said that the concept was elaborated in relation to its functions in contributing to the strategic role of collective identity in social movements literature, i.e., building networks, solidarity, and collective identity to pave the way for collective mobilization. As Yates (2020) summarizes, the conceptualization of prefigurative politics, in this context, traveled "between several meanings, but generally is taken to mean something which is moral, cultural and expressive but which can be productively combined with strategic currents" (p. 6).

In this framework, Barbara Epstein (1993) focused on the political practices of various organizations that are part of the direct-action movement that was active in

¹⁰ It was also Polletta who suggested prefigurative politics may be of use for other political groups other than left-wing ones. It should be emphasized that it was Epstein, who underlined prefigurative political aspects of the religious communities that were part 'direct action movements' she discussed. It is significant to show her implication that different engagements with prefigurative political actions are possible. Later, Futrell & Simi (2004) took up on Polletta's (1999) idea in their research on white power movement in US.

the US throughout the 1970s and 1980s. These organizations primarily focused on the resistance against nuclear power, while they are influenced by ideological commitments combining “feminism, ecology, a form of anarchism that rests on grass roots democracy, and a leaning towards spirituality” (Epstein, 1993, p. 1) and the movement represented a “prefigurative, utopian approach to politics” (1993, p. 16). According to her, this approach was rather uneasy with the considerations of strategy, as they embraced the expression of their nonviolent, egalitarian, and democratic values in a spontaneous manner.¹¹ Epstein identifies this approach as having a tendency towards a cultural revolution: “The direct action movement has been about cultural revolution, its aim not only to transform political and economic structures but to bring to social relations as a whole the values of egalitarianism and nonviolence” (Epstein, 1993, p. 16).

Diverging from the preceding authors’ attempt to assert possible implications of prefigurative politics within movement strategy, Epstein rather emphasizes its cultural character as acting upon the values that are part of the movement’s utopia in the present, i.e. to “live out the values of the new society” (Epstein, 1993, p. 267). That is to say, she tends to think of prefigurative politics as developing a ‘prefigurative community’ that possesses cultural properties of the future society.¹² In this sense, her stress is rather on the cultural value commitments embedded in the present community, yet are reflective of the constitution of another, and better, social whole. Overall, this understanding seems to conflate or equate the current value

¹¹ “If egalitarianism means that everyone's views have equal merit, then adopting a particular project and strategy (and rejecting or subordinating others) seems to go against the movement's values. There is a broad consensus within the direct-action movement about what kind of society people want, but there is also a widespread reluctance even to consider the question of strategy” (Epstein, 1993, p. 17).

¹² As Epstein (1993, p. 9) sees ‘affinity groups’ as the basic units of the direct action movement, developing prefigurative communities can be thought in relation with this concept. Affinity groups are “made up of roughly eight to fifteen people who already knew one another and could work well together and rely on one another” (p. 66).

commitments of a political organization with their future value commitments, as in the phrase of living by one's values.

At this point, I would like to stress that this interpretation may pose certain questions for the conceptualization of prefigurative politics: If future values are deemed already extant in the present, then what is the difference between future values to be developed and current values that are already in effect? If present values are expected to exist as they are in the future, then how come they can *pre*-figure but not stand as figures rather? As Epstein (1993, p. 83) understands prefigurative politics as constituting the cultural terrain of a community "in which one could construct a life based on one's highest values," I think that differentiation between future values and present values becomes blurred, as with the possible indicators for conceptually identifying a political practice prefigurative.

Located in between the attempts to discuss prefigurative politics as an overall movement strategy (Boggs, 1977; Breines, 1980, 1989; Rowbotham, 1981) versus prefigurative politics as community-building deferring strategical questions altogether (Epstein, 1993), William A. Gamson (1992) elaborates the role of prefigurative politics in the development of a collective identity. For Gamson, developing a collective identity is of strategic importance in achieving movement goals, in terms of "how the meaning that individuals give to a social situation becomes a shared definition implying collective action" (1992, p. 55). In this process, developing solidarity and commitment functions as social support mechanisms that enable individuals to embody the collective identity. In this context, proceeding from Breines' conceptual definition, Gamson elaborates on prefigurative politics as an aspect of building commitment and solidarity.¹³ "Direct participation

¹³ Along with prefigurative politics, 'free spaces' and 'affinity groups' are among the other organizational forms that functions to foster solidarity and commitment.

rather than representation, decentralization rather than centralization, and holistic personal relationships rather than bureaucratic and segmented role relationships” (Gamson, 1992, p. 63) are the prefigurative political basis through which such social support can be forged. In this sense, he stresses prefigurative politics as organizing around certain moral and cultural values, albeit these are understood as strategic practices.

In a similar vein, Polletta (1999) delves into the role of ‘prefigurative groups’ as one of the associative structures facilitating certain key tasks of mobilization. According to her, there are three types of associative structures in social movements which have often been lumped under the concept of ‘free spaces.’ Namely, these refer to transmovement, indigenous and prefigurative forms of association that play different roles as preconditions for mobilization. As she sorts out (Polletta, 1999, p. 11), prefigurative groups include but are not limited to “‘autonomous zones’ of European new social movements, the ‘women only spaces’ of 1970s radical feminism . . . the alternative food co-ops, health clinics, credit unions, and schools that flourished in the late 1960s and 1970s.” Specific characteristics of these groups are identified as:

Explicitly political and oppositional (although their definition of “politics” may encompass issues usually dismissed as cultural, personal, or private), they are formed in order to prefigure the society the movement is seeking to build by modeling relationships that differ from those characterizing mainstream society. Often that means developing relations characterized by *symmetry*, that is, reciprocity in power, influence, and attention (Polletta, 1999, p. 11)

According to her, these structures may play roles in developing new identities and claims within movements or organizations; helping to foster members’ commitment to the movement goals, whereas they may not play role in singling out political opportunities. Furthermore, prefigurative groups’ commitment to the egalitarian

direct democracy is also what makes them prone to instability. This is not only because Poletta sees such decision-making processes have difficulties to provide swift decisions when needed, but also because existing social inequalities might very well affect associations within the organization. Overall, while these possibilities and limitations stem from the symmetric structure of prefigurative associational ties, considering prefigurative groups' normative commitments is yet another step to make a proper account for their roles in mobilization, as Poletta stresses.

2.4 Strategic prefigurative practices in the global wave of mobilizations:

Synchronizing the movement means with ends

With the turn of the twenty-first century, the concept has gained more popular attention in parallel with the growing interest in identifying the novelties of the global mobilizations such as the alter-globalization movement, square movements as well as various contemporary social movements all around the world. It was especially with discussions regarding the characteristics of the alter-globalization movement it has first gained momentum in the studies of social movements. This interest, later on, would be boosted by the effect of the square movements of the 2010s. In this context, the concept has started to be applied outside the political context of the global north for the first time, while its different forms, aspects, and roles have started to be further discovered. I will now try to summarize this course before I delve into the most recent literature on prefigurative politics in the next part.

As with the preceding literature, discussions of strategy surface both in the studies on the alter-globalization movement and contemporary social movements around that time. At the turn of the millennium, David Graeber (2002) became a signal flare introducing prefigurative politics to discuss the organizational and

ideological bases of the organizations in the alter-globalization movement. Graeber (2002, p. 62) highlights that the notion of ‘direct action’ was in effect in this regard: “with its rejection of politics which appeals to governments to modify their behavior, in favor of physical intervention against state power in a form that itself prefigures an alternative – all of this emerges from the directly libertarian tradition.” In this sense, a prefiguration of the alternatives through developing a culture of democracy, practicing direct democracy, and fostering horizontal networks based on anti-authoritarian principles, comes to the fore as different ways to intervene against the state power. This, again, is an accentuation of the prefigurative strategy that was identified by the abovementioned scholars such as Boggs, Breines, and Rowbotham.

While Graeber did not elaborate further on the relationship between prefigurative politics vis-à-vis direct actions, Benjamin Franks (2003) makes an explicit connection as he locates resurfacing of the direct-action methods in the alter-globalization movement and the contemporary anarchist movement. This is also specifically important as he systematically discusses prefigurative politics in relation to direct action, whose connection was before signaled by the authors shedding light on the roots of the prefigurative politics that rests on anarchist praxis (Boggs, 1977a; Breines, 1980; Rowbotham, 1981; Epstein, 1993). In this framework, Franks (2003) elaborates on the anarchist forms of direct action and their repercussions in the abovementioned contemporary movements. Anarchist direct action is in mesh with a particular ethic, composed of two components. The first refers to the prefiguration, i.e., the means of the movement should be in accordance or in consonance with its ends, whereas the second implies that the subjects or identities involved in the act themselves should be affected by the act itself. In other words, “direct action must primarily be for the benefit of those who carry it out, and to be prefigurative, it must

seek to equalise power relationships” (2003, p. 27). Here, he subsumes prefigurative ethic, indicating the equivalence between means and ends, as a feature of direct action. This means and ends equivalence orientation was once identified as a feature of prefigurative politics or, rather, the prefigurative tradition (Boggs, 1977a). Franks rather prefers to interpret prefiguration in terms of a specific ethical disposition instead of a set of political practices that could make up a political strategy, a community, or a set of specific interpersonal relations indicating commitment, and solidarity. In Franks’ account, it seems that this ethical orientation matching the means with the ends of a movement underlies or conditions these direct action practices.

Turning back to the question of strategy, direct action and its underlying prefigurative ethic should be understood as tactical, rather than strategic. According to Franks (2003) these tactical dispositions: “acknowledge a multitude of oppressive irreducible powers with no objective position that can identify how they would operate acontextually” (p. 31). This is in discrepancy with the strategic orientations that hold on to “a singular, central problematic whose successful outcome resolves all problems. For tactical politics, there is no central location of power, but different oppressions operate in different forms. These might require longer-term, prefigurative methods to overcome” (Franks, 2003, p. 32). Hence, it indicates that the tactical orientations of contemporary forms of direct actions assume a different conception of power than that of strategic ones.

Richard Day (2004, 2005) also emphasizes the centrality of direct actions in the alter-globalization movement, while he presents a different connection between prefiguration and direct action. According to him, actions, groups, or tactics in these movements were characterized by an anarchistic ‘logic of affinity’ rather than a

‘logic of hegemony.’¹⁴ This logic is basically characterized by affinity-based, constructive direct actions. This entails “the use of tactics that not only prefigure non-hegemonic alternatives to state and corporate forms, but also create them here and now” (Day, 2004, p. 731). Implicit in this explication, Day understands prefiguration as a sort of direct action that is constructive of new and alternative social relations. Namely, it refers to the construction of new/alternative institutions, forms of subjectivity, and forms of community that lean-to “block, resist and render redundant both corporate and state power in local, national and transnational contexts” (Day, 2004, p. 733). As with Franks (2003), this builds on a conception of power that acknowledges the existence of different forms of oppression that do not have a specific central location but operates on multi-levels. However, this does not mean that these actions, groups, or tactics ignore a more macro-level social transformation. Concomitantly, this understanding is at odds with an association of prefigurative politics as astrategic, spontaneous, and merely cultural (or moral) phenomena (Epstein, 1993). Rather, it is reminiscent of a contemporary reflection of the attempts to question the dichotomy between strategic politics and prefigurative politics (Boggs, 1977; Breines, 1980; Rowbotham, 1981).

Similar concerns can also be traced in Cindy Milstein (2004) and Marina Sitrin’s (2004, 2006) works. They both assert it as a strategy to change the world, whereas prefigurative politics are understood with reference to creating alternative institutions and organizational culture. Milstein (2004, p. 283) writes referring to the alter-globalization movement: “prefigurative politics would necessarily involve

¹⁴ “The key elements of an anarchistic logic of affinity are: a desire to create alternatives to state and corporate forms of social organization, working ‘alongside’ the existing institutions; proceeding in this via disengagement and reconstruction rather than by reform or revolution; with the end of creating now a new knowable totality (counter-hegemony), but of enabling experiments and the emergence of new forms of subjectivity; and finally, focusing on relations between these subjects, in the name of inventing new forms of community” (Day, 2004, p. 740).

creating institutions that could potentially replace capitalism and nation-states.”

Sitrin (2006) also adds to this view by referring to a variety of ‘prefigurative revolutionary movements’¹⁵ which are:

creating the future in their present social relationships . . . Most of these movements are anti-capitalist, and some anti-state, but their strategy for the creation of a new society is not grounded in either state dependency or the taking of power to create another state. Their intention is, to borrow John Holloway’s phrase, to change the world without taking power. (p. 4)

In his study on contemporary anarchist movements, Uri Gordon (2008) also elaborates on this strategic orientation, while he proceeds from a perspective that conjugates ‘prefigurative politics’ as a form of ‘direct action.’ Differing from Franks’ (2003) attempt to subsume ‘prefigurative ethics’ as a feature of direct action and in parallel with the identification of ‘prefigurative politics’ with ‘constructive direct action’ (Day, 2004), Gordon argues that “Prefigurative politics . . . represents a broadening of the idea of direct action, resulting in a commitment to define and realise anarchist social relations within the activities and collective structures of the revolutionary movement itself” (Gordon, 2008, p. 35). In this sense, it now refers to a “constructive and enabling” form of direct action that seeks to build “grassroots alternatives, community outreach and confrontation” (Gordon, 2008, p. 4). On the other hand, there are “destructive and defensive forms such as industrial sabotage or forest occupations” (Gordon, 2008, p. 4). Prefigurative politics as direct actions might entail developing alternative institutions (i.e. social centers, community gardens, and cooperatives), egalitarian values and practices within the organization and community setting (i.e. decentralized and horizontally organizing, decision-making based on consensus, confronting different forms of oppression within the organizations and communities, affinity groups, etc.), individual prefigurative actions

¹⁵ Sitrin refers primarily to the alter-globalization movement as well as autonomous Zapatista communities of Chiapas, Mexico; Landless Workers Movement (MST) in Brazil and different struggles in South Africa, India, Ecuador, Bolivia, Italy, Eastern Europe, US and Canada.

and certain violent actions¹⁶. Adding these all up in sum, prefigurative politics stands as a “dual strategy of confrontation to delegitimise the system and grassroots alternative-building from below” (Gordon, 2008, p. 18).

It can be said that the key themes regarding the discussion of prefigurative politics in the context of contemporary social movements have reached a more ripened level with the end of the decade. The main outline can be inferred with reference to Marianne Maeckelbergh (2009; 2011). As with the abovementioned scholars, Maeckelbergh posits prefigurative politics as a key characteristic of the alter-globalization movement. For her, “Practising prefigurative politics mean removing the temporal distinction between the struggle in the *present* and a goal in the *future*; instead, the struggle and the goal, the real and the ideal, become one in the present” (Maeckelbergh, 2011, p. 4). It implies that the means are as significant as the goals of a movement, rendering them inextricable: the means are also the ends by themselves. “The means are important because they have consequences. The democratic practices that constitute the *how* of movement organizing are important to movement actors because they constitute the movement’s alternative to market-driven, neoliberal, representative, homogenizing politics” (Maeckelbergh, 2011, p. 16). Yet, this stress does not mean that it is only the means that matter. Prefigurative politics entail a strategy that considers the achievement of both ends as future goals and means as present ends: “Prefigurative strategy involves two crucial practices: that of confrontation with the existing political structures and that of developing alternatives, neither of which could achieve the desired structural changes without the other” (Maeckelbergh, 2011, p. 15). It can be summarized that this conception

¹⁶ “Finally, it can be argued that anarchist violence against the state is precisely prefigurative of anarchist social relations. This is because anarchists would always expect people, even in an ‘anarchist society’, to defend it (violently if necessary) from any attempt to reconstitute social hierarchy or impose it on others. Thus violent action taken against the (re)production of a hierarchical social order is as appropriate now as it will be in a stateless society.” (Gordon, 2008, p. 99)

has four main implications: 1a) the movement goals are not to be understood as singular and fixed; 1b) the organization is understood in a sense that is alternative to its hierarchical conceptions; 2a) the strategy does not only refer to the tactics that would ensure structural changes only after seizing the state power; 2b) the strategy does not only seek changes that are external but also internal to the movement (2011). Overall, this understanding settles on a different position from those who identify prefigurative politics as nonstrategic (Epstein, 1993), as complementary to the strategic but somehow distinct from it (Boggs, 1977a; Breines, 1980), and as strategic considered only with reference to the cultural domain (Polletta, 1999; Gamson, 1992).

2.5 Strategic prefigurative practices in the global wave of mobilizations: Beyond the consonance of the means with ends

As of 2011, there has been an upsurge of mass mobilizations all around the world: Arab Spring in the Middle East and North Africa, Indignados in Spain, Direct Democracy Now! in Greece, Occupy movement all around the world, the Gezi Protests in Turkey and so on... In parallel, 'prefigurative politics' has gained considerable prominence in discussing the novel strategical, organizational, and ideological characteristics of these movements. This popularity has grown bigger in the next decade to an extent that it started to be referred to its mainstreaming (Yates, 2020). The discussion and research based on the concept have extended beyond the social movement studies and activist fora towards other disciplines such as psychology, linguistics, anthropology, geography, organizational studies, and more. It could have been interesting to trace the concept's travel in the other disciplines, which is yet to be explored, but in this part, I will remain within the confines of

social movement studies, while I will summarize the continuities and breaks with its preceding conceptualizations.

One persistent continuity in the literature is the recognition of prefigurative politics as being strategic (where the ‘strategy’ was stripped of its rather conventional uses), while more elaborate analytical accounts on its conceptualization were to be provided. This strand has built itself on the interpretations in the previous decade which asserted its dual role in strategic practices (Franks, 2003; Day, 2004; Milstein, 2004; Sitrin, 2006; Gordon, 2008; Maeckelbergh, 2011). Among those, proceeding from these bases on the overall movement strategy, van de Sande (2013, 2015) discusses prefigurative politics in Tahrir square, Occupy, and Indignados; Dixon (2014) and Hammond (2015) focus on Occupy; and scholars such as Yates (2015, 2020), Cooper (2017), Swain (2017), Gordon (2018), Franks (2018), van de Sande (2019), Raekstad & Gradin (2020) reflect on different conceptualizations of the concept with reference to different contemporary social movements. It should also be stressed that Gamson (1992) and, especially, Polletta (1999) cannot be seen as incompatible with this strand as well as with those who delved into the sub-dynamics of organizational practices and values (Dixon, 2014; Yates, 2015; Raekstad & Gradin, 2020; Eleftheriadis, 2015; Naegler, 2018; Ishkanian & Saavedra, 2019). Besides, what was rather new are those who set forth prefigurative political practices of individuals as a strategy to achieve social change (Haenfler et al., 2012; Portwood-Stacer, 2013), reminiscent of Segal (1981) although there seems to be no direct connection. As the literature grew more so as to disclose different aspects with a crystallized conceptual outlook, they have come to focus on different modalities of individual and collective engagements with prefigurative politics. Before going into

the details of these different forms, I would like to identify another common development in its conceptualizations.

Starting with Breines (1980), “means/ends consonance” had been an important defining feature of prefigurative politics, which has also floated in the preceding decade (Franks, 2003; Day, 2004; Milstein, 2004; Sitrin, 2004, 2006; Gordon, 2008; Maeckelbergh, 2009, 2011). As Gordon (2018, p. 522) summarizes, “In popular usage, the term unproblematically entangles two different notions of ends: as expressions of intrinsic value (‘an end in itself’) and as desired future situations (‘an end result’).” Whereas the first refers to the practices and values that can be instantaneously realized (i.e., direct democratic decision-making practices, developing egalitarian values with anti-hierarchical principles) within movement contexts; in conjunction with that, the latter incurs the creation of “alternative” institutions that would be the bases of these desired future situations. It can be argued that different conceptualizations until now have come to stress either the first (Epstein, 1993; Gamson, 1992; Polletta, 1999) or the latter aspect (connecting both), which is rather emphasized by the recent works on the contemporary social movements (Boggs, 1977a; Breines, 1980; Day, 2004; Milstein, 2004; Sitrin, 2004; Gordon, 2008; Maeckelbergh, 2009, 2011). Although such emphasis on building alternatives with a multiplicity of ends can be considered as continuing in the following decade of the 2010s (van de Sande, 2013, 2015; Dixon, 2014; Yates, 2015; Hammond, 2015; Raekstad & Gradin, 2020), the understanding that there should necessarily be unity between means and ends have started to be questioned (Yates, 2015, 2020; Swain, 2017; van de Sande, 2019). That also has been going hand in hand with an attempt to clarify the definition of the concept. Yates (2015, p. 15), for

instance, declares that ‘means/ends equivalence’ “as a qualifier of prefiguration . . . is misleading”:

Some authors using the ‘means–ends equivalence’ idea make it clear which means resemble which ends; however, they almost never acknowledge the other ‘means’ and ‘ends’ at play. This limits the descriptive power of prefiguration in these terms and makes distinguishing prefiguration from other aspects of protest and everyday life a difficult interpretative task. No movement can relate all means and ends. (Yates, 2015, p. 15)

Apart from this, Yates identifies two more concerns with the conceptualization of prefigurative politics. He states that it is necessary to make a distinction between “prefigurative activities and the collective identity processes of countercultures, subcultures” (Yates, 2015, p. 5) when considering building alternatives. Another concern points out a lack of attention in the literature to what extent movement participants deem these desired future situations as culturally and strategically important for themselves. In this regard, Yates (2015) proposes a clarification: “prefiguration necessarily combines the experimental creating of ‘alternatives’ within either mobilisation-related or everyday activities, with attempts to ensure their political relevance” (p. 19).¹⁷ As this definition seeks to assert the difference between prefigurative groups and subcultural or counter-cultural groups, “who normally do not try to consolidate, proliferate and diffuse their perspectives and collective conducts” (Yates, 2015, p. 19), it indicates the multiplicity of means and ends other than those that are expressed in consonance.

¹⁷ More specifically, prefigurative politics underlies a combination of five intertwined dynamics. “First, prefiguration involves experimentation . . . Second, . . . prefigurative groups host, develop and critique political perspectives, ideas and social movement frames . . . Third, prefiguration involves establishing new collective norms, which draw upon both experimental performances and political perspectives or ideas. . . Fourth, prefigurative politics usually involves intervention or consolidation in material environments or social orders in attempts to decisively inscribe or consolidate these codes of conduct, their political messages and symbolism, and experimental origins. . . Fifth, the demonstration and diffusion of practices, orders, devices and perspectives allows prefigured ‘alternatives’ to persist beyond the present for groups and collectives.” (Yates, 2015, pp. 13-14)

In a similar vein, Swain (2017) discusses how means and ends cannot be fully identical, nor consistent. Interpreting prefigurative politics as ‘revolutionary rehearsals,’ he argues that there is always a discrepancy between the desired future situation and its instantiations in the present to be held. In this sense, his approach “sees political action (means) in the present as attempts at enactment of later anticipated forms of action (ends), attempts which are acknowledged as falling short of the desired practices, but at the same time help bring them into being” (Swain, 2017, p. 12). This discrepant space presents two implications for a definition that diverges from means/ends consonance. Namely, prefigurative politics carry an experimental character which, in turn, allows them to procreate multiple ends and defy a fixation of them. This means that they do not assume that the envisioned social relations are going to be necessarily achieved in the future. It rather emphasizes that future possibilities are manifold and contingent on their present incarnations. In relation to that, Swain (2017) reinstates that:

This also can help represent how new (proximate) ends can be formulated from within existing practices, since it is possible to identify and elaborate specific ways of doing better through the processes of practical enactment, and attempts to live out a specific practice open the possibility of new ones, including ones that once appeared impossible or unthinkable. (pp. 12-13)

This divergence from means/ends consonance brings us to another development in the current formulations. That is, the emphasis on experimentation has come to be settled as an essential feature of prefigurative politics (van de Sande, 2013, 2015, 2019; Yates, 2015, 2020; Swain, 2017). In addition to those mentioned above, van de Sande (2013) sets forth that contemporary examples of prefigurative politics are inherently experimental and experiential. For him, ‘prefigurative politics’ “refers to a political action, practice, movement, moment or development in which certain political ideals are experimentally actualised in the ‘here and now’” (van de Sande,

2013, p. 230). This experimental actualization does not only refer to experiments with novel resources and methods to build organizations or institutions, but also refers to the creation of new ideas, values, norms, and subjectivities where constantly “new political ideals were formulated, realized, tested, improvised, and discussed” (van de Sande, 2015, p. 190). This also incurs a self-reflection on the means and ends of a movement. This self-reflection implies that different means and ends are to be continuously formulated and reformulated, giving rise to novel practices, ideas, values, and methods, through an incessant critique of the already existing ones. As possibilities for constant recreation appears in this sense, the means and ends can never be fully consonant. In this regard, van de Sande (2019) summarizes two consequences of asserting the importance of experimentation in prefigurative politics:

First, it means that a plurality of different possible futures can be prefigured alongside each other. Prefiguration is never the realization of one particular objective but a continuously changing strategy that can have a variety of different, contingent outcomes (Maeckelbergh 2011, p. 12). Second, and more importantly, it also follows that a prefigurative politics is not primarily concerned with establishing a full consistency between means and ends (Swain 2019, p. 56). A prefigurative politics, perceived as an experimental practice with a variety of different outcomes, arguably has no concrete ends at all . . . prefiguration can be perceived as a radically open-ended process, which nevertheless is oriented toward a plurality of distant, radically different futures (p. 232)

At this point, it is important to note that van de Sande’s emphasis on experimentation may relate more to the recent global wave of mobilizations. This point reveals their novel character as well as their difference from different modes of prefigurative politics. However, experimentation alone cannot explain such a difference. It can be also connected to a difference resulting from these mobilizations’ orientation towards the future. One can argue that the prefiguration of a well-defined and a singular future can be possible, as well as a prefiguration of a future “which does not require

an articulated, positive conception of what this future looks like” (van de Sande, 2019, p. 231). Existing literature revolves around an emphasis that the recent wave of mobilizations shares the characteristics of the latter. Multiple futures may be envisioned along with each other, whereas the content of these futures continuously is at stake. In this sense, it should be emphasized that the recent instances of prefigurative politics substantially differ from its past incarnations. By focusing on these specific experiences, recent attempts to refine conceptualizations of prefigurative politics may be at risk to conflate or overextend these specific experiences to possibly different forms of prefigurative politics and political actions. At this point, it leaves an important question how can we specify different modes of prefigurative politics?

2.6 Vagueness of prefigurative politics

Until now, I have presented a handful of different conceptions of prefigurative politics. The same concept has been used for referring to an overall understanding of politics, movement strategies and tactics, organizational procedures and practices, political repertoires of individuals or collectives, expressions of certain cultural or ethical values in social movement communities, and other subcultures, mechanisms for developing collective identity. This variance alone points out an unclarity in the usage of the concept, which is not limited to such variance itself. Yates’ (2015) and Franks’ (2018) explications summarize these concerns in the literature:

Prefiguration forms part of a general understanding of politics as an instrument of social change. Yet it is often not clear if it is a tactic, orientation or way of doing protest, an alternative type of movement activity or a combination of these, and it is rarely apparent where distinctions with other types of political activity ought to be made. (Yates, 2015, p. 2)

Prefiguration is conceptually inadequate as it is vague enough as a guiding principle to allow for hierarchical and oppressive activity and it is unclear as

to whether it applies to types of organisation or tactic or epistemology.
(Franks, 2018, p. 27)

Adding up to these, such inadequacy even ended up in discussions regarding the abandonment of the concept.¹⁸ Overall, these concerns indicate that the definition of the concept remains vague, and it is unclear to which units of analysis it could be applied. In this sense, answering what is prefigurative politics still stands as an important and timely task. The need for such clarification has already been undertaken by various scholars in the literature (Yates, 2015, 2020; Gordon, 2018; van de Sande, 2019; Franks, 2018; Gürer, 2019; Raekstad & Gradin, 2020). Relying on these efforts, I will provide an outline of this research's conceptual approach to prefigurative politics.

My central proposition is to approach prefigurative politics as certain compounds of individual and collective prefigurative actions. If we proceed from a view that 'prefigurative politics' can refer to a general understanding of politics, it connotes that prefigurative political actions serve as one of the fundamental characteristics for the course of a movement. Namely, the movement pursues a set of individual and collective prefigurative political actions (although not solely them), and articulates these in a way that would bring them towards the enactment and achievement of their goals, either in the present or the future. It can be expected from the corollary of such articulation that it should bring a prefigurative experience; in other words, a different sense of time, space, and, concomitantly, a different sense of social life in relation to the fundamental premise of prefigurative political actions that commends to evoke a sense of future social relations within the present ones.

In this sense, as discussed above, prefigurative politics seek to achieve a certain consonance between its means and ends, while it may be acknowledged that

¹⁸For instance, Uri Gordon (2018) suggests the concept of 'concrete utopia' to replace the 'prefigurative politics.'

they can never be fully consistent. On the one hand, this is related to the fact that political actors always engage in other types of political activity. Besides, as prefigurative political actions inherently entail experimentation, it points out a constant formulation and reformulation of the means and ends at play. In this regard, it may be possible to discuss prefigurative politics as a general understanding of politics; that is, politics that articulate their individual and collective political actions in ways that they continuously seek consonance between their means and ends, although it may be acknowledged that a full identity or consonance can never be possible.

However, this alone may not explain what prefigurative political actions entail. A constant search for means/ends consonance can be associated with prefigurative politics, but it does not necessarily fully qualify ‘prefigurative political actions’ and their conglomerations. It becomes meaningful only when considering the overall movement contexts. It should be emphasized that prefigurative political actions can be understood as individual and collective actions (and their compounds) that can stand alone within or outside such context. Prefigurative actions, individual or collective, may seek to challenge dominant structures of authority, while at the same time challenging certain established movement means and goals. Within a prefigurative political movement context, the first may indicate a search for securing a consonance but the latter may also be indicative of a different relationship between means and ends that cannot just be understood in rationally strategic terms. Hence, I suggest that it is more plausible to delve into the very actions that could be considered prefigurative to discuss prefigurative politics.

2.7 Prefigurative political actions as prefigurative direct actions

For that matter, this research proceeds in line with the attempts to conceptually bind ‘prefigurative politics’ and ‘direct actions’ (Franks, 2003; Day, 2004, 2005; Gordon, 2008). I basically argue that all prefigurative political actions are direct actions, while vice versa may not always be possible. Direct actions have first come to be identified with defensive or destructive actions that directly (and physically) intervene in the sources of grievances. These may include sabotages, road blockades, physical resistance against evictions, occupations, and, in some cases, the use of firearms or explosives. Although such acts can be considered as direct actions depending on the context, this can only form a part of it. On the other hand, there are ‘constructive direct actions’ (Day, 2004, 2005; Gordon, 2008). These may rather refer to “directly making something happen regardless of whether or not it is legal (such as opening up a vacant building so that houseless people can live in it)” (Dixon, 2014, p. 112), cultivating an urban garden to renovate an unused land for people to benefit or setting up a ‘pirate’ website so that people can access scientific journals for free. In this sense, these may very well include prefigurative political actions. These two forms may not account for all types of direct action; however, they certainly share their main pillars.

That said, direct action is not characterized by the directness of the acts but rather by a certain sort of directness. Not all sabotage or all urban gardens can be identified as direct actions. In this sense, it should be noted that ‘direct actions’ share a certain ethical, political, and affective disposition that could also help us to make sense of prefigurative political actions. David Graeber (2009) exemplifies such disposition with reference to various resources:

Direct action implies one’s acting for one’s self, in a fashion in which one may weigh directly the problem with which you are confronted, and without

needing the mediation of politicians or bureaucrats... -Sans Titres Bulletin, "What is Direct Action?" (p. 201)

Direct Action aims to achieve our goals through our own activity rather than through the actions of others. It is about people taking power for themselves... – Rob Sparrow, "Anarchist Politics and Direct Action" (p. 202)

Broadly, the direct political intervention at hand defies resorting to any external authority except for the individuals themselves. Such a resort would have been what inclines the political action to be indirect. In this sense, trying to defer any indirect or mediating relationships with one's own self as well as with the others, direct action can be asserted as a search for the autonomy of the individual, who at the same time acts by embracing one's autonomy. In this sense, this individual search can only be understood by considering the ideas, values, and affections around which a sense of autonomy is developing. I argue that these ethical, political, and affective dispositions are also characterizing features of prefigurative political actions. Approaching prefigurative political actions in terms of direct actions in this sense may enable us to make sense of these actions in a more refined way.

Differently, Franks (2003) rather approaches this question the other way around in his discussion of anarchist direct action. According to him, anarchist direct action is entangled with two particular ethical components that are, first, a prefigurative ethic (understood as means/ends equivalence) and, second, the subjects undertaking the act being affected by these very acts by themselves. It connotes that the primary beneficiaries and the undertakers of direct actions are overlapping, and these actions are somehow in line with these political subjects' future ideals.¹⁹ I

¹⁹ Franks (2003) discusses this reflection of future ideals with reference to two terms from semiotics, *synecdoche vis-à-vis symbolic*: "The prefigurative element distinguishes direct action from symbolic and constitutional action. Symbolic actions are those acts that aim to raise awareness of an issue or injustice, but by themselves do not attempt to resolve it. They are acts that signify other acts. There are many forms of symbolic action: parades, vigils, fasts, slogans, songs, festivals, badges, flags and salutes. A possible criticism of the division between symbolic and direct action is that the latter too is symbolic. Direct action too presents a partial or temporary solution to a larger set of practices. It is here that the terminology of semiotics helps to provide a clearer basis for division. Direct action is

tend to agree that they somehow reflect desired future relations; however, I doubt that we should always understand this reflection in terms of means/ends equivalence. Above, I have already mentioned why prefigurative politics should not always be understood in terms of means/ends equivalence. Similarly, not all direct actions can solely be composed of direct actions themselves. They proceed together as different agglomerations of symbolic actions or violent actions that result in a divergence from a full equivalence.

For instance, Graeber (2009) also puts forth that direct actions echo how “the structure of one’s own act becomes a kind of micro-utopia, a concrete model for one’s vision of a free society” (p. 210). Yet, as there are forms of direct actions that may be defensive or destructive, the use of certain violent means in the name of building a democratic society seems not always consistent with the future ideals of building a peaceful society. Also, it may be dubious whether undertaking direct solidarity actions for an individual or group necessarily involves such a utopian sense rather than an urge to satisfy an immediate need. On the other hand, direct actions may be very well experimenting with the creation of new methods or ideas that may deviate from the expected consonance between means and ends. These all raise questions for identifying anarchist direct action integrally with a prefigurative ethic.

Here, we come back to the main problem related to the vagueness of the concept of prefigurative politics, again. As indicated above, I tend to think of means/ends equivalence with reference to an overall strategy within the movement contexts and this may not necessarily apply to the particular actions. In this sense, say, anarchist movements may be pursuing a consonance between their means and ends that they embed in combinations of their direct actions, which would be another

synecdochic. A synecdoche is a symbol that contains a small part that represents a larger whole” (pp. 18-19). I think that not all direct actions but rather prefigurative direct actions appear as synecdochic.

question. This question would concern the character of the anarchist prefigurative strategy. On the other hand, an elaboration of the actions themselves seems to require another outlook. Thereof, I suggest that we can reformulate the first part of Franks' (2003) explication as the following: in the context of an anarchist movement, articulation of direct actions may entangle, first, an anarchist ethic that is enmeshed with a prefigurative strategy that seeks means/ends equivalence... This also implies that the direct actions of different movements might be intertwined with different ethical and political dispositions. Depending on these differing understandings, we can also arrive at different interpretations of how these subjects are to be understood, be it anarchists, feminists, ecologists, proletarians, or queers.

In essence, this reformulation comes concurrent with an understanding of prefigurative political actions as a mode of direct actions. More explicitly, prefigurative political actions are direct actions that are *synecdoches* of the desired future social relations: "It contains elements of the object it is representing. It stands both as a practical response to a given situation, but also as a symbol of the larger vision of societal change" (Franks, 2003, p. 20).

'Prefigurative political actions' "thus represents a broadening of the idea of direct action, resulting in a commitment to define and realise anarchist social relations within the activities and collective structures" (Gordon, 2008, p. 35)²⁰ of political subjects. As Gordon's discussion specifically focuses on the contemporary anarchist movement, I suggest that we proceed with replacing the word 'anarchist' with 'desired' social relations. In this sense, reminiscent of Gordon's constructive direct action, or as a part of it, I argue that 'prefigurative political actions' are direct

²⁰ Here, it should be noted that Gordon (2008) makes this comment by referring to the 'prefigurative politics.' In relation to the discussion above, I reinterpret this explication as reflective of the character of prefigurative political actions.

actions that embody “the deliberate experimental implementation of desired future social relations and practices in the here-and-now” (Raekstad & Gradin, 2020, p. 10).

Connecting with the above-mentioned part, prefigurative political actions can be discussed with reference to two integral components. First, prefigurative actions are synecdochic; implemented social relations and practices in the here-and-now are informed by and reflective of their desired future social relations. In this sense, a synecdochic action may seek to achieve an equivalence between means and ends but it does not necessarily imply a full achievement; so, allows for discrepancies throughout this course. Thusly, I argue that it makes sense to identify prefigurative actions as synecdochic rather than with reference to means/ends equivalence. This also may allow us to understand how political subjects may undertake the action in relation to the multiplicity of goals that may not always be in congruency with each other. If the small part (that is the political action itself in this case) is to represent a greater whole, this small part can refer to more than one future envision. Direct interventions into dominant social relations through developing alternative institutions, for instance, may correspond to a variety of ideals, values, and affections.

In relation to that, second, political subjects undertake prefigurative actions with a deliberate attempt, arising from their ethical and political dispositions concerning their identities, and affection towards the envisioned future social relations. More specifically, political subjects deliberately seek to defer mediation of external authorities in this process, and they are and expect to be the main beneficiaries of the action itself. In this sense, it points out the historical constitution of the action by these political subjects whose ethical, political, and affective terrains are also constituted by historical processes themselves. That said, prefigurative

actions appear as reflective of future social relations with reference to specific historical times, whose sense may take on different meanings (or fade out), as social meanings and feelings transform in time and space. What appears utopian may vanish and what remains aloof may flourish. Depending on the context, even seemingly the most quotidian act, for instance, being nice, may constitute a prefigurative political action.

This approach disaggregates to explore how different modalities of prefigurative actions can be discussed with reference to a compound of their 1) temporality, 2) spatiality and 3) ethical, political and affective underpinnings. If prefigurative political action implies “deliberate experimental implementation of desired future relations and practices in the here-and-now” (Raekstad & Gradin, 2020, p. 10), it answers to the questions such as: 3) what kind of social relations and practices do activists aspire to live by, in the future, and are already living in, in the present; 2) where do they enact such relations and practices in the here-and-now; 1) how do they political, ethically and affectively relate to their future envisions vis-à-vis practices in the now and the past. In this sense, this approach may allow us to locate whether prefigured futures are multiple or single, while it implies that their anticipation might depend on the ways in which political subjects bind the present and future times.

On the other hand, it sets forth that these actions may occur in individual or collective spaces, ranging from an individual lifestyle, social movement, social network, state actor, public space, digital space, and so on. Furthermore, it contends that the intentions and effects of these actions are pertaining to different ideological, ethical, and emotional motivations and considerations. In this sense, it proceeds from a view that the deliberative part of the action does not only stem from ideational

interpretations but also from affective interpretations, which in fact coalesce together in terms of the experiences that prefigurative political practices arose. Henceforth, it settles that the effects of these actions may be depending on these specific constellations that can take different political ideological, social and affective forms.

CHAPTER 3

A GLANCE AT THE HISTORY OF PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS IN TURKEY

In Turkey, ‘prefigurative politics’ and its practices have followed a rather different trajectory. The term itself was virtually nonexistent both in activist circles and the scholarly literature until post-Gezi (Kara, 2018; Binbuğa Kınık, 2020; Uncu, 2022; Ertuğrul, 2022; Salman, 2022). It is possible to refer to certain prefigurative practices rooting way back, although it is beyond the scope of this research to provide a full account as these areas remain rather unexplored. The earliest practices and ideas regarding prefigurative politics can be traced to the anarchist ideas and actions in the Ottoman Empire, as the conjugation of prefigurative politics with anarchist direct-action tactics has been pointed out by various scholars (Franks, 2003; Day, 2004, 2005; Gordon, 2008). Besides, it has been revealed that some intellectuals associated with Young Turks had been influenced by anarchist ideas (Soydan, 2013) and there had been an organized group of Armenian anarchists around the end of the nineteenth century (Selbuz, 2006). Although these groups were mostly known for their use of defensive or destructive direct actions, it seems plausible to contend that their organizational forms or ideas might be carrying prefigurative elements. Apart from these few examples, one can expect that prefigurative political acts may not be limited to these anarchist tendencies. At the time, different social movement actors, such as feminists, socialists, or different minority groups, were also in action, whose encounters with prefigurative political ideas and practices remain rather undiscovered – if there were any. Besides, it can be possible to trace prefigurative political actions in everyday forms of resistance that could not show a certain level of institutionalization as the abovementioned actors did. I believe that the initial phases

in the development of *Lubunca*²¹ may point out one such example (Kontovas, 2012). Partially because of a lack of attention in the scholarly literature and partially because of the course of modernization in Turkey, prefigurative political ideas and practices virtually came off the stage until the 1970s, according to our current knowledge. This disappearance and reappearance may constitute yet another line of scrutiny that might be of interest to the social movements literature on Turkey.

As the course of modernization in Turkey eventually brought about increasing levels of industrialization in urban along with land enclosures and mechanization of agricultural techniques in rural areas, the urbanization process had a rapid acceleration. While this mechanization and enclosure left many people with lesser job opportunities in agricultural areas, increasing levels of industrialization in the urban add on to this development and led many people to migrate to the urban sites. As a result, people had to deal with these new grievances either in rural or urban areas; so, these processes came along with the struggles of students and the labor movement in cities together with that of landless peasants and small producers in the rural. At the time, the students and the labor movement came to the forefront as remarkable political actors, whose rise was conjoined with the development of various socialist organizations and parties. This development has already started to put a mark on different struggles in the 1960s, which was to accelerate itself further in the 1970s.

²¹ *Lubunca* can be identified as a certain type of slang that was mainly used by the marginalized queer communities which has then become prevalent among the queer movement today. Although its development through the interaction between marginalized queer and ethnic communities can be traced back in the late-Ottoman and early Republican period (Kontovas, 2012), it has become a significant tool for marginalized queer community to resist the state's and society's heterosexist repressions especially throughout 80s and 90s. It has been indicated that the use of this slang was important for the community to safeguard themselves against the police, military and mafia violence. It was also an important element in developing commune-like living spaces in various ghettos of Istanbul and Ankara. See: <https://kaosgl.org/gokkusagi-forumu-kose-yazisi/lubunca-uzerine-notlar> Retrieved 27.06.2022

In this context, while landless peasants had undertaken certain actions against enclosures starting from 1950s, these actions occasionally took a form of land occupations. These land occupations especially became visible and politicized near the end of the 1960s. As Begüm Özden Fırat (2019) discusses, initially appearing as rather “silent resistances,” this “groundswell” developed into a social movement, especially with their interaction with different political actors such as the socialist-revolutionary students or the Republican People’s Party (CHP). Concomitantly, as the economic and physical infrastructural deficiencies could not equiponderate the increasing numbers of new inhabitants in cities, many migrants started to occupy unused land in the suburbs of the biggest cities to build themselves accommodation sites. Usually referred to as the *gecekondu* (squatter) neighborhoods, the proliferation of these accommodation sites throughout the 1950s and 1960s amounted to the development of a *gecekondu* movement. Similarly, this movement’s interactions with political actors brought about the politicization of these processes, especially in the 1970s. Adding on to these, a wave of occupations and boycotts broke out in certain universities and workplaces for the first time in 1968 (Zarakolu, 1988). These developments had also been remarking a process where various socialist organizations and the labor movement were exuding their increasing influence. While these mobilizations provided the basis for various political actions throughout the 1970s, it can be contended that one of the common and characterizing repertoires of action that was used by all these, landless peasants, students, and workers, movements were occupation (Fırat, 2019). This consideration may bring one of the heritages of Turkey’s 1968 to the fore: occupation as a defensive direct action.

Building on these developments, certain occupant direct actions showed up with a new character throughout the 1970s and took the form of prefigurative (or

constructive) direct actions especially in certain urban activisms. These prefigurative direct actions were mainly aimed at intervening in the grievances stemming from the rapid urbanization process. These actions were revolving around provision of the immediate accommodation needs, developing solidarity ties, and promoting participatory democracy mechanisms among the people.

One remarkable strand of such examples was put into action within the context of gecekondü movement in the second half of the 1970s. As the socialist organizations started to take part in the construction and coordination of these neighborhoods, the development of many of these neighborhoods started to be forged around the political perspectives of these groups. Moreover, socialists endeavored to actualize their political ideals in the daily life of these spaces, which often led these spaces to be referred to as ‘liberated zones.’ It can be exemplified by a variety of such neighborhoods in metropolitan cities, one being The May Day Neighborhood (*1 Mayıs Mahallesi*) that was located in Ümraniye, Istanbul.

As emphasized above, the politicization of the gecekondü movement brought about novel implications in terms of their development. Whereas the waves of occupation throughout the 1950s and 1960s had rather proceeded in a haphazard fashion, interventions of the socialist organizations in the 1970s gave countenance to a planned course in accordance with the implementation of socialist goals (Aslan, 2004). 1 Mayıs Mahallesi was one such neighborhood that represented a different course, especially in the second half of the 1970s. Especially with the effect of socialist presence in the neighborhood, inhabitants stood against the mafia dominance and state repression in order to retain a certain autonomy, sought to distribute and organize the settlements according to the needs instead of the profits, and promoted solidaristic relations and certain political values within the community.

It can be argued that these characteristics were developed as a result of their deliberate political attempts, which evoked a sense of social life that is reflective of the socialist goals.

This becomes more apparent if we take a look at the “People’s Committee,” in which socialists took an active part in its development. The committee functioned as an executive and legislative body to coordinate the construction and distribution processes of the squatters and to resolve arising conflicts. It also provided the basis for the participation of the inhabitants so as to express their autonomous power against their own grievances. That said, the committee was intervening in the daily concerns of the people while coalescing these with certain political principles. Şükrü Aslan (2004) identifies that these efforts amount to the development of a “new urban life” within these spaces. This new social life was to be made possible by the priorities and principles followed by the committee.

As Aslan (2004) elaborates further, these principles were revolving around procuring the immediate accommodation needs of the individuals and the welfare of the community within the neighborhood. In that regard, the committee sought to distribute the land in equal parcels and only for those who are in need. In order to ensure the equitable distribution of the land, the committee also conducted background checks and sought to convince older inhabitants who have bigger portions of land to share their land with those who are in need. This did not only aim to provide equity among people, but also to avoid the usage of the land in a profit-oriented way. Furthermore, the distribution of the land was being planned in a way that the inhabitants could easily reach education, health, cultural and social services. This plan was also being supported by the participation of the experts or university students in the related disciplines. On the other hand, the committee was also paying

attention to provide space for the green areas as well as community spaces where people can socialize. In this sense, one other significant principle for the organization of daily life in the neighborhood was to promote solidaristic relations instead of a profit-oriented ones. Although these efforts were by no means without any conflicts within the community itself as well as with the state, these endeavors amounted to a new life experience which was also echoed in the subsequent years. As a result, 1 Mayıs Mahallesi, which was to be remembered as a ‘liberated zone,’ has been engraved in the memories of its inhabitants as well as activist circles as an important political experience utilizing different forms of prefigurative direct actions.

Another noteworthy experience of prefigurative political actions was also actualized within the context of the housing problem in the 1970s. These experiences can be discussed in relation to the development of the “new municipalism movement” as a broader response to the repercussions of this versatile problem (Batuman, 2010). As the rapid urbanization processes brought about new grievances for the urban and rural dwellers, social democrat and socialist organizations sought to adopt newer strategies to politicize these individual grievances and to correspond to the growing immediate needs of the people. One such quest was realized by a new outlook on municipal politics. In this context, a set of efforts, usually referred to as “new municipalism” or “social(ist) municipalism,” were set off with the initial attempts of the CHP and Workers’ Party of Turkey (*Türkiye İşçi Partisi*) to encourage the development of radical urban policies. The basic intentions were to embrace the power of municipalities to intervene in these grievances and to redefine the scope of municipal policies. As the CHP won municipal elections of 1973 in thirty-three cities, these initial steps have found concrete bases as a result of the cooperation attempts of these municipalities. The principles of this movement were

reflected in a brochure titled “Social(ist) Municipality” (Ankara Belediyesi Başkanlık Uzmanları, 1977). As Batuman (2010) summarizes, these principles were participatory democracy, organizing production and consumption of urban services according to the needs of laborers, establishing cooperation among municipalities, and creating new resources. Proceeding with these basic principles, certain municipalities came up with different projects to ease the living conditions of the laboring masses of urban. One such example within this context was the “İzmit Progressive Settlements Project,” which was also embodying prefigurative political aspects.

Initiated by İzmit Municipality, this project was aiming at providing affordable housing for 30.000 low-income families, most of whom were working in manufacturing industries around the city (Çavdar, 1978). In accordance with the abovementioned principles, the municipality sought to intervene in the housing problem by putting the needs of the laboring masses to the center. For this regard, the municipality brought different urban professionals together to lead the project as well as to conduct a thorough preliminary preparation of the social and economic needs of the people. Throughout this preparation phase, the project developed various participatory democratic mechanisms to identify these needs, while another goal was to raise the consciousness of the people in a way that they can act against their grievances through their autonomous power. As Tuncay Çavdar (1978, p.55), one of the architects of the project, expresses, the project aimed to promote horizontal relations to take hold against the misuse of governmental power as an instrument of exploitation or oppression. This was to be realized through certain organizational mechanisms such as street councils, cooperatives and cooperative associations to ensure a certain self-administration system that would, in a way, develop a counter-

power vis-à-vis the power of the central government (Bozkurt, 2019). After all, as the tension between these two powers ended up with the discharge of the mayor Erol Köse in the subsequent local elections, the project could not be realized. Nevertheless, the project indicated a significant example of a set of prefigurative political actions. Adding on to the prefigurative character of the participatory democratic mechanisms developed, the position of the urban professionals throughout the project was also reflecting a such character. Çavdar (1978, p.55) states that “the role of the planner is to take the responsibility of being an intellectual that exposes the current ill conditions to open up new horizons so as to transform these conditions and to keep the imaginary of the people alive.” Similarly, “instead of remaining as a reckless technician, the architect has taken on a task of being a sparking intellectual to transform this process into a collective action” (Çavdar, 1978, p. 60). All in all, these characteristics amounted to one of the earliest experiences, exemplifying how prefigurative political actions can be actualized within the domain of the state.

One another remarkable prefigurative political experience near the end of the 1970s was also deployed within this domain, by another municipality, Fatsa. While the actions of the İzmit Municipality within the context of the new municipalism movement were reflective of rather social(ist) democrat future prospects, Fatsa Municipality was constituting a more radical experience, where the Revolutionary Path (*Dev-Yol*) movement was the main organizing actor. Throughout the 1970s, as the abovementioned urbanization processes were being accompanied by further advancements in the socialist movement, new socialist organizations were established as well as new perspectives were to be developed. One such development had been the formation of Dev-Yol in 1977, which was soon to gather considerable

mass support in the vast geography all around Turkey. According to Necmi Erdoğan (1998), one condition that made such grassroots support possible was a perspective that diverges from orthodox Marxism in terms of its differing emphasis on the importance of class struggle. As he discusses, while Dev-Yol had been reserving its emphasis on the class struggle, it articulated a discursive strategy that put emphasis on the importance of the struggle of (masses of) the people against the dominant classes. In this sense, the movement's perspective carrying a populist character enabled them to penetrate the grassroots by its ability to "incorporate popular demands, traditions, and symbols into its political platform" (Morgül, 2019). Yet, a certain 'socialist populist' strategy was only one of the conditions that were in effect for Dev-Yol to garner mass support. Adding on to Erdoğan's (1998) emphasis on the importance of discursive populist strategies in this regard, Kerem Morgül (2019) extends the discussion on the non-discursive performances utilized by the movement, where prefigurative performances constitute one of these tenets. According to Morgül (2019), the Fatsa experience was being characterized by a set of prefigurative (along with contentious and lifestyle) performances which allowed them to advance their effectivity, viability, and legitimacy.

In 1979, the independent candidate of the Dev-Yol movement, Fikri Sönmez (popularly known as Fikri, the tailor), won the by-elections. Already having experienced cadres as well as certain support from the people in the region, the movement gained considerable power after Fikri Sönmez succeeded in the elections. From that moment onwards "the Dev-Yol activists focused on transforming political and social relations in the direction of their vision of the ideal society" (Morgül, 2019, p. 289). Subsequent to the elections, activists formed 'People's Committees' in various sub-districts of the municipal center. The committee members were elected

by the residents of each district, while the residents secured the right to recall these members upon any dissatisfaction or inconvenience. These administrative bodies were providing participatory mechanisms for people to voice their needs, and problems and to take part in the social and political life of the municipal area. In this way, together with the people, Dev-Yol activists were intervening in different political problems in the area, such as usury, stockpiling, land disputes, bribery, clientelism, and stiff prices, while putting considerable effort to improve the infrastructural conditions of the city, by fixating the sewage system through collective work or providing cheaper public transportation. Other than that, Morgül (2019) emphasizes that “the committees turned into an instrument for restructuring social relations in the town,” where “women, in particular, utilized them to discipline men who were prone to alcoholism, gambling, and domestic violence” (p. 289). As these efforts proved to be effective interventions, committees soon proliferated in rural parts of Fatsa as well, while this socialist governance experience received greater popular attention. Dev-Yol activists were also aware of the possibilities of this broader reception, strategically utilizing this experience to grow its operation within Fatsa as well as in the broader geography of Turkey. “Fatsa People’s Festival” that was organized by the municipality in 1980 indicates the scope of this broader attention and the way in which this experience was exuded by Dev-Yol. The festival, organized by the activists together with the direct participation of the Fatsa inhabitants, was comprised of various events including music, theater, choir, folk dance, cinema, exhibitions, sports, conferences, and forums. As the movement promoted this event in order to further publicize this political experience, many people including intellectuals, artists, journalists, and public figures attended the festival, turning the place into a parade of a vision of a socialist society. As cited in

Morgül (2019), an article published in Dev-Yol magazine was commenting on the festival as the following: “Fatsa is a real challenge to those who assert that a new social order founded upon equality, fraternity, freedom and collectivism . . . is an unachievable utopia” (p. 290). Consequentially, the Fatsa experience settled itself as the most remarkable prefigurative experience that connotes one of the hallmarks of the political effect of the socialist movement in the 1970s. This experience still occupies a considerable space in the memories of the current generations of activists.

As with the liquidation of Fatsa experienced by a military operation in July 1980, this period came to a close with the violently disruptive effect of a coup d'état on September 12th, 1980. While this large-scale military operation wiped off most of the political experiences and cadres that were parts of the above-mentioned social movements, prefigurative politics had to face the same fate. It was only to be revived within and beyond the socialist movement after certain re-considerations over the course of the movement.

After all, it has been emphasized that it was only after the socialist movement has become a remarkable political actor along with the labor movement, noteworthy prefigurative political experiences emerged. Although strategies of these movements were rather attuned to confronting or utilizing central state power, which are often seen in tension with prefigurative tactics, these engraved examples have shown how these two orientations may, in fact, not be thought of as mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, this coexistence was never fully translated into a fusion of instrumentalist and prefigurative strategies to characterize the overall movement strategy of socialist organizations. At the time, the social movements' scene was dominated by instrumentalist Leninist strategies and the deployment of prefigurative political actions was rather relatively sporadic. But still, their strategic importance

has come to be embraced, and some of these actions came to the fore as influential instances that is engrained in the memories of the subsequent generation of various activists. These strategic prefigurative practices, which found a place within the socialist movement, especially in the second half of the 1970s, have left an important mark which is then to take different forms and experimentations. The reflection of prefigurative politics in the strategic and organizational considerations of different social movements was now about to assert itself after such a disrupting effect of the coup d'état in 1980 brought about new developments.

Starting from that violent disruption onwards, Turkey has undergone a significant social and political transformation, as well as the socialist movement itself. As the military government attempted to restructure the course of modernization in Turkey, it sought to designate a political context where divergent voices were violently excluded. Within such context, implementation and institutionalization of neoliberal policies had accelerated, while socialist and labor movements were being kept under control; repression against the Kurdish minority, and the movement, has escalated in conjunction with the rise of a consensus among nationalist discourses; while radical Islamist actors had been liquidated from the political-institutional terrain, Islamist and conservative values and ideas were to be circulated within the society so as to manufacture the consent of the people (Bora, 2017). In parallel with these developments, it can be argued that the ideological and strategic commitments of the socialist movement started to be questioned, especially from within the movement itself.

Although the movement was by no means homogenous in terms of these commitments and cultural values, it can be argued that all of them shared a certain instrumentalist strategy aiming at conquering and maintaining political power. This

aim was ultimately directed at the instrumentalizing political power of the state institutions to confront the capitalist power relations, while the operation of power relations regarding different domains rather seems to be sidelined. Besides, the movement was rather objectifying power relations as mainly stemming from an external source, which leaves them indifferent to the operation of these power relations within the movement organizations and the culture themselves. In this sense, as the implications of the ongoing social and political transformations added to these power relations that have already been evoking further grievances within and outside the movement, it paved the way for the questioning of this instrumentalist strategy; thereof, for the exploration of different ideological and strategic tools as well. That said, it can be argued that the revivification of prefigurative political strategies and tactics stemmed from these questionings, if partly.

Furthermore, it should be emphasized that increasing communication with different social movements and ideas around the world was intertwined with these questioning. On the one hand, the violent repression of the activists by the coup has led many Turkish and Kurdish activists to seek political asylum, especially in different countries in Europe, creating different hubs of activist diasporas. As these activists interacted with different social movements through their political activities in their host countries, they have become acquainted with different ideological and strategic tools. As a result, they sought to support different struggles in Turkey by transmitting this knowledge to feed the activist fora within the country. On the other hand, the repercussions of the underlying globalization were another part, accompanying these processes.

Proceeding from these bases, the 1980s and 1990s saw concretized instances of prefigurative politics. Different social movements have come on to the scene with

their autonomous ideological positions and different identities within the socialist movement have sought their organizational independence from the movement. These developments were reflected in different individual and collective political actions, organizational orientations as well as characterizing movement strategies. However, as the disruptive effects of the coup incarcerated different realms of social and political life, these newly forging movements were operating in a limited terrain. Throughout the 1980s, activities of these groups were not always visible to the public but rather proceeding in affinity groups, discussions, publications, and resistances in everyday life. When it came to the 1990s, these activities were to become more publicized in parallel with the development of these social movement organizations.

If to give several examples, starting from 1980 onwards, women within the socialist movement institutionalized their independent organizations, which was accompanied by the development of an autonomous feminist movement. Nükhet Sirman (1989) signals that these groups organized rather horizontally as small autonomous groups, developed cooperative and supportive mechanisms, and experimented with different repertoires of action such as festivals and campaigns other than protests or rallies. Concomitant to this, the ecology movement started to assert itself, which also organized horizontally around certain campaigns but was more influenced by the rise of ecology movements abroad (Bora, 2017, p. 708). In a similar fashion, the seeds of an anarchist movement have been planted in Germany through the appearance of several affinity groups around certain publications (Zileli & Özkaya, 2008). The anarchist movement was rather embracing prefigurative politics as an overall movement strategy. Other than these, while the marginalized LGBTQ+ community was tightening its ties against police, mafia, and military repressions in daily life, they developed new resistance tactics. This community

started to gather around commune-like living spaces in various ghettos and further developed Lubunca, which especially served to ensure their security. As these different social movement actors started to come into the scene, these movements also sought to build alliances at times. One such example was Radical Democrat Union (also known as the Radical Democrat Green Party) which was founded in 1985. The union was defined as a coalition for action that was comprised of horizontally tied affinity groups of ecologists, feminists, LGBTQ+s, anti-militarists, atheists, and anarchists who emphasized the integrality of their struggles (Baykan, 2020). Nearing the 1990s, these actors were advancing their political actions.

In the 1990s, while these separate movements developed further, it became possible to trace different implications of these developments. It can be argued that while these movements fostered new organizational structures and experimented with new tactics, the interactions between these separate (and at times intersecting) movements grew throughout the 1990s. These interactions culminated in a basis for joint actions, campaigns, and organizational forms, whose repercussions were to be more influential in subsequent phases.

An anti-war movement that embraced non-violent direct-action tactics and anti-hierarchical organizational principles emerged (Başkent, 2014). The LGBTQ+ movement started to establish its autonomous organizations. A socialist-leaning independent student organization Student Coordination was founded, which organized through horizontal networks and resorted to direct action repertoires (Savun, 2012). As the Kurdish movement has gone through a restructuring process influenced by Murray Bookchin's ideas of social ecology, it ended up in an attempt to fuse instrumentalist and prefigurative strategies under the rubric of democratic autonomy (Akkaya & Jongerden, 2014). And certain other socialist organizations

have also started to embrace prefigurative elements regarding their organizational structure and collective actions... As these developments seem to have proceeded with the acknowledgment of the intersections in the operation of different power relations, these various activisms sought to resort to new ideas, strategies, and tactics, one being prefigurative politics.

As all of these movements branched out further, their influence has become more and more visible in various mass mobilizations and campaigns throughout the 2000s. These collective mobilizations can also be related to the repercussions of the alliance attempts of the abovementioned movements, as well as to the resonance of ongoing global mass mobilizations. The embodiment of these new aspects and cultural elements has characterized some of these important collective mobilizations. Throughout my research, I realized that the memory of these events has been consonant with veteran activists' experiences related to Gezi.

The initial repercussions can be traced to a series of anti-war protests against US intervention in Iraq in 2002-2003 and against the NATO Istanbul summit in 2004. These mobilizations seem to be designated certain instances where all of these social movements have coalesced around a common theme. This was also closely related to the resonances and reception of the alter-globalization movement. At the time, the slogan "Another world is possible!" started to echo in Turkey as well. As an example of one of the initial steps, the Istanbul Social Forum (as a part of the World Social Forum) was established in 2002 with the aim to provide a democratic field of interaction for different social movement actors (Şensever, 2003). This development then led to the development of the Turkey Social Forum in 2005.²² As with the abovementioned collective mobilizations, these fields of interactions were providing

²²See: <https://www.tmmob.org.tr/icerik/turkiye-sosyal-forumu-kuruldu> Retrieved 15.06.2022

important bases for different social movement actors to interact with each other, as well as to find common junctions for joint actions. One significant concretized example of the reflection of these anti-war and alter-globalization stances came into being in Barışarock in 2003 (Eliaçık, 2006).²³ At that time when Iraq War was on the agenda, a festival called Rock'n Coke sponsored by the Coca-Cola company was announced. A coalition of activists took a stance against this festival within this context in order to counteract against the industrialization of music and to expose Coca-Cola's support in the ongoing war.²⁴ Various socialist, feminist, student, LGBTQ+, anti-war, ecologist and anarchist groups participated in the organization of this counter-festival. Barışarock was organized in a do-it-yourself fashion by the efforts of volunteers and the entrance was free. It was not only designating a space for music but also offering a wide range of social and political activities. Throughout the festivals, different activities such as workshops, concerts, discussions, dances, performances, and political actions were conducted with the participation of tens of thousands of people. In this sense, it was engendering a space of interaction for the proliferation of values and ideas of an alternative social and political life. This series of experiences was signaling the characteristics of the salient prefigurative political actions of the 2000s. Within the same context, founded in 2003 as a part of the global Indymedia network²⁵, Istanbul Indymedia was also one such important reference point. Istanbul Indymedia was an autonomous media initiative that sought to mediate

²³ Barışarock, referring to Rock for Peace or Rock through Peace, was organized annually between the years 2003-2008. See: <https://m.bianet.org/bianet/kultur/108926-barisarock-sen-basladi-buruk-bitti> Retrieved 15.06.2022

²⁴ A blog site explains the ideas and principles behind this organization, while critically examining how these initial intentions were to be misused in time. These problems eventually led organizing committee to stop organizing the festival. See: <https://barisarock.wordpress.com/> Retrieved 15.06.2022

²⁵ The network that was first established to report on 1999 Seattle protests and became central in delivering the activities of alter-globalization movement. For an interview about Istanbul Indymedia, see: <https://kaosgl.org/haber/bagimsiz-ve-anti-otoriter-alternatif-medya-ornekleri-olarak-ainfos-ve-indymedia> Retrieved 15.05.2022

the knowledge of those who cannot have a place in dominant media institutions, sharing news, events, activities, and statements of different social movements all around Turkey. Until it ceased its activities in 2017, it was an important hub for the activities of different social movements all around Turkey.

All in all, the early 2000s saw reactions to neoliberal globalization through mass mobilizations and the development of different strategies, tactics, and organizational forms as a result of the interactions between different social movement organizations. It can be argued that these prefigurative experiences that provided the bases for these interactions were influential in this regard. This can also be traced through certain influential prefigurative political experiences in the subsequent phases.

As one of the outcomes of these processes, the Rock-A festival constituted a significant exemplary of prefigurative politics at different levels. Settled around the motto of “Demo’s of an Alternative Life,” Rock-A was prepared by horizontally organized volunteers every year between 2007-2012, without any sponsors and for free.²⁶ Apart from the music concerts, the festival organized a variety of workshops, art events, theater plays, and activities that are politically oriented with the principle of anti-hierarchy. Besides its reference to any hierarchical relationship between and among its participants as well as organizers, it referred to a stance against war, racism, capitalism, heterosexism, patriarchy, and ecological deterioration. In this sense, the festival was putting emphasis on a specific ethical and political disposition in its prefigurations. While this festival can be seen as a continuation of Barışarock in a way, this specific emphasis seems to point out the main difference between these two in terms of their prefigurative character.

²⁶See: <https://www.mmo.org.tr/izmir/haber/rock-festivali-26-28-haziranda-izmir-ozderede> and <https://kaosgl.org/haber/alternatif-yasamin-demosu-rock-a-tamamlandi> Retrieved 20.05.2022

Another series of actions were organized under the name of *direnİstanbul* (*resİstanbul*) campaign to expose the penetration of global capitalism in Turkey with the occasion of the annual meeting of IMF and World Bank in Istanbul in 2009.²⁷ The organization committee assumed a horizontally organized coordination form with the principle of anti-hierarchy and anti-authoritarianism and was constituted by feminists, LGBTQ+s, libertarian Marxists, anarchists, anti-authoritarians, and ecologists.²⁸ In a way, it was also resembling the “forum” form, as it provided a field of interaction for different political actors to coact together. Within the scope of the campaign, activists organized a wide range of events in different neighborhoods to draw attention to the impacts of global capitalism in terms of exploitation of labor, precarity, gentrification, ecological deterioration, and gender inequality. While they undertook different prefigurative political actions in this regard, they sought to create a carnivalesque environment and articulated a humorous discourse during their actions. The coordination was explicitly stating that their aim was also to experiment with different tactics with which they can more effectively act against these grievances, while at the same time finding ways to reverse police violence. As these experimentations aimed at developing strategies and tactics that are attentive to the peculiar conditions of the political context in Turkey, they also raised criticism against the ways in which other oppositional social movements have been acting.

Following these events, the early 2010s were remarked by occupations of public places, whose ultimate reflection became the occupation of Gezi Park. The occupation itself was no such new form and can be traced back to the activities of the socialist and labor movement. However, back then, it did not manifest itself in public spaces as well as with the embodiment of these new tools, values, and discourses.

²⁷ See: <https://direnistanbul.wordpress.com/> Retrieved 20.05.2022

²⁸ See: <https://m.bianet.org/biamag/diger/117690-imf-db-istanbul-da-direnistanbul-sokaktaydi> Retrieved 20.05.2022

One such echoing event where activists experimented with the occupation of public spaces was TEKEL workers' resistance in 2010. Standing against the government's attempt to privatize TEKEL – a state-owned enterprise that sells tobacco and alcoholic beverages –, workers initiated a series of encamped protest events on one of the central streets in Ankara starting on 15 December 2009.²⁹ The occupation lasted almost three months until March 2010 and the encampment served as a hub where different social movements partook to show their support and attend protests. Soon after, a series of global mass mobilizations, such as Arab Spring and Occupy, outbreaked, in which the occupation of public spaces and prefiguration has been a characterizing form. This outbreak also seems to have encouraged activists to occupy public places as a form of political action. The repercussions of TEKEL resistance and this global wave of mobilizations were to flourish in Istanbul as well. In October 2011, a small group of activists, under the name of Occupy Istanbul, called people to gather in Gezi Park to organize a public assembly to discuss Occupy movement and its possible reflections in Istanbul.³⁰ This event was soon followed by Occupy Starbucks campaign, which lasted between December 2011 and February 2012, in Boğaziçi University, where students embraced the occupation as an effective tactic to stand against the penetration of certain neoliberal conduct.³¹ Students occupied the Starbucks coffee shop within the university as a reaction against the reflections of the ongoing privatizations within the campus and the spread of neoliberal labor market relations. Students demanded to utilize spaces on campus for their public use instead of handing these spaces over to a transnational private company. In this sense, the occupiers were emphasizing the connection between their local concerns and the

²⁹ See: <https://m.bianet.org/english/labor/120248-tek-el-workers-have-final-say-for-end-of-resistance> Retrieved 20.05.2022

³⁰ See: <https://bianet.org/bianet/genclik/133738-ayaklan-istanbul-hareketi-taksim-de-bulustu> Retrieved 20.05.2022

³¹ See: <http://starbuckssenligi.blogspot.com/> Retrieved 20.05.2022

global functioning of the capitalist social structure. As a response to these, after the occupation of the coffee shop, students organized various workshops, courses, assemblies, and activities to discuss how they would like to relate to and utilize this place in the future as a public space. In this way, along with developing a space where they stand against neoliberal policies, students sought to develop a solidaristic environment where LGBTQ+s, migrants, and Kurdish people can coexist.³² That said, students were rather identifying the action rather as a ‘counter-occupation’ (Kocagöz, 2012) against a broader occupation of their spaces and lives by the impacts of the intersection of different authority structures. Overall, these events were soon to be followed by the occupation of Gezi Park, where their memories and experiences have come to be ingrained in broader repercussions.

Although these events signal the significance and recognition of prefigurative politics as an important strategy, tactic, and ideational or affective expression by the activists, it was with Gezi Protests it has reached a broader public. As of Gezi, prefigurative politics multiplied into different sites, where it has increasingly penetrated the daily lives of people. Starting from the very experiences through the occupation of the park, prefigurative politics proliferated beyond the confines of this space and achieved a broader reception. Certain prefigurative experiences initiated within the park have come to be sustained through similar practices in various other spaces, while it has been followed by the emergence of new ones.

³² See: <https://kaosgl.org/en/single-news/welcome-to-occupy-starbucks> Retrieved 20.05.2022

CHAPTER 4

THE FLOW TIDE:

PROLIFERATION OF PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS AFTER GEZI

The abrupt eruption of mass mobilizations around Gezi Park has opened a crack where an emotional atmosphere came to be designated with intense feelings of shock, outrage, solidarity, sense of belongingness, joy, and hope. If the massive scale and sudden emergence of the protests were a part that sparked these feelings, the heterogeneous character of this mass was solidifying these affections. When political practices around the encampment in the park were added on, they have become influential in the reproduction and further spread of these feelings. While the mass protests had been going on around the park as well as supporting protests in different cities all around Turkey, the occupation in the park has turned into a space where occupiers endeavored to organize a different daily life experience for themselves. This life experience has come to be cheering to the extent that it developed independence from the dominant social relations. Subsequently, the experiences and reemerging memories in the park have led activists or scholars to identify this sense of new life as a revolution, utopia, commune, or carnival. In this sense, the temporality of the rupture created by the unanticipated outbreak of these mass protests was to be reinforced with a certain temporality pertaining to the creating of a different daily life. It can be argued that this underlying temporal experience, accompanying and reproducing the initial outcomes of this rupture in time, was emerging through prefigurative political experiences in the park. As the initial rupture with the quotidian daily life allowed for a certain free space and time where people can express their desires, ideals, and tastes, protestors sought to instantiate

these through their practices and relations in the park. These practices include but are not limited to the encampments themselves; direct democratic public assemblies; an urban garden; self-organized groups to distribute different materials including foods, books, or protective equipment; collectively conducted infirmary, and other solidarity practices. These experiences seem to have provided nodal points where egalitarian relations between individuals are established; solidarity ties are vivified; new tactics are experimented with; and, new organizational practices are developed. Apart from the strategic and relational implications of these political practices, it can be argued that these experiences reproduced the feelings of solidarity, sense of belongingness, and hope that was created after the initial crack, while, at the same time, promoting these feelings by producing feelings of pride, joy and a sense of accomplishment. Yet, constant clashes with the police around the park and the reactions of the government were also in effect, growing the indignation, fear, and anxieties of the people. Within such an environment, prefigurative political actions have found more room to proliferate beyond the confines of the park, reaching out to different sites with different expressions. In this part, I will focus on the course of this proliferation and its multiplication into different sites.

To begin with, I observed throughout my research that if one part of these prefigurative experiences were made possible by certain activists who have already been embracing certain strategies and tactics, the other part was made possible by the spontaneous actions of the people as well as by the immediate needs of the occupiers to secure the encampment that was under constant threat. In this sense, it can be argued that the overall prefigurative experience within the park did not fully arise out of strategic considerations, even though it had strategic implications. I think that these intertwined efforts constituted a prefigurative experience on the broader scale

of the park as it had created a sense of living a life that they hope to live in the future and, in this way, it seems to have led to the deepening of the crack. In parallel to the impact of a critical juncture that is expected to dissociate people from the existing social structures, prefigurative experience in the park was integrally important in the development of different political ideas and practices. I think that this, first and foremost, pertains to the temporal experience that is made by prefigurative political actions. As Çetin Gürer (2019) argues:

Prefigurative politics creates a tension between the current space of expectation and the horizon of expectation by producing a new space-time that negates present structures with immanent imaginative utopias and publicly demonstrates concrete egalitarian alternatives. Such an instantiation of egalitarian forms in an exemplary locality counters the hegemonic presentist closure of temporal horizons and opens up new egalitarian possibilities. Prefigurative spatio-temporality enables such broadening of the horizon, even when the prefigurative movement fails to achieve its set goals. (p. 198)

Although I diverge from Gürer's (2019) explication as I argue that not all prefigurative experiences may create egalitarian possibilities necessarily, I agree that the prefigurative practices within Gezi indicate one such experience. I think that concretizing egalitarian possibilities pertain to a certain ethical and political disposition of the agents undertaking these actions, which also indicates the emergence of a new subjectivity. Characteristics of this subjectivity would become more apparent as the process moves towards the vibration phase.

At this point, of the initial crack, the experience of critical juncture and prefigurative practices had been reinforcing each other, providing solid grounds for new political practices to emerge within the park as well as in the succeeding phases after the protests. This reinforcement was, on the other hand, made possible by the ongoing mass mobilizations that took place around the park (as well as all around Turkey), securing the advancement of practices within the park from the constant

threat of eviction, strategically, and fueling indignation, emotionally. Besides, the constant threat of eviction seems to have awakened feelings of anxiety, driving some of the activists to develop ways to secure the environment in the park by organizing networks for patrolling and firefighting. Furthermore, such anxiety was not only directed at procuring these immediate security needs but also at the proper organizational sustenance of these political practices. Overall, the disruption of the quotidian daily life through these prefigurative practices provided the primordial bases through which new political experiences and ideas can be spread throughout the vibration process. Whereas the course of these newly emerging aspects is contingent on the sequent strategic interactions between different actors and relational mechanisms of the collectives, the production of such a new space-time had an enduring affective outcome by turning the emotional atmosphere in the park into an 'emotional climate.'

In this sense, I will argue that the emotions that were produced after this initial crack, and solidified with the prefigurative practices within the park, have come to designate an enduring emotional climate in the aftermath of the protests. This has been especially important for the multiplication of prefigurative practices into different sites, as well as for the development of new subjectivities. That said, I would like to highlight that the impact of this initial crack and its subsequent phases of vibration and sedimentation do not produce the same consequences for every actor. For instance, Gürcan & Peker (2015) rather focuses on the path dependencies created by this critical juncture by focusing on its impact on AKP and its increasing authoritarianism. Within the scope of this research, I rather focus on such implications for the new subjectivities that engage in prefigurative political actions. In relation to that, by no means do I identify that this emotional climate was shared

by all of the protestors. Within the scope of this research, I focus on the emotional climate within which prefigurative activists operate and proceed with the development of this new subjectivity. As Barbalet (1998) sets forth:

Emotional climates are sets of emotions or feelings which are not only shared by groups of individuals implicated in common social structures and processes, but which are also significant in the formation and maintenance of political and social identities and collective behavior. Emotional climate therefore includes emotional tones and patterns which differentiate social groups or categories by virtue of the fact that they are shared by their members and unlikely to be shared with non-members. (p. 159)

Although the characteristic of this emotional climate can be traced to different political actors' experiences, it should be noted that I specifically single out an emotional climate that was influential in the formation and maintenance of a new subjectivity that engages in prefigurative political actions.

Whereas this emotional climate roots in the political practices within and around the park, it has been sustained through the subsequent political practices, i.e., through mass protests, solidarity networks, issue-specific defense networks, neighborhood forums, squats, urban gardens, collectives, cooperatives, political organizations, as vibrations of this crack. İlhan Demiryol (2018) and Zihnioğlu (2019) single out re-enactments of the newly emerging political agencies through subsequent mass protests. Della Porta & Atak (2017) emphasize the significance of the neighborhood assemblies that popped up right after the eviction of the encampment in the park. They even come to argue that these prefigurative experiences, as “the experimentation with alternative imaginaries of politics . . . might have also worked as critical junctures in shaping new subjectivities” (2017, p. 53). Uncu (2022) provides an overview of a variety of different organizations, networks, and repertoires of action that a new subjectivity hinges upon, while he locates prefiguration as one of its central principles. In sum, I build on the emphases

of these scholars on different collective efforts, by arguing that these efforts have been especially important in the maintenance of an enduring emotional climate that came to contribute to the constitution of a new subjectivity.

With regards to this constitution, the set of feelings that are characterizing the emotional climate can also be seen as reflective of the ethical and political disposition of the individuals. That is to say, feelings provide insights to make sense of the grievances and strategies they have. As Jasper (2011, p. 289) suggests, “different emotions correspond to different things we care about, different goals we may have.” Thereof, the affective processes can be thought of as intertwined with ideational processes, where a dichotomous distinction cannot be held: “emotions interact with cognition in determining an individual’s behaviour” (della Porta & Giugni, 2013, p. 126). That said, “emotions help us make sense of the world around us and formulate action in response to events – a form of thinking and evaluating more often than a source of irrationality” (Jasper, 2010, p. 973). In this sense, the emotional terrain of the prefigurative activists is one of the most significant aspects to make sense of their political agency in the aftermath of Gezi, throughout the vibration and sedimentation phases. Linking these understandings with ‘emotional climates,’ Barbalet (1998) summarizes:

By functioning as a locus or point of reference for feelings and sentiments about social and political conditions, and opportunities and limitations, shared with others, emotional climates are both social influences on individual behavior and constitute a source of collective action. Indeed, the contents of emotional climates not only identify a subject’s socioemotional milieu, but will also point or orientate the subject against, or toward, those outside that milieu to whom these emotions may be directed. (p. 159)

In this regard, the emotional climate that was making its presence felt starting with the cracking, and reaching to the vibration period, has been an important source for activists to start engaging with and sustaining their political actions. The set of

emotions constituting the climate was especially crucial for developing and nurturing a sense of hope. The development of this hope was vitally important for activists to undertake collective efforts throughout the process. I argue that this hope, mainly forged through certain affective loyalties, moods, and moral emotions (Jasper, 2011), provided bases for the ‘emotional liberation’ of the individuals (Flam, 2005), emboldening them to join and stay with their political actions (Pearlman, 2013). In her discussion on the micro-foundations of the Arab Uprisings, Wendy Pearlman (2013, p. 401) accounts for such a process in Arab Spring that resembles that of Gezi:

What uprisings across the Arab world held in common, and what distinguished them from the past, was the dramatic transformation from dispiriting to emboldening emotions evidenced by large portions of the population—especially those who had never before participated in public resistance. Repression generated an indignation that gave energy and courage to resisters. Emboldened by uniting with others and hopeful about the potential for change, people intensified their demands to the once unimaginable overthrow of the regime. These emotive experiences were not simply calculated or organized. Nor were they a mere byproduct of structural or strategic conditions. Rather, they helped change those conditions by propelling people into the streets and thereby altering—suddenly and shockingly—the balance of power between regime and opposition.

Underlying this explication, she argues that “a dispiriting emotional climate might be transformed into an emboldening one, and the social power unleashed would be tremendous” (Pearlman, 2013, p. 394). Although I agree that some emotional climates may have emboldening or dispiriting effects, I have substantial concerns with her conceptualization of emotional climates and their implications. First, although she argues that “emotional climates are more amorphous moods that endure within a collective over time” (Pearlman, 2013, p. 391), her discussion does not trace any endurance or amorphousness. She specifically focuses on how abrupt changes may create cracks within the existing dispiriting emotional climate and give rise to certain emboldening emotions that drive people to mobilize. In this sense, she singles

out a set of ‘reflex emotions’ that enabled this mobilization. Jasper (2011) defines reflex emotions as “fairly quick, automatic responses to events and information, often taken as the paradigm for all emotions, such as anger, fear, joy surprise, shock and disgust” (p. 287). Although I agree that such reflex emotions have also been important in the cracking process of Gezi, I am skeptical of the extent to which these emotions can constitute an enduring emotional climate that extends beyond the time and space of the protests. In this sense, whereas emotions of surprise, shock, anger, and joy have been influential in the emergence of the crack and provided bases for the development of an emotional climate that extends beyond Gezi, the development of an enduring climate has been made possible by the effective loyalties, moral emotions, and moods that are reproduced by the abovementioned collective efforts. On the other hand, this emotional climate was amorphous as with Pearlman’s (2013) emphasis, whose boundaries have been altered by the subsequent political interactions in time. In the following chapters, I will discuss how these boundaries are being reshaped by the interference of a new emotional climate that arose with the impact of growing authoritarianism. Although this new emotional climate started to override the emotional terrain of the preceding climate that Gezi gave rise to, I will also contend that the affections of the preceding emotional climate can still manifest themselves. That said, while I will unfold the characteristics of this emotional climate in this chapter, it should be noted that it carries an amorphous character.

Throughout this research, I identified certain moral emotions and affective loyalties that had been integral to building and sustaining a hopeful mood that are characteristics of the emotional climate for an emergent subjectivity. To begin with, Jasper (2011) defines moral emotions as “feelings of approval or disapproval (including of our own selves and actions) based on moral institutions or principles,

such as shame, guilt, pride, indignation, outrage and compassion” (p. 287). In the vibration process, whereas the indignation of the activists had continued to be expressed through concomitant protest events and collective prefigurative experiences, it was accompanied by senses of approval forming a sense of belongingness to their collectivities. This sense of approval is comprised of compassion through solidarity ties and practices. While solidarity ties have been an important source of compassion within the collectivity, it was also aimed at securing the autonomy of the individuals, providing a sense of approval for their own selves and actions. I think, evoking a sense of autonomy for the individuals may also correlate with expressions of indignation, as this sense allows individuals to have trust in their political actions against their grievances. That said, it can be argued that these moral emotions were arising affective commitments to their collective actions and organizational milieu. Basically, activists liked what they have been doing. They undertook political actions with a certain joy, comfort, and elation. It did not appear as a burden or as an instrumental responsibility that they have to fulfill apathetically. This point also indicates their taste in certain tactics and organizational forms and contempt regarding the others, as I will show in the next parts with reference to the instrumentalism of the socialist organizations.

Overall, I think that this set of emotions is intertwined and reproduced by an emotional mood of hope that is integral for an emotional liberation for the emboldenment of political actions. Jasper (2011, p. 287) defines moods as “energizing or de-energizing feelings that persists across settings and do not normally take direct objects; they can be changed by reflex emotions, as during interactions.” I argue that these abovementioned sets of feelings embodied an emboldening mood of hope, which was interacting with anxiety reflexes. Besides,

with the increasing authoritarianism that was already underway, activists' grievances and strategic interactions evoke certain anxious reflexes and, at times, work as 'emotional batteries.' As Jasper (2011, p. 291) states "an emotion can be strengthened when we explicitly or implicitly compare it to its opposite, just as battery works through the tension between its negative and positive poles." I think that the interaction between hope and anxiety was, at times, influential for activists to seek organizational persistence to sustain this hope throughout the vibration process. However, as I will discuss in the next chapter, this interaction is to be transformed as anxieties have grown into a persistent mood because of the growing authoritarianism and led to an ebb and flow between anxiety and hope that embodies the experience of different forms of hope. For now, considering the phases of crack and vibration, this interaction seems to produce an emboldening hope that "can drive defiance despite strategic disincentives" (Pearlman, 2013, p. 392) and is integral for emotional liberation.

That said, emotional liberation refers to a certain articulation of emotions that "removes blockages to protest, including a shift of affective loyalties from dominant identities and institutions to protest-oriented ones, reflex emotions of anger rather than fear, moods of hope and enthusiasm rather than despair or resignation, and moral emotions of indignation" (Jasper, 2011, p. 296). More specifically, emotional liberation refers to a reinterpetative process, where activists come to identify their individual experiences and social surroundings in a different way that is more conducive for them to engage in political actions. In a sense, it can be argued that this reinterpretation paves the way for a transformation of 'individual grievances' into 'mobilizing grievances' that may account for the conditions of such emboldenment. According to Snow (2013, p. 1): "Mobilizing grievances . . . are

grievances that are shared among some number of actors, be they individuals or organizations, and that are felt to be sufficiently serious to warrant not only collective complaint but also some kind of corrective, collective action.”

The vibration after Gezi fostered such a transformation into mobilizing grievances through a persistent process of emotional liberation, whose memories may also partly reach out, as with the amorphousness of this climate, until now. Throughout this process, emotional liberation occurs through “detaching loyalties and other positive emotions from the institutions and organizations to which they were hitherto attached. Emotional liberation includes one’s emotional transformation, relaxation and cutting of the old emotional attachments, and the construction of new emotional bonds” (Flam, 2005, p. 31).

As argued above, the emotional liberation of the activists was made possible by the emergence and reproduction of the emotional climate by prefigurative practices throughout these phases. If to emphasize again, I think that this is related to the cracking of the antecedent quotidian experience of time by the critical juncture and formulation of new spatio-temporalities by prefigurative political experiences. I argue that these political actions help to maintain an autonomy-seeking, if not autonomous, spatio-temporal experience to confront and transform dominant social relations. As these experiences constitute a life experience that diverges from the existing form of social relations from where activists’ grievances stem, it seems to indicate ideational future possibilities to overcome these discontents and to experience and feel fragments of these possibilities in the present. It can also be argued that this experience resonates with “the desire to have an effect on the world,” which is one of the important affective motivations of individuals (Jasper, 2011, p. 291). In this sense, in addition to the reproduction of the emotional climate, it can be

argued that prefigurative practices also have an independent power to contribute to this liberation. Overall, the emotional liberation amounts to an ideational and affective reinterpretation of the existing reality, which is enmeshed with individual grievances, towards developing a challenge by turning these into mobilizing grievances against the prevalent order.

As Flam (2005, p. 4) suggests, emotional liberation can be discussed with reference to two elements. First, “particular emotions and feeling rules which social movements construct to accomplish the emotional re-framing of reality, with the other being on the structural preconditions leading to individual emotional liberation.” Second, “movement emotions towards opponents and then on movement emotions and feeling rules in order to persuasively demonstrate that these have significant structural and action consequences.” It can be argued that these two elements correspond to the implications of the emotional climate that is reproduced by the prefigurative practices of the activists. Furthermore, it implies that emotional liberation occurs interlocked with the ideational processes in cognitive liberation or strategic interactions: this process “of cognitive-emotional liberation is not to be understood as a single moment of enlightenment but rather constitutes a never ending process for many activists” (Flam, 2005, p. 32). As in our case, thinking of emotional liberation as a continuous process becomes important to elaborate not only on the initial dynamics characterizing Gezi but also on conditions that are in effect in its aftermath. In this sense, discussing emotional liberation with reference to the characteristics of an amorphous emotional climate may be of value to trace this course, which ultimately embodies a sustaining legacy.

I think that the abovementioned framework also connotes Snow’s (2013) emphasis on the transformation of individual grievances into mobilizing grievances

through a process of interpretation. Snow (2013, p. 2) argues that “the key . . . is not merely the presence or absence of grievances, but the process of grievance interpretation, which has been theorized and analyzed empirically in terms of framing processes.” However, he exclusively focuses on the cognitive mechanisms to develop shared meanings of grievances in this sense. This view has been contested by various scholars that put emphasis on the interactions between affective and cognitive mechanisms (Simmons, 2014; Jasper, 1998; Jasper, 2010; Bray et al., 2018). This process of interpretation should be seen rather as constituted by both of these dimensions, as with Flam’s (2005) emphasis on cognitive-emotional liberation. Within this direction, I will show how reflex emotions to these individual grievances they face in daily life interact with moral emotions of solidarity, compassion and a sense of belongingness created by prefigurative practices, transforming them into mobilizing grievances. Besides, I will seek to identify the ethical and political attitudes of the activists to these grievances, through which they link these reflexes with broader ideational interpretations. This, on the other hand, may signal the ideological character of an emerging subjectivity that seeks autonomous ways of being through confrontation with certain intersections of authority structures.

As emphasized above, the deployment of this subjectivity did not come in a single moment of enlightenment but through certain processes. In this sense, processes within the vibration phase were differing for groups. It is possible to identify three general courses I observed throughout my research. Groups, such as Migrant Solidarity Network and Collective 26A, that was already existing preceding Gezi had been empowered within the vibration process and have grown their operation into a multiplicity of sites. Istanbul Anarchy Initiative, Food Not Bombs, Northern Forests Defence, Abbasağa Park Assembly, and Caferağa Park Assembly

were established in the earlier phases, whereas Kadıköy Cooperative, Istanbul Zapatista Coffee Coordination, and infIAI were established in the later phases of the vibration process. In addition to these, BİRARADA, Kadıköy Solidarity Network, and Barber for Everybody were rather special cases, as these groups were formed with the effect of new disruptive events. I think that these cases represent how memories of the initial crack, and the emotional climate that was developed afterward, can be still influential for activists to build solidarity ties, organizations, or undertake collective actions even in the very later periods. As these groups take on different courses, the strategic interactions and challenges they faced during the vibration phase are also variant. As the vibration implies a process where structural opening gives its place to the resettlement where other actors and structures realign as well as the emotional climate readapt, strategic interactions proceed to be increasingly important. Nevertheless, in this chapter, I specifically sought to delineate an explication to single out certain enduring characteristics that might have paved the way for the sedimentation of a new subjectivity. Therefore, instead of focusing on the strategic practices of a specific case, I will outline certain themes to uncover certain important dynamics and interactions for this endurance subsequent to an explication regarding the abovementioned framework.

Within this direction, following the identification of the development of activists' grievances in relation to the emotional climate, I will take a glance at how activists proceed with prefigurative strategies and ideological expressions. I will, first, focus on strategic incentives in their interaction with the increasing authoritarianism and different structures of authority that they seek to confront. In the first place, ideological public manifestations of the activists seem to allow more room for them to avoid government repression. Nonetheless, activists claim to be

aware of the limits of their manifestations, who may face increasing repression after trespassing; so, they seem to strategize accordingly. This can be related to them being a new political actor, whose actions are yet to be detected by the government so that it can align accordingly. Besides, strategic implications of collective and organizational practices to defer such threats can also be presented. Whereas prefigurative solidarity practices may help to cope with the dispiriting emotional effects stemming from the increasingly authoritarian practices, prefigurative organizational practices provide flexible and experimental ways to adapt to the changing environment. Furthermore, it enables activists to confront the intersection of authorities at the same time, by allowing them to prefigure different future social relations along with each other. As these provide a glance into a part of these actions' strategic implications, a further glance into their positioning vis-à-vis other strategies and tactics may provide a more comprehensible account. In this regard, I will focus on the activists' understanding of instrumentalist strategies of certain socialist organizations in the remaining part of the chapter. This explication may also hint at how their solidarity actions are also engrained as political actions with a certain ethical and political disposition that rests on the embracement of the autonomous individuality of the people.

4.1 Emotional climate in and after Gezi

Above all, the emotional climate in and right after Gezi Protests has been one of the most influential conditions that formed a basis for the proliferation of prefigurative political actions in Turkey. It can be said that there has become a shared emotional atmosphere among activists engaged in prefiguration right after the protests. This atmosphere was what has been enabling in the first place as it turned into a lasting

emotional climate, providing activists with certain freedom with which they can undertake political actions with more courage and creativity. In this sense, it opened up the way for activists to launch their relatively new tools of prefigurative politics:

I think you were able to realize what you imagined to some extent, and of course, it was very satisfying. Something very encouraging. Something very joyous. It's something that makes you feel like you live the world you imagine even if just for a bit. You could shape your daily life according to it. Not only the Food Not Bombs but also the solidarity networks were very strong at that time. (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

We were dreaming; finding our friends; discussing and, it was just happening. Of course, it was also challenging but it was happening. And that gives people something amazing: "I can do something different; I can live in a different way." (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

These expressions describing the emotional climate after Gezi, in a way, remind us of a sense of euphoria of autonomous expression, i.e., a certain emotional liberation. Activists seem to be driven more by the enabling feelings of hope, solidarity, joy, and courage, despite the indications of a recent upsurge of authoritarianism in the political climate as well as in their daily lives. In this sense, these feelings have been primarily enabling for those who sought to initiate prefigurative political actions and organizations, as the interviewee states. These senses developed great self-confidence and a sense of hope that they can achieve their future goals here-and-now.

This climate was mostly cultivated by the prefigurative practices in Gezi Park and the massive character of the protests happening around that time. The memories of these both have remained alive throughout the period after Gezi, reaching even until very recent times. Activists often expressed that the social relations within their organizations are reflective of these memories and feelings. In this sense, these have been significantly influential in different activists' subsequent engagements with prefigurative political actions to the extent that they initially sought to develop

similar environments within their own groups. Their activities were born as an extension of these experiences, which in turn become essential for them to sustain. Moreover, these memories seem to have been influential in times of further shocks and disruptive events, providing bases to develop solidarity ties, as in the case of BİRARADA after they faced dismissal from their job; and to undertake individual prefigurative political actions, as in the case of Barber for Everybody. Whereas an interviewee from the first group referred to their actions as a certain appendage and reinterpretation of the practices and values of Gezi, the interviewee from the second group explains how the experiences and knowledge she gained from Gezi have been influential in her personal trajectory that ended up in establishing a prefigurative space.

One source of these feelings and memories was the prefigurative practices within the park. The prefigurative practices in the park have brought a sense of hope that different social life, of another world, can be possible and is already experienced in the park. These practices, in the first place, have shown that social relations within the park can be organized in a more egalitarian way than the dominant values and ideas in daily life. Experiencing such social relations has been so much influential for the activists that its taste has been lingering for so long:

I think that we took our feeling “if we imagine and endeavor for it, we can make a part of it real” based on there. Because in that place, people built a small urban garden; also, an infirmary, and a market for free goods; staying in tents was already possible; when someone played music, instantly everyone was gathering around... As if it was a semi-magical thing: you desire, you act, and it was just happening. It was a bit like a fairy tale land. Not to lose this feeling gives very much strength and creativity to oneself. Because when you lose that feeling, you come to be unable to imagine. Then, I don’t know, you can just open a banner or read a press statement at most. Haha! You would then even consider yourself lucky to be able to do that in this atmosphere. But, I mean, your activities would not diversify. (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

It was not only important for them to experience social relations different than dominant values in daily life. Activists also had the chance to experiment with various new activities and tools which they come to embrace as more effective vis-à-vis different repertoires of action. It can be argued that this may also have grown a certain sense of hope that these new tools may work better to act against grievances. As it will be shown in the following parts, activists' dissatisfaction with certain repertoires of action and strategies was also influential in their resort to prefigurative practices. This sense seems to have developed first with the practices in the park. Nonetheless, prefigurative practices in the park cannot be thought of as independent of the massive character of the Gezi Protests. If these practices developed a joyous environment in the park as well as a sense of solidarity, these had been complemented by the effect of mass protests, where there had been a certain pluralism in terms of the worldviews, values, and tastes. A vast number of individuals and collective groups were acting altogether in harmony and that was a considerably encouraging incident. Overall, these senses have been influential for activists to participate in prefigurative politics after Gezi. When I asked about how he first came to be engaged in a collective, an interviewee summarizes these points :

We are talking about a large crowd who are already fed up with the state and its oppression; and they are gathering all together around other common big themes, although they think differently. And this crowd has really made people feel that they are not alone . . . In fact, adding on to its crowdedness itself, I felt that Gezi was crowded with many different people and many different thoughts. This was very important. Apart from that, even though Gezi subsequently fell under state control, the atmosphere in the Gezi continued in the locals and the neighborhoods. Neighborhood assemblies were organized; people with similar views gathered in parks and gardens and tried to maintain the assemblies – that they practiced in Gezi – in their neighborhoods or places closer to their homes. This process, that way of doing politics was tried to be sustained. In this context, there was such a political atmosphere when I met Collective 26A, and I saw that the things that were expressed in Gezi, communion, solidarity, and the practice of another world in Gezi were also carried out in 26A. (Interview 10, Collective 26A)

Similarly, activists often refer to the character of protests where there were people with manifold ideologies and world views, being able to act collectively. Such pluralism seems inspiring for activists, as they sought to develop this sense further in their engagement with the prefigurative practices and organizations following Gezi. The sense of belonging arising out of being a part of this diversity was special for many. This sense was also reflected in their subsequent engagements with prefiguration:

One of the crowning glories of the Gezi Protests was that it made everyone feel belonged. That's why it has grown bigger. Think of leftists, say, anti-capitalist Muslims, HDP, CHP, etc. Concomitantly, when people saw that it was a space where they can belong, it grew a bit. Kadıköy Cooperative also makes me feel the same a little bit. (Interview 5, Kadıköy Cooperative)

So, that was one of the beauties of Gezi. You are in water that is constantly flowing, and it is unknown who is yet to come just next to you in a second or a minute. It is not clear with whom you are just about to talk. So many different perspectives. I am wondering when you will be able to be in such a prosperous structure, in such a rich social atmosphere once again... I mean, maybe I still experience a much weaker and tiny form of it. (Interview 6, BİRARADA)

More specifically, this sense of belonging implies more than just belonging to their own communities with like-minded people, sharing identical lifestyles, ideas, values, or tastes. Activists seem not to be fond of a sense of belonging to a rather closed community in this sense. Instead, what they were cheering for was a sense of belonging to the whole of society, with all of its pluralism.

This sense of belonging was cheering because people from such diverse backgrounds could come together in common reference points to act collectively and establish solidarity with each other. The solidarity among people, in this sense, was integral to this sense of belonging. This seems to have nourished activists' hope for a future society where people could act collectively in harmony by establishing strong solidarity ties with one another. This sense of hope that was first sprung with the

protests has lasted until recent prefigurative practices. If not on a mass scale, activists sustain this hope by building solidarity ties within their own groups. In this sense, it can be observed that the initial emotional atmosphere in the park has been reproduced by activists through their prefigurative political actions:

Yes, I was in Gezi. Actually, it evoked feelings that are similar to my experience in the cooperative. It felt empowering, and of course, the common feelings that arose in many of us; you know, being able to meet around that least common denominator, to come together and do something for it. It felt really nice for me. Also, it wasn't really something like I have ever experienced before. It was only after the Gezi that I participated in collective organizations first, of course. These collective organizations, actually, have increased after Gezi, it's also about that. It felt good to experience it. As I said: empowered, common, solidaristic. Everyone there was helping each other; supporting each other as much as they do for themselves or sometimes even more than they do for themselves. Everyone taking care of each other, without knowing who they are... Since such things were unordinary for us, they felt really elating. (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

For example, when we think of the beginning of the pandemic and the conditions underlying the establishment of the solidarity network, it was a matter of keeping each other alive. We can say that the solidarity spirit of Gezi was reflected there. (Interview 8, Kadıköy Solidarity Network)

It should be emphasized that activists differentiate these solidarity relations from “dominant” solidarity practices within the society that may reinforce certain hierarchies. When asked about their understanding of solidarity and its difference from the other forms of solidarity, activists often express its prefigurative political aspect. For them, solidarity occurs between equal parties different from charity work. As charity sustains a hierarchical relationship between the one who offers and the one who receives, activists express that they seek to defer such a relationship. In this sense, this is also reflective of their future envisions. Activists see the parties of solidarity as autonomous and equal individuals supporting each other as they envision a society where social relations are accorded with such an understanding of egalitarianism. That is to say, it does not imply a unidirectional relation of solidarity but rather a mutual one. In this sense, this relationship aims at reserving autonomous

individuality of the parties, while establishing collective or intersubjective bonds. This nuance has also been another important aspect that has been reflected in the solidarity practices of the activists. Once again, activists state that they inherited these practices and senses from the emotional climate in and after the Gezi:

It was a culture with a sense of solidarity, that does not marginalize any individual, in which everyone is equal, everyone really 'is.' You know I said I feel good here in the cooperative; that's why it was the same. As I said, everyone was supporting you without questioning who you are, nor would anyone say "I don't know who you are" and left you in the corner. Everybody was acting together. It seems to me that a culture with a strong sense of solidarity and inclusivity was created. And people probably – especially those who haven't tasted it before – have seen the fact that "Yes, such a thing can be possible!" Because they tasted it there. Maybe that's why such political groups have increased. Inasmuch as there is no such environment, the spaces where you can experience this will be limited, or not so many people will be able to experience or feel it. Because when you feel it there, you say "Oh, there is such a thing!" and then you realize that something else is distressing you; that something is missing... (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

In sum, it can be seen from the abovementioned explications that feelings of joy, sense of belongingness, solidarity, and hope have been influential for activists engaged with prefiguration during and after Gezi. In turn, these feelings arose a certain sense of hope for a better society, which activists sought to sustain in their prefigurative practices afterwards. In this sense, one of the underlying reasons behind their engagement with prefiguration comes from the enabling effect of these emotions. Such solidarity provided room for activists to express individual tastes, views, and values, while, at the same time, facilitating them to build collective bonds as well as collective actions, with a certain sense of belongingness. These senses overall seem to have fostered a sense of hope that they can achieve their political ideals in the future and now. Inheriting these feelings from the environment in and after Gezi, activists sought ways for clinging to these feelings through their prefigurative practices. Yet, the need for such refuge did not come from these

feelings themselves. As authoritarianism started to make its presence felt more, the anxieties of the activists started to come to the forefront.

In this sense, feelings of hope, solidarity, joy, and belongingness were not alone within the emotional climate after Gezi. These were accompanied by feelings of anxiety, fear, or anger as a response to the growing authoritarianism, as well as its reinforcing effect on the already existing social inequalities. As these were a part that drove people to be a part of the Gezi Protests, they were also in effect in people's subsequent experiences and involvement in the prefigurative practices:

After all, if the AKP hadn't been so authoritarian and oppressive; interfered in our lifestyles; narrowed people's lives with its economic policies during the Gezi period . . . But they don't know or realize that, as long as Erdoğan is in charge, you will come here to organize, if not today but tomorrow, if not tomorrow but the next day. Because he came to power as the representative of the moderate Islamic regime and as the implementer of neoliberal policies; he came to do these. In other words, if your condition did not change in Gezi, it would change now. And now we are in a huge swamp together. (Interview 8, Kadıköy Solidarity Network)

In this sense, anxious feelings grew bigger with the impact of increasing authoritarianism as time progressed. People started to feel deeper anxieties as the authoritarian government proceeded to consolidate itself. It can be said that these emotions, in the beginning, were so laid aside by the feelings of hope, solidarity, joy, and belongingness that they could not override the overall emotional climate right after Gezi. Yet, it does not defy the fact that certain anxieties have already been there. And besides, it can be argued that these anxieties were partly contributing to the flourishing of these prefigurative practices, as activists were concerned about the future course of their actions. Although activists may not have felt such anxiety mostly regarding their present actions, for feelings of hope, joy, solidarity, and sense of belongingness were outweighing, it cannot be denied that they had certain anxiety for the future. In this sense, while clinging to a certain hope seems to be one of the

influential reasons behind activists' engagement with prefiguration, a search for sustaining this hope seems to have been accompanied by a sense of anxiety and fear:

Such an atmosphere of companionship indeed. Solidarity... It was a really beautiful incident where we perceived what can be possible, that what we imagine is possible. It was a short time, but not too short actually. There was enough time to feel the hope and to understand. That's why it was so beautiful. It was a hopeful and joyful time, but there was also fear and stress, of course. Because it was among an unending state of violence, where we had been receiving bad news from not only Istanbul but also from Ankara and the rest of Turkey. In this sense, it was a process that brought two emotions to coexist, of course. (Interview 2, Kadıköy Cooperative)

Although these statements single out one of the sources of anxiety and fear as that is related to the government intervention in the protests, it was not the only one. Some of the activists also had concerns with the spontaneity of their actions in and after Gezi themselves. While they acknowledge that this spontaneity has brought creativity and flexibility that allows for adaptability to the changing conditions in the political environment, they were anxious about the possible results of a lack of organization and coordination among the political subjects in the park:

But there was another side, of course. I think it was very uncontrolled. On the one hand, that's a good thing, that everyone can do whatever they want. But we were very well open to all kinds of attacks and all kinds of things. We didn't have any defense. Like, they dispersed us whenever they wanted. There was such a situation that is both organized and disorganized. Uncontrolled. So, it is something worrying. Yet, it's not just about the attacks. Something a little more structured in itself, now that I think about it, would have been much healthier. (Interview 2, Kadıköy Cooperative)

Similar concerns seem to be echoing even in the consequent prefigurative practices, although not all of the prefigurative organizations were able to deal with these anxieties appropriately. Anxiety that accompanied hope led some to find ways to make their actions more continual and their organizations more sustainable. In this sense, it can be argued that this anxiety may have partly contributed to a search for undertaking prefigurative actions in a more organized and coordinated way. When successful, these organizations may develop ways to last long; whereas, otherwise,

the internal organizational problems and external pressures may have led some of the groups to dissolve. Still, certain anxiety seems to have been important to deal with the limitations of such spontaneity at least for some. Overall, such anxiety was in effect for people developing prefigurative organizations and to sustain themselves, when these concerns could be dealt with success:

Growing an inspiration to go beyond the methods of consciousness towards using one's intuitions... That was the Gezi spirit, maybe. Because when talking about the method, governance is getting involved, hierarchy is getting involved; those who have more knowledge about the method begin to find the right to give orders from above to those who will bring the method into force, etc . . . But it works until one point with such a vagrant spirit. There should be another yield after a certain point. Then you need to turn it into something institutive . . . After a certain point, when you say "I will continue on my way through friendships, my heart, and intuition" by putting away institutionality, being systematic, and the dream of a method, it remains very romantic. After a while, the number of people who will continue this enthusiasm until the very end does not exceed five. Institutionality takes a group as far as it can go. You would also recognize that. So, the question is how do I find the balance between these two... (Interview 6, BİRARADA)

Thereof, these anxious considerations that were accompanying hope had a bolstering effect at times. For certain activists had certain anxiety and fear for the increasing social inequalities as well as growing repression because of the government policies, they sought to step up this hope by seeking ways to institutionalize in a way that they can secure ideational and affective bases of the Gezi. This was also because they were concerned with the extent to which their strategies and organizational structures can handle the effect of growing threats. Therefore, it can be argued that such anxiety or fear might have had a fueling effect in their search for building and sustaining hope. In the next chapter, I will specifically delve into the impact of this relationship between this anxiety and hope on the efforts to sustain political actions.

All in all, in this part, I outlined the characteristics of the emotional climate that emboldened activists to undertake and drive to sustain their engagement with prefigurative politics. While these characteristics enabled them to undertake different

prefigurative political actions in the aftermath of the encampment in the park, they also fostered attempts to maintain these actions through finding ways to institutionalize different organizational practices and cultures. Besides, these were indicating the main pillars through which activists have been turning their individual grievances into mobilizing grievances throughout the subsequent processes. In order to elaborate on these grievances and the ways that were resorted to mobilizing them, I will now focus on the ideological and strategic considerations of the activists that are enmeshing with this emotional terrain.

4.2 Confrontation with the intersecting dominant authority structures

Activists engaged in prefiguration in Turkey did not merely have discontent against the increasingly authoritarian government policies but also against different sources of dominant social and political authority structures. They have come to be engaged in prefigurative politics to confront different concerns that are stemming from the penetration of these authorities in their daily life. These concerns include but are not limited to social inequalities arising out of patriarchy and heterosexism, permeation of neoliberalism in labor relations and governance, certain anthropocentrism that disregards the ecological ways of organizing social and natural life, or a discomfort with the anti-democratic ways of organizing social relations. Although these all point out a heap of more specific concerns that could be branched out further, I think that, overall, they point out a discontent against the inegalitarian ways of organizing social life. In this sense, even when individuals put forward a specific issue as a source of uneasiness, these intertwine with one another and, ultimately, seem to incur a search for autonomous ways of being.

The discontent of the activists engaged in prefigurative political actions cannot only be understood with reference to their ideological opposition to more macro policies. As emphasized above, it can be argued that such discontent initially develops upon individual grievances, where they confront such policies, measures, and practices in their personal or social daily life. Adding on to the ideological underpinnings of the individuals, as these confrontations have a multidimensional negative effect on their affections, future envisions and daily social relations, individuals seek ways to stand against them. It can be argued that prefigurative political actions intertwine with the ethical and political dispositions of the activists and provide certain strategic implications to utter these commitments by turning these individual concerns into mobilizing grievances.

To begin with, a certain reaction to capitalist, or neoliberal, labor relations stands as one of the most significant contentions activists had. These relations spring from a structural basis that concerns the general organization and regulation of the capitalist social relations and their relationship with the state. This forms a part of activists' grievances – they apprehend that their participation in the labor force is part of a bigger structural concern. Therefore, they express certain ideological opposition to that very organization, while, on the other hand, this discontent starts from their individual experiences in daily working life. If ideological considerations account for one part that leads activists to undertake political actions, the need for intervention in these daily discomforts is yet another part that can be considered beyond ideational cognition. These experiences are in part what leads activists to search for ways to overcome such discontent and prefigurative political actions seem to provide emotional and strategic possibilities in this regard. For instance, an interviewee from

Kadıköy Cooperative sets forth his discomfort in his working life as one of the reasons behind his engagement in the group:

I am a software engineer, working since 2010. In a 10 years amount of time, since I have been working as a white-collar worker from 8 to 5 every day, something got piled up inside me. I was hateful anyway being a white-collar, this kind of a plaza life and the people there. I was in a period of my life when I was looking for a way out. (Interview 5, Kadıköy Cooperative)

At the time I was about to join Kadıköy Cooperative I was fed up with this plaza life and being a white-collar. Because capitalism is such nonsense that it has total control over people; yet, it also makes them think capitalism is good, after one point. As I have been stuck inside this carelessness, I started to get quite angry and exhausted. (Interview 5, Kadıköy Cooperative)

As emphasized above, these feelings can be seen as concomitant to a broader understanding of how labor relations are structurally organized nationally or globally. It could be said that these individual experiences intertwine with these broader understandings as they turn into political actions. The anger, tediousness, or nuisance alone might not turn this grievance into political action, for these emotions are not expressed in a vacuum, independent of people's understandings. In this sense, how people make sense of the roots of their discomfort underlie them as they act against these grievances. People seek political actions not just because they have been having problems in their particular workplace, but also because these problems reflect a general organization of society from which they dissent. Such dissent results in a search for different ways of organizing social relations here in their daily life and in the future in the broader organization of social life. This search seems to find certain answers in prefigurative politics. Another interviewee deliberates on this connection, expressing how he could find relief in the group against his disturbance towards permeation of neoliberal social relations:

If we ask how I feel in daily life... I don't know, I mean I don't see the AKP in daily life. I see a bad atmosphere, but it is not mostly AKP that I think about. Rather, I can say that I am uncomfortable with the forms of organizations resulting from capitalism, and neoliberalism. In the end, it is

also a separate regime, a regime which has its own ideals, proposing a distinct form of citizenship. And what makes me breathe is, in fact, being inside a different experience from this. It is beautiful to be a part of what makes possible this different form of organization, together with people who have similar thoughts as you, that locates human beings and nature in a different position. But, as I said, I connect this with capitalism etc. rather than authoritarianism. (Interview 1, Kadıköy Cooperative)

These expressions reflect another commonality regarding the concerns of activists that are engaged with prefiguration. It could be observed that many activists' concerns are beyond the organization of the existing polity and its actions. It seems that they are not mainly concerned with the repercussions of authoritarian practices of the government, or they do not frame these repercussions as stemming mainly from this political source. Rather, they put emphasis on different social structures of authority that are in action and they raise their voice against these. Along with the impact of the current forms of capitalist relations of production, patriarchy, heterosexism and anthropocentrism are among other significant sources of authority that are confronted.

This also reflects activists' ethical and political dispositions regarding the character of prefigurative political actions at hand. Activists acknowledge the existence of the intersection of different sources of authority, as they engage in actions and build social relations against them. In this sense, discontent regarding capitalist social relations never comes in isolation from patriarchy, heterosexism, or ecological concerns and vice versa. Activists acknowledge that different sources of authority interrelate in effect and initiate their actions based on such awareness. For instance, an interviewee that operates a genderless barber shop, Barber for Everybody, expresses her personal experience with social inequalities that led her to open a place where everybody is welcomed without regard to their sexual identity and orientation, ethnicity, or any other status:

As a woman, on the one hand, the workplace limits you. They say that you are a woman, so you should do manicures. It is not only about the manicure actually, you should always stay in the background. Therefore, they constantly push you aside. I'm just mentioning the workplace... In the home, you are also being pushed aside. They say that you may learn the profession until you get married so that you can do your own job in one room of the house if your husband's job goes down. In fact, everywhere, you experience this as a woman. I don't say as a worker, not even the work itself, it is about being a woman. (Interview 9, Barber for Everybody)

The interviewee further expresses how she had been facing precarious working conditions, i.e. mobbing, illegal dismissals, or unpaid leaves, as she exposes that these are intricately with the fact that she is a woman. Interrelating with capitalist labor relations, patriarchal social relations arise certain grievances for her, which ultimately leads her to open her independent barbershop that seeks to promote gender equality and operates collectively, without a boss. Bringing together a broader queer perspective and an anti-capitalist stance with her personal experience, the interviewee engages in a prefigurative political action where she could overcome such discomfort for herself as well as the others:

It's not a unisex barbershop. It's not a shop where just men and women are welcomed. It is a hairdresser where all genders are welcomed; all are welcomed without regard to their gender, orientation, status, etc. We aspired it to be a shop where, either a doctor or a sex worker, everybody can come. We imagined a place where anybody would be able to come to, and nobody would feel uncomfortable. (Interview 9, Barber for Everybody)

Activists from Kadıköy Cooperative also proceed in a similar manner. Although the cooperative mainly focuses on the issue of 'food sovereignty' that aims to deliver justly and ecologically produced food for people, they also seek to provide a safe space for women and the LGBTQ+ community as well as to support their struggles. As you step into the cooperative store, the rainbow flag welcomes you at the entrance. Going through the shelves, there you could find many foods, natural hygiene, and cosmetic products as well as clothes coming from all around Turkey. Some of those products are presented to promote solidarity with different women-

only cooperatives, as well as with labor or ecology movements. Apart from the products, the cooperative also has a special fund to be delivered for the different struggles in need. The cooperative allocates a part of its profit for different collective actions or campaigns, such as for workers on strike, a protest camp against the construction of a gold mine in the Ida Mountains, or citizens fighting against a forest fire on the Aegean coast. Another interviewee in this regard expresses how their actions are concerned not only with food sovereignty but with an intersection of different sources of authority:

The cooperative, for instance, supports ongoing resistances. It makes contacts and operates as a platform in this respect. Actually, cooperative does this in any respect in a wide variety of issues from gender inequality to social equality and so on. It has an impact on everyone. We purchase plenty of goods from women-only cooperatives . . . There was an atelier whose owners ran away, Kazova Collective. You have Kazova's goods behind you for example. Next to it, you see Ovacık Cooperative. There, Ida Mountains' Solidarity, etc. I mean here is like a summary of politics in Turkey! So, it becomes a force that unites and provides a medium of communication, as well as solidarity, for all of them. Because here, we do many things. Like, we send aid to strikes or sometimes we go there in person. We went to the Validebağ protests for instance. I cannot say that the cooperative is a direct political figure in terms of its impacts. It can be, but now it is not. But I cannot also say that it is of no worth. It operates as an important catalyst. (Interview 4, Kadıköy Cooperative)

In a similar vein, the Food Not Bombs Istanbul collective shared a similar disposition before they were dissolved. The main concern of the group was to draw attention to the capitalist relations of consumption and production that causes global poverty and exploitation of nature. Questioning the consumption habits in the society, the group gathered foods and items that are considered waste because they do not look bright, fresh, or unused and are about to be dumped. Instead, the group recycled such items by cooking meals and distributed those meals in public places for free and presented other items in swap markets to reintroduce their use. Underlying these actions, there was a broader questioning of different forms of oppression in this sense. For

instance, in addition to their focus on changing capitalist relations of consumption, the group also sought to serve vegan meals as they paid attention to the liberation of animals as another source of oppression.

Apart from their actions aimed at reaching a broader public, the group also worked as a solidarity network where activists sought to develop more egalitarian relations with each other. In this sense, the group did not only proceed with anti-capitalist or ecological concerns but also stood against the dominance of certain values and ideas. They organized workshops that questioned the effect of patriarchy, heterosexism, or monogamy in romantic relations; they engaged in solidarity actions with different struggles that are concerned with issues such as migrant solidarity, urban rights, animal liberation, and preservation of different ecosystems. Overall, the Food Not Bombs Istanbul experience also reflects that activists' engagement with prefigurative politics stems from their discontent with various sources of authority.

Until now, I have put emphasis on different sources that activists are fed up with, but one of the most important has remained unvisited. Namely, the increasing authoritarianism in Turkey. For more than a decade until now, the increasing authoritarianism has had many ramifications in different spheres of social and political life. The government has taken steps to restructure the political organization of the state, while it also sought to permeate its own values and ideas into the society through education, religion, or non-governmental organizations. This incurred tremendous and ramose changes in the social and political democratic organization of the society as well as in individual lives. In this sense, it could be stated as another source of grievance, interrelating with and reinforcing the grievances stemming from all of those mentioned above. As an interviewee underlines, it can be argued that activists are:

concerned with authoritarianism as something that reinforces and deepens everything we worry about. (Interview 1, Kadıköy Cooperative)

It could be said that activists are ideologically concerned with the dominance of different structures of authority that interrelate and lead to various social inequalities in the first place, while at the same time they think that an authoritarian polity has been deepening all of these inequalities. In this sense, it may be argued that they are rather concerned with the practices resulting from the increasing authoritarianism because of its reinforcement of the existing social and political hierarchies in many different spheres of society. Hence, activists are concerned not only with the measures that settle authoritarianism in the current polity but also with the ways in which this permeates into the daily lives of people as they produce and reproduce existing social inequalities by reinforcing the dominance of certain ideas, values and actions. As this permeation makes its presence felt in various domains of social life, activists vocalize the need for a resort to different prefigurative political actions, for example, to establish a specific solidarity relationship:

Actually, I really don't want to think about the political atmosphere of Turkey! Well! I mean, my life has been packed with a struggle against AKP . . . All my youthhood, all of it... My life has been packed with the struggle to get rid of this government since the day it came to the power. I can say that I postponed, and awaited most of my dreams. Why was it that important? As I said, I grew up in a neighborhood, it has its own culture and you can see how the policies of the government change your whole life and the development of your history, past, future, and the present . . . Until now, this government has wiped off every beautiful and good thing existing in this society, every historical and social aspect of it. It wiped off the solidarity culture between people. Everybody is after individual salvation now . . . We need each other a lot. Independent from our political views, we need each other. A lot... (Interview 8, Kadıköy Solidarity Network)

Thereof, as a response to these growing social inequalities and anxiety regarding their future lives, activists seek ways to protect themselves from these immediate threats so as to be able to reverse these social inequalities in the future. For this task, prefigurative politics comes to the forefront as one of the tools with which people

can develop their autonomous initiatives to build solidarity with each other in the present moment so as to confront these inequalities in the future as well:

Now, at this point, we are divided among those who hold the power and the remaining, those who are stolen from themselves. This happened independent of what political party we voted for. Right at this point, capital holders and those who use power in defense of them are on one side; and the oppressed, the poor, workers, women, those who are excluded from society, transgender people, homosexuals, and immigrants are on another... It is clear as black and white that the polarization and taking stances in this society are composed of this. So, what will happen there? In order for the government to consolidate itself again, all kinds of aggression will be deployed . . . Therefore, today, we are in a time where we need these solidarity networks more than ever. I am in such a need. As a woman, and as an ordinary citizen. (Interview 8, Kadıköy Solidarity Network)

This understanding admits the part that authoritarianism plays in terms of reinforcing the impact of different authorities; however, activists also see these social inequalities as rooted in different sources of authority in the society and not only from this authoritarian political center. In relation to that, they do not only seek to act against the authoritarian policies of the government but also against the effects of these different authorities that are eroding egalitarian social relations. In this sense, it can be argued that there is a shared understanding among these activists that social change can be pursued through developing a certain autonomy of the individuals and their organizations. Such autonomy seeks to confront both of these sources at the same time by becoming more independent of their implications. Activists often refer to how they would like to keep their organizations independent of the effects of different authorities. This may hint at the reasons behind their engagement with prefiguration, as prefigurative political actions can be a way of building such autonomous relations. Such autonomy may be sought through developing egalitarian relations in the organization, building safe spaces, decision-making in a directly democratic manner; and also, through strategic decisions for not being co-opted by different political parties, municipalities, or the broader constitution of dominant

social relations. Furthermore, this understanding seems to float in their future envisions, as many of them refer to their ideal society as a place where such autonomous organizations cooperate and organize social life in harmony.

Adding up to these, it should also be noted that there is no common and strict overlapping agreement among prefigurative activists on how to reach such ideals. In this sense, there is a variety of strategic or tactic articulations as well as actions, and practices that may be seen as more favorable by different activists engaged in prefigurative politics. For instance, some were standing for a rather clearer program for a radical political change; some other emphasized more of the political practices that should be done focusing on the present moment, abstaining from resorting to a political program or a broader strategy; while, some another was emphasizing the need for a strategy to coordinate between these different autonomous group that might, in the end, bring about a radical social transformation... Hence, although the future envisions of their ideological underpinnings share a certain commonality regarding their position against different authorities, activists' perspectives differ in terms of strategies, tactics, and actions they could mobilize to attain such social and political change on a broader scale. Among such variance, prefigurative political actions stand as only one of the tools that they resort to for developing social relations that are more autonomous from these authorities. To single out each of these different tools and the way in which they are articulated in different strategies for the specific groups would be beyond the scope of this research. Although a glance at these specific articulations may be of explanatory value to make sense of the proliferation of these specific prefigurative politics after Gezi, within the scope of this dissertation, I will only focus on the strategic implications of prefigurative political actions in a rather general sense.

4.3 Strategic importance of prefigurative political actions: flexibility and experimentality

As emphasized above, prefigurative political actions have come to serve as diverse strategies, tactics, or actions to challenge disparate authorities as well as the growing authoritarianism. Prefigurative actions may provide a certain strategic refuge for the emotional, intellectual and physical oppression they have been facing resulting from the permeation of these practices. While prefiguration of egalitarian relations and the solidarity in groups enable activists to build an environment where they could be more autonomous from dominant social relations, prefigurative political actions may also help to cope with the distress coming from living in such a political climate where people constantly have to face repression. For instance, when asked about the reflections of such a political environment on her mood, an interviewee expresses how her engagement in a prefigurative politics interacts with this mood:

This oppressive environment causes trouble, of course. There are situations where we all get distressed. But it does not cause a considerable problem in the cooperative. Because, on the contrary, in the cooperative, we feel in such a way: “Yes, we are all overwhelmed by that, but we can find a solution when we bunch up somehow!” Actually, we do not suffer from this situation within the cooperative, as there is always this feeling that we can do something about it. As far as I know, no one really has a problem with this. Because contrarily, it is rather approached with a more empowering, more solidaristic orientation. (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

These words reflect how prefigurative politics may provide an empowering environment where activists can sustain different political actions despite the growing oppression. Activists find emotional relief in such spaces, as well as a proper basis through which they can undertake or support different political actions and express their ideological commitments. Prefigurative actions in this sense work as a suitable tool for those seeking to oppose different kinds of authority, who at the same time require a certain refuge from the emotional hardships of the political

climate. Although these hardships are not akin from just one source, growing and settling authoritarianism stands as one of the most important factors reinforcing these hardships that dispirit people from taking political actions. Henceforth, the emotional relief that these activists may find through prefigurative political actions stands as an important condition that leads them to engage in these actions.

Apart from the relieving effects of these collectivities, it can be presented other factors that allow for such refuge in prefigurative politics within an authoritarian political environment. This, in fact, pertains to public manifestations of the ideological commitments of the activists. In this regard, these groups themselves seem not to have been the central focus of the state repression because of their ideological stance and the use of rather an uncommon repertoire of prefigurative political action. For instance, an interviewee reflects on how they had been able to avoid harsh confrontations with the state power :

In fact, I think we've reaped the benefit of being an anti-authoritarian, anti-oppression group. Because when we unfurl a banner, it wasn't a banner of a leftist organization, so it could escape the attention of the police. So, I mean that they couldn't intervene that much, because they didn't know how to define us: "Okay, they are political; oh, but they also deliver food; oh, but they say things that should not be said." Until the pressure of the state of emergency grew, they were hesitating between intervening or not. They were just standing there for a while when we are doing whatever – film screening or press release in Galatasaray. Sometimes they would say "Go away!" Sometimes they would check our IDs; sometimes looking from afar and taking a photo. So, they weren't really creating a major obstacle. (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

As it can be observed, the group places itself in a different position than other political groups and asserts that they have rather more opportunities to act or to avoid repression. Although they may face relatively fewer of these interventions, it is also apparent that the increasing state repression still affects how they act. Thereof, activists also think that there are limits to their actions and ideological expressions,

which would result in their excessive repression if they would have trespassed these limits. Another interviewee reflects these concerns:

There aren't so many obstacles, especially, for the ecology movement in Turkey at the moment. The government doesn't put so much pressure on it. It butchers nature, that's different. I mean, people have been in Mount Ida for a year. Nobody does anything to it. Especially after Gezi, the state pulled itself away in this regard. It allows for these. Therefore, I don't think there is so much pressure on the cooperatives. Or, I don't think that there is much pressure on other organizations that struggle for ecological concerns. You can comfortably conduct political actions anywhere – as long as you don't exceed certain limits, of course... (Interview 4, Kadıköy Cooperative)

If a part of the understanding of these limits comes from the physical intervention of the state, it should be noted that it also comes from the emotional climate within which these activists operate. So, activists' moods can be presented as an important factor that may negotiate the boundaries of that limits. Finding hope in relief or joy, in this regard, might be what makes people resort to prefiguration as well as to extend the possibilities of their political actions. On the other hand, fear, anxiety or resignation might bring about certain limits by creating, reinforcing, or making people think that the limits are strong even though it may not always be the case. I will also extend to this issue in the following chapter.

In addition to these, prefiguration allows activists for expressing their discontent towards diverse authorities along with each other, while at the same time providing certain flexibility with which they can adapt to the changes in the political environment related to authoritarianism. Such multitudinous discontent indicates that the activists have a variety of aims which they seek to achieve along with each other, developing various future envisions for the course of society. Concomitantly, this coexistence defers a fixed or a singular path towards the attainment of these goals. Prefigurative political actions may give room for the concurrence of such diverse goals and methods, enabling people to reflect on social relations of different possible

future envisions in the here-and-now. Activists may prefigure different futures along with each other, as well as through their organization and collective or individual actions:

When someone shares their dream by saying “what if we will do something like that?”, we immediately start to talk about “yeah, can we make it come true?” (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

For instance, if I put forward a dream of mine for the future that we can actually work on together within the cooperative, and if I spend more energy and research on this, maybe the cooperative would direct towards it as a whole. Apart from the individual supports, maybe such things can be actualized . . . In other words, if someone brings it to a certain point, if someone encourages it, these are things that can happen. Actually, it's also nice to think about that. (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

In this sense, prefiguration allows for certain flexibility, creativity, and experimentality where activists can stand against a variety of issues, as they can seek to achieve different future envisions simultaneously. Apart from making room for the expression of plural future envisions, such disposition also allows activists to be flexible so as to adapt to the changes in the political environment. Activists seem to have more space for experimenting with these long-term future envisions as well as the short-term strategic choices, bringing about new actions, tactics, and organizational practices. That said, it can be asserted that such flexibility enables activists to sustain their actions despite growing or expected repression:

We tried a few creative things against authoritarianism, for example, combining the sewing workshop with the Food Not Bombs events . . . I think these were very joyful. Because anyone could do whatever they really wanted as long as they suggested and took charge. And I think it strengthens the movement. It was contacting so many different places. (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

If the appeal to prefigurative politics comes partly from the possibilities it offers to oppose the plurality of authorities as well as to express a coexistence of political ideas and values, another part comes from how these activists position themselves vis-à-vis different ideological dispositions and strategies, tactics and actions used by

different social movement organizations. This positioning comes, first and foremost, from a certain difference pertaining to the ideological beliefs of the activists. As it was mentioned above, activists put more emphasis on the autonomous initiative of the people for bringing about social and political change, even though there is no strict or common agreement on the articulation of strategies and tactics at hand. Yet, on the other hand, it does not imply that there is not any general understanding of why prefigurative strategies may be of value vis-à-vis other strategies. A glance at their reactions to different ideological positions as well as social movement organizations may make their strategic considerations more explicit.

4.4 Prefigurative politics vis-à-vis instrumentalism, once again

It can be argued that activists' appeal to prefigurative politics is also related to their reaction to instrumentalist ideas and practices of the socialist movement in Turkey. Although this reaction starts, first and foremost, from a rather fundamental ideological and strategical difference, it is also directed against the ways in which certain repertoires of action and cultural elements are embraced by the socialist movement. Although it may not be possible to single out each of these aspects within the scope of this dissertation, it can be argued that these reactions revolve around criticism of the instrumentalism of the socialist movement after all.

In the first place, these reactions remind me of Carl Boggs' discussion, where he identified a dilemma between instrumental and prefigurative tasks of a revolutionary movement. For Boggs, there were two tasks that have often been seen as distinct from each other: "the instrumental, which includes above all the struggle to conquer and maintain political power, and the prefigurative, which expresses the ultimate ends of the revolutionary process itself: popular self-emancipation,

collective social and authority relations, socialist democracy” (Boggs, 1977b, p. 359). As with Boggs, activists neither see these two as distinct from each other nor do they attest to prior importance for any. On the other hand, it is possible to trace different views in the socialist movement in Turkey attesting prior importance to the first, while the latter is instrumentalized to the extent that it could contribute to the success of maintaining political power. Although these views may differ and branch out in their emphasis on the relative importance of these two, this understanding seems to be floating in the understandings of activists in the socialist movement. With respect to that, activists often express their dissatisfaction with the political practices of the socialist movement stemming from such overemphases on instrumentalism.

The emphases of activists engaged in prefiguration may also differ, but it can be asserted that they rather tend to see these two as intricated with one another, where neither one nor the other has the utmost importance. Even though there are no strict commonalities regarding the specific strategies that these organizations use, there seems to be a broader agreement on the integrality of struggles in social and political realms. In this sense, the prior importance of, so to say, the political struggle for the socialist movement had many implications with which activists have discontent about. Activists often complain how different social inequalities are deemed of secondary importance or even overlooked, as the socialist organizations put more effort into growing their own political organizations so that they can reach a power that can confront, conquer and maintain the central political power of the state in the future. They see this aim as being so central for the socialist movement that everything else appears for them to be instruments to amplify this end. Prefigurative activists dissent from these views and were disturbed by their effects in

the aftermath of Gezi. While we were talking about the reasons behind the dissolution of some of the park assemblies that popped up right after Gezi, an interviewee uttered such concerns as one of the main factors:

I mean, there was something about certain political organizations... Actually, following Gezi, my observation about all these movements is like that, in general. Because these political organizations were concerned a little or not at all with all of that's happening, or because it wasn't their main concern. Instead of being involved and existing in it, they tried to add their own names and turn a hand to it. As such, it certainly had a negative effect. The movement in Gezi that was arising spontaneously was also affected negatively . . . I mean, also the park assemblies were affected that way. Yeah, it actually goes on like that. It's the same, the logic of self-inclusion in political organizations actually continues everywhere. But it, of course, had negative effects. (Interview 2, Kadıköy Cooperative)

As the interviewee expresses, socialist organizations did not pay enough attention to the self-emancipatory aspects of these neighborhood assemblies. Rather, each of them sought to instrumentalize these experiences in order to escalate the power of their own political organizations. Activists contend that this situation sparked a tight competition between different socialist organizations that are participating in the neighborhood assemblies to maintain control. This severe competition, at times, led the assemblies to split up into different factions. As a result, the competition for maintaining power within the assemblies undermined the autonomy of the people participating, for these organizations sought to instrumentalize this power on behalf of their organizations alone. In the end, where these tensions were coupled with different problems, the assemblies receded or got dissolved. Activists further express that their group, learning from this experience, took precautions so as to prevent dominance of similar attitudes within the group so as to secure their autonomy. Instead, prefigurative politics sought to develop horizontal institutions where people with diverse ideological views can express themselves and coexist in harmony. An interviewee exemplifies an encounter with socialist organizations in this sense:

Sometimes political organizations come here, but they come to transform this place, change it, and control it a little bit. In such a situation, they can't find a respondent in front of them anyway. With whom they should talk? I am not an authority here. They try to talk with the most experienced volunteers, for instance. These volunteers respond: "What can we really do? We want no chiefs or something here, so you came for nothing." That's the case. Above all, the left should revise its attitude if we are to establish an effective solidarity relationship. (Interview 4, Kadıköy Cooperative)

A certain dissatisfaction is also rooted in activists' understanding that the struggle to change the operation of political and social power does not proceed in two separate tasks, but rather is a one that is intertwined. For activists, practices proceeding from this separation disallows them to deal with certain social inequalities that are rooted in society, which they face in everyday life. An extensive focus on confronting and maintaining political power falls short of changing these daily social relations, which in fact was one of the most important sources of discontent for these activists. Hence, they take a certain distance to that separation in their actions. In order to grasp activists' understanding better, I addressed several criticisms to several activists from different groups that might possibly come from a view that holds on to this separation. One such criticism, without explicitly mentioning the socialist movement, was: "It has been argued that your activities do nothing but seek to emancipate yourselves instead of seeking to emancipate the whole society; that you cannot really elicit a broader social transformation; that you do not have a proper strategy to do so. Some of those also say that you are just a small circle of friends but nothing more." As a response, activists complained how this criticism overlooks that the struggles to change political power and to change the operation of power in daily life are two integrated tasks:

This criticism seems like it is separating the political struggle from the individual life . . . But everything is intertwined, actually. Well, are you going to politically fight for eight hours a day and then lead a completely different life? The aim is to integrate everything together already. That's why, I think it was a very important gain to be friends with the people there, for example, to

share these points for our own consumption or to call each other when one of us is in trouble. I mean, we had such a network for about four years, even though that network now has come to be thinner, include fewer people, and isn't that dense. And it's something that makes you feel safe, something that feels very empowering I think. Something that keeps you really alive.
(Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

In this sense, the struggle to maintain political power by itself is not sufficient to confront the social inequalities they face in daily life for prefigurative politics. As emphasized above, this can be related to their ideological positioning, where they acknowledge the existence of various authorities rooted in society. For them, as social inequalities are understood to be arising out of different interrelated sources, which are not always necessarily stemming from (but always related to) the political power of the state, challenging these authorities requires more than challenging the political power of the state. This requires another complementary work, mainly through the autonomous initiative of different individuals and collective efforts that would make an immediate difference in people's everyday lives. In this sense, the socialist movement's indifferences that may ignore the importance of such change are an important source of dissatisfaction. Another interviewee comments on this issue from her personal experience within one of the socialist organizations. After her discomforts within a socialist organization, the interviewee broke up with the organization and, in due course, has turned to engage in prefigurative politics. The interviewee explains her disturbance as the following:

After all that, you get exhausted because of the fact that you are so oppressed, that you are a woman, that you are a worker; because you are struck and laid aside as you are a worker, you are struck and laid aside as you are a woman. In fact, because you are constantly thrown into the background physically and mentally. Since you are fed up, someone shows up and says: "Come, I promise all of these to you." A political organization. And they say that "We will assert all your rights as a woman." As an organization, it says that "I will defend all your rights, as you are a worker." When you go to a feminist organization or a socialist organization, then you may experience the following: "Dear, you are getting so much tired, shouldn't you move to another occupation?" But, well, that's a sentence I already hear at my

workplace! Companions who want to take me out of capitalism and bring me to socialism also make the very same sentence. (Interview 9, Barber for Everybody)

Yet, activists' resort to prefiguration, in this context, by no means implies indifference to a broader social transformation. Rather, they see self-emancipation as a way to confront different social authority structures and this is integrally connected with providing bases for a broader social transformation. In this sense, self-emancipation does not solely refer to certain personal salvation that disregards broader implications. Instead of focusing on emancipating themselves on an individual level, activists are concerned with a social transformation on a societal level. They think that prefigurative political organization and actions may offer different possibilities to contribute to this change by penetrating daily life and directly intervening in grievances by providing immediate changes. Thereof, activists have concerns with an overemphasis on instrumentalism to the extent that it may become less effective to deal with these social inequalities permeating daily life. In relation to that, an interviewee states referring to certain socialist political organizations:

I can't say I have so much grip on the political party dynamics, but the fact that the cooperative has no leaders or owners makes all the difference, I think. Besides, it's penetrating into daily life. That's why I think it's very special. I think it's not something that political parties do very well. For example, within parties, there might be ecology branches, etc., but I don't think they are that successful. I don't think their concerns about consumption patterns reflect in the daily life very well... (Interview 1, Kadıköy Cooperative)

Furthermore, activists are also dissatisfied with the ways in which this instrumentalism designates socialist organizations' actions in daily life. These actions seem not to promote autonomous political actions of the individuals but rather to instrumentalize individuals to reinforce the power of their organizations. These concerns are also unveiled by another interviewee's personal experiences in a

socialist organization. After being a member of a socialist organization for several years, the interviewee left the organization and, eventually, come to be a part of prefigurative politics. When I asked how would he compare his experiences and feelings in a socialist organization vis-à-vis those in his current engagement in a prefigurative group, the interviewee expressed a turning point for him that roots in this difference:

For instance, when I came to the first meeting, even I was surprised. I am a person who believes in solidarity to the full extent, but... I have just met these people, we were having fun together, etc., and they invited me to their house immediately. (Interview 4, Kadıköy Cooperative)

What I am particularly surprised at is because of this: these people are, yes, in the end, organized around a political idea, but they don't just try to organize you into their own, they don't just want you to be recruited. After all, they are people who live their own lives and, at the same time, provide support for here. So you wouldn't expect that from those people: usually, political organizations are like "Let's call them right away, let them come to us, let's be friends and then recruit them." Theirs was not such an invitation, not such a call! It was quite a sincere invitation. You know, without expecting anything in return. This surprised me and I had never seen anything like it before, as I said earlier, when I was in such an organization myself. Yes, we were also inviting people home, etc. but it usually had a different meaning! (Interview 4, Kadıköy Cooperative)

As it can be observed the interviewee thinks of socialist organization's invitations as a disingenuous act in his prior experiences. The invitation for him did come as a warm request, with feelings of solidarity or because his individuality was specifically cherished. It rather had an instrumental motivation to recruit him to the organization and it seems to make him feel devalored individually. Yet, on the other hand, activists in the cooperative were not acting with such motive, but rather with feelings of solidarity that valorized his autonomous individuality. In this sense, if ideological and strategic considerations of the activists are one part that drives activists more into prefigurative politics, they also intertwine with their emotional implications.

That said, activists do not only have contempt for the instrumentalist ideological underpinnings, strategies, and organization of the socialist movement but also for certain repertoires of action and the ways in which these repertoires are utilized. Activists think that some of these utilizations may be worn, insufficient, rotely repetitive, dull, and therefore, at times, remain futile. In this sense, it can be argued that there is a general understanding that certain repertoires and tactics should be replaced or renewed:

Well, these conventional methods, of course, have all created themselves based on something. There were times when they were valuable, there have been places where we can do it. But that doesn't mean let's do them all the time, and that doesn't mean these are our only tools to organize. (Interview 4, Kadıköy Cooperative)

We need to have more knowledge than this political authority so that we can be in a position to destroy it, or at least regress it. Therefore, we need to change ourselves first and then our whole structure. Today, we cannot get anywhere with the methods of the 70s or 80s. We need to leave this thing, we need to change ourselves first . . . With these traditional methods, we are just to run shops or do the reactive reassurance for the day. (Interview 4, Kadıköy Cooperative)

In this sense, activists think prefigurative political actions may offer different possibilities. Yet, it should be emphasized that activists do not totally defer the use of different strategies or repertoires. They always consider prefigurative political actions along with the others. Possibilities that may arise out of combining prefigurative political actions with different repertoires might be yet another important factor that led activists to embrace prefigurative politics. Within an environment where already existing grievances are increasingly reinforced by an authoritarian polity, these possibilities seem to stand as of considerable value for activists. For instance, an interviewee discusses how prefigurative collective practices, such as community kitchens or consumption cooperatives, may be

articulated together with protest actions to act against social inequalities more effectively:

We can actually support each other by creating collective spaces against these current price increases. Of course, I'm not saying that we shouldn't do that either: this community may also oppose the price increases. This community may also protest for taking back our economic resources, which have been carelessly poured into corporations. It does not have to refrain from this, but it would also try to give over as little money as possible to these companies. Thus, this is also a defense. At the same time, in terms of women, for example, small women's communities can be established there to raise awareness against violence. This is also self-defense and solidarity as well. (Interview 8, Kadıköy Solidarity Network)

It can also be inferred that activists do not approach instrumentalist and prefigurative strategies as mutually exclusive nor as binary oppositions. Activists may also deploy prefigurative repertoires for confronting the political power of the state and its implications. In this sense, the contempt of activists regarding certain instrumentalism should not be understood as if they are avoiding the questions regarding the confrontation and transformation of political power. These reactions rather incline towards emphasizing the need to recognize possibilities of prefigurative political actions. Such an emphasis also makes sense considering the authoritarian context, where activists can be expected to have rather lesser spaces to undertake political actions and to face different oppressive measures. As activists frequently need to adapt to the limiting changes in the political environment, they may need to flex to accommodate themselves in the face of these limitations. As emphasized in the previous part, prefigurative political actions may provide certain flexibility and experimentality to adapt to the changing environment:

After all, there has been fascism in Turkey for a very long time. And today, with the presidential regime, this fascism completes its self-construction process and consolidates itself in this country. When we look at this situation, flexibility becomes a very functional thing considering people's fears and anxieties. These kinds of structures are not rigid organizations, you can very easily participate and leave, you can be a part or stay out of them, you can act according to yourself, and what you are doing is comforting and non-binding

for your individuality. These all are advantages for both the organizations and the individuals. Because when a person shows an attitude individually, it does not bind the whole organization. It's a plurality in here and there, how can I say... Let's say someone wants to do a more rigid political action, wants to go out and protest on the street, shout somewhere, wave or hang something from the balcony, etc. They all are political actions. Each of these constitutes a part of a whole. But each of these can be shaped according to the skills, talents, strengths, and courage of everybody. Therefore, such flexibility becomes an advantage. (Interview 8, Kadıköy Solidarity Network)

After all, prefigurative politics offer certain flexibility for organizational practices and culture as well as undertaking collective political actions that allow activists to penetrate more into people's and their own daily life while enabling emotional relief to cope with the limitations of the political environment. In this sense, along with strategic implications of prefigurative political actions, they also provide more room for the autonomous expression of activists' individuality and collectivity by developing radically transformative solidarity practices. In this way, if not only with the driving force of the emotional climate that was created by the Gezi, activists may find ways to sustain.

CHAPTER 5

THE EBB TIDE:

PREFIGURATIVE POLITICS IN A TIME WHERE WORDS FAIL

Today, activists undertake prefigurative political actions in an environment where they feel the impacts of the growing authoritarianism more and more. Such an environment is not only characterized by the government's direct physical interventions in the political actions of the activists, i.e. through protest bans or repressive measures, but also by an emotional climate that significantly affects activists' daily lives and future prospects. It can be said that the emotional climate that has been forged in and after Gezi Protests has significantly changed, especially after 2015, as the authoritarian character of the regime has gained a new character and momentum. In this sense, it is important to outline these changes in order to understand how activists sustain prefigurative political actions despite the growing authoritarianism in Turkey. Within this direction, before focusing on a specific case, of Kadıköy Cooperative, I would like to take a glance at the set of emotions that are shared among activists engaged in prefigurative politics within this environment.

In general, it can be said that the antecedent emotional climate has been subject to a substantial change until now. Although it is still possible to trace repercussions and memories of the feelings aroused by Gezi, the consolidation of the authoritarian regime has awakened feelings of anxiety, insecurity, fear, and loneliness that override the sense of hope that arose with the effect of the Gezi Protests. However these feelings are becoming more overwhelming for activists, it can be said that they seek to cling to feelings of solidarity, a sense of belongingness, and hope within their groups, which enables them to sustain their actions despite

these overwhelming feelings. In this sense, it can be argued that the emotional climate now is rather characterized by rather feelings of anxiety, insecurity, loneliness, and fear, but is still accompanied by a sense of hope that activists seek to keep alive through their prefigurative political practices. As we proceed with the sources of these feelings, it can be seen that these are not only stemming from the character of the regime, but also from the position of other political actors and social movements as well as the tensions within the group itself.

Still, growing authoritarianism can be posited as the ultimate source of this atmosphere. It has been not only stemming from the increased repressive measures implemented by the government, especially after the declaration of the state of emergency following the coup attempt in 2016 but also from its reinforcing effect on different social inequalities that activists started to confront more and more in their daily lives. As the authoritarian regime proceeded to consolidate itself, activists have come to be marginalized from the public fora, be it from organizing protest marches or sustaining their own public spaces. This can be seen as the continuation of the government's deliberate attempts to marginalize radical politics in daily life, which has been a process escalating since the eruption of the Gezi Protests. For it caused activists to lose contact with a broader public as they were seen as more marginal than ever, and the outcome led most of the activists to a deadlock. Now, they have difficulties undertaking collective actions in public places and reaching broader audiences to recruit new members and sustain their actions. This deadlock is, on the other hand, being reinforced by their internal organizational tensions and coupled with activists splitting up from their organizations either because of being burn-out, having to face severe legal processes, financial problems, or internal conflicts. As many different activist groups have been facing similar limitations, chances to

cooperate and emotionally foster each other has also gotten weakened. Besides, the initial changes in the antecedent emotional climate came along with a series of violent events, including suicide bomb attacks and armed conflicts. As it was mentioned above, the biggest shift in the shared emotional terrain of activists started in 2015 after when there have been many violent events. Since some of those were also specifically targeting different political groups, this spiral of violence has grown feelings of fear, anxiety, sorrow, and grief for many activists and considerably gave shape to the emotional climate they share today. Activists carry the intensity of these feelings even now and that is considerably influential in the ways in which people undertake political actions. Such traumatic incidents have inseminated such strong feelings beyond the verbalization of these feelings. They were and are still difficult to describe and express. In this regard, I realized throughout my interviews that activists have been relatively silent on talking about the affective implications of this period. Even sometimes, they did not mention any of these and this particular period at all, when not asked. As it was mentioned above, these feelings might have been so loaded that they become a gulp that got stuck on activists' throats. That said, it should be kept in mind that the effect of this emotional climate might be much more than activists express in verbal terms.

Overall, this climate stands as one of the most important conditions that affect the ways in which activists sustain their political actions. If to give a clue about this emotional climate, this climate characterized by fears and anxieties renders activists speechless and hopeless at times, restraining them to undertake any actions. On the other hand, a sense of hope and relief that activists could find in their groups' practices strives for opening up a space for hope so that they can sustain their

activities. In this sense, it seems that there is never a pure expression of either hope or hopelessness. Rather, there is always an ebb and flow between different feelings.

5.1 Where words fail

The new emotional climate is so intense that the emotions of the activists can only be understood beyond their words. Throughout my interviews, I sensed that activists have been staggering in different ways, in this regard. When I asked questions about activists' feelings regarding the general political climate, most of the time, I felt like they needed to step back for a moment to think or grasp these feelings after I pose these questions. Sometimes they expressed that they actually refrain from thinking about these in their daily lives; sometimes they slightly shifted to mentioning another topic; sometimes their flow of thought was not fluent as before; and sometimes they even laughed or had a grin on their face as a sudden, uncontrollable reaction. I think that this shows how emotionally loaded people are and could not easily express all of these feelings verbally, in a moment of time. Words of an interviewee summarize the gist of these points when I asked "how does the current political atmosphere make you feel at the moment?":

Uncanny... Well, now it's like... I really have the opportunity to go to France, they will ask about it too: What is going on, how do you feel? To be frank, I can feel so many things and I realize I have stayed silent for so long that it has assumed a form of a gulp that I cannot make myself to spit it out. Really, when I hear this question, I am lost for words. I just stand still. It's like, you can tell that I am not a person who has any problems whatsoever about speaking. But seriously, it compels me to answer this one. So many things have turned into sentiments and left unsaid... Here is the true meaning of this togetherness and synergy, you know? Thus, the gulp in your throat and the unspoken words that won't come out unless asked denote how much you have abandoned yourself to loneliness. It also means that you haven't released yourself within a collectivity. Me being around here has such a benefit. You speak, all the time. So, the highway between the concepts, words, and emotions is wide open. That place is non-clogged. But if you go lock yourself home and watch the whole thing without even commenting, that highway gets roadblocked, there happens an avalanche blast; a rock rolls

over... The traffic stream gets interrupted somehow. That's how I feel. But of course, I can say that too: I mean, unfortunately, nothing will change with a leap of consciousness. Something will change with the economic collapse, it seems. We will see together how big of an atrocity and violence would be unleashed depending on the extent of the loss of the government with this economic collapse. I foresee something like this. I believe rather bad things will happen with regards to this. But something... How can I put it? I told someone today... Well, if you would like the sun to come up, you have to deal with the rain once in a while." (Interview 6, BİRARADA)

In these expressions, it can be observed an oscillation between different feelings of anxiety, insecurity, hopelessness, and a certain relief, as well as hope. Although the interviewee expresses that the general political climate feels insecure and anxious, he also states that he could find some relief within their collective practices through which he can somehow negotiate with these feelings. Then, he turns back to a pessimistic interpretation regarding the future, in which there is still some sort of hope he tries to cling to. In this sense, it can be argued that there is hope in the present as well as in the future, although these two seem to take different forms. On the other hand, it goes the same with the feelings of anxiety which seem to be extant in the present as well as in the future. This, in a sense, differentiates from what people have been expressing in and right after Gezi Protests. After Gezi, there was hope in the present as well as towards the future, but the anxiety was concerning more with the present moment where people have been expressing certain reflexes. Anxiety was still accompanying a feeling of hope; however, as it did not have an overwhelming effect on the future prospects of the people, it could not override these feelings. People rather got stuck on to the feelings of joy, solidarity, and a sense of belongingness that brought about a sense of hope. For this hope was accompanied by a certain sense of anxiety, it has never been pure though. As with this hope, anxious feelings, today never come alone but rather together with a complicated agglomerate of different feelings. That is to say, it can be said that these feelings of anxiety cannot

totally erase feelings of hope. Nevertheless, as anxiety takes hold of the future prospects of people, it becomes a significant obstacle to sustaining hope. In this sense, people always have to negotiate between these feelings in order to pursue their actions. I think, that when they successfully negotiate with these feelings of anxiety, they can cling to an active hope that permeates both the present and future. On the other hand, there can be traced a dormant hope that awaits to flourish itself more in the future moments. In this sense, as mentioned above, activists today seem to be oscillating between two different types of hope that are active and dormant. I think this active hope comes to the forefront as an important aspect that enables activists to sustain their activities despite paralyzing feelings because of the current emotional climate. At times, when this active hope may give its place to a rather dormant one, it seems that it directs activists to standby for the future moments where they can hope and act actively again. Thusly, it is possible to trace the ebb and flow of these feelings in activists. In this regard, it seems possible to experience different genres of hope and this always comes with an interplay between different feelings.

5.2 The current emotional climate

As the insecurities and anxieties of activists grew bigger in such an environment, and it became difficult for many to find an active hope, some sought to find such hope in prefigurative practices. An interviewee outlines the general characteristics and the development in this context:

This oppressive phase is a period where everybody, every single individual in the society feels anxious. Besides the fact that every single person who is walking down the street is feeling uneasy, there happen explosions on the street, you can easily encounter police brutality. As of now, for the last couple of years or so, a night-watchman or a cop can lash out at you or impose violence. It is a period of perturbation for everyone because of the encounter with the anxious, state-fearing, tyrant condition and reality. Apart from that, it is a process that targets any individual or let's say activist that is present in

the demonstrations. As you know, there were explosions in Suruç and on October 10th, and people who died lost their lives during a demonstration. They lost their only lives during an action. They were directly engaged with a political action at that moment. Apparently, by practicing the increased number of operations, police busts, abducting political people after the protests, the endeavor of agencification; a compellingly overwhelming process for the politically engaged individuals emerged to a point where they feel under tremendous pressure, and they have to bite back at this point. (Interview 10, Collective 26A)

Apart from this interviewee describing the overall environment, activists also give more specific examples from their specific personal experiences. For instance, an interviewee explains how this process, of the shift in the general emotional climate, started around 2015 and peaked in 2016 with the declaration of a state of emergency. From these times onward, undertaking political actions has been surrounded by feelings of insecurity, anxiety, fear, and loneliness:

Personally, it felt risky. Because I was a clerk back then and when I clocked out for the day, where I worked was fortunately in Tepebaşı, I would take a hike to Tarlabası and go to the demonstrations after participating in the preparation to distribute the meal. In fact, some coworkers of mine saw me participating in Food Not Bombs, and it was on the news around 2015. But if it happened one or two years later, it could have begotten different results. Therefore, personally, it made me feel rather uncanny as I was in the civil service. I was trying not to be conspicuous during the press releases but still, I was attending them. Indeed, I believe it generated anxiety in all. I mean, it already takes a lot of labor . . . Other than that, we had to specify a plan in case of the police showed up. Maybe in 2014 or 2015, a passerby or a friend of a friend or the people who did not even engage in politics would come and say “Ah, how nice what you’re doing...” Whereafter 2017, it is how it is now. You can’t just while away around either Tunnel square or Galatasaray Square. They won’t even let you hang around at the Mis corner. So, the participation of people who aren’t from this political entourage has declined. Even we can barely go out. Another person who is as clean as a whistle... For them, it turned into a way of borrowing trouble, in my opinion. This ceased our contiguity with larger crowds of people. (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

Although this interviewee describes her feelings around that time, these feelings have also come to be engrained in today’s political actions as well. Besides, activists do not only carry these feelings while they are doing political actions, but they also have to confront them before they engage in any action:

In such a bad time where there are this many political factors, where many women are killed, a lot done against LGBTs, where there are such terrifying incidents... Opening up this store in such agendum... All this time, we ask ourselves when every time LGBT is attacked, every woman is assaulted: would our store also be ransacked? There were big incidents during and just before this Pride Week. When these happened, we said to ourselves that we are also at the forefront, will something happen to us as well? If something happens, will someone from the street definitely help? But why would they help us? We said we would help ourselves when the chips are down. (Interview 9, Barber for Everybody)

This also shows how this environment is being moulded by the government's repressive measures targeting the collective mobilizations or organizations, which in turn reinforces the feelings related to the prevalent social inequalities. Activists also feel insecure or anxious in their daily lives preceding any political actions regarding these. It was emphasized in the previous chapter that activists do not think of these social inequalities are mainly stemming from the government or its authoritarian character. Rather, they are concerned with how these are being reinforced by its very character. Although they tend to understand the sources of these concerns ideologically in this way, it seems that emotionally they are more concerned with this regime or the government itself. This does not only reveal itself in one specific sphere, as with patriarchy or heterosexism but seems to permeate all spheres of daily life, another one being economic:

This authoritarian regime is reflecting these economically in the same oppressive manner. People's shifts have increased, their purchasing power has exponentially decreased, more mobbing, more things... Indeed, most people's problems originate in the economy and these problems are also related to the mobbing they experience there. Since I did not experience much mobbing and did not suffer many financial difficulties, I wasn't terribly affected by these events. But since the people around me have their fair share of it a lot, of course, I am affected; so, I am participating in the Kadıköy Cooperative and I feel the need to produce a discourse against these things. (Interview 5, Kadıköy Cooperative)

Overall, increasing repressive measures, the spiral of violence, reinforced social inequalities, and the resulting eroded emotional climate significantly alter activists'

everyday lives and strategic considerations. Repressive measures reduce their possibilities to organize collective actions and events in public spaces, whereas this is also fueled by the anxiety and fear that is now taking hold of their general mood and dispiriting them to undertake political actions. This sometimes results in some activists to drawback from activism. As more activists drawback, the active groups come to be left with lesser resources as well as lesser motivation to sustain their actions. Within this framework, the number of active groups decreases, possibilities to cooperate with like-minded groups and coalesce around common campaigns weaken and people lose chances to emotionally foster each other. Thereof, activists face lesser opportunities to develop more empowering emotions and strategic advances in their individual and collective interactions with each other. In this sense, this stands as yet another intensifying dispiriting effect on the mentioned emotional climate. After all, this situation brings a sense of loneliness for all:

There were a lot of people who were left out when the movements got narrower, without a doubt. There are many people who withdrew from there, who didn't want to be there in the first place, who couldn't find a place for themselves, or didn't find and didn't even seek. Now when I reflect, what are the people in these old movements doing these days? They must be getting by and getting on with their lives. Again, some of those who have remained their affiliation are within those institutionalized structures . . . Some of them work a little bit now and then but there are also too many people who retreated to the safety of their homes . . . Of course, there is also isolation involved. That feeling of being together was injured by... By the pressure that emanated after Gezi Protests. But later on in 2015, a much graver restraint started to hurt it. I can say that this goes for (not only the ones I know but also for the ones that I don't know as well. (Interview 2, Kadıköy Cooperative)

As these developments bring more and more difficulties for activists to deal with in their daily lives, they now need to be more concerned with such difficulties they face in their individual spheres. For activists, this does not only hold for themselves but also for the general public as well. So, some of the activists tend to think that many people have to focus on their individual concerns, or so to say their individual

salvation, instead of undertaking more collective actions. If this view might not be shared by all activists, I believe that it provides a glimpse of activists' understanding of this emotional climate, which is also characterized by a feeling of loneliness.

Activists tend to think of themselves as lonelier than before as with the other people in society. That said, these result in restrained interactions not only with each other as well as possible allies but also with the broader public:

But it wasn't like it back then. You could transform anything you touched, even if it was just a notch. Hypothetically, say we would have knocked on the doors of an apartment and said, "This Wednesday we do something like that." They would have joined us. Now, perhaps there is more and more distance between people and everything? Is this what happened as a consequence of the fading of these movements? Or I don't know if it's rather rooted in the climate of this country, but... I mean before I think we rendered every place our own, spatially. (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

Although the sources of loneliness might stem from the abovementioned developments, this is also related to the activists themselves, who, in fact, have the power to negotiate with these feelings in the process of emotional liberation. Yet, as many people start to feel or think in these dispiriting ways, these feelings might begin to be expressed in a rather recurring fashion. When the possible ways to negotiate such feelings are not there or fall short, these feelings could lead people to drawback from undertaking political actions. That said, this complex interplay on different levels of interactions ends up as a significant obstacle in front of the emotional liberation of the individuals themselves. Even if these feelings are mainly caused by the character of the regime, it can be argued that the understandings or feelings of activists can stand as self-limiting as well:

When you lose that feeling, that grip on the basic feeling of trust, which can perhaps be summarized as: "Maybe if we try and imagine, we can do at least a part of it," it shrinks itself. Of course, there are many external reasons to think so but, in the end, we abandon this feeling inside us. (Interview 7, Food Not Bombs)

That is to say, individuals, their collectives, or other political groups can be different sources where these feelings are being reproduced as self-limiting. It should be recognized that emotions are not just imposed upon them. Both individual and collective political actors participate in this process as subjects. In this sense, this reproduction proceeds through different interactions on the individual as well as collective level. It, on the other hand, seems difficult to identify where to draw the line, as activists face many external limitations within their own group as well as in their interaction with other actors. As the overall emotional climate led many activists or groups to drawback or cease to exist, the active groups also have difficulty cooperating, coping with repressions, and negotiating with such dispiriting feelings. These, in turn, lead them to operate in a rather narrowed field, with lesser organizational resources and future envisions:

Well, more precisely it reflects more like this: you need a colorful and lively environment outside so that you can relate to them. We have hit a sticky patch in terms of establishing this relationship because that dynamic and lively thing is not there anymore. There is no such field existing outside the cooperative. The previous flow is gone. Therefore, there's only whom you know... What you do... You can only communicate with the people you already know and your own environment. For example, you lose that idiosyncratic colorfulness. You eventually lose that diversity. This hinders your growth. But for instance, if we look at my own feelings, I sometimes feel restricted to the bounds of the cooperative: I mean, we can't have the necessary discussions, we can't extend them, we can't be more effective. It's a little bit about that too. (Interview 2, Kadıköy Cooperative)

After all, activists are not wholly dragged by the dispiriting affects of the emotional climate. Rather, these shared emotions are always in negotiation with their ideological and ethical dispositions as well as with different emotions. While their ideological dispositions may allow them to override certain dispiriting effects of this emotional climate; on the other hand, the expression of their ideological dispositions through political actions remains always surrounded by these feelings. In this sense, there seems to be an interplay between and within different emotions as well as

ideational considerations. That is to say, the dispiriting impacts of these feelings can be somehow negotiated so as to sustain activists' political actions. This negotiation, at times, occurs through the prefigurative practices of the groups.

5.3 Finding hope when 'I see no future'

Overall, this narrowed environment did not only affect how activists position themselves within this current environment. It also affected their future prospects and envisions. Activists now tend to think that there are lesser future possibilities for themselves to undertake collective actions and also to pursue a better life for themselves. When asked about how they feel about or think of their future, many activists expressed that they see no future for themselves. This also reflects the ways in which activists feel hope. As it was mentioned above, this comes as an oscillation between an active hope for today and a dormant hope regarding the future for activists who are still engaged in prefigurative practices. It should be noted that this distinction does not imply a clear-cut separation, as there seems to be always an interplay between different feelings and their forms. For instance, an interviewee reflects on how their present organization gives her hope:

This established structure makes me elated. The rules and the other things are clear, and it's not domineering. This egalitarian but settled institutionalization is one of the things that please me. Well, it's nice, I mean, a lot of new people come and go, who don't know each other at all, and there is always an opportunity to communicate with these people very easily. In other words, five different individuals that are not quite similar to each other can really come together in a harmonious way. And the relationship they form can be very friendly, which is a good thing, I would say. It is indeed a hopeful thing. (Interview 2, Kadıköy Cooperative)

Yet, on the other hand, when asked about "if the present actions appear to be futile," another interviewee from the cooperative explains how it sometimes feels futile but

at the same time these actions appear to be important because it is anticipated that they are somehow important for the future:

It certainly does! But rather... As I just said... It's all about looking at the glass half full and half empty. Because I mean, I sometimes feel like "Oh, what are we doing? Among all that is happening, is that what we're concerned with? What a nonsense!" Of course, the steamroller feeling of "What a nonsense!" Because, really... I don't know, sometimes one feels something like: "Let's change much bigger things and have much more radical transitions and movements." Of course, you can't operate like that under current circumstances. I mean, that's why I reflect on it, but at that point, a day or two later, I say, "But look, you're doing all these, and it's not by no means a trivial thing. Wait a minute, stop there! Don't be fooled by such manifestations in the world. Hold on a minute. Little things do matter." Then, when I conceive things from the other side, and I proceed to I say "No, it's not futile. These are important matters." I relieve myself as such. It goes on and on like this. Though it really haunts me back sometimes. (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

In this sense, even though activists see no future for themselves they sustain their actions within such an oscillation between different forms of hope they feel towards the present and the future. This oscillation seems to bring about a negotiation for the scope of their feelings of hope. Temporally, it comes to swing between the present and future moment. Spatially, it focuses on the individual or local level. These are also surrounded by an ethic for changing social relations within such space and time. This ethic commends that the changes within the individual or local geographies might be meaningful for the individual as well as for the society, in the future if they cannot be today. When asked about their future, activists express that they do not see any future; nevertheless, at the same time, they feel certain hope that seems to be in oscillation:

Well, I don't see a future. Maybe America or something... I don't know... You know... But... Do I think about it? It's just that... I start thinking about it as you ask. Will I come back after? Of course, these are the things I constantly consider, but... It looks to me like some of us should stay somehow and that something must be done. It's not very much like remorse, but my whole life, the things that I have attached meaning to, are here. I mean... This authoritarianism etc. brings anger in me as well as boredom, and it also fuels and revitalizes me to change things. You know, without uttering

such big words. Slow-wise, gingerly. That is, by changing the relationships between people in a local scope. (Interview 1, Kadıköy Cooperative)

I see no future! Hahaha! Well, it really is... I mean, completely from my personal perspective, I have a lifestyle that doesn't require much thinking about the future anymore . . . This is how I progress in most of my life. Because I am really of the opinion that there is no such thing as foreseeing the future for it doesn't happen the way you see it anyway. I get very, very angry. I really don't have much to say. I don't know how to express it. But there is nothing for me to embrace the future with hope in these mainstream things. To put it in another way, that's actually the reason why I tend towards alternatives. Since I don't have much faith that we still can change things completely, I am in a hurry and desire to have a world, at least as an alternative to it, that is suitable for me, a world in which I can roam freely. (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

5.4 Oscillating hopes

On the one hand, an active hope finds a certain relief in the present moment actions with a belief or understanding that these actions provide more possibilities to better off the present and future social relations. In this sense, the present actions appear to be promising for today as well as for the future. On the other hand, a dormant hope seems to abandon such possibility for today. It rather tends to have a belief or understanding that things might be different in the future. So, present actions might not be promising but, in the future, there might be a time when their future actions can make social relations better off. In this sense, it seems to urge people to standby until that time, when they can grow their hope and political actions bigger. In disjunction with these, hopelessness seems to abandon any possibility in today as well as in the future. At its most extreme, hopelessness commends that any action is futile for the present or the future moments. Yet, although hopelessness incurs a sense of futility, it does not necessarily evoke a sense of desperateness. As the feeling of hope may have a specific object depending on its spatial and temporal location as well as the individual's ethic through which this hope(lessness) is

processed or negotiated, it might not lead to a complete paralysis for undertaking actions. In other words, hopelessness does not seem to be a state of mind or a mood that conquers the individual without regard to in which space or time s/he is living in. It is always targeted with respect to a specific space and to a specific time, even when it takes up one's future time. In this sense, it cannot fully conquer one's possible geographical as well as future locations. An individual can move in time and space. In time, the individual can go either to the past to the hopeful memories, or to one's utopias which can be located in the very present and the future. In space, the individual can basically move to somewhere else. And in terms of ethics, the individual can form different meanings for time, space as well as hope, and its object. Basically, even though an individual might cease to have hope on a specific thing, s/he might have in another time and space, also with a different meaning on the hope itself and on this specific thing. In this sense, what comes to be identified as hopelessness in the verbal sense may be beyond its verbal expression in the present moment, which can connote different meanings and feelings. Hence, I come to question whether the expression of the feeling of hopelessness amounts to the total lack of hope or to an agglomeration of different feelings that override hope.

Overall, activists engaged with prefigurative actions sustain their political actions within such an oscillation between different types of hope. Within the scope of this research, this oscillation stands as one of the answers to the question of how undertaking political actions can be possible within an authoritarian regime, despite all the limitations it brings through repressive measures, ideological penetration into the daily life and, connected with all of the repercussions of these, emotional burdens it brings. I am specifically focusing on how activists within Istanbul seek to sustain their prefigurative political actions with such an oscillation within a political

atmosphere that is increasingly designated by a political environment that is characterized by an authoritarian regime. As I sought to outline above, the emotional terrain of this environment is characterized by the actions of the government, other social and political actors, as well as those prefigurative activists and their groups. Until now, I focused on activists' understandings and feelings regarding the actions of the government and other actors that make up this political environment. Now, the discussion on how a certain hope is developed stands as another significant part to make sense of this questioning.

As mentioned before, this environment led many activists to such a loaded emotional state that they could not fully address their feelings, at times. Within such a limiting environment, sustaining their political actions have been utterly difficult. Despite all of these difficulties, many activists seek to sustain their political actions, so the ways in which they sustain their actions deserve attention to answer the abovementioned questions. In this sense, I will now focus on a specific case, of Kadıköy Cooperative, in order to make sense of how activists sustain prefigurative political actions within and despite this political environment. An activist from the cooperative states:

This oppressive environment causes trouble, of course. There are situations where we all get distressed. But it does not cause a considerable problem in the cooperative. Because, on the contrary, in the cooperative, we feel in such a way: "Yes, we are all overwhelmed by that, but we can find a solution when we bunch up somehow!" Actually, we do not suffer from this situation within the cooperative, as there is always this feeling that we can do something about it. As far as I know, no one really has a problem with this. Because contrarily, it is rather approached with a more empowering, more solidaristic orientation. (Interview 3, Kadıköy Cooperative)

CHAPTER 6
SEDIMENTS OF THE TIDE:
KADIKÖY COOPERATIVE AS A COUNTER-CONDUCT

In this chapter, I will seek to identify characteristics of a subjectivity that sedimented as a legacy of Gezi with reference to the case of Kadıköy Cooperative. As I identify ethical and political dispositions as well as strategic considerations of this subjectivity, I will specifically focus on the organizational practices of the cooperative. While these organizational practices are crucial in the making of this subjectivity, they also come to the fore so as to make sense of how this subjectivity operates within the current emotional climate I described earlier. Throughout this explication, I will try to be attentive to the emotional terrain that underlies the abovementioned characteristics of this subjectivity in this current period. In this sense, I will emphasize how this subjectivity can be sustained by negotiation with the anxious affections created by the climate. This negotiation seems to occur through an ebb and flow between different forms of hope that are active and dormant. I would argue that this oscillation embodies an ‘anxious hope’ that accompanies activists’ political actions, though vulnerably.

6.1 In search of autonomy

In this framework, I identify the emergent subjectivity as an autonomy-seeking one, if not autonomous. I think that the political actions of the activists in the cooperative embody a social experience that strives for certain independence from the dominant authority structures. Although the publicly manifested goal of the cooperative revolves around the transformation of dominant production and

consumption relations within the society, collective actions and organizational practices of the group extend beyond a uniform goal. Collective solidarity actions and organizational practices of the cooperative indicate that they do not only seek to develop egalitarian relations via prefigurative political practices in order to confront dominant capitalist social relations or ecological deterioration, but also to confront a variety of authority structures. In this sense, the cooperative seeks to be autonomous from the impositions of an intersection of various authority structures related to patriarchy, heterosexism, domination of nature as well as increasing authoritarianism. This confrontation unfolds in an intertwined process of opposition to these dominant social relations and creating new egalitarian forms of social relations. Central to this is the prefiguration of their desired future ideals here-and-now. As prefigurative practices of the cooperative tend to create more egalitarian social relations, it evokes a social experience that stands in opposition to these dominant relations. Yet, these new social relations can never be fully independent, as they are surrounded by and experienced through these dominant structures. Activists always need to confront them, not only by creating prefigurative experiences but also within prefigurative experiences themselves. Hence, there seems to be a constant search, if they are to seek autonomy.

In relation to that, I argue that this subjectivity can be elaborated with reference to the concept of ‘counter-conducts.’ Counter-conduct can be simply defined as the “struggle against the processes implemented for conducting others” (Foucault, 2009, p.201). Foucault (1982), clarifies what this process entails as:

Perhaps the equivocal nature of the term conduct is one of the best aids for coming to terms with the specificity of power relations. For to “conduct” is at the same time to “lead” others (according to mechanisms of coercion which are, to varying degrees, strict) and a way of behaving with a more or less open field of possibilities. The exercise of power consists in guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order the possible outcome. (pp. 220-221)

In this sense, the exercise of dominant power relations is to be understood as ‘conducting the conduct’ of the subjects, a conduct upon conduct, whereas counter-conduct is the resistance against the ordering of these possibilities of action. It can be suggested that this framework refers to the two types of conduct in which the first corresponds to the actions in terms of the exercise of dominant power relations (putting the possible outcomes of one’s actions in order) and the second refers to the action towards the exploration of the possibilities of alternative and autonomous forms of being, confronting these ‘the ordering’ actions.

Davidson (2011, p. 27) identifies forms of resistance that can be associated with counter-conducts as having a double dimension: “They are movements characterized by wanting to be conducted differently, whose objective is a different type of conduction, and that also attempt to indicate an area in which individual can conduct himself, the domain of one’s own conduct or behavior.” The first of this double dimension, the objective of the counter-conduct, refers to “the will not to be governed thusly, like that, by these people, at this price” (Foucault, 2007, p. 45). Simply, it is an expression of the will that one does not want to be governed by a dominant authority structure. The latter dimension, of counter-conduct, refers to the search for autonomous ways of being for the individual through a certain process of ‘self-care.’ Self-care refers to the process where “one attempts to transform to develop oneself . . . to attain certain mode of being,” (Foucault, 1997, p. 282). For Foucault (1997), the underlying concern with self-care is that: “The renunciation of the self will be the prime form of the care of the self” (p. 288).

Foucault argues that individuals are subjected to the orderings of dominant authority structures, which limit their possibilities of action and direct them to think, feel, behave, or act in specific ways, i.e., creating certain conducts for the

individuals. These constitute a set of dominant social relations that individuals interact with. While these dominant social relations are produced and reproduced through different institutions, they are also transmitted through individuals themselves, who are constitutive of these very institutions. In this sense, although power relations constrain and construct individuals' actions, and direct them to act in specific ways; individuals are also subjects of this process, constraining their own selves as well as each other. Basically, individuals are subjected to and are subjects of power relations; thereof, they are both being conducted and are conducting. In this sense, self-care is to renounce the actions of dominant authority structures that subject individuals to and that individuals are subjects of. It is a call for a continual critique of oneself and the way one relate to others, of the ways in which power relations constitute individuals as specific subjects. That said, counter-conduct "is an exercise on self on self; it is a sort of close combat of the individual with himself in which the authority, presence, and gaze of someone else is, if not impossible, at least unnecessary" (Foucault, 2009, p. 205).

With this process, the one steps towards an autonomous re-making of oneself and engages in "a whole new attitude, way of doing things and being, and a whole way of relating to morality and civic life" (Foucault, 2009, p. 204). Davidson (2011, p. 32) summarizes that:

Counter-conduct, political and ethical, is an activity that transforms one's relation to oneself and to others; it is the active intervention of individuals and constellations of individuals in the domain of the ethical and political practices and forces that shape us.

Yet, on the other hand, it should be emphasized that this activity puts forward the necessity of continuous critique of one's own subjectivities, as these subjectivities have already been constituted by power relations. As Death (2010, p. 239) states, counter-conducts may work "paradoxically, to reinforce as well as to challenge

dominant power relations . . . Thus there is no grand refusal, only dispersed and shifting points of resistance, or forms of counter-conduct.” Besides, as counter-conduct itself implies the development of another conduct (that is, *countering-conduct*), it may create its own limitations. Hence, counter-conduct does not imply a single moment of emancipation after which one can be autonomous, but rather a search for autonomy through a continual criticism of oneself.

Within this framework, I identify Kadıköy Cooperative as a counter-conduct that makes an autonomy-seeking subjectivity possible. In the existing scholarship, Death (2010, 2016), Pourmokhtari (2017), Çabuk Kaya & Ural (2018) focus on protest events with a counter-conduct approach, while Nişancıoğlu & Pal (2016), Rossdale & Stierl (2016) and Ertuğrul (2022) single out the embodiment of certain counter-conducts by certain prefigurative actions. All of these works focus rather on events that last for a shorter period of time. Building on them, by focusing on a rather more lasting collectivity, I will elaborate on the prefigurative practices and organizational dynamics that make a counter-conduct possible to be sustained within the current political context in Turkey.

The counter-conduct of Kadıköy Cooperative has been organized around three central tenets: prefiguration, self-reflection, and solidarity. Prefigurative political actions of the group seek to counter certain conducts of dominant authority structures by implementing their desired future relations here-and-now. The cooperative seeks to confront dominant production, consumption, and distribution relations by building radically egalitarian ecological, gender, economic and democratic relations through their prefigurative actions within and outside their organizational domain. If their publicly manifested actions constitute one part in countering such conduct of dominant production and consumption relations, their

solidarity practices and the horizontal organizational structure indicates the development of counter-conduct, promoting “a whole new attitude, way of doing things and being, and a whole way of relating to morality and civic life” (Foucault, 2009, p. 204).

It can be argued that the prefigurative political orientation of the activists provides the sources upon which activists’ knowledge may rely. Activists’ envisions of a future society inform their ethical and political dispositions, as they indicate how the social life can be organized in a different way, towards building more egalitarian relations with each other. This implies how people, ethically and politically, have new possibilities to relate to themselves, as well as to each other differently than the existing dominant forms. These possibilities, in this sense, seem to designate new forms of knowledge and affections for this new subjectivity. Developing a certain hope within the current political context seems to be made possible in this regard.

In relation to that, as activists proceed with putting this knowledge and affections into operation, they have to confront the dominant power relations that surround them. If they are to implement their desired future social relations here-and-now, these can never be expressed in pure form as they are always exercised through power relations even when countering dominant power relations. Being aware of this tension, activists self-reflect on their actions to expose how they are affected by these power relations when they seek to confront them. This indicates a self-reflective ethical disposition to uncover the ways in which they relate to their own selves as well as to others. In this sense, this self-reflectivity connotes with a certain ‘self-care’ through which they seek to renounce their own selves that are abetting conduction of others. This self-reflectivity also reflects activists’ anxieties stemming

from the current political climate as well as from the tension within their own collectivity. Thereof, it is always to interact with activists' efforts to build on hope.

This interaction comes to constitute the course of new, countering, conduct that the cooperative develops through political solidarity actions and practices. I argue that the cooperative brings about new forms of being and a sense of civic life that is built on radical solidarity practices. On the one hand, this solidarity refers to the solidarity ties among people to soothe their immediate material, ideational and emotional needs related to the current political context. On the other hand, it is reflected in the organizational structure and culture of the group that seeks to prefigure egalitarian social relations. Binding these solidarity practices together, the group deploys solidarity as a political and ethical action that could embody a counter-conduct within the current political context of Turkey.

It has been summarized in the previous chapter that activists operate within a different environment compared to the period right after Gezi. Now, activists have to sustain their actions within an environment where they have to face more physical repression from the government as well as more dispiriting emotions because of the current emotional climate. Besides, these developments are accompanied by tensions within the organizational structure. As activists face more and more drawbacks stemming from these very sources, limitations, and tensions that are peculiar to their way of organization come more to the forefront as significant obstacles to the sustenance of the group. These overall limitations seem to oblige activists to confront more threats. Now, activists have to find ways to sustain their actions that could avoid these physical repressions, while coping with the dispiriting effects of the emotional climate and the growing tensions within their organization. Within such an environment, Kadıköy Cooperative seeks ways to sustain its political actions.

Activists in the cooperative undertake prefigurative political actions at various levels. Primarily, the collective prefigurative actions of the group focus on changing production and consumption relations within the society. For that matter, the group engages in various actions that do not demand something from political authority, but that directly intervene in the working of these social relations. Through these direct actions, activists aim to create immediate changes in people's daily lives. Yet, as the collective actions of the activists are mainly directed towards producers and consumers, these actions may not always have a direct effect on themselves. Although some of the activists are consumers of the products in the cooperative themselves, not every activist consumes products in the cooperative on a daily basis. If these changes may not always directly affect activists' own lives, prefigurative actions and procedures they settle within their own organizational structures have an immediate effect on the individual lives of activists.

As activists seek to build and directly participate in organizational procedures, mechanisms and practices that are reflective of their future society, their experiences within the organizational structure have a more direct effect on their everyday life. Through these procedures and mechanisms, activists seek to build an inclusive environment where diversity of views, values, lifestyles, and political actions can coexist. While these efforts create an environment where individuals can participate in the decision-making procedures in a radically equal way, the group also seeks to create an environment where activists can relate to each other in an egalitarian way outside decision-making procedures as well. In this sense, the group designates specific guidelines for the ensuring a direct democratic decision-making mechanism, aiming to ensure everybody has an equal right to say throughout the meetings. These guidelines include certain rather technical suggestions about the

very micro details such as tone of voice, duration of speeches, or allowing more room for those who speak lesser or who participate very recently. On the other hand, these guidelines seek to avoid certain discourses that might reinforce social inequalities, such as those that are stemming from the patriarchy. Besides, they seek to prevent the effect of certain inequalities that might arise specifically with regard to the organizational structure, such as a hierarchy of those with more knowledge or those who invested more time and effort in the organization; and the effect of certain inequalities pertaining to the broader organization of social relations, i.e. that of gender inequality. This attitude also holds for the ways in which activists relate to each other within the community, trying to promote egalitarian ways of relating to each other. In this sense, it can be argued that the organizational culture of the cooperative presents another way to act against the activists' grievances. This also becomes more apparent in activists' expressions:

It's something I intend that it should be considered as a horizontal organization rather than under a cooperative label. It can be an association, it can be a cooperative, it can be something else... It can be a resistance, it can be a neighborhood organization. In any case, the most important thing for me is that it should stay as a horizontal organization that works very well, in fact. It is these guidelines that are most likely to protect it. This culture per se. As long as these guidelines are developed, strengthened, and explained to everyone properly, I think that this may be the thing that will bring this utopia to the fruition it deserves. Other than that, I can't think of anything else, to be frank. I presume this is what we can deem the most concrete and practical thing. (Interview 5)

That is to say, if not only through their collective actions, activists also find ways to challenge various authorities and see an immediate effect of these confrontations through the actions within their organizational structure. In this sense, these prefigurative political actions, especially within the organizational sphere, allow activists to act against their grievances, while at the same time providing them a certain relief because of these immediate changes in their daily life. These immediate

changes also bring certain emotional relief, with which they can cope with the distress resulting from the emotional climate. It seems that this burden is being relieved by the political solidarity actions that create a sense of belongingness to the group while trying to keep the autonomous power of the individuals intact. This sense does not overwhelm or disempower individuals for the sake of the power of the group or its ideas themselves. It rather seeks ways to be empowering for the individuals, while developing a sense of collectivity.

In this sense, it seems that it comes to constitute a different experience of social life in their engagement with the group activities. This different experience opens up possibilities to dissociate from the grievances of dominant social structures as well as the limitations of the increasing authoritarianism. Articulation of feelings of comfort, joy, solidarity, autonomy, sense of belongingness, and a certain anxiety coming from self-reflectivity in a way that they contribute to the search for an autonomous subjectivity, ultimately, constitutes this hope and keeps it alive. Before, I have emphasized that this hope is experienced with regard to a specific time and space. As prefigurative actions are about constituting different spatio-temporal locations with a particular ethical, political and affective disposition, they seem to provide a new time and space experience for hope to emerge. It is through such different social life experience activists seem to find ways to sustain their actions with an active hope. As they now have a social life experience that differs from dominant social relations, they can cling to hope for its present and the future. In this sense, it does not make activists standby until the future but make them keep acting in the present to make up for this future. Yet, this experience remains quite vulnerable as it exists along with a social life that is organized by dominant social and political structures from which they cannot totally become independent from.

Besides, these dominant social relations are not only coming from an outer source but also directly from within the individuals in the group themselves. So, activists can sustain this hope to the extent that they can deal with these limiting power relations that they are subjects of and are subjected to. The capability of activists to build an organizational structure and culture that can deal with these anxieties in this sense brings to the fore an important aspect of how the cooperative sustains its actions within this political environment. In this sense, I argue that the autonomy-seeking subjectivity of the cooperative is sustained by negotiation with the anxious affections created by the climate. This negotiation seems to occur through an ebb and flow between different forms of hope which I identified as ‘active’ and ‘dormant.’ I will argue that this oscillation embodies an ‘anxious hope’ that accompanies activists’ political actions, though vulnerably:

While . . . hope is constantly repeated through the abeyance and reclamation of agency in everyday actions, the affect that accompanies this hope is anxiety. Instead of being an opposite of hope, anxiety is a companion to it. This hope rests on thin ice. The desired results attached to hope, and the effects that are hoped for may never materialize . . . Instead of driving . . . to despair, the anxiety that they feel about the future accompanies their hopeful condition and all the more pushes them to act in the present. (Abiral, 2015, p. 96)

6.2 Prefiguration

Although the group’s explicit concern seems to be focusing on building a cooperative that could intervene in production and consumption relations, they are not the only grievance activists have. Activists’ concerns are, in fact, numerous, including capitalist social relations, patriarchy, heterosexism, or the colonization of nature. In this sense, activists also engage in collective solidarity actions with different struggles concerned with the dominance of the abovementioned social

relations. On the other hand, they also seek to challenge these dominant social relations within their organizational sphere. This challenge does not solely proceed with a confrontation with these dominant social relations but also come through creating new social relations, practices, procedures, and mechanisms through experimentation. That is to say, the group seeks to actualize their desired and hoped future social relations here-and-now. Overall, these collective actions that are aimed at a broader public, as well as actions within their organizational sphere, are articulated in a way that it constitutes a prefigurative political experience. This prefigurative political experience, on the other hand, seems to express a certain subjectivity that seeks to transform dominant social relations by creating new social relations and practices.

In this sense, activists create different conduct of social relations and a different expression of subjectivity in their engagement with the group activities. This conduct challenges diverse authorities, either through their ideological discourses or the practices in daily life. In this sense, this challenge does not only come on an ideological level but is also engrained in the daily life and affections of the individuals. These affections emerge from their challenge to these different authorities, whereas it also provides a space out of the dispiriting emotional climate resulting from the increasing authoritarianism. Overall, prefigurative experience within the group creates a sense of different conduct of social relations, through developing a different subjectivity for the activists involved:

I don't think the cooperative upholds a specific purpose. Solidarity is one of the most important aspirations of all. Creating good feelings within this organization, for example, within these forms of relationships... After all, solidarity is not just about buying goods from the producer and sending money to the producer. That's what volunteers do; making life easier, rendering it meaningful, in a collective way. The power and the grit to achieve as a collective what one cannot achieve individually . . . I think it is the experience of living an independent life. Well, frankly, I don't want to

portray it as if we are merely socializing while we are coping with the producers. Cooperative is just like that already. There will be different emotional outlets, that's the thing. We are getting organized. (Interview 1)
You know, I wouldn't be tempted to call it persuading people to do something. It's rather about constructing a separate subjectivity, which these cooperatives entail. (Interview 1)

As this subjectivity is reflective of activists' future ideals where the social relations are organized in a more egalitarian way, it incurs a search for an autonomous way of being. However, it does not imply that this subjectivity is already fully autonomous or that it can ever be. By the term autonomy, I basically refer to the possibility to become autonomous from the dominant social relations that are produced and reproduced by dominant social structures. That is to say, it indicates the possibility to become independent of these social inequalities so as to organize social life in a different and egalitarian way. As activists undertake political actions either through their opposition to various authorities or through creating a new form of social relations, they proceed to develop a feeling of a different social life. Although this social life is characterized by the actions of this subjectivity that is in search of autonomy, an autonomous subjectivity can never establish itself fully. Rather, it is always to be searched.

As this search does not only opposes the dominant social structures but also creates new social relations, this seems to create a sense of relief that they can intervene in these grievances by instantiating immediate changes in daily life. This creation goes beyond merely complaining about social inequalities and waiting for an authority to interfere in these inequalities. Instead, it constitutes different concrete examples of how social relations can be organized in a possibly different way.

I think the way politics is defined should be that way. It occurs to me that you must have a concern, a desire for something . . . About what kind of a world you want, and about yourself, about what you desire. You must yearn for something, and you have to do something in actuality beyond just demanding it. I think that this form of politics we are talking about makes manifest the

path of not just demanding, even getting tired of demanding it, and thinking that those demands will not help or reach anything. (Interview 1)

Yes, I believe (that we create a world of our own). We can't just spread it to the whole world, yes, but after all, we are running that alternative world within ourselves, around us, or in certain situations. So I see it as we have managed to actualize it. (Interview 3)

This enables people to experience and feel how things might work differently. In this sense, these experiences seem to create a feeling of joy, comfort, and hope. Activists find relief in these experiences, as they support their ideological opposition by producing new feelings and practices. As an activist expresses, mere opposition might incur a dispiriting effect, whereas the creation of new social experiences feels more valuable and hopeful:

I think what we do has value in this regard: it is not just blaming capitalism and positioning against it . . . In this way, I'm actually looking for better ways to complain. In lieu of crying out, "it's just capitalism," rather than just declaring that capitalism is bad and whatnot, I tend to see it as just one thing in all economic diversity. I think this is one of the most important things about Kadıköy Cooperative. Admittedly, it contains capitalism, I don't think it is really possible to get around that fact. But it also makes different things possible. It provides both potential and actual possibilities. I mean, that's why I am not willing to depict anything pessimistic. Capitalism is just one of these potentialities. Let's avoid producing it discursively as much as possible, let's focus on other things . . . That's why I'm not pessimistic. As it unveils all different potentialities . . . I find Kadıköy Cooperative valuable in that respect. For it enables everything, it opens doors. (Interview 1)

Yet, this different life experience is not situated totally outside of this ordinary daily life. It rather operates within this daily life, countering dominant social relations and inequalities by creating new social and political experiences that are informed by future ideals but are surrounded by the actual conditions. As it was emphasized above, activists are also aware of these threats and the effects of dominant power relations. Therefore, they do not think of this different life experience as if they are already emancipated, nor does the whole society. In this sense, their experiences are by no means resemble an echo chamber. They constantly acknowledge and stand to

these limitations. As activists could develop ways within their organization to cope with these limitations and the accompanying anxieties, it seems that they feel more empowered. As the interviewee suggests, they don't see their prefigurative experiences through rose-colored glasses and the way how they can deal with the problems feels more hopeful:

From my point of view, if we look at what I acquire the most from the cooperative . . . The biggest obtainment for me as it is a place that makes me think that we are actually doing what people said was impossible. I think day after day, I learn a lot about being together and working together in this fashion. Because not always it is a bed of roses. When you encounter a predicament, you have to come up with new possible methods and solutions which are bound to teach you through concrete experience. I would say it is the biggest achievement for me. On the other hand, the validity and veracity of what we do continue to stand still. Therefore, the fact that it is sustainable to this very day, against all odds . . . These are all great achievements for me. Let me put it this way: it is a place that recuperates and keeps my hope alive. (Interview 1)

In relation to that, the sense of autonomy I mentioned does not indicate that one is already free. It rather clings on to the possibility that one can develop ways to be more autonomous despite these limitations and that one can develop autonomous ways to deal with these limitations. In this sense, it is neither the first nor the latter that incites a certain hope but rather both. That is to say, this hope does not exist in a vacuum, but is surrounded by feelings of anxiety and understanding of limitations. As the cooperative can deal with these limitations, their search for autonomy turns out to be more encouraging and incurring a sense of approval to one's own self:

Because the Kadıköy cooperative is completely independent right now, it does not need any financial resources, nor does it needs any help . . . This is a very good feeling, a really good feeling. I mean, we never bend the knee for anyone. We can do what we want, go to any manufacturer we want. We can speak with confidence and stand tall thanks to this independence. So, we produce our discourse accordingly . . . Therefore, when we produce that discourse, the pleasure of being able to stand behind it fully is beyond imagination . . . When you sit down and explain all these, we receive reactions from people, from those who join later, such as: "How amazing you are, how did you achieve all of this on your own?", "Well done! You have turned this thing around astoundingly well only by the effort of the

volunteers.” So, when you hear such words, it is so gratifying and it turns out that being independent is the most important, the paramount. (Interview 5)

6.3 Self-reflection

Even though activists could be able to develop independent social relations within their organizational sphere as well as through their collective actions, these actions are always accompanied or negotiated by the limitations of actions akin to the dominant social structures. Activists explicit aim is to transform production and consumption relations towards a more democratic way, based on the principle of ‘food sovereignty.’ The basic intention behind food sovereignty is to provide equal rights to say for both producers and consumers to decide how, by whom, for whom and how much food is to be produced, and how these products are going to be distributed. For that purpose, the cooperative establishes connections between producers and consumers without resorting to any mediator company and tries to provide room for consumers and producers to communicate. This communication aims to ensure that the food is produced in a just way, i.e., by using ecological methods or without resorting to the exploitation of child or women labor. On the other hand, the cooperative seeks to establish solidarity with the producers in need, or with producers that are excluded on the basis of gender or sexual orientation. In this way, the cooperative seeks to promote radically democratic production and consumption relations. This implies that these relations can be organized in a rather autonomous way that can be independent of dominant social relations. However, as they have to operate within the dominance of capitalist social relations, they cannot always settle these relations in an exclusively autonomous way. They have to face certain limitations related to the working of dominant social relations – one being

capitalist – as well as different subjectivities that are pertaining to these. As an example, an interviewee complains about that matter:

But the supply and demand pressure is far too much for us . . . Although we don't want to work in line with the supply and demand, even if we don't make a profit here, even if we use this place purely for developing solidarity, the manufacturer may not do the same. In fact, they usually don't. They work entirely along the lines of the supply and demand market and set their prices accordingly . . . On the one hand, it really serves something else now. I sell natural products to the middle-upper rich classes here, and simultaneously, I turn out to be a worker who works here under minimum wage, in fact for free, for the small farmers. Definitely, this cycle needs to be broken. But you know, since the supply and demand are so hard to beat, what am I to do now? (Interview 4)

For me, this very question summarizes the gist of these tensions: activists want a way out of these recurring dominant social relations. But what is to be done? This very question itself expresses a certain desire and hope, whereas underlying this question lies another anxiety about the question, then how to, in these circumstances? It shows that although the activists in the cooperative are in search of promoting autonomous social relations, they always have to cope with the domination of social relations that are limiting how to. This is why this subjectivity is never fully autonomous, but rather always in a search.

Throughout this quest, if not activists can be fully autonomous subjects, it can be said that they can engage in and evoke autonomous political and social actions. That is to say, activists can exert autonomous social relations, but this does not mean that they can easily settle these social relations to elicit a social transformation on a broader scale. Yet, activists seem to be aware of these tensions and are always self-reflective in this regard. It can be said that this self-reflectivity is yet another aspect of this subjectivity that seeks to promote autonomous social relations. Another activist also reflects on this issue:

We talked to a manufacturer, and their neighbor also showed up and learned from them and they also started to do something. At least we can see things

like that. Or, again, as we speak, other consumer cooperatives have been established – let's not say because of us but – inspired by our endeavors . . . We can say that we started to establish a different world. Have we set it up yet? No. Whether it will be installed or not is also a remaining question mark. . . . I mean, if you imply that we built it, I think you are mistaken. You always need something; you always need to change something and question it. That's why stating that we already established it or that we feel that we have accomplished something is a misstatement. I believe that most of the people in the cooperative have such a mindset. So, we're endeavoring and we see that we're starting to change things. We can merely say that we started to build this world. Is there light at the end of the tunnel? It's not so bad after all. (Interview 5)

In this sense, such self-reflectivity implies that there are no preordained ways to achieve activists' future ideals. As they have to operate in relation to dominant social relations, the consequences of their actions are always at stake. This drives activists to a constant self-reflection to understand the extent to which their actions can lead to egalitarian social relations that can retain this independent social life. It is also related to the abovementioned point that how activists can undertake autonomous actions but may never establish a fully autonomous subjectivity. In this sense, this self-reflectivity seems to create more room in this search for developing egalitarian relations through autonomous actions. Through this process, activists do not only reflect upon the consequences of their collective actions aimed at the broader public but also reflect upon the consequences of their actions and practices within the organization. In this sense, self-reflections on their way of organization also enable activists to procure different ways to act against different authorities within the organizational context.

As they never fully acknowledge that radical equality between the individuals is established once and for all, they always seek to find more egalitarian ways of relating to each other and are always aware of these practices might be disturbed because of the effect of different power relations within the group. Whereas the threat of this disturbance might arise certain anxieties, as the cooperative could settle

organizational mechanisms that support this self-reflectivity on an individual and collective level, promoting autonomous actions and, thereof, egalitarian relations through such self-reflectivity ensure certain comfort. An activist expresses how these self-reflection processes are important for the group and how he is cherished by them:

I mean, I really like this kind of thing about horizontal organization. And I feel the presence of its necessity to constantly question itself . . . And I think that is a very beautiful thing . . . I mean, we should be a group that constantly questions each other. Yet, we should of course raise the awareness of our friends to ask more questions. (Interview 5)

As it was emphasized above, activists have discontent with various authorities that goes beyond the explicit focus of the cooperative on changing consumption and production relations. Self-reflectivity is also important in this regard, connecting these different struggles. Activists are not only concerned with one specific grievance while they act but they are also concerned with the impact of different power relations. This makes a cooperative more than a grocery store or even more than a cooperative itself:

So, we are not a grocery store. In fact, we are constantly questioning our function in terms of organizing discussions, publishing information, taking actions if necessary, and increasing them more. And I do not believe that we are terribly successful these days, but we are going to try increasing it soon, and we have to increase it. This is one of my favorite things about horizontal organizations. It is a structure that constantly investigates itself. Have you had a chance to read *The Dispossessed* by Ursula Le Guin? One of the classics. There is an anarchist mindset at work and they always teach people this: no matter what we do, we should not forget to question each other. Because, if not, something will definitely be overlooked, and something will definitely fall into place. In fact, the important thing is that everything should not fall into place. If everything is perfectly streamlined then it's almost like you just let it go, you become complacent. I mean, someone should always come out and challenge us, actually. This is what we want. Let someone criticize constantly, even if at the expense of hurting each other's feelings. Because then we will have practically turned into a grocery store. That's why we're trying to do that. Sometimes we really give it a loose. But one day, someone punches life out of our diaphragms, then we come back to ourselves and regain consciousness. (Interview 5)

6.4 Solidarity

Coming to the specific character of the actions that make this sense of autonomy possible, solidarity actions, especially within the group, comes to the forefront. I do specifically refer to solidarity actions because the solidarity relations for the group imply a political action. The solidarity relations within the group do not solely encapsulate providing material benefits, nor merely establishing companionship ties. The solidarity within the group, of course, involves these, but with a specific ethical and political disposition. This ethical and political disposition is again akin to a prefigurative political experience. Activists undertake solidarity actions so as to implement or reflect their desired future social relations in the here-and-now. In this sense, activists engage in solidarity actions to promote autonomous social relations either in their collective actions or organizational practices.

These actions, in the first place, meet the immediate needs of the people that are stemming from the social inequalities. In this way, activists procure material, ideational and emotional support to cope with the effects of different authority structures such as capitalism, patriarchy, or heterosexism and their reinforcement by the authoritarian polity in the specific case of Turkey. For instance, when asked about how her experiences in the cooperative enable her to cope with the senses of loneliness, inadequacy, and despair resulting from the emotional climate that we described before, an interviewee expresses:

As I said, it feels a little bit empowering. I mean, it doesn't make you feel lonely, rather, it's beyond being powerful. Because if I have a problem right now, I know that the cooperative will support me right away. This can happen in many ways. Let's assume I told my friends that I'm unemployed and having financial difficulties, people can contribute financially. They can offer an alternative so that you can make these products and sell them here. They can offer a job, here in the cooperative. I'm sure a myriad of things will be produced and supported. Feeling it, knowing it can happen even though I don't ask for it, prevents me from feeling lonely; it is empowering and it definitely feels good. (Interview 3)

Going beyond the procurement of these immediate needs, activists also seek to confront these social inequalities by developing social relations around solidarity ties. If these authority structures evoke unequal relations between people, these solidarity relations seek to transform such inequality and establish equal ties between people. In this sense, solidarity actions stand as another way to act against these grievances. If society is driven into unequal social relations, solidarity seems to offer possible ways out. If social relations are affected by patriarchal authority structure and deem certain people to face disadvantageous conditions, solidarity actions provide, first, support through immediate needs to relieve the impact of these disadvantages, while enabling to develop different social ties to oppose this authority structure by opening up possibilities to develop more egalitarian social relations, concomitantly. Yet, as it has been emphasized above, that is to be done through a specific type of solidarity relations that entail a certain ethical and political disposition, i.e. this disposition seeks to promote autonomy. In this sense, the solidarity actions of the cooperative activists are prefigurative to the extent that they instantiate social relations that recede from hierarchical social relations. These prefigurative actions, above all, are reflected in the organizational practices of the cooperative and this makes activists feel affectively committed, nice, and encouraging:

I think the feelings that the horizontal organization, collective work, and joint decision-making provide is very good feelings. And that's what we're making real. That's how we operate, that's how we do a lot of things. The fact that solidarity is so strong, that everyone cooperates with each other on many regards and can organize extremely quickly on this issue . . . Or it seems like you can grow conceptually enriched, by contributing to everything, and also by taking it. So that's why the world that I envisioned is coming to life in here. (Interview 3)

If we take a closer look at the characteristics of the underlying ethical and political disposition behind this solidarity, this prefigurative aspect of seeking autonomy

becomes more explicit. Activists do not think of solidarity as a unidirectional relationship, where the one is the provider, and the other is the recipient. They assert that this very understanding reinforces a hierarchical relationship between the two. If this understanding would be settled, the provider will always remain the same, and so do the latter. However, those who are in immediate need of solidarity are also capable of undertaking solidarity actions and contributing to this solidarity relationship. If one part of the relationship comes to assume the role of the provider by itself and this relationship becomes settled, the provider might fix itself in an authority position that undermines the autonomous actions, ideas, and values of the other part. Henceforth, it becomes important to seek to establish an egalitarian relationship that allows more room for autonomous expression for both of the parties. By this way, activists propose to capsize these unequal relations as they engage in solidarity actions:

Between those who receive support and those who provide support... That's what we call a hierarchy, there are other hierarchies as well, but if one side constantly receives support and help – the other one who constantly gives help, after a while, becomes who makes the other dependent. It becomes something that always maintains and perpetuates that hierarchical relationship. There is no such thing in solidarity, you both give and receive. There is a mutual relationship going on. That is mutual and consistent. (Interview 2)

I may sound like I'm bragging a bit, but I think that our solidarity is a kind of solidarity that fills the void in people. Because to me, solidarity is not just about helping people out, raising their standard of living. I don't perceive solidarity as a material or spiritual giving. I mean, not only being the party that gives but also being the party that receives is significant for me. What fills me up too is actually when I find that concomitant solidarity with someone. (Interview 5)

This understanding underlies the political actions of the activists in the cooperative and designates how do they relate with people as well as each other. In this way, activists develop more egalitarian relations within the organization. In this sense, it also has implications for their decision-making, organizational structure, and the way

in which they conduct their actions. Organizing around a culture of solidarity against social inequalities, activists make effort to organize a more inclusive space where people from a diversity of backgrounds can coexist in harmony. This, again, aims at improving the autonomous expression and action of the individuals:

This place is really perfect in that respect! I mean, you really feel like you belong to something because even the smallest idea should be thought about and discussed by people. You know, it used to upset me when I saw that other people were harmed in the white-collar system, even the things that I wasn't a part of upset me; even what someone else did or ordered someone else. It affects the whole environment in a company, too. But here, when everyone here is nice to each other, you like it even though you're not a part of it!
(Interview 5)

On the other hand, this inclusivity creates a sense of belongingness to the group. Yet, it should be noted that this sense of belongingness is also achieved through making room for the autonomy of the individuals. The sense of belonging does not reach a point that it can override individual tastes, values, and ideas. Rather, it opens up the space for them. In this sense, it is not to instrumentalize these individual properties for enhancing the power of the organization or reassuring the ideas of the group itself, but rather to enhance the power of the individuals themselves. This point became clearer when activists compare their experiences vis-à-vis the instrumentalism of the socialist organizations that we mentioned before.

For one of them, the instrumentalism of the socialist organizations does not feel comfortable because they are organized around certain hierarchies. Above all, the hierarchical structure of these organizations does not allow every individual to freely express themselves. This inability evokes discomfort and blocks the ways for autonomous and diverse political actions for the activists. The interviewee expresses that the cooperative feels like a “breathing space”, first, because of the grievances resulting from neoliberalism and its reinforcement by the authoritarian government, and, second, that it differs from such organizations that fall short of providing

autonomous ways to act against these grievances. After we talked about his feelings about the increasing authoritarianism, I asked the interviewee whether he feels cooperative as a breathing space also because these organizations make him feel satiated. He answered:

What does change in conventional politics? I mean... Even if we think of the political party closest to us, what does change? . . . How do the ones in the below have a say in the decisions made? . . . They pride themselves on that like “We are coming from such a culture that we can object to something coming top-down.” But my observation was showing otherwise. Their thing is different from ours. In many respects, they tend to be passive . . . When the ones below do not have the freedom to say that “why don’t we do something like that,” it is something totally different. But we have that. I can pride on ourselves, on our cooperative in this respect. (Interview 1)

If such dissatisfaction is, in one part, about the hierarchical structure, another part comes from their indifference to the other hierarchical relations that might arise within the group. To the extent that these organizations are indifferent to developing egalitarian relations within the group and making room for autonomous expression of the individuals, there may arise different inequalities based on specialization or hierarchy of labor. In this sense, activists find more comfort in the cooperative as they could avoid these inequalities as well:

What makes me feel comfortable? I think the fact that I am not alone in this feeling feels comfortable since I see everyone is comfortable. It comprises a place where everyone has a clean breath in general. Sometimes I think about whether it is a utopian place. It is true in the sense that it differs from most of our ways of establishing relationships. The most important one is the absence of hierarchy and relations of superiority. For instance, it prevents such relations which possible to stem from specialization and hierarchy of knowledge. In this respect, I feel good. (Interview 1)

These differences also have implementation for the feelings of solidarity one can have within these instrumentalist organizations. Another interviewee compares his experience within a socialist organization with that of cooperative in this regard:

What I am particularly surprised at is because of this: these people are, yes, in the end, organized around a political idea, but they don’t just try to organize you into their own, they don’t just want you to be recruited. After all, they are

people who live their own lives and, at the same time, provide support for here. So you wouldn't expect that from those people: usually, political organizations are like "Let's call them right away, let them come to us, let's be friends and then recruit them." Theirs was not such an invitation, not such a call! It was quite a sincere invitation. You know, without expecting anything in return. This surprised me and I had never seen anything like it before, as I said earlier, when I was in such an organization myself. Yes, we were also inviting people home, etc. but it usually had a different meaning! (Interview 4)

The interviewee's experience unveils that this solidarity is oriented towards an instrumental purpose rather than a political action itself. Although it provides material support as well as a sense of companionship, it serves a different purpose than directly intervening in activists' grievances. That is more directed towards developing the power of the organization itself so that it could reach a point where it can confront these grievances in the future. On the other hand, the solidarity actions of the activists tend to create a transformation both within today and the future. This difference makes explicit how activists' ethical and political dispositions are more encouraging for themselves. If this instrumental solidarity may provide certain immediate needs, it does not seem to be oriented toward providing grounds to act against these grievances to make a difference in activists' daily life. Hence, activists may be left alone in radically transforming these grievances in their daily life and within the organizational sphere. Yet, on the other hand, prefigurative solidarity actions within the cooperative enable such companionship and a sense of belongingness that is more empowering for the activists. Besides, it can be said that this sense is yet another important aspect to diffuse feelings of loneliness that we described with reference to the general emotional climate.

6.5 Anxious constitution of hope

I have already mentioned how the solidarity and self-reflection practices within the group contribute to this process. Apart from these, the horizontally legislated and flexible structure of the group that is based on a radically egalitarian constitutional order is yet another vital aspect. Adding up to prefiguring egalitarian relations through developing a culture around solidarity and self-reflectivity, the group seeks to solidify this culture by establishing a constitutional structure. Informed by this self-reflectivity and solidarity, all of the parts and parcels of the constitution are democratically produced and are open to being revised in time of need. Basically, this constitution is composed of different regulatory documents that describe: the principles and the organizational model of the cooperative; its decision-making procedures; the customs and arrangements for the working of its sub-units and routine works; and facilitatory information regarding specific tasks.

While this constitution designates how organizational practices are to be conducted, it basically seeks to designate the limits of power relations within the group so as to ensure non-hierarchical egalitarian relations between activists and the units of the cooperative as they engage in these practices. This designation is informed by the activists' ethical and political disposition that we discussed earlier, and it is in this sense it also seeks to intervene in the power relations within the group. In this sense, the constitution is to ensure equality between the individuals within the group and to tackle possible tensions that might arise, as I signaled earlier. In addition to the contents of this constitution, it is characterized by certain flexibility that allows for greater adaptability and opportunities to resolve tensions and limitations that activists face inside and outside of the organization. Overall, such an

established structure with opportunities to flex itself tightens the feelings of solidarity, belongingness, autonomy, and joy and, thereupon, solidifies hope:

This established structure makes me elated. The rules are orderly; yet, are not domineering. This egalitarian but settled institutionalization is one of the things that please me. Well, it's also nice that a lot of new people come and go, who don't know each other at all, and there is always an opportunity to communicate with these people very easily. In other words, five different individuals that are not quite similar to each other can really come together in a harmonious way. And the relationship they form can be very friendly. This is a good thing, I would say. It is indeed hopeful. Besides, there is something that makes you detect your own problem and give effort in order to come up with solutions. It is a really ripened squad. I mean everyone can take action in a really ripe manner. There is a problem and you say let's solve it. Let's sit together, discuss together and act together. It is something important. In most of the organizations in Turkey, as far as I could observe, there cannot be found something like this. When there is a huge concrete problem, it is avoided or ignored most of the time. In this sense, it is one of the things that makes me happy that this mature approach and organizational schema make it possible. And a certain hope towards the future... I mean, are we going to be able to apply this kind of an organizational schema to other places? What if lots of organizations alike come and act together? Would it be possible to achieve greater, more influential work? (Interview 2)

Nonetheless, as I have mentioned in the previous parts, such hope is never pure, but always accompanied by different feelings. If the abovementioned feelings are a part that constitutes hope, they become meaningful only in relation to the other feelings that may boost or undermine this hope. Even when the emotional climate right after the Gezi seems to have boosted this hope towards an emboldenment, it was accompanied by certain anxieties. As this climate has changed, activists come to be surrounded by feelings of loneliness, anxiety, insecurity, and fear. Therefore, if they are to find hope, they had to ascertain this hope vis-à-vis these feelings that may undermine their hope for the present and the future actions. In this sense, as the weight of these undermining feelings grows, this hope has rather become to be characterized by an oscillation. As I have mentioned in the previous parts, this oscillation may be in between an active hope for the present and the future; a dormant hope to be found in the future; and a certain sense of hopelessness. As I

sought to reveal in this part, activists try to cling to an active hope, whereas that can be disturbed by the growing anxieties and drive them towards experiencing a different form of hope. In this sense, there seems to be an oscillation resulting from the need to negotiate with the feelings of the emotional climate. I think that this oscillation is characterized by the growing anxieties about the present and the future. Feelings of loneliness, insecurity, and fear resulting from the emotional climate described in the previous part embody such anxiety in the present and the future. In this part, I showed how political actions and the organizational practices of the cooperative correspond to negotiation with anxiety, especially, stemming from their grievances as well as the impact of increasing authoritarianism. Yet, on the other hand, this anxiety is also incited by the practices within the organization as well. Now, I will try to elaborate on this oscillation through its reflection on the tensions within the organization.

In this context, activists also contend that the course of the actions of the cooperative is always in flux. They always go through different tensions regarding the conduct and the effect of their collective actions as well as organizational practices. In this sense, they often have to face certain anxieties, dissatisfactions, distress, and feelings of inadequacy. Activists may feel demotivated, worn out, or hopeless when the effect of the emotional climate combines with these feelings. However, as they seek to develop ways to intervene in these tensions, activists could find possibilities to negotiate with these feelings. As I have emphasized, this negotiation occurs through an oscillating hope as the cooperative is always in the ebb and flow:

There are ups and downs in horizontal organizations, then they find themselves. I have seen this process like three or four times in several years. There may happen in some cases that certain habits of doing things are forgotten. It can be counted as one of the dilemmas. I mean, indeed, there is

no guarantee that since everyone is a volunteer everyone would do work for two years 7/24. No one can promise this. One can undertake so much work and then leave it unfinished. Then, boom... You are alone. It can happen. (Interview 5)

One of the basic tensions may be the scarcity of the workforce within the cooperative. As the cooperative's actions depend on the voluntary work of the individuals, who do not receive any material benefit in turn, it is always subjected to a fluctuation in the workforce. Sometimes there might be an inadequate number of volunteers participating or even when there is an adequate number, volunteers may not invest adequate effort to keep up with the cooperative's workload. Henceforth, these fluctuations may arise feelings of anxiety at times:

There are not much of young people. Younger people do not have the tendency to join these kinds of places. Therefore, there is a significant decrease in participation. And this kind of atmosphere constitutes a significant threat to these kinds of organizations. And in the application of other kinds of things. (Interview 4)

Apart from the changing number of volunteers, inadequacy in the workforce can be related to the free-rider problem. As I have explicated earlier, the cooperative seeks to promote the autonomy of the individuals by avoiding the settlement of different authorities within the group. Although this autonomy is providing certain possibilities for the activists, it may also bring certain tensions as the sustenance of the actions depends so much on the discretion of the individuals. As the workload within the cooperative is not decided, coordinated, and implemented by a hierarchical center that leads and oversees this workload's functioning, individuals and the sub-units of the cooperative have a greater responsibility to undertake all of these tasks and to act in a harmony. Activists do not only need to take initiative to fulfill and decide on daily tasks but also need to take initiative in order to coordinate and oversee the actions of the other individuals as well. This process might be an

uneasy process as the activists abstain from evoking unequal relations. This, on the other hand, may reinforce the free-rider problem more and more:

There can be a strange situation in horizontal organizations. As far as everyone works based on voluntariness, people tend to stay silent when there arises a problem with the feeling that it will wither away. As this happens, as problems get piled up, they can reach a tipping point. When it is failed to be intervened correctly, issues sometimes can get bigger. (Interview 5)

In this sense, proper maintenance of the actions and practices within the cooperative depends so much on the individual initiative and responsibility. This seems to harden the effects of the free-rider problem for the proper maintenance of the organization. When the free-rider problem cannot be handled, the organization faces different threats with regards to the functioning of its daily operation as well as to the subversion of its organizational structure and culture:

There is no one above us who decides on our behalf and it's a good thing. But, at the same time, there lacks a plan, program, a structure either. These kinds of things, albeit they've existed some time, are getting harder in horizontal organizations . . . At least authority brings about a structure, plan, and program in an organization. When it is absent, you have to do it yourself, and take responsibility by yourself. And everyone has to do it at the same time, you cannot be alone. It is the hardest part. As long as everyone does not, things hitch, and you cannot make a plan. This is the con of it. And honestly, you can get coopted. There is such a danger . . . Therefore, it is about how it is managed, partly by yourself, partly by everyone in it. (Interview 4)

On the other hand, an organizational structure that depends so much on the discretion of the individuals might evoke other tensions. As certain individuals invest more effort than the others, they may come to claim more responsibility than the others. This creates a twofold tension for the activists. As they take on more responsibilities and divest more effort into the group activities, they acquire more knowledge and experience. It implies that these individuals become open to claiming more power than other individuals to decide on how things should work. If they seek to settle this power, this situation might create a hierarchical relationship between these individuals and the others, leaving others in an inferior position to have a right to say.

Activists are concerned with the threat of this unequal relationship, as settlement of this hierarchical relationship might be overwhelming for the other activists because they would have less room to express their opinions and to take part in the activities of the organization:

But of course, there can be such a hierarchy, it's a danger. For this reason, we try to take some precautions about it. It is for no hierarchy of knowledge to occur. (Interview 2)

It is literally a hierarchy of the experienced, you know. I mean, it is the hierarchy of the experienced that causes most of the disputes in horizontal organizations. How can I exemplify... A group of people, for example, from the cooperative, who do not work anywhere else at the time, unemployed. They can spare more time than others for the cooperative, meets with producers, watches the store, and so on . . . Then they show up like "We are dealing with everything, but you are just always raising certain objections." Another one responds "It is a horizontal organization, it is expected that work is being done in this way. You can leave if you are not okay." Then a huge quarrel happens. That's what it is. Then you look back, some people have left, some stayed at the end. And since the one who left is the one who was conducting most of the work, Kadıköy Cooperative stumbled at that time. But it has found its way after anyway. (Interview 5)

On the other hand, as certain individuals acquire more knowledge and experience than the others, these individuals come to specialize more in certain tasks, leaving the others with lesser ability to fulfill and express an opinion on these tasks. As they specialize, the operation of these tasks may become more dependent on them. This dependency, on the one hand, may become a burden for these individuals and, therefore, may be so much exhausting for them. Besides, when these individuals relinquish from these tasks, the operation of the group may be interrupted as the others end up in giving lesser effort to the group. At times, this may also have negative repercussions for group culture:

When a group of people does all the work, the rest starts to loosen a little. There was a period, for instance, several people undertook too many shifts for the shop. There were students and did it voluntarily. They didn't exercise a hierarchy of the experienced. But it was a whole different topic. They undertake shifts so often that I forgot what kind of work it was. And then, since they were students, at the time of their final exams they stopped

undertaking shifts all of a sudden. Whoosh! Immediately, the shifts has come to be unfilled, because the rest has lost their habit. Therefore, one of the problems of the hierarchy of the experienced is also related to this. When one group takes responsibility so much the rest can loosen up, but it's better not to loosen up because I feel that I belong to the Kadıköy Cooperative, for instance, when I have shifts in the shop. (Interview 5)

Threats such as these grow anxieties of the activists for the sustenance of the group and lead activists to seek possible ways to work on these tensions. I think that this is mainly made possible through the ability of the organization to flex via individual and collective self-reflection practices and through its constitutional order that seeks to designate the limits of power relations within the group. In this way, activists could develop ways to tackle these problems and integrate these ways into their organizational culture. For instance, the coordination unit of the cooperative basically strives to facilitate the proper operation of decision-making processes, regular tasks, and events, communication and coordination between sub-units, integration of the new members, and detection of the possible malfunctions and problems. One of the activists explains how they have been able to deal with the free-rider problem by organizing this unit:

The biggest dilemma of horizontal organizations is the point of how people are going to conduct the work, and how the tasks will be divided among the people. When there was no coordination unit, what happened? You do weekly meetings, settle on an agenda, and distribute tasks . . . Who is going to take responsibility for the task? Let's say Jay will take the responsibility. You leave the meetings with the comfort that Jay took up the responsibility. But you are now up to Jay's will. Did Jay take care of it? What did s/he do? It has been a week; two weeks and you still didn't hear from Jay . . . When there is no coordination unit, such a danger may come up . . . If someone would show up and ask "Why didn't you do that task?", some people react to this person as if s/he forces Jay to do so. At this point, the coordination unit has been a brilliant solution. In fact, they thought about this back then, someone from Caferağa Solidarity told me. They have been facing such problems so often. So, they said let's organize a unit under the name of coordination so that it can call people to account for . . . If we assign this capacity to that unit, then people would no longer react as such. (Interview 5)

Furthermore, the problems that may arise from the specialization or settlement of a hierarchy based on experience or knowledge are also tried to be avoided in any sub-unit of the cooperative, as with the establishment of a coordination unit. The cooperative resorts to two main mechanisms in this regard. The first one is the rotation of the responsibilities. The members of the sub-units are to be rotated on a regular basis, which varies from three to nine months. Whereas this rotation helps to prevent the possible establishment of hierarchies based on experience and knowledge, it also allows different individuals to gain experience in various tasks and defer problems that might arise because of specialization. This makes the functioning of the cooperative more sustainable:

We are organized based on sub-units. Each unit has its own duties and we work through rotation so that no one would hang into a specific unit, nor any hierarchy or different problems would arise. Also, so that everybody can learn something about the cooperative system, make the same effort and these affairs will be more sustainable. (Interview 3)

On the other hand, cooperative resorts to a buddy system, where each of the new members is accompanied throughout their orientation to the group activities and culture. In this sense, this system seeks to make accumulated knowledge and experience of the group more accessible. Besides, it introduces new members to the constitutional order and the culture within the group. In this way, it seeks to ensure that they can easily become more familiar with the organizational structure of the cooperative and it aims to avoid possible tensions related to free-rider problems, specialization, or hierarchy based on knowledge or experience:

It's a little bit about grasping the nature of how things work. I mean, it really functions when some things are systematized, when it is settled. There can be a difference between junior and veteran volunteers, which we in fact try to avoid. Therefore, we formed an accompaniment mechanism. But we now realize that it doesn't function very well. Ideally, it should have been something where everybody can ask anything to each other and transfer their experience, and transfer all of their knowledge. (Interview 2)

This buddy system is actually a very recent development in the group and is a good example of how the cooperative can flex to deal with possible tensions. The organizational structure and the culture of the group contain working mechanisms and procedures to allow for that. The cooperative is always in motion to identify and resolve these problems. For instance, if the development of this system as a response to an identified tension was one step, the cooperative takes another step to identify and resolve the malfunctions in this system by developing a new regulatory document for its functioning:

There has been an incomplete experience transfer a couple of times. Then we said: “Friends, what if accompanists would also convey the following...” We made reminders when there were such situations. But as I said earlier, what did we notice last week or two weeks ago is that there is no directive on the accompaniment system. We said then, let’s arrange directives for this as well, because the accompanist may also be forgetting what to convey, maybe forgetting what to do. We are now preparing an instruction so that we can share with each new volunteer to show what they are going to do when they become accompanists. (Interview 3)

Overall, the sustenance of the cooperative seems to hinge upon harmony between the diversity of practices, mechanisms, and procedures. In this sense, these processes require considerable effort. Apart from taking part in collective actions and the basic organizational processes such as decision-making, activists have to involve in these diverse tasks and invest more emotional power. Activists often contend that these all feel time-consuming, burdensome, and quite exhausting from time to time:

Some things just click into place and go on. Some things can take a long time to be decided. This is very normal, I think. It’s tiring... And really slow. You want to see the results as soon as possible, but it is healthier when you can convince everyone, and make decisions together, where no one feels overwhelmed or insignificant. So, honestly, it’s slow. But I act by acknowledging it. Actually, it’s also a little hard to get used to. Well, you know, some people are like “Let’s get started right away, let’s do it right now, let it be...” There are people who act a little more hastily, but that is something to get used to. It’s a little bit about grasping the nature of how things work. (Interview 2)

However, activists can bear these feelings as they deem these practices, procedures, and mechanisms as of vital importance to safeguard egalitarian relations within the group as they see it as of integral importance for the sustainment of the cooperative:

Sometimes I feel fed up. I'm not talking about the outside. For us inside, you think that there is a really simple issue . . . But when the topic gets too long and you cannot really proceed, I say I have had enough. But, as I said, I can still find it healthy and say, okay, it's better in this way, let it be like that. Because when you say let's do this exception this time, that exception that time, you're allowing it to happen at another point. Then those practices we talked about would remain in vain. Or it can cause differences between people, as if it is okay for one person but not for another, so it causes trouble again. So, no matter what, I still like to comply with it. But as I said, I feel fed up sometimes. (Interview 3)

On the other hand, when it comes to the impact of their collective actions, different anxieties for activists come to the forefront. Although activists are eager for a social transformation on a broader scale, they acknowledge that the actions of the cooperative are inadequate to ignite such change. Throughout my interviews, many activists stated that they have a concern that the activities of the cooperative can mainly reach a narrow audience, which are upper classes that are living in the neighborhood. This situation disturbs them, in fact, and they try to find ways, such as founding a solidarity fund to support different political struggles, reach out to a broader audience as well as arouse a greater impact. However, they are concerned that these efforts remain limited. This inefficacy leaves activists to feel inadequate and poke certain anxieties:

It's such a dead-end. It really is. Because it cannot appeal to the lower classes. Because it also has to protect the producer. Here, the cooperative is in fact concerned that it cannot reach the lower classes, to the working class. We are trying to support in this way (with solidarity funds), but we also have limited resources. From this point of view, it shouldn't be expected much. Our ability to solve structural problems is also very limited. It's something we think about though. (Interview 1)

This situation seems to undermine activists' hope at times. Along with their concern to transform certain social structures, one being the capitalist structure that dictates

certain production and consumption relations, activists also feel concerned about their impact on the growing authoritarianism. As they have lesser effects on these grievances, they feel rather inadequate, which, in turn, may consign their hope:

Well, yes, it has a good impact in this sense. But if we are adequate enough, or not? One may fall into despair. Well, okay, we're going, doing this and that, but in the end, it still stands like that on a plain. It also has this side. Or, for example, we live in an anti-democratic, fascist place, after all, and we have no influence on it if you take a look... I wouldn't say we have no impact at all, but it's very very minimal. You know, we stand in solidarity with each other, but I don't think we can raise our voices enough. We have no influence on that, here. To tell the truth, such an inadequacy... In the first place, it is not directly related to us. That too, step by step, maybe slowly... (Interview 2)

Nevertheless, to the extent that the cooperative could sustain its collective actions to ignite certain changes on an individual or local scale and to inspire others to undertake prefigurative actions to intensify these changes, activists can resist this undermining effect and can cultivate certain hope:

In fact, I fantasize about extending these institutions, these practices, actually. This is what my utopia actually is. But it is now seen as an institution that will not work very well, you know, as an institution that appeals to the middle class; that it cannot be the main system anyway... Yes, maybe it will never be a mainstream thing, but maybe at least it can be much more by small steps turning into bigger ones, I think. I mean, that's actually my dream, and I see a little bit of that coming true, too. This is something that motivates me. A few years ago, when there were no cooperatives, no food collectives at all; or let's rather say when there were only a few and people couldn't dare to do certain things, now there are formations that are very interested in this, taking steps and establishing it. I think that's a very good development and I think it shows this is happening. Albeit slowly, it is, in a way. (Interview 3)

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This thesis sought to discuss the course of development for prefigurative politics as a legacy of the Gezi Protests. As it unfolded around two main questions, why prefigurative politics had an upsurge following the Gezi and how these prefigurative political practices are sustained within the current political context of Turkey, its implications have been manifold. Above all, taking up on recent debates on the vagueness of the concept in the literature (Yates, 2015, 2020; Gordon, 2018; van de Sande, 2019; Franks, 2018; Gürer, 2019; Raekstad & Gradin, 2020), I reworked a recent conceptualization of prefigurative politics in the second chapter. Drawing on the field observations in this regard, I suggested that we approach ‘prefigurative politics’ as certain compounds of individual and collective ‘prefigurative political actions.’ Until now, different scholars in the literature used the concept of ‘prefigurative politics’ to refer to a wide range of political activities, which were overlapping at times: a general understanding of politics or strategy, strategic and tactic practices, organizational procedures and mechanisms, expressions of certain cultural or ethical values in social movement communities or other subcultures, mechanisms for developing collective identity, and individual political actions. Although these different activities may indicate exercise prefigurative political practices, this variance and overlapping have left certain conceptualizations inadequate.

In order to make sense of this wide range of prefigurative political practices without conflating their peculiar characteristics with each other, I asserted that we focus on ‘prefigurative political actions’ whose different constellations may amount

to different sets of individual and collective political activities, corresponding to the abovementioned categories. ‘Prefigurative politics’ indicates one such constellation, referring to a general understanding of politics which connotes that prefiguration serves as a guiding principle for the overall strategy of a political subject. In this regard, I set forth that ‘prefigurative political actions’ can be understood as “the deliberate experimental implementation of desired future relations and practices in the here-and-now” (Raekstad & Gradin, 2020, p. 10).

I argue that these actions are a specific form of ‘direct actions’ that can be understood with reference to two integral components. First, a prefigurative action is a synecdoche of the desired future social relations: “It contains elements of the object it is representing. It stands both as a practical response to a given situation, but also as a symbol of the larger vision of societal change” (Franks, 2003, p. 20). Second, they are undertaken by political subjects without resorting to the mediation of an authority except for themselves, where these subjects are – and expect to be – the main beneficiaries of the action itself (Graeber, 2009). Taken together, these point out the conduct of the action by these political subjects whose ethical, political, and affective dispositions in a specific historical time and space constitute a prefigurative political experience. This approach enables to disaggregate the concept in order to understand how different modalities of prefigurative political actions can be discussed with reference to a compound of their temporality, spatiality, and ethical, political, and affective underpinnings. Namely, it allows us to locate the individual or collective spaces of action; the ways in which political subjects bind their experiences of past, present, and future; and the political subjectivities engaging in the action.

While this outlook allows me to navigate better through the recent conceptualizations in the literature, it also provides certain analytical leverage to make sense of different aspects of these political activities. As I visit a brief history of different sets of prefigurative political actions in Turkey in the third chapter, I implicitly rely on this framework to indicate different modalities of prefigurative political actions that were present in history. In this sense, this research also contributes to the exploration of the history of prefigurative practices in Turkey, which has yet remained an unvisited area. As I proceed with tracing the course of development for prefigurative politics as an outcome of Gezi in the subsequent chapters, I also demonstrate that the affective composition of the political subjects has been integral to their prefigurative experiences. Besides the fact that there are only a few works that focus on the affective implications of prefigurative practices in the existing literature (Wilkinson, 2009; Dinerstein, 2015; Gordon, 2018; Raekstad & Gradin, 2020), there are only sporadic enterprises to incorporate an affective dimension to the conceptualization of prefigurative politics (Gordon, 2018). Focusing on the development of prefigurative politics as an outcome of Gezi, I contribute to recuperate these gaps by substantiating the integrality of affections to ‘prefigurative politics.’ By this way, I also build up the studies of Gezi as a prefigurative experience (Binbuğa Kınık, 2020; Ertuğrul, 2022; Salman, 2022) or Gezi’s prefigurative outcomes (Uncu, 2022).

Following this course of development, I especially focused on the affective micro-dynamics that made prefigurative politics in and after Gezi Protests possible. While I present that the political practices in and around the park have come to constitute an emotional atmosphere forming the bases for these dynamics beyond the confines of the park, I argue that this atmosphere had been first made possible by a

temporal experience stemming from the unanticipated eruption of mass protests. In this regard, following the emphases on the need for further attentiveness to the temporality of movements (Gillan, 2018; della Porta, 2018; Gillan & Edwards, 2020), I single out that the massive and abrupt character of Gezi indicates a disruption with the quotidian functioning of time (Sofos, 2018) as the experience of time became accelerated and compressed. This experience enabled activists to steer away from the limitations of dominant social and political structures, bringing abundant possibilities to transform their social relations. Subsequent to the emergence of this accelerated time experience with mass protests, its transformative effects were reinforced by the temporality of prefigurative political actions deployed within the park. These practices were substantially influential in the development of new political horizons, as they bind the future and the present in a way that “negates present structures with immanent imaginative utopias and publicly demonstrates concrete egalitarian alternatives. Such an instantiation of egalitarian forms in an exemplary locality counters the hegemonic presentist closure of temporal horizons and opens up new egalitarian possibilities” (Gürer, p. 198, 2019). As a result of a cluster of these temporalities, Gezi came to the fore as an ‘eventful protest’ (della Porta & Atak, 2017) initiating abrupt transformations in people’s accustomed political ideas, values, habits and practices and bringing new political practices into being. While several authors dwelt upon different political implications of the temporality of Gezi (Özdüzen, 2019; della Porta & Atak, 2017; Taşkale, 2016), Gürer (2019) specifically focuses on the significance of temporality created by its prefigurative practices. This research banded these works together by identifying it as an ‘eventful protest’ that prompted a ‘critical juncture’ whose temporality can be

traced with reference to the subsequent phases of ‘cracking,’ ‘vibration’ and ‘sedimentation’ (della Porta, 2018).

While this framework takes the exploration of the temporality of Gezi beyond the boundaries of the mobilizations around the park, it puts forward the central importance of prefigurative practices in terms of generating and transfusing these temporal experiences. I argue that prefigurative experience within the park was integral to the departure of cracking in the ‘normal’ functioning of time and politics, whereas the implications of this crack were to be reproduced and spread by the concomitant prefigurative practices in its ‘vibration’ phase. This indicates that the temporal experiences in Gezi did not vanish but transferred to different spaces and times, taking new forms. While this study gives countenance to the views that emphasize the continual transformative power of this ‘eventful protest’ (Özdüzen, 2019; della Porta & Atak, 2017; Taşkale, 2016), it complements them by settling the central political significance of prefigurative actions in terms of transplanting this power (Gürer, 2019; Ertuğrul, 2022). In this sense, it also provides a basis through which miscellaneous repercussions of this transformative effect on different social and political actors can be traced in the ‘sedimentation’ phase. Within the scope of this thesis, I focused on one such outcome, that is, of the development and sustenance of prefigurative politics, by drawing on this framework to trace the changing course of the experiencing of the temporality of Gezi. For this regard, in the fourth chapter, I discuss how the emotional atmosphere that was created by the initial cracking has been turned into an enduring emotional climate with the help of prefigurative practices and paving the way for the sedimentation of prefigurative politics. Concomitantly, I also address how memories and affections of Gezi can be revivifying for activists to develop prefigurative politics, especially after new events

that disrupt their quotidian time experience. In brief, it can be observed that the temporality of Gezi can be continuous, though restlessly: whose experience can be “multiple, reiterated, and situated” in different forms over time and space (Wagner-Pacifici, 2010, p. 1336).

Moving towards the conditions that made prefigurative politics possible following Gezi, I discuss affective, strategic, and relational aspects of cracking and vibration phases that led activists to engage in prefigurative practices. Here, I attest particular attention to the articulation of an enduring ‘emotional climate’ by different forms of feelings, i.e., moral emotions, affective loyalties, reflexes and moods (Jasper, 2011). Whereas the development of this climate was rooted in the political practices within and around the park, it has been sustained through subsequent prefigurative political actions, i.e., of solidarity networks, issue-specific defense networks, neighborhood assemblies, squats, urban gardens, collectives, cooperatives, and political organizations, as vibrations of the cracking. I contend that these practices were influential in the embodiment of hope, characterizing the political significance of this emotional climate. If this hope was vitally important for the ‘cognitive-emotional liberation’ (Flam, 2005) of individuals to engage and stay with their prefigurative political actions by turning their individual concerns into ‘mobilizing grievances’ (Snow, 2013; Simmons, 2014; Bray et al., 2018), it cannot be thought of as independent from their ideational considerations (Jasper, 1998, 2011; Goodwin, Jasper & Polletta, 2004; Flam, 2005). Therefore, I turn to the exploration of their grievances, strategic considerations, and positioning vis-à-vis different strategic orientations in their engagement with prefigurative politics.

First, I discuss how prefigurative actions provide different possibilities for activists to act against a variety of intersecting grievances. While prefiguration offers

political possibilities to confront and transform dominant social relations produced by different authority structures, it also allows for immediate changes in their daily life. Second, they provide experimental ways of action and flexible forms of organization that can be strategically important to adapt to the changes in a political environment where repression permeates. Third, compared to the instrumentalist strategic orientations of the socialist movement, activists consider that the implications of these are more effective in terms of bringing about a social transformation and immediate changes in daily life - which they see as two integrally connected tasks - and coping with the limitations of the increasing authoritarianism. While I navigate through these points, I also reveal how these considerations were integrally connected to activists' affections. In this sense, it also implies that the constitution and sustenance of hope have been made possible by continuous interactive political processes, as with the process of 'cognitive-emotional liberation.' After all, this process underlies the course of development for prefigurative politics after Gezi Protests.

Proceeding to the disruptions of this course in the fifth chapter, I identify the characteristics of the dispiriting emotional climate that is created by the consolidation of authoritarianism. As the chapter singles out different feelings embodying this climate, it brings it in contact with the preceding emotional climate whose repercussions can still be traced in the currently active prefigurative politics. Also connecting with the abovementioned points, the chapter prologuizes an answer to the question of how activists engage in prefigurative politics in this current political context. While activists retain certain hopes, it is now to be accompanied by anxious feelings of insecurity, fear, loneliness, sorrow, and grief. This accompaniment points out that activists express different forms of hope that are 'active' and 'dormant.' By

moving toward the case of Kadıköy Cooperative in the last part of the chapter, I basically argue that these expressions seem to be amounting to the experience of a hope that is in an oscillating motion between its active and dormant forms; namely, an experience of ‘anxious hope.’ In this sense, activists’ experience indicates a state of feeling whose boundaries are yet to be fixed. I think, this pertains to the political subjectivity that is made possible by the ‘counter-conduct’ of the Kadıköy Cooperative.

The last chapter, in a way, focuses on the formation of this anxiously hopeful condition. The chapter, in this sense, unfolds in a manifold manner. As it focuses on the sedimentation of the critical juncture sparked by Gezi, it identifies Kadıköy Cooperative as one of its enduring legacies. Instead of influencing already existing institutions and mechanisms of legislation (della Porta, 2018), this case constitutes an example where a prefigurative constitutional order (Kinna et al., 2019) has become institutionalized. Furthermore, I contend that the cascade of political actions that embodied this institutionalization ever since Gezi indicates a permanent exercise of ‘counter-conduct.’ In the first sense of the term, it constitutes subjects that are conducted differently and, in the second sense, an area where subjects can have possibilities to conduct themselves – their own conduct or behavior –autonomously (Davidson, 2011). The first point out the set of practices, values, ideas, habits, affections, procedures, or mechanisms of the collectivity that makes up the social and political institutionalization terrain of the cooperative; whereas the second indicates the possibilities for individuals to act autonomously within and outside this terrain. While this counter-conduct (in these two senses) interacts with ‘power as conduct of conduct’ (Ertuğrul, 2022) in relation to the broader social and political context, it also brings about peculiar possibilities and limitations depending on the negotiation

between these two aspects of the counter-conduct. In this sense, counter-conduct implicates a complex interplay between these power dynamics. While this interplay would result in a reorganization of power relations as well as the creation of new ones, the implications of this process are also dependent on continual criticism of the course of these processes. That is, a ‘self-care’ through self-denial to conduct and to be conducted; and, a self-invention towards the counter-conduct. Although this term was discussed with reference to the ethical/political “attitude, attention and practices” of the individuals (Foucault, 1997; Davidson, 2011, p. 30), I used it to make sense of the collective self-care practices of the cooperative.

In this regard, I rely on a view that this process entails a solidaristic attitude, self-reflective attention, and prefigurative practices on the ways in which power relations are operating in the abovementioned interplay. As Davidson (2011, p. 30) summarizes, components of self-care are: “a general attitude with respect to oneself, to others and to the world; a form of attention turned towards oneself; a series of practices or techniques of the self.” In this regard, I sought to identify these attitude, attention, and practices throughout the chapter. As I observed that this collectivity developed certain radically democratic mechanisms, procedures, and practices to carry out self-reflection processes, I came to the conclusion that this ethical stance constitutes one of the principal tenets of the cooperative, which was also floating in the activists’ individual interpretations. These self-reflections enabled me to locate the strategic and political significance of their prefigurative orientation and solidarity actions as well. Prefigurative political orientation was of central importance, underlying and binding the exercise of self-reflection and solidarity practices. In this sense, this orientation, in a way, seems to be articulating the central principles of the group. This also concretizes in the development of a prefigurative constitutional

order that is radically horizontal and flexible. I think that this orientation has also been significant for cultivating and sustaining a certain hope.

I argue that the set of practices that are instantiated by ethical, political, strategic, and affective dispositions of this collectivity embodies an autonomy-seeking, or counter-conducting, political subjectivity. By tracing this subjectivity's interactions with its political environment through prefigurative, solidarity, and self-reflective practices, I sought to reveal how activists sustain a prefigurative politics with a specific focus on the affective implications of these practices in this chapter. I came to the conclusion that the counter-institutionalization of the cooperative around a radically solidaristic culture and a prefigurative constitutional order enable the group to exercise collective self-reflection mechanisms, procedures, and practices to work on individual and collective anxieties; and, tightens feelings of solidarity, belongingness, autonomy, and joy, thereupon, solidifies hope. As I emphasized earlier, the course of this counter-institutionalization unfolds as a complex interplay of power relations, on which individual and collective self-care practices rework. Although these processes occur in conjunction with a complexity of different forms of emotions, I think that the experience of hope has a peculiar political significance. In this sense, an experience of 'anxious hope' characterizes the course of these political actions. As I mentioned, this experience is pertaining to an oscillation between what I identify as active and dormant forms of hope.

This explication can be thought of in concordance with certain scholars' attempt to work on Ernst Bloch's (1995) 'principle of hope' in order to make sense of the political content of hope that can be found in contemporary social movements. These enterprises can be better understood by referring to Terry Eagleton's (2019) differentiation between 'performative' and 'optative hope.' Different than its optative

form, performative hope “is not simply an anticipation of the future but an active force in its constitution” (Eagleton, 2019, p. 84). For Bloch, this type of hope carries a positive utopian function and would pertain to a political revolution: “The utopian function of hope alters the given past-present-future temporalities by articulating the possibility of anticipating the future within the present” (Dinerstein & Deneulin, 2012, pp. 594-595). This hope is also interpreted as a ‘radical hope’ (Gordon, 2018; Dinerstein & Deneulin, 2012) with reference to Jonathan Lear: “What makes this hope radical is that it is directed toward a future goodness that transcends the current ability to understand what it is” (Lear, 2008, p. 103). Both of these conceptualizations, in conjunction, set forth this type of hope as constituting a moral orientation, where reasoning and affections are intertwined. As Eagleton (2019, p. 61) comments:

Hope of this kind is a moral orientation, not simply a wish or spontaneous impulse. Reason cannot blossom without hope . . . and hope cannot flourish without reason. Perhaps hope engages reason more deeply than some other modes of desire because, as we have seen, its end must be feasible, and such feasibility may call for fine judgment. We have also seen that hope involves a kind of plotting or projecting, in the sense of an imaginative articulation of present and future, and this, too, has its rational aspects

Similarly, Uri Gordon argues that Lear’s radical hope describes “the choice to sustain ethics and dignity even through the passage of a way of life . . . Lear contrasts radical hope to mere optimism, linking it to a virtue ethic centred on courage and imagination” (Gordon, 2018, p. 534). While I agree with the conjunction of these conceptualizations, I doubt whether one can attain such orientation once and for all. Should we understand these states as an ethical stance which one can choose or attain and retain for the rest of the time? Or, as a moral affection that arouses and lasts in a specific time and place, and develops as a result of specific ethical and political actions? Based on these conceptualizations and inclining more towards the latter

question, instead of proceeding with ‘performative/radical’ or ‘optative hope’, I prefer to rely on the terms ‘active’ and ‘dormant hope’ – also because of their connotation. To the extent that optative hope articulates certain discourses and feelings, it can also be a constituent of an anticipated future; or, certain optations can be articulated together to incur different senses that can be radically hopeful. In the sense that these hopes can find different times, spaces, and expressions where they can become something else, they just seem to be dormant in terms of their active constituency in the development of the future. This dormancy does not necessarily connote that they are non-radical or ineffective. Proceeding from this reinterpretation and inspired by Abiral’s (2015) take on how compositions of different feelings may constitute different experiences of hope and Gordon’s (2018) suggestion to bind Abiral’s enterprise and Blochian hope with the character of the current exemplar of prefigurative politics, I elaborate on the coexistence of different anxieties with the experience of active and dormant hopes.

The object of ‘dormant hope,’ if there is any, seems to be the anticipation of a broader social transformation, while it is pretty much dependent on the general political context. As the growing authoritarianism brought more and more limitations on the publicly manifested collective actions, it created such an environment that activists feel extremely dispirited and limited. Even when they attempt to overcome these limitations and sustain their actions, they do not operate within an environment where other groups can also do so. Individuals and groups feel lonelier and more detached from each other than ever. These conditions consign future prospects of the individuals in a way that their political actions cannot lead to meaningful changes in the present but may amount to an accumulation of experiences that may turn out to ignite broader transformation in the future.

Therefore, activists seem to have a dormant hope regarding the impact of their political actions and the way in which they can interfere in the operation of social and political authority structures. On the other hand, the political actions and practices of the activists especially within their organizational sphere seem to point out to a difference. As they seek to create different experiences of social relations within this domain, it seems to amount to a different experience of hope as well. Their organizational practices and actions seem to be more promising for the course of their group either in the present or the future. Therefore, they seem to cling to a hope which I identify as rather active. Activists do not solely expect that these actions will eventually amount to a meaningful change in the future; rather, it is already now and expected to sustain in the future. Yet, this organizational life itself is not fully independent from the impact of dominant power relations and is also not exempt from its own tensions. Activists seem to be aware of their inadequacies in these two senses and that these practices may not translate into a broader transformation and feel anxious about that.

As prefigurative actions develop different spatio-temporal locations with a particular ethical, political and affective disposition, they seem to provide a new time and space for hope. It is through such experience activists seem to find ways to sustain their political actions with an 'active hope.' As they now experience social relations that can provide a certain independence from dominant social and political relations, activists can cling to hope for the present and the future. In this sense, it does not make activists to standby until the future but keep acting in the present to make up this future. Yet, this experience remains quite vulnerable, for it exists along with a social life that is organized by dominant social and political structures, not fully independent of it. Besides, these dominant social relations are not only coming

from an outer source but also directly from within the individuals in the group themselves. Hence, activists can sustain this hope to the extent that they develop ways to deal with these limiting power relations that they are subjects of and are subjected to. The capability of activists to build an organizational structure and culture around a constitutional order that can deal with these anxieties, therefore, comes to the forefront as an important aspect of how the cooperative sustains its actions within this political environment.

By this way, the cooperative seeks to settle up a space for negotiating with anxious affections created by the current emotional climate, organizational tensions, and power relations within the group. If this constitutional space allows activists to work on their present anxieties at one part, it is also concerned with sustaining their ethical, political and strategic stance so as to respond to the anxieties regarding the future. Namely, the constitutionalizing practices of the cooperative functions to reserve a solidaristic political and social culture, engagement with prefigurative political practices, and a self-reflective ethical stance to evaluate the course of social and political relations furnished by these. It points out to the embracement of a dynamic process in this regard, where there is constant negotiation about the limitations and the possibilities of the implications of the political actions at hand.

In this sense, their political experiences within this political context are embodied through an ebb and flow between different senses of hope and anxiety. Instead of getting fixed on one part in this oscillation, activists seem to have conceded themselves to this motion itself. They neither strictly settle on a hopeful belief that the future, in some way, will be better, nor that the present is, in any way, already good. Besides, their anxieties seem not to drive them into feelings of despair in the present, nor into absolute hopelessness for the future. Nevertheless, this

oscillation seems to remain in a fragile condition within this political context, where dispiriting anxious senses may (and at times do) easily take over.

In this sense, this motion reflects the negotiation between active and dormant hopes which are accompanied by anxieties of this specific context, for the present and future moments. I contend that the activists' hope does not indicate a fixed state to be settled on, but rather experienced as a motion. Adding on to different anxieties regarding the present and future moments, this motion itself also makes this hope anxious. Thinking together with the abovementioned discussion on Blochian hopes, I identify the character of these oscillating hopes as constituting an experience of 'anxious hope' expanding on Bürge Abiral (2015). While she argues that this experience points out to a hope that is accompanied by anxiety, I add on to this view by questioning whether this accompaniment embodies one form of hope and anxiety, or the interaction between their multiple forms and experiences. In brief, this negotiation occurs through a motion, reminiscent of the ebb and flow, between different forms of hope that embody an anxious hope, accompanying activists' political actions, though vulnerably. While activists engage in political practices with such an anxious hope, these practices amount to an enduring legacy of Gezi: the sedimentation of the cooperative as a 'counter-conduct' that makes autonomy-seeking subjectivities possible.

APPENDIX

ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 23.06.2021-18476

T.C.
BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER YÜKSEK LİSANS VE DOKTORA TEZLERİ ETİK İNCELEME
KOMİSYONU
TOPLANTI TUTANAĞI

Toplantı Sayısı : 18
Toplantı Tarihi : 17.06.2021
Toplantı Saati : 13:00
Toplantı Yeri : Zoom Sanal Toplantı
Bulunanlar : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen, Prof. Dr. Ebru Kaya, Prof. Dr. Fatma Nevra Seggie
Bulunmayanlar :

Fahir Yumuk

Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Türkiye'de Gezi Sonrası Toplumsal Hareketler ve Prefigüratif Siyaset" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığımız SBB-EAK 2021/35 sayılı başvuru komisyonumuz tarafından 17 Haziran 2021 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve uygun bulunmuştur.

Bu karar tüm üyelerin toplantıya çevrimiçi olarak katılımı ve oybirliği ile alınmıştır. COVID-19 önlemleri kapsamında kurul üyelerinden ıslak imza alınmadığı için bu onay mektubu üye ve raportör olarak Ebru Kaya tarafından bütün üyeler adına e-imzalanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla, bilgilerinizi rica ederiz.

Prof. Dr. Ebru KAYA
ÜYE

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr.Ebru KAYA
Raportör

SOBETİK 18 17.06.2021

Bu belge 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununun 5. Maddesi gereğince güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

REFERENCES

- Abiral, B. (2015). *Catastrophic futures, anxious presents: Lifestyle activism and hope in the permaculture movement in Turkey* (Unpublished MA thesis). Sabancı University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Akçalı, E. (2018). Do popular assemblies contribute to genuine political change? Lessons from the park forums in Istanbul. *South European Society and Politics*, 23(3), pp. 323–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13608746.2018.1437007>
- Akkaya, A. H., & Jongerden, J. (2014). Confederalism and autonomy in Turkey: The Kurdistan Workers' Party and the reinvention of democracy. In C. Gunes & W. Zeydanlıoğlu (Eds.), *The Kurdish question in Turkey: New perspectives on violence, representation, and reconciliation* (pp. 186–204). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Ankara Belediyesi Başkanlık Uzmanları. (1977). *Toplumcu Belediye*. Ankara, Turkey: Ankara Belediyesi.
- Aslan, Ş. (2004). *1 Mayıs mahallesi: 1980 öncesi toplumsal mücadeleler ve kent*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Auerbach, E. (1984). *Scenes from the drama of European literature*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Barbalet, J. M. (1998). *Emotion, social theory, and social structure: A macrosociological approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Başkent, C. (Ed.). (2014). *İzmir Savaş Karşıtları Derneği: Bir sözel tarih*. Propaganda Yayınları.
- Batuman, B. (2010). Toplumcu bir belediyeçilik modeli: "Yeni Belediyeçilik Hareketi" 1973-1977. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 34(266), 223–241.
- Baykan, B. G. (2020). Radikal Demokrat Yeşiller: 80'ler Türkiye'si'nden alternatif bir koalisyon. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 44(3), 487–513.
- Binbuğa Kınık, B. N. (2020). *Political and social opposition represented by environmental movements against neoliberal politics in contemporary Turkey* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Bloch, E. (1995). *The principle of hope*. MIT Press.
- Boggs, C. (1977a). Marxism, prefigurative communism, and the problem of workers' control. *Radical America*, 11(November).
- Boggs, C. (1977b). Revolutionary process, political strategy, and the dilemma of power. *Theory and Society*, 4(3), 359–393.

- Bora, T. (2017). *Cereyanlar: Türkiye’de siyasî ideolojiler* (K. Ünüvar, Ed.; 1st ed). İletişim Yayınları.
- Bozkurt, E. (2019). *The changing dynamics of the architectural profession in Turkey, 1960s—1970s: The rise of participatory design and the experimental case of İzmit New Settlements Project* (Unpublished MA thesis). Bilkent University.
- Bray, L. A., Shriver, T. E., & Adams, A. E. (2018). Mobilizing grievances in an authoritarian setting: Threat and emotion in the 1953 Plzeň Uprising. *Sociological Perspectives*, 62(1), 77–95.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121418791771>
- Breines, W. (1980). Community and organization: The new left and Michels’ “Iron Law”. *Social Problems*, 27(4), 419–429.
- Breines, W. (1989). *Community and organization in the new left, 1962-1968: The great refusal*. Rutgers University Press.
- Çabuk Kaya, N., & Ural, H. (2018). The Gezi Resistance of Turkey as young people’s counter-conduct. In S. Pickard & J. Bessant (Eds.), *Young people re-generating politics in times of crises* (pp. 199–215). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58250-4_11
- Çavdar, T. (1978). Toplum Bilinçlenmesinde araç olarak katılımsal tasarım: ‘İzmit Yenilikçi Yerleşmeler Projesi’. *Mimarlık Dergisi*, 16(1).
- Cecilia Dinerstein, A., & Deneulin, S. (2012). Hope movements: Naming mobilization in a post-development world. *Development and Change*, 43(2), 585–602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2012.01765.x>
- Çıdam, Ç. (2017). Unruly practices: Gezi Protests and the politics of friendship. *New Political Science*, 39(3), 369–392.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2017.1339413>
- Collier, D., & Munck, G. L. (2017). Building blocks and methodological challenges: A framework for studying critical junctures. *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research*, 5(1), 2–9.
- Cooper, D. (2017). Prefiguring the state. *Antipode*, 49(2), 335–356.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12277>
- Davidson, A. I. (2011). In praise of counter-conduct. *History of the Human Sciences*, 24(4), 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695111411625>
- Day, R. J. F. (2004). From hegemony to affinity: The political logic of the newest social movements. *Cultural Studies*, 18(5), 716–748.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0950238042000260360>
- Day, R. J. F. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. Pluto Press; Between the Lines.

- Death, C. (2010). Counter-conducts: A Foucauldian analytics of protest. *Social Movement Studies*, 9(3), 235–251.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2010.493655>
- Death, C. (2016). Counter-conducts as a mode of resistance: Ways of “not being like that” in South Africa. *Global Society*, 30(2), 201–217.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2015.1133566>
- della Porta, D. (2020). Protests as critical junctures: Some reflections towards a momentous approach to social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 19(5–6), 556–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1555458>
- della Porta, D., & Atak, K. (2017). The spirit of Gezi. A relational approach to eventful protest and its challenges. In D. della Porta (Ed.), *Global diffusion of protest* (pp. 31–58). Amsterdam University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048531356-003>
- della Porta, D., & Giugni, M. (2013). Emotions in movement. In D. della Porta & D. Rucht (Eds.), *Meeting democracy: Power and deliberation in global justice movements*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dinerstein, A. C. (2015). Autonomy in the key of hope: Understanding prefiguration. In *The politics of autonomy in Latin America: The art of organizing hope* (pp. 58–78). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dixon, C. (2014). *Another politics: Talking across today’s transformative movements*. University of California Press.
- Eagleton, T. (2019). *Hope without optimism*. Yale University Press.
- Eleftheriadis, K. (2015). Organizational practices and prefigurative spaces in European queer festivals. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(6), 651–667.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2015.1029045>
- Eliaçık, K. (2006). *Müzikal isyan Barışarock*. Mephisto Kitabevi.
- Epstein, B. L. (1993). *Political protest and cultural revolution: Nonviolent direct action in the 1970s and 1980s* (1st ed.). University of California Press.
- Erdoğan, N. (1998). Demokratik soldan Devrimci-Yol’a: 1970’lerde sol popülizm üzerine notlar. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 78, 22–37.
- Ertuğrul, K. (2022). Gezi Insurgency as ‘counter-conduct’. *Middle East Critique*, 31(3), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2022.2098901>
- Fırat, B. Ö. (2019). Müşterekleştirme ve çitlemenin zamanı: Göllüce’de toprak mücadeleleri. *Praksis*, 49, 39–66.
- Flam, H. (2005). Emotions’ map: A research agenda. In H. Flam & D. King (Eds.), *Emotions and social movements* (pp. 19–40). Routledge.

- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault, beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997). The ethics of the concern of the self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*. New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2007). What is critique? In S. Lotringer (Ed.), *The politics of truth*. Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78* (M. Senellart, Ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Franks, B. (2003). Direct action ethic. *Anarchist Studies*, 1, 13–41.
- Franks, B. (2018). Prefiguration. In B. Franks, N. J. Jun, & L. A. Williams (Eds.), *Anarchism: A conceptual approach* (pp. 28–43). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Futrell, R., & Simi, P. (2004). Free spaces, collective identity, and the persistence of U.S. white power activism. *Social Problems*, 51(1), 16–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2004.51.1.16>
- Gambetti, Z. (2014). Occupy Gezi as politics of the body. In U. Ozkirimli (Ed.), *The making of a protest movement in Turkey*. Palgrave Macmillan.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137413789.0010>
- Gamson, W. (1992). The social psychology of collective action. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. Yale University Press.
- Gillan, K. (2020). Temporality in social movement theory: Vectors and events in the neoliberal timescape. *Social Movement Studies*, 19(5–6), 516–536.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1548965>
- Gillan, K., & Edwards, G. (2020). Time for change. *Social Movement Studies*, 19(5–6), 501–515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2020.1806813>
- Goodwin, J., Jasper, J. M., & Polletta, F. (2004). Emotional dimensions of social movements. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 413–432). Blackwell Pub.
- Goodwin, J., Jasper, J. M., & Polletta, F. (Eds.). (2001). *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, U. (2008). *Anarchy alive! Anti-authoritarian politics from practice to theory*. Pluto Press.
- Gordon, U. (2018). Prefigurative Politics between Ethical Practice and Absent Promise. *Political Studies*, 66(2), 521–537.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321717722363>

- Gorz, A. (1968). The way forward. *New Left Review*, 52(1).
<https://newleftreview.org/issues/i52/articles/andre-gorz-the-way-forward>
- Graeber, D. (2002). The new anarchists. *New Left Review*, 13(January/February).
- Graeber, D. (2009). *Direct action: An ethnography*. AK Press.
- Graeber, D. (2013). *The democracy project: A history, a crisis, a movement* (1st ed). Spiegel & Grau.
- Gürçan, E. C., & Peker, E. (2015). *Challenging neoliberalism at Turkey's Gezi Park*. Palgrave Macmillan US. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137469021>
- Gürer, E. Ç. (2019). *Prefigurative realism: The politics of space-time in the square movements*. Villanova University.
- Haenfler, R., Johnson, B., & Jones, E. (2012). Lifestyle movements: Exploring the intersection of lifestyle and social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 11(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.640535>
- Hammond, J. L. (1984). The Portuguese Revolution: Two models of socialist transition. *Insurgent Sociologist*, 12(1–2), 83–100.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/089692058401200108>
- Holloway, J. (2010). *Crack capitalism*. Pluto Press.
- İlhan Demiryol, G. (2018). Turkey's Arendtian moment: Gezi Park Protests. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 20(6), 531–546.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2018.1482082>
- Ishkanian, A., & Peña Saavedra, A. (2019). The politics and practices of intersectional prefiguration in social movements: The case of Sisters Uncut. *The Sociological Review*, 67(5), 985–1001.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026118822974>
- Jasper, J. (1998). The emotions of protest: Affective and reactive emotions in and around social movements. *Sociological Forum*, 13(3), 397–424.
- Jasper, J. M. (2010). Social movement theory today: Toward a theory of action?. *Sociology Compass*, 4(11), 965–976. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00329.x>
- Jasper, J. M. (2011). Emotions and social movements: Twenty years of theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37(1), 285–303.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150015>
- Kara, O. E. (2018). *Minor politics and its promises: The case of Turkey* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

- Karakayalı, S., & Yaka, Ö. (2014). The spirit of Gezi: The recomposition of political subjectivities in Turkey. *New Formations*, 83(83), 117–138.
<https://doi.org/10.3898/NeWf.83.07.2014>
- Kinna, R., Prichard, A., & Swann, T. (2019). Occupy and the constitution of anarchy. *Global Constitutionalism*, 8(2), 357–390.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S204538171900008X>
- Kocagöz, U. (2012). Karşı işgal deneyimi: Neo-liberalizm ve kamusal. *Birikim Dergisi*. Retrieved from <https://birikimdergisi.com/guncel/391/karsi-iscal-deneyimi-neo-liberalizm-ve-kamusal>
- Kontovas, N. (2012). *Lubunca: The historical development of Istanbul's queer slang and a social-functional approach to diachronic processes in language* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Indiana University.
- Koopmans, R. (2007). Protest in time and space: The evolution of waves of contention. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 19–46). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470999103.ch2>
- Lear, J. (2008). *Radical hope: Ethics in the face of cultural devastation* (1st ed.). Harvard University Press.
- Maeckelbergh, M. (2009). *The will of the many: How the alterglobalisation movement is changing the face of democracy*. Pluto Press.
- Maeckelbergh, M. (2011). Doing is believing: Prefiguration as strategic practice in the alterglobalization movement. *Social Movement Studies*, 10(1), 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2011.545223>
- McAdam, D. (1997). The political process model. In *Political process and the development of black insurgency: 1930-1970* (pp. 36–59). University of Chicago Press.
- McAdam, D., & Sewell, W. H. (2001). It's about time: Temporality in the study of social movements and revolutions. In R. R. Aminzade, J. A. Goldstone, D. McAdam, E. J. Perry, W. H. Sewell, S. Tarrow, & C. Tilley (Eds.), *Silence and voice in the study of contentious politics* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815331>
- McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2001). *Dynamics of contention* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805431>
- Meyer, R., & Kimeldorf, H. (2015). Eventful subjectivity: The experiential sources of solidarity. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 28(4), 429–457.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12083>
- Milstein, C. (2004). Reclaim the cities: From protest to popular power. In D. Solnit (Ed.), *Globalize liberation: How to uproot the system and build a better world*. City Lights Books.

- Morgül, K. (2019). Performing revolutionary populism: The Revolutionary Path movement in Turkey. *Qualitative Sociology*, 42(2), 273–297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9416-4>
- Naegler, L. (2018). ‘Goldman-Sachs doesn’t care if you raise chicken’: The challenges of resistant prefiguration. *Social Movement Studies*, 17(5), 507–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1495074>
- Nişancıoğlu, K., & Pal, M. (2016). Counter-conduct in the university factory: Locating the Occupy Sussex campaign. *Global Society*, 30(2), 279–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2016.1144565>
- Özduzen, Ö. (2019). Spaces of hope in authoritarian Turkey: Istanbul’s interconnected geographies of post-Occupy activism. *Political Geography*, 70, 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.01.003>
- Palacios-Valladares, I. (2020). Chile’s 2019 October protests and the student movement: Eventful mobilization? *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 40(2), 215–234. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-090X2020005000106>
- Pearlman, W. (2013). Emotions and the microfoundations of the Arab Uprisings. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2), 387–409. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713001072>
- Polletta, F. (1999). ‘Free spaces’ in collective action. *Theory and Society*, 28(1), 1–38.
- Portwood-Stacer, L. (2013). *Lifestyle politics and radical activism*. Bloomsbury.
- Pourmokhtari, N. (2017). Protestation and mobilization in the Middle East and North Africa: A Foucauldian model. *Foucault Studies*, 44, 177–207. <https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i0.5240>
- Raekstad, P., & Gradin, S. (2020). *Prefigurative politics: Building tomorrow today*. Polity.
- Rossdale, C., & Stierl, M. (2016). Everything is dangerous: Conduct and counter-conduct in the Occupy movement. *Global Society*, 30(2), 157–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2015.1133569>
- Rowbotham, S. (1981). The women’s movement and organizing for socialism. In S. Rowbotham, L. Segal, & H. Wainwright (Eds.), *Beyond the fragments: Feminism and the making of socialism*. Alyson Publications.
- Rowbotham, S., Segal, L., & Wainwright, H. (1981). *Beyond the fragments: Feminism and the making of socialism*. Alyson Publications.
- Salman, S. (2022). *Gezi Protests: Between carnivalesque and prefiguration* (Unpublished MA thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Savun, B. (2012). 1980 sonrası Türkiye öğrenci hareketi: Öğrenci Dernekleri ve Öğrenci Koordinasyonu deneyimi. *Sosyolojik Araştırmalar*, 3, 99–120.

- Scholl, C. (2016). Prefiguration. In *Keywords for radicals* (pp. 319–325). AK Press.
- Segal, L. (1981). A local experience. In S. Rowbotham, L. Segal, & H. Wainwright (Eds.), *Beyond the fragments: Feminism and the making of socialism*. Alyson Publications.
- Selbuz, C. (2006). Biography of Armenian anarchist Alexander Atabekian (D. Keskin, Trans.). *Abolishing the borders from below*. Retrieved from <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/cemal-selbuz-biography-of-armenian-anarchist-alexander-atabekian>
- Şensever, F. L. (2003). *Dünya sosyal forumu: Aşağıdan küreselleşme hareketi ve küresel direniş*. Metis.
- Simmons, E. (2014). Grievances do matter in mobilization. *Theory and Society*, 43(5), 513–546. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-014-9231-6>
- Sirman, N. (1989). Feminism in Turkey: A short history. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 3, 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.15184/S0896634600000704>
- Sitrin, M. (2004). Prefigurative politics: Weaving imagination and creation: The future in the present. Globalize Liberation. In D. Solnit (Ed.), *Globalize liberation: How to uproot the system and build a better world*. City Lights Books.
- Sitrin, M. (Ed.). (2006). *Horizontalism: Voices of popular power in Argentina*. AK Press.
- Sitrin, M. A., & Azzellini, D. (2014). *They can't represent us! Reinventing democracy from Greece to Occupy*. Verso.
- Snow, D. A. (2013). Grievances, individual and mobilizing. In D. A. Snow, D. Della Porta, B. Klandermans, & D. McAdam (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470674871.wbespm100>
- Sofos, S. A. (2018). A momentary lapse of reason? Gezi in social-historical perspective. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 31(1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12193>
- Soydan, B. (Ed.). (2013). *Türkiye'de anarşizm: Yüz yıllık gecikme* (1st ed.). İletişim.
- Swain, D. (2017). Not not but not yet: Present and future in prefigurative politics. *Political Studies*, 67(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321717741233>
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813245>
- Tilly, C., & Tarrow, S. G. (2007). *Contentious politics*. Paradigm Publishers.

- Uncu, B. A. (2022). Embedding the prefigurations of the Gezi Protests: The rhizomatic spread of new subjectivities and politicized identities. In N. Göle (Ed.), *Public Space Democracy: Performative, Visual and Normative Dimensions of Politics in a Global Age* (pp. 47–73). Routledge.
- van de Sande, M. (2013). The prefigurative politics of Tahrir Square: An alternative perspective on the 2011 revolutions. *Res Publica*, 19(3), 223–239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-013-9215-9>
- van de Sande, M. (2015). Fighting with tools: Prefiguration and radical politics in the twenty-first century. *Rethinking Marxism*, 27(2), 177–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2015.1007791>
- van de Sande, M. (2019). Prefiguration. In H. Paul (Ed.), *Critical terms in futures studies* (pp. 227–233). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28987-4_36
- Wagner-Pacifci, R. (2010). Theorizing the restlessness of events. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(5), 1351–1386. <https://doi.org/10.1086/651299>
- Wilkinson, E. (2009). The emotions least relevant to politics? Queering autonomous activism. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2(1), 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2009.05.007>
- Wood, L. J., Staggenborg, S., Stalker, G. J., & Kutz-Flamenbaum, R. (2017). Eventful events: Local outcomes of G20 summit protests in Pittsburgh and Toronto. *Social Movement Studies*, 16(5), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2017.1319266>
- Wright, E. O. (1994). *Interrogating inequality: Essays on class analysis, socialism, and Marxism*. Verso.
- Yates, L. (2015). Rethinking prefiguration: Alternatives, micropolitics and goals in social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2013.870883>
- Yates, L. (2020). Prefigurative politics and social movement strategy: The roles of prefiguration in the reproduction, mobilisation and coordination of movements. *Political Studies*, 69(4), 1033–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321720936046>
- Zarakolu, R. (1988). 68'in mirası. In *Sosyalizm ve toplumsal mücadeleler ansiklopedisi*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Zihnioğlu, Ö. (2019). The legacy of Gezi Protests in Turkey. In R. Youngs (Ed.), *After protest: Pathways beyond mass mobilization* (pp. 11–17). Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Zileli, G. & Özkaya, E. (2008). Türkiye'de anarşizm. In M. Belge (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de siyasî düşünce* (pp. 1153–1168). İletişim.