T.R.
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES M.A. PROGRAMME

M.A. THESIS

PARK AS URBAN PUBLIC SPACE: A CASE STUDY IN ZEYTINBURNU SEYITNIZAM PARKI

FATMA DİLŞAD OKÇU BAYBAŞ
14735010

THESIS SUPERVISOR
Prof. Dr. AYŞEGÜL BAYKAN

İSTANBUL
2019

T.R.
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES M.A. PROGRAMME

M.A. THESIS

PARK AS URBAN PUBLIC SPACE: A CASE STUDY IN ZEYTINBURNU SEYITNIZAM PARKI

FATMA DİLŞAD OKÇU BAYBAŞ
14735010

THESIS SUPERVISOR
Prof. Dr. AYŞEGÜL BAYKAN

İSTANBUL
2019

T.R.

YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MA PROGRAMME

M.A. THESIS

PARK AS URBAN PUBLIC SPACE: A CASE STUDY IN ZEYTINBURNU SEYITNIZAM PARKI

FATMA DİLŞAD OKÇU BAYBAŞ
14735010

Date of Submission: 27.05.19
Date of Oral Examination: 01.07.19
Thesis is approved unanimously.

	Title name surname	Signature
Thesis supervisor	: Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Baykan	
List of Referees	: Prof. Dr. Sait Özervarlı	
	Dr. Ebru Çiğdem Thwaites Diken	

İSTANBUL

MAY 2019

ABSTRACT

PARK AS URBAN PUBLIC SPACE: A CASE STUDY IN ZEYTINBURNU SEYITNIZAM PARKI

Fatma Dilşad Okçu Baybaş

July, 2019

Parks in Istanbul has started to be of great importance in city planning recently. Parks are essential urban public spaces of being a refuge to nature, a place for relaxation, playground for children, and a place of socialization. The urban park is an inseparable element of the city, to provide a place for the meeting of strangers and mingle different social groups.

This paper deals with park, which is subject to regulation, control in one hand, and negotiated, recreated space of everyday life on the other. As Foucault suggests, spaces can only be read about the individuals and things within them and the various significations they bring. Urban green areas had variable meanings from ancient civilizations to the modern world, from being a space of religious excitement to being a symbol of political power, being a quiet space and source of physical and psychological health for inhabitants of the modern city. That's why to have a broader understanding of urban park; we need to evaluate it in the complex historical line of urban public spaces. Literature review of the history of parks and gardens in medieval and early modern era ensured the aim to understand the functions, significations of the urban public space and then how it evolved to urban green spaces. On the other hand, the theories of the right to the city, accessibility, public-sphere provided the ground for examining Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Park's functions, meaning-making processes of individuals, and the nature of the public character of the park.

As a case study, Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı is chosen whose inhabitants include disadvantaged groups and immigrants. Using the data gathered from in-depth interviews, the main themes of inquiry are the public character of the park, the park being an extension of private space, the physical and social accessibility in the park and park as a site of negotiation and reconstruction. Within the light of these themes, this study aims to reveal different layers of the park as an urban public space in Istanbul. As each mode of production produces its own space, each place, the practices attached to that place produce its own product. This study is an effort to understand Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı in its own specificity as a social product in its own context.

Keywords: Urban, Public Space, Neighbourhood Park, Istanbul

ÖZ

KAMUSAL MEKAN OLARAK PARK: ZEYTİNBURNU SEYİTNİZAM PARKI VAKA ANALİZİ

Fatma Dilşad Okçu Baybaş

Temmuz, 2019

Son zamanlarda İstanbul'da parklar şehir planlamasında önemli bir yer teşkil etmektedir. Parklar doğaya kaçış yeri, rahatlamak için bir alan, çocuklar için oyun alanı ve sosyalleşme yeri olarak şehrin önemli kamusal alanlarındandır. Mahalle parkı ise, yabancılara tanışma ve değişik sosyal gruplara kaynaşma olanağı tanıyan kentin ayrılamaz bir sosyal unsurudur. Bu çalışma, parkı hem kentsel planlama, kontrol ve düzenlemenin öznesi olarak, hem de tartışılan, değişen ve yeniden üretilen bir mekan olarak ele alacaktır. Foucalt'nun da belirttiği üzere, mekan ancak mekan-birey ilişkisi, mekanın içindeki unsurlarla olan ilişkisi ve bu farklı unsurların getirdiği anlamlar bağlamında ele alınabilir. Kentsel açık yeşil alanlar, ilkel toplumlardan modern dünyaya kadar dini anlamlar, siyasi güç sembolleri, sakin ve huzur verici alanlar, şehir sakinlerinin fiziksel ve psikolojik sağlığına iyi gelen alanlar olarak çok farklı anlamlar taşımışlardır. Bu nedenle, şehir parkına geniş bir bakış açısıyla bakabilmek için, parkı bir kamusal alan olarak, kamusal alanın tarihsel incelemesi ışığında değerlendirmek gereklidir. Bu tarihsel bakış açısı sayesinde, kamusal mekanın tarih içindeki işlevleri ve anlamlandırılmaları ve kamusal mekanın kentsel açık yeşil alanlara dönüşümü incelenmiş, böylelikle parkı bir kamusal mekan olarak geniş bir kapsamda değerlendirmek mümkün olmuştur. Ortaçağ, erken modern dönem ve modern dönem park ve bahçe literatür taraması parkların tarih içindeki sosyal işlevlerine ışık tutması açısından yol gösterici olmuştur. Bununla birlikte, erişilebilirlik, kamusal alan, kent hakkı tartışmaları ele alınarak Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam parkının fonksiyonları ve kamusallığı tartışılmıştır.

Alan araştırması için Zeytinburnunda Seyitnizam parkı seçilmiştir. Zeytinburnu son zamanlarda Suriyeli göçmenlerin, öncesinde de kırsal alandan şehre göçmüş insanların ve dezavantajlı grupların ikamet ettiği bir semttir. Bu parka giden kişilerle derinlemesine mülakatlar yapılarak, mülakatlar ışığında parkın kamusal karakteri, parkın özel alanın bir uzantısı olması, otoriteler tarafından yapılan düzenlemeler ve bu düzenlemelerin bireylere etkileri, bireylerin parka dair kararlarda etkin rol alıp almadığı, bireylerin mekanı yer olarak benimsemeleri konuları irdelenmiştir. Bu unsurlar minvalinde çalışma kentsel bir kamusal alan olarak parkın farklı sosyal katmanlarını ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemiştir. Her üretim şekli kendi mekanını yarattığı gibi, her yer ve o yerle kurulan ilişkiler de yeni bir ürün yaratır. Bu bağlamda, Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı yeni bir kentsel ürün olarak ele alınmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kent, Mahalle Parkı, Kentsel Mekan, Istanbul

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is a result of the support of various people in different aspects. Firstly, I would like to sincerely thank my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Baykan, for her support through this period. She provided different perspectives with her insightful comments and fast feedbacks that she provided in every phase of this study. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Sait Özervarlı and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Teyfur Erdoğdu for their encouragement and support.

I would also like to thank my friends, Zeynep Bilgehan Can, and Gülşah Türk, for their valuable perspectives and discussions. They were always supportive. Last but not least, thanks to my parents and husband, Nazım Bora Baybaş for their patience and belief in me, for spiritually supporting me.

Istanbul, July 2019 Fatma Dilşad Okçu Baybaş

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research Questions and Aim of the Study

This study is concerned with the twofold meaning of ‘public’ space, firstly, of the meaning of space which is open to everyone and of the space which is in the possession of people, and secondly, its appropriation by the state or the official bodies as a site of regulation, organization, and designation. Lefebvre argues that social space consists of three spatial levels, which are: perceived social practices, conceived representations of space, and lived spaces of representation. Perceived social practices are the activities of reproduction of social relations, representations of space denote to construction by experts, social engineers, and spaces of representations refer to the everyday life of inhabitants. The dialectical relationship between conceived and perceived spaces form what is lived. It is then, crucial to understand the clash of two spatial arguments, namely what is conceived and what is perceived. (Lefebvre, 1991) Lefebvre explains urban space as a social product through these implications of spatial appropriation. Spatial appropriation is a claim both by inhabitants of urban space and state power. Public space is a social space, which reproduces meaning and functions through struggles of spatial appropriation.

In capitalism, the contemporary city is the milieu of accumulation. The contemporary city cannot be seen as a distinct entity since it is an inseparable feature of a neoliberal capitalist era. Urban green areas are of utmost importance in the sense of urban design. Urban green areas are instrumental places of urban politics as they are designed, planned, organized in the name of urban planning. Parks as urban green areas are then conceived spaces, which are subject to the design process, spatial policy. While construction and design phases imply the ownership of the state, the practice phase indicates appropriation, which makes a space ‘place’. Urban green areas are the realms of reproduction of everyday social relations. As people perform and experience the space, they reproduce themselves and interact with nature and each other in these spaces in several ways. Urban green areas and parks are spaces of

communication, encounter, and negotiation. Urban green areas do not only refer to spaces of strategies, but rather of tactics, reproductions, everyday practices of people.

In this study, parks are defined as green, open, and public spaces to present a site for spatial practices in daily life. Parks can be seen as both everyday stages of spatial – political struggles, but also a layer of open green areas acting as a site of recreational activities and encounters. Park is not merely a site of political struggle, but also a site of daily interactions, encounters, and recreation.

Parks are urban open green areas with changing functions, forms, and historical meanings. They differ in terms of their form, functions, and historical meanings attached, but also in terms of specific activities of inhabitants. The reason that I chose one of the urban green areas, specifically parks in this study is because of the limitation of time not giving a chance to handle different urban green areas. However, I chose parks intentionally for this study instead of other urban green areas, as I believe it consists of many characteristics of urban green areas in the city. Parks are a vital element of daily life for diverse users of political, economic background. There are diverse types of parks in urban life, such as national parks, amusement parks, and playgrounds. A neighborhood park has a distinct characteristic in its functions, physical features, and historical meaning as an urban green area. I tended to choose neighborhood parks as they are providing as a space for the expression of individuals of the neighborhood, showing the parochial realm of urban life, and as it is a small unit of contestations of urban life. Neighborhood parks carry great value for certain people because of the limitations of their social and economic backgrounds. These are also spaces of negotiation, as diverse people inhabit a neighborhood. The meanings that are attached to space also depend on this diversity of users. That's why this study revolves around access to neighborhood parks and meanings that are attached to space by its users.

Neighborhood parks are crucial public open green spaces as they are close to households and a place for multiple formal and informal activities. Mills states that neighborhoods are significant in urban life, that they are including connections between the private spaces of houses and the public life of the streets (Mills, 2007). Parks constitute both physical and psychological wellbeing for the neighborhood and provide recreational facilities. The neighborhood is also the residential space where close ties and relationships occur. The access to the neighborhood parks is

significantly important for certain groups as these parks improve the lives of residents by being the closest refuge to nature in an urban area. Neighborhood parks then combine aesthetical, social, cultural, political, ecological, recreational functions of urban public space.

This study is an attempt to understand distinct functions of urban green area and socio-political aspect of the public space in an urban context. This study tries to explore the interrelated ties of historical significations of urban public space, urban planning strategies, and tactics, reproduction of individuals of the contemporary urban life together. I argue that these levels of public space and urban green areas cannot be separated.

The specificity of Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam Parkı in this study comes from my relatives' and my own experiences in this park. While I was dwelling around the neighborhood, I came across this park as it was on my way to school, to work, to meet my friends. Then, it became a place of practice for me more than a place of observation, when I started to go to this park with my aunt and my mom to walk my aunt's dog. Hereafter, I started to recognize the negotiations of the space especially told by my aunt, meanings of the park for the users, last but not least, reproduction of space in this neighborhood park. As I observed the park and the users, I aim to comprehend the interpretations, thoughts, and even emotions of people who experience the park. With these multiple layers of urban green areas, public space, and parks, I concluded with below questions for this study.

- How does urban park reflect the complexity of urban public space?
- How does urban park reflect the complexity of urban green areas?
- How does a neighborhood park both denote to a space of negotiation and designation?
- How do people experience the neighborhood park as a part of their daily lives?

1.2. The Scope of the Study

Given the aim and the questions of the study, this study benefits from two bodies of literature on public space and urban green areas. As the first body of literature, I focused on urban green areas in historical context. My interest in urban green areas lies in that complexity of them as urban public space firstly. The historical gaze

strives to give the idea of the complexity of urban green areas with its inseparable relation to urban space. Because space can juxtapose "in a single real place different spaces and locations that are incompatible with each other," we need to look at historical significations of the urban space, and the meanings that are generated in contemporary urban life. Urban green areas had variable meanings from ancient civilizations to the modern world, from being a space of religious excitement to being a symbol of political power, being a quiet space and source of physical and psychological health for inhabitants of the modern city. It is thus, crucial to comprehend the historical context of urban green areas, gardens, and parks to understand contemporary spaces of such.

The second body of literature is derived from the processors of space and public space theories. Discussions around space are important to demonstrate the socio-political function of public space. Critical urban space theories and Marxist tradition are employed to understand public space in the era of capitalism. These theories underline conceived and perceived spaces in an urban context. Meanwhile, the post-modernist approach to urban theory is also appreciated as they shed light on localities, everyday practices, and reconstructed spaces of urban life. As urban green space is a complexity in terms of today's global and local context, we also need to approach urban space in terms of the everyday practices of individuals. The post-modernist body of literature, combined with a historical approach to urban green areas, provide the basis for daily interactions, encounters, and recreational functions of parks.

1.3. Contributions and Limitations of the Thesis

Public space and urban green areas are not a recent phenomenon. Urban green areas from ancient civilizations had variable meanings from being an instrument of political power, a quiet space, a source of physical and psychological health of inhabitants. They are closely connected to the historical process of public space. Thus, there is a need to study urban park in the sense of urban green areas with a historical approach. The literature review indicates that most of the studies of diverse urban parks lack historical approach to urban green areas. Few of them have a historical background of the city or neighborhood. However, a broad historical

background of what is urban space and its relation to urban green areas is missing in these studies. The first contribution of the thesis is then, comprehensive historical background of urban green areas as public spaces.

Moreover, neighborhood parks are sometimes the only place to be a part of the public space for certain groups of people. I recognized that most of the studies about urban park evolve around national parks, and they mainly focus on a specific user profile, especially young people. I argue that neighborhood parks need to be analyzed to find out disadvantaged people's relation to urban public space. Immigrants, women, and disadvantaged people have claims and demands over the urban space through neighborhood parks. This study focuses on the needs of diverse users, especially the ones who are compelled to neighborhood space with limited social and leisure activity opportunities.

The first limitation of the study was the difficulty of having spontaneous interviews, as I wanted to interview people who use the park, and I could not find them without going to park and doing interviews. Mostly, it was hard to build rapport as they thought it was a political survey; they were suspicious of where it would be used. I tried to build rapport first by explaining my study, what I want to know in a general sense before starting the interviews. I interviewed twelve people; I could get voice records of 10 of them; for 2, I took notes. Secondly, as they were in the park, they were mostly busy with something, so answers to questions were shorter than I expected. So, I tried to find a good time to approach them, and it led to a loss of time in many cases. Lastly, because of the scarcity of time, I could not go to other parks of Zeytinburnu, especially the ones mentioned in interviews. It could have given me a more comparable approach for this study. I believe the idea of comparing can be good advice for further studies, and this study will remain as a source for it.

1.4. Structure of the Study

This study explores the interrelated ties of historical significations of urban public space, urban planning strategies, and tactics, reproduction of individuals of the contemporary urban life together.

Accordingly, this thesis consists of 4 chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction chapter, which focuses on the aim of the study and research questions, scope of the study, contributions, and limitations of the thesis, and lastly methodology. It begins with the definition of the problem, the importance of studying neighborhood parks, and how I address the issue through different kinds of the literature of urban public space and history of urban green areas. The reason behind employing historical approach and public space theories is defined in this chapter. In the methodology section, the philosophical assumption, the motivation to choose this specificneighborhood park is explained first. Secondly, it discloses the reasons for employing qualitative research methods and the data collection process.

Chapter 2 explores the literature about the history of green areas and public space together. The section starts with public spaces and open green areas with different signification they gained in a socio-political context. Then, urban green areas are handled as they evolve through time within social, economic, political context up to the neoliberal era. Gardens, pleasure grounds of European cities, commons in the USA are examined to understand the urban green characteristics, and how they gained different significations. Ottoman gardens and new Turkish republican approach are also taken into account to show urban green areas' development. This historical approach is crucial to understand resemblances, commonalities even differences of meanings, significations that are attached to urban public space and green areas throughout history. As urban green space is a complexity in terms of today's global and local context, one of the two relevant bodies of literature, the historical significations of the urban space historical approach is employed in this chapter.

Chapter 3 dwells on public space, urban public space, and landscape theories. Critical urban theory and modernist approaches are introduced firstly. Modernist approaches define the urban area in the context of the capitalist era. The contemporary city cannot be seen as a distinct entity since it is an inseparable feature of the capitalist era. As the accumulation of capital is at the core of modern urban, Marxist tradition is essential to understand the underlying elements of urban life and its functions when one tries to understand the contemporary city. It is crucial to evaluate the urban as a part of the political, economic conditions of the era.

Post-modernist approaches are also examined in this chapter. This approach, with a focus on localities, several urban public spaces with relation to global provided the basis for the park a site of interaction, reproduction. As parks are a site of political struggles in a global context, they are also terrains for interactions, encounters, and reproduction through daily activities of inhabitants. This body of literature questions the end of public space and demonstrates new emerging public spaces in the neoliberal era. This approach shows that a neighborhood park is a small unit of contestations, expressions of individuals, and reproduction of urban life.

Chapter 4 concentrates on the inferences of the interviews. These inferences are gathered around five themes, which are relationship building, social and physical access to the park, park as an extension of household and park as a site of negotiation and reconstruction. In 'Relationship Building' part, characteristic of the park as the parochial realm is questioned. Park's function as relationship building and socializing is examined through questions of 'Who do you come with to park?', 'Do you come alone?', 'Why do you come to this park, and what activities do you do?' 'Do you meet and chat people here? Do you build relations?'. The networks either built in the park or reproduced in the park are investigated in this section. In the section devoted to 'Social and Physical Access to Park,' social and physical access is interrogated through questions of 'How far is this park to your home? Can you come easily?' 'Do you have access to a garden around your house?', 'Why do you come to this park, and what do you do?' 'Do you feel comfortable here? 'Do you feel safe here?' 'Does this park satisfy your needs and demands? What is not working for you? What demands would you have?' 'Has been there any changes in a park in positive and negative ways? What are these?' and 'In what ways is this park useful for you?'. These questions indicated that social access to the park is gendered. The physical structure of the park affects women's social access to the park. In 'Park as an Extension of Household' part, the combination of public and private uses of the park is enlightened. The answers show that for some users, the park is a parochial realm as it is a site of informal activities. In the last section, 'Park as a Site of Negotiation and Reconstruction,' and the existence of unwanted users of public space is shown in the case of Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı. These unwanted users are diverse, based on the perception and demands of users. This section also indicates

that different needs and desires of the individuals transform public space; it is reconstructed through practices.

The conclusion chapter a synthesis of analyses of interviews, two bodies of theories are presented as a historical approach to urban public space, modern, post-modern aspect to public space.

1.5. Methodology

1.5.1. Philosophical Assumption

A close tie does exist between the philosophical and theoretical perspective one brings to research activities and how one proceeds to use a framework to shroud his or her inquiry. (Creswell, 2013, 40)

As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) suggest in their Research Process, I will begin the process with personal history and the philosophical assumption to illustrate how I end up with this topic and methodology. As philosophical premise is the first idea in developing a study, it will be efficient for me to start with it. By having in mind that the researcher is a multicultural subject, I will strive to demonstrate why I chose to study this specific topic. My intention is derived from a project that I participated in. The study,'*MARDİN: DÖNÜŞEN BİR KENTTE KÜLTÜREL MİRAS VE KENTSEL MEKANIN YENİDEN ÜRETİMİ*' aimed to represent cultural heritage in Mardin and how it is preserved, transformed, and reproduced within the context of urban renewal due to the tourism industry and development strategy, and inquired how change is perceived from different positions of the citizens. As the study investigated how social and cultural liabilities are reflected in Yeni Mardin (New Mardin) and Eski Mardin (Old Mardin), my interest relied on the ways the inhabitants made use of spaces in terms of their liabilities, practices. One of the inferences of the interviews was that inhabitants of New Mardin were trying to make sense of new place with old practices. The specific example for it was to use of parks in apartments with the old habits of '*avlu*.' The inhabitants of modern apartments were trying to relocate the practices of *avlu* as a socializing space and extension of the household to new parks of flats. The main question of this study arose from that specific practice and the way they reproduce the parks in these apartment blocks. After this project, I started to observe parks in my neighborhood in a different gaze. I wanted to analyze how the

user of these parks who immigrated from rural areas lately, and Syrian immigrants might reproduce public parks in similar or different ways.

As the goal of this research is to rely as much as possible on the participants' views of the situation, I employed the interpretive paradigm to frame the study to analyze the subject matter better. Social constructivism tries to develop the complexity of participants' meanings that are formed through interaction. The questions of the interview are broad and open-ended questions to address the meaning-making process of the individuals.

On the other hand, ethnomethodology is studying people's methods of constructing reality in everyday life. It aims to reveal how people create meaning for themselves and others in daily interactions. (Silverman, Marvasti, 2008, 16)

In the essence of this study relies on two philosophical standpoints, which are social construction and ethnomethodology approaches. I preferred to use both perspectives as the aim of this study to understand the meaning-making processes of individuals. Parks are sites that conveyed social meaning, primarily where gender power relations and power relations between men, women, and the natural world were shaped, negotiated, reconstructed. That's why it is vital to highlight the ethnomethodological perspective, as spaces can only be read with regard to the individuals and things within them and the various significations they bring.

1.5.2. Qualitative Research and Instrumental Case Study

In this study, qualitative research methods are used through semi-structured interviews, the adequate method of inquiry when one is interested in the qualitative features of human experience. (Brinkmann, 2013, 4) "Qualitative researcher... examine social processes and cases in their social context, and look at interpretations or the creation of meaning in specific settings. They try to look at social life from multiple points of view" (Neuman, 2007, 88).

In a single instrumental case study, the researcher focuses on an issue or concern and then selects one limited case to illustrate this issue. (Creswell, 2013, 131) This study is an instrumental case study as I focus on a single park in Zeytinburnu. I aim to show diverse meanings in this specific sample that are attached to parks and urban green areas. I am aware that this case is not a representative of meanings attached to urban green spaces, even parks in general. There are intrinsic relations, meaning-

making practices that are embedded in Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı. My aim is not to have a general idea of parks or urban green areas extracted from this specific case, but rather to comprehend the complexity of relations in parks in the light of the literature review I have done of urban green areas.

1.5.3. Data Collection

Seidman (2013) noted, "At the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience." As this study focuses on meaning-making processes of individuals in Zeytinburnu park, qualitative interviewing is suitable to offer insights into a variety of experiences specific to this location. As Benney and Hughes (1970) pointed out, the interview is the "favored digging tool" of social researchers. Face-to-face semi-structured interviews enable participants to describe and elaborate on their own experiences and to understand personalized feelings attached to the park rather than group-based motivations.

Although conversation in a broad sense is a universal notion, it is worth to note the analytic focus of qualitative interviewing, which is explained by Briggs as "the larger set of practices of knowledge production that makes up the research from beginning to end." (Briggs, 2007, 566 cited in Brinkmann, 2013, 5) So that, qualitative research is not merely a face-to-face interaction but a knowledge – producing practice. (Brinkmann, 2013, 5)

Firstly I started with the walkthrough and observing the neighborhood park. I chose this park because I was also a part of that neighborhood, and I used the park from time to time with my aunt and her dog. As my aunt always went to the park, she was telling me about the users of the park, where they are from, how many children they had. Her experience was also a starting point for me to recognize the interactions and relations that are made in the park.

The research was conducted through semi-structured interviews. The participants for the study were selected from among those who were the users of the park. I started my interviews with my aunt. In this study, I ended up with twelve interviews for data collection in Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam Parkı. I had set of a pre-determined list of questions that are the systematic, methodical tool to frame the interviews. However, the format of semi-structured interviews gave me the opportunity of adding

improvisational questions during the interview when needed. I did not choose a specific group for the interviews. I tried to include people who evaluate park in their everyday practices and comprehend how they receive the right to the city through Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam Parkı. The interviews aim to reflect all the performing actors and the range of interviewees that use this park.

2. HISTORY OF URBAN GREEN AREAS AND PUBLIC SPACE

2.1. Parks

A garden or a park is a forest, which is subject to the law of art says Starobinksi in "Invention of Freedom." With the principles of efficiency, pleasantness, and order, the regulation of the space seems like an art, but at the same time, the outcome of an ordering. The method is to give it more order, pleasantness, and utility. That way, it is possible to read the history of parks and gardens as the history of intentions behind the specific orders that are implemented on nature. These urban spaces have become transmitters of some particular expectations.

Limitation and borders of the park and gardens personify with hedging. Within the hedges, there are rules, regulations, and precautions for the plants and people who are in there. They are not alone to grow on their own, but they are all subject to surveillance. Let it be a flower, if there is a harmful insect for that flower, that space would be arranged not to have these insects. Furthermore, people would be protected from wildlife. It is not that those plants, insects, greens belong to there, it is more of a construction of human that is build on the principles of order, utility, and pleasantness.

If we come to the notion of "diagram" for Foucault, he explains it as a display of the relations between forces, which constitute power; it is a map that has the same extent with the whole social field. It is defined both by informal functions and discursive and non-discursive formation. (Deleuze, 1986) So, the relations between forces in the park or garden should be understood behind the curtains of the aesthetical aspect of the green spaces. It has an aesthetical expression, which gives people a sense of joy, being with nature and silence. However, with this aesthetical function, there are power relations. If we can evaluate power as a relation rather an attribute, it is then possible to understand the necessity to map this system of the relationship between

various actors. These urban spaces are meant to maintain, aesthetical, economic, social, and even scientific functions.

2.2. Transformation of Urban Public Space

Urban green areas had variable meanings from ancient civilizations to the modern world, from being a space of religious excitement to being a symbol of political power, being a quiet space and source of physical and psychological health for inhabitants of the modern city. Besides, they are closely connected to the evolution of urban public space. In order to grasp the complexity of today's parks and gardens, we need to understand in which historical processes they evolved. Space has the ability to juxtapose "in a single real place different spaces and locations that are incompatible with each other," the term heterotopia employed by Foucault. (Foucault,1986) He argues that spaces can only be read with respect to the individuals and things within them and the various significations they bring. Parks and gardens have had various connotations, were the spaces of different activities; they were as different spaces at the same location. That's why to have a broader understanding of these urban public spaces; we need to evaluate them in the complex historical line of urban public spaces, firstly to understand the functions, significations of the urban public space and then how it evolved to urban green spaces, areas.

The very first meaning that gardens had before the Industrial Revolution was a religious content. Mayer- Tasch argues that the idea of heaven in Koran, till 15th Century BC in Adapa Myth of Akkas is one example of the relation of gardens with heaven. He argues that this myth also influenced the Sumerian-Babylon gardens in 12 the Century BC explained in the Epic of Gılgamesh. Furthermore, it is also possible to find a similar idea of gardenlike heaven description in the Torah in 1600 BC. (Mayer-Tasch, 2003)

It is possible to map landscaping until B.C 4000-5000 with Egypt, which had gardens in their houses and grown fruit trees. Assyrian and Babylon civilizations also had gardens garnished with lakes, which the most famous one is Hanging Gardens of Babylon. Hebrews, on the other hand, formed gardens based on utility, with fruits, olives, and vineyards. (Sarkowicz, 2003)

Another dimension of the garden is linked to the relation between human and nature. Since the first civilizations appeared, the relationship between the built environment and nature has been a concern. In the Palaeolithic era, people connected the nature directly by virtue of their nomadic culture and hunter-gatherer mode of production. In this era, human beings had three spatial formations, which can be counted as the core of public space and open public spaces. These ware caves, which are used for both protection and religious rituals, nodes in which dead people are buried and primitive camping areas around lakes, etc. In the Neolithic Era, the relationship between human and nature started to change along with the agricultural revolution, so does the spatial conceptualization. (Mumford, 1961)

On the other hand, in Middle age, there appear mechanic figures such as artificial birds, soldiers, and other figures. Both for Arabs and Byzantine lakes and water held an essential place for gardens. They built gardens with fountains, pools, and waterfalls. In Europe, the notion of the garden started mostly in church. Where priests were taking care of gardens, they were also in most cases, the one who planned it. (Sarkowicz, 2003)

Primary villages and urban areas of Bronze Age (3000 – 1300/1000 BC) appeared. Along with the permanent settlements, the need for more open spaces, for instance in Anatolia such as courtyards (*avlu*), gardens, karums, agoras, forums, theatres, squares, roads and streets increased. (Malkoç, Sönmez, 2006) In Çatalhöyük also, there were around 1000 houses, which had open areas to share, such as courtyards. Three essential spatial formations were recognized; firstly, the dead bodies were buried outside the settlements. Secondly, Karums or large trade centers as a result of the trade development and the invention of alphabet and writing appeared, and lastly, there seemed to be structural planning of streets, courtyards, and houses. (Malkoç, Sönmez, 2006)

In Hittite Civilization (2000-700 BC), like open public spaces, there were more impressive temples of out-doors, the same was true also for Turkish, English and Hellenistic civilizations. The colonnade streets and structures came into prominence in Lydia, Karia and Lycian civilizations (750-300 BC), which demonstrated the way to the Ancient Greek urbanization and open space structures. (Malkoç, Sönmez, 2006) In Ancient Greek Period (1600 – 1200 BC), social life and sports activities took place in open spaces; outdoor spaces were part of daily life. (Malkoç, Sönmez,

2006) Agora is an urban open space in Ancient Greek, which came forward with democracy. Agora had an economic essence as it functioned as the market place but also had a political role, since it was also the gathering place of the assembly (Mattson, 1999; Zucker, 1959, cited in Tunç, 2003). However, women, slaves, and immigrants were excluded from this gathering space. (Dijkstra, 2000)

In Roman cities (30 – 95 AD), squares, city assembly buildings, gymnasium, stadium, theatres, public baths, and fountains were the monumental structures, and there was a road system, which was consciously structured. There were villa type houses and gardens attached to them, which had fountains, sitting areas, and vegetable cultivations. Forums and hippodromes were also significant open public areas. (Malkoç Yiğit and Sönmez Türel, 2006) Forums were the space for religious, political, and sports activities. (Mumford, 1961, cited in Carr et al., 1992, 53)

In the Byzantine period (476 – 1453 AD), the cities were built behind the walls. The open public spaces were markets. (Malkoç, Sönmez, 2006) And Seljuk sultans had their palaces with gardens built in the 13th century. (Evyapan, 1972, cited in Malkoç, Sönmez, 2006)

The history of urban green space is closely related to open public space. These open public spaces before the Industrial revolution had various functions and embedded different meanings, forums, agoras, and markets had economic, political, religious, and even sport functions in different civilizations through the ages.

The word place's origins lie in the ancient Latin word plateau, which referred to open space. By the medieval period, the Latin word had evolved to place, or in Middle English place. Today the word place is commonly understood to denote to "a particular part of space, of defined or undefined extent, but of definite situation,". However the first definition in the Oxford English Dictionary is "an open space in a city, a square or marketplace." Dating back to ancient Greek and Roman cities, and to the early medieval period, the definition implies that the first openings in the fabric of cities, where the street grid gave way to some form of open space (probably a marketplace or gathering place), became the spaces that would characterize one subarea from another within a city. In the twentieth century, the term place became a generic word used to distinguish one part of the urban fabric from another. (Herzog, 2006, 6)

Bingöl (2006) claims that there are two types of urban green areas before Industrial evolution, the first is squares, which are owned by ruling class and aristocrats, the second one is small green lots which are natural landscape elements. At this point, there are decisive characteristics of the urban green areas of the time. Firstly, they were not public, they belonged to the ruling class, and secondly, human relation to nature with these green lots was a passive relation. Nature was picturesque, quiet place for human beings at the time. So, human social interaction was taking place more on places such as markets, forums, agoras than these urban green areas at that time. (İlkay, 2016)

So, why are these urban public spaces are important? Because they constituted the historical vein from which the first urban green areas rose from. Centrally located squares were major public spaces in European and American cities were the inspirations for the urban green areas. (Bingöl, 2006 cited in İlkay, 2016) Commons in the USA emerged from urban public spaces as the squares and plazas. (Low, et al., 2005, 19). City Hall Park in New York and Boston Common are the examples of these commons, which were used for recreational and military reasons. (İlkay, 2016, 17) As they were extensions of urban space, they also refuged from the urban space that connects city and green areas in the urban context.

Along with the Industrial Revolution, the interaction between built and natural environment has changed. Firstly, with industrialization, migration to cities appeared as a result of work opportunities. With the effect of mass migration to cities, some problems such as housing, water, and air pollution and health problems arose in the city because of population growth. New functions of urban green areas, as sanitation and regulation came forward associated with new issues of the city.

Urban green areas were differentiated from natural green lots like cemeteries and picnic areas, and new areas were designed with forms of imitating nature, which resulted in artificial environments in some cases (Cranz, 1982). In the same period, English picturesque, natural, landscape parks appeared as a reaction to French Baroque gardens of royalty in the 18th century (Sarcowicz, 2003).

2.3. History of Parks and Gardens

Gardens and parks are never constant. They change with seasons, by the tending and maintenance implemented on them, subject to the fashions and needs of a given time. As gardens, parks, and their representation intersected with many of the critical, defining social transformations of the early modern period, we will focus on parks and gardens in the modern era. Along with shifting patterns of land use and evolving political discourses of splendour and power, new scientific ideas about the natural world, botany and medicinal writing, religious changes, and aesthetics, the natural domain was used to justify the unprecedented social, cultural and political changes of the time, especially starting with the with the Renaissance effect. (Samson, 2012, 1) We present below a short history of urban green spaces to indicate the differences in landscaping through time and for understanding the complex character of urban green spaces.

2.4. Gardens of Early Modern Era

Until the fifteenth century, gardens had depended on empirical experience. But by the mid-sixteenth century, gardens are seen as work of art. As gardens had begun to reflect the ideas of architects like Francesco di Giorgio and Sebastiano Serlio, involving conceptual thinking, models and drawing, through their motifs, themes, and mythological schema, they started to tell a story. (Samson, 2012, 4)

However, the gardens are complicated by their non-linear phases and evolution. Giusto Utens lunettes of Medici villas from around 1599–1602 typifies one of the best evidence for that complexity. While the Cafaggiolo garden from the mid-fifteenth century embodies an ideal of rural, a productive, enclosed, agricultural style that continues until the seventeenth century, on contrast the Tuscan Villa La Petraia of 1575 is more self-consciously architectural, with house and garden drawn together on one scale. (Samson, 2012, 19-20)

River gods as colossal statues incorporated with water took an important place in Rome in the early sixteenth century and then in Medici gardens. They were inspired by the ancient statues and reflected sacredness, which was constructed in political, artistic, gendered, and cultural terms. From ideas about natural science to good lordship, the river god was a measure of evolving relationships between the natural

world, its artistic representations, and mankind's place in the changing geographies of their environment. (Samson, 2012, 19-20) The river gods are used as indicators of geographical states through their association with symbols, e.g., Roman wolf and Florentine lion. They came to be vehicles for contemporary notions such as natural science, artistic creativity, and political hegemony.

As modern sciences and mathematics seemed as potential instruments of power and a source of valuable technical and socio-political knowledge, this change also affected landscape and garden designers. With the effect of the Renaissance, the landscaping approach changed with the principle of imposing order on nature. The Renaissance garden is theoretically founded on the Age of Humanism, with the rediscovery of the classical world. (Tosi, [18.12.2018])

Jesuit Gaspar Schott's Cursus mathematicus (Schott,1661) and another work by Mario Bettini, the Apiaria universae philosophiae mathematicae (Bettini 1642) show how the practice of gardening and mathematical sciences intertwined. In the preface of Bettini's Apiaria, he mentions Hortus mathematicus, which refers to the garden of the mathematical sciences, which is seen as a field in which theory and practice of gardening relate with mathematical sciences. Gaspar Schott, in the frontispiece of his Cursus mathematicus, and Bettini, in the frontispiece of his Aerarium, made use of the notion that everything needed to create a garden of amusement and edification could be derived from the mathematical sciences such as geometry, architecture, perspective etc. (Remmert 2004, 2011, 214–228, cited in p.11-12, Fischer et al., 2016)

The knowledge gained from the mathematical sciences provided gardeners with new ways to control and dominate nature. Because gardens played an important role in the political culture of the era, they were used to represent domination over nature. Promoting techniques of controlling the nature was mostly in the interest of the ruling class. The most important example of this political representation and exhibition of power is Versailles gardens (Mukerji 1997; Ve´rin 1991, cited in Fischer et al., 2016, 14)

Many early modern gardens were structured by more than just geometry, indeed by a whole array of mathematical sciences; gardens are the personification of the superiority of human creation and art over the natural world. Geometry, architecture,

hydraulics, perspective and acoustics, all these fields of knowledge that are accounted in mathematical sciences are needed to be an honest gardener, Stromer von Reichenbach said. As knowledge of geometry is essential to the layout, for designing architecture is required, for the making of fountains hydraulics is needed, and familiarity with perspective to design and even knowledge of echoes. (Fischer et al., 2016, 19)

The French formal garden, for instance, is a style of garden which is influenced by the Italian Renaissance garden and based on symmetry and geometrical shapes. Chandra Mukerji expressed the characteristic of French formal gardens, as they "were meant to represent nature as it was understood by science, full of order and diversity" (Mukerji, 1990, 671). Geometric patterns and symmetrical planning could be found in Château de Villandry and Château de Vaux-le-Vicomte. (Cavus, 2015, 14)

The great landscape gardens in France built at royal residences, most notably Versailles, referring to the king's capacity to rule the earth. Along with waterworks, complex infrastructure of walls and roads, these gardens were indicators of territorial domination by royal power. French formal gardens that were models of territorial governance of Louis XIV, widely imitated throughout Europe. Europe (Goldstein, 2008, Thacker, 1979, cited in Fischer et al., 2016, 58-59) Fouquet who was the minister of finance of Louis XIV, also regulated Château de Vaux-le-Vicomte, whose architect is Andre Le Notre, who was also the architect of the garden at Versailles. (Pamay,1979, 15) In the garden at Versailles, the knowledge derived from nature is used to serve the king. At this point, it is crucial to recognize what meant to control nature for the era. The mathematical, scientific knowledge is employed through the gardens to serve for political domination.

Italianate garden's religious and political associations are crucial to the aesthetic, moral, and political understanding of English gardens from this period onwards. English gardens have an ambivalent relationship with Italianate models, of emulation and rejection. While it is able to trace architectural settings of the Italian features of avenues of trees, water features, topiary, arbors, and grottoes, on the other side, there was a rejection of formal parterres, staged effects, fountains and mythological Baroque statuaries. For English Protestants, Roman tyranny and oppression, and its

aesthetic of complex allegorical/mythological symbolism was not acceptable. (Samson, 2012, 10)

English style gardens also called landscape gardens were full of flowers and were imitating what is already in nature, as opposed to French style gardens. They were more flexible, less strictly formed, picturesque, and not following the symmetrical landscaping idea of the French garden. For this more 'natural' style of landscaping, the boundary between the formal garden and the woodland and agricultural land that surrounded it was blurred. (Samson, 2012, 10)

These gardens evoked the ideas of the earthly paradise of Eden, and the cultivation of gardens seemed like a way back to the prelapsarian world for the ones who cultivated them. Furthermore, cultivation was symbolized as inhibiting sexual desire. Cuttings, transplanting, etc. had metaphorical meaning that underlines the relationship between art and nature, and its ability to improve. (Samson, 2012, 12) While the French garden is a symbol of the hierarchical state and world order, English gardens were more critical to this kind of strict political order. For instance, in Stowe landscape garden, there was a headless statue, which was a signifier of corrupt politics and immorality of the era. (Sarkowicz, 2003, 146-147)

The gardens were sites that conveyed social meaning, especially where gender power relations and power relations between men, women, and the natural world were shaped, negotiated, reconstructed. It is possible to see it in the case of flowers, which encoded social difference, as gillyflowers and carnations were accessible to lower social scale, tulips and auriculas were popular among the upper classes.

Gardens, women, and poetry had long been associated in the early modern period. The garden was something between as a space of intimate retirement, also for female leisure and pleasure and as an extension of the public space of the household. The pleasure or walled garden was created explicitly as a female space. As gardens were more private areas for secret assignations, behind the secret doors, rather than the more public spaces of palaces and houses, they were also sexual spaces. Melibea's huerto or huerta in the book "La Celestina: Tragicomedia de Cailsto y Melibea" or garden could have seemed a space of sexual liberation unlikely the city. (Francisco Lobera et al., 25-27 cited in Samson, 2012, 15)

Also, it is indicated in the travel diary of the Marquis de Sade that in the late eighteenth century such activities took place in the Villa Medici, as do other such journals claim for other Italian gardens. (Conan, 1999, 75)

If we quote from Francis Bacon who explained gardens as "Greater Perfection," we could conceive the underlying philosophy of mid-sixteenth to mid-eighteenth centuries that garden is represented as the highest form of nature ("third nature"). (Bacon, 1625, 266, cited in Fischer et al., 2016, 15)

Nico Stehr explains scientisation as a process of mutual exchange between scientific and technological development, and social and cultural change, the former typically generating constant change in the latter. (Stehr, 1994, cited in Fischer et al., 2016, 24) The gardens and landscapes of the time, mingled with the idea of controlling and dominating nature, is one of the most examples of this process. However, these ideas and interaction of garden design and the mathematical sciences did not last longer than from the mid-sixteenth century to the mid-eighteenth century. (Fischer et al., 2016, 24)

2.5. Park Movement in the USA

The philosophical source of park movement in the 1840s was romanticism that occurred as a reaction to the industrial city. Romanticism opposed growing cities, factory life, and smoke and suggested that nature has positive effects on people, and this idea influence park movement in the 1840s in the USA, continuing for 50 years. Prospect Park was built in this period in 1866; Central Park, was constructed earlier, in 1857, which is a well-known example (Low et al., 2005)

The movement offered great parks with sunlight, fresh and open air, trees, all of which presents a 'remedy' for the adverse living conditions and chaos in cities (Bingöl, 2006, cited in İlkay, 2016). These first parks imitated the nature with the influence of Romanticism and English landscape gardens, against the ideals of formal perspective and straight lines. These parks have the importance of showing the first examples of public access to urban parks.

Public Park Movement appeared in the USA. Public park movement transferred English aristocratic picturesque parks to municipal parks for public use. As these parks were an imitation of nature, they were often built artificially.

‘The pleasure grounds’ dated between 1850 and 1900 were also influenced by English picturesque theory. Also called as pleasure gardens, are widely acknowledged as originating in London in the late seventeenth century. Spring Gardens and New Spring Gardens being the first such sites, they were often the grounds to manor houses or as tavern gardens. (Stubbs, 2013, 2) The pleasure gardens were home to theatres presenting full-length plays, displays, and exhibits. (Stubbs, 2013, 3) They were usually built areas rather than natural landscapes. They were open to middle-class for recreational activities, like picnics, games, and festivals. They were the spaces including various spatial forms as statues, lakes, waterfalls, fountains, and tents for performances. The idea behind the pleasure grounds was to combine beauty and utility. They were important, as they were open to the public, but also still preventing the picturesque beauty of the previous landscape gardens.

As British pleasure gardens have been identified as being sites in which to see and be seen, and American pleasure gardens were also sites for watching and being watched. (Stubbs, 2013, 2)

The last movement is the state park movement that took place in the USA before the modernist era which started in California in 1866, with Yosemite Park. The examples of these state and country parks were Niagara Falls Reservation (1885), Lake Itasca Park (1891), the first country park organization in Essex Country, New Jersey in 1895, the Starved Rock State Park in Illinois (1911), a State Park Board in Wisconsin (1907), and a State Park Commission in Connecticut (Newton, 1971, cited in Low, et al, 2005). The background of this movement was reserving and protecting lands with recreational potential from urban development.

2.6. Parks in the Modern Era

Along with the positivist scientific methods and rational thought, holistic approaches appeared in spatial policies in the first part of the 20th century.

Three phases of urban green area politics are highlighted in the modernist era. First one is the utopian way of planning, and the idea of systemized green in which green areas were meant to be accessible to citizens, between roads and zones. In the second phase, the concept of recreation came forward. “Within this era, the meaning of

green areas shifted from natural, picturesque beauty of romantic scenery to a functional role in health and recreational needs" (Bingöl, 2006 cited in İlkay, 2016). Lastly, the urban green area has been used as instruments of social reform. As Bingöl expresses the importance of parks for the working class as an important place to get together, parks had another significant meaning as a tool of organization of society. "Moreover, small scale, neighborhood parks were also developed parallel to reform parks and playgrounds, since more children were outside now; however, playgrounds were not enough" (Cranz, 1982).

After World War 2, with the influence of welfare state, urban green areas were considered as a spatial component of the welfare of the society. So, these places needed to be provided by public authorities and policies.

"Later in the 1960s, the recreation concept was enlarged with commercial facilities and entertainment commodities, cultural and educational institutions such as exhibitions and museums, zoos, added amazing and entertaining activities with commercial content such as restaurants, bars, beer gardens, buffets, taverns, etc." (Bingöl, 2006 cited in İlkay, 2016).

2.7. Ottoman and Turkish Urban Planning

Nurhan Atasoy firstly emphasizes the resemblances and most significant differences of Ottoman garden with other gardens. Firstly, she points out that the Ottoman garden is seen in the fashion of Islamic gardens. Islamic gardens were as symbols of Koranic paradise, with four rivers, flowing waters and fruit was an essential part of the garden. She states that there is not one prototype for all Islamic gardens as this culture is spread over three continents and many centuries, varies from India to Spain. Especially because of the different climate, soil conditions and culture, Islamic gardens cannot be put in one homogenous category.

Mainly, Ottoman gardens are different from the general framework of Islamic gardens. Ottoman gardens seem to serve the same purpose as gardens in other Islamic countries, as creating a resemblance to Koranic paradise of flowing water and full of trees, it has its characteristics. For instance, tent-dwelling culture can be found in gardens, coming from a nomadic lifestyle. Additionally, for Ottomans, paradise is depicted as gardens of flowers, even though in Koranic heaven, fruits are

mentioned than flowers. Ottoman gardens are in fact, more influenced by Byzantine gardens. The influence of Byzantine garden started even before 1453 when they first came to Rumelia. When Ottomans conquered lands from Byzantine, they kept gardens, vineyards mostly as they are and added characteristics of their own culture to make a synthesis. (Atasoy, 2011, 22)

Ottoman approach to the garden is reflected upon being the part of nature and enriching what nature has already provided. These gardens conformed the climate, the conditions of the soil, topography of the place. So, they do not resemble Islamic gardens. Ottoman palace gardens were closed with walls, reflecting the value of intimacy. Gardens were functional as well as beautiful. For instance, fruits and vegetables were significant features in Ottoman garden.

Atasoy expresses the characteristics of Ottoman gardens from the information of writings of the time and miniatures mostly. One of the important attributes of Ottoman garden is garden kiosk (in Turkish, köşk). They were elevated to provide a gaze at the garden from above. (Atasoy, 2011, 27-29) Another element of the privy garden is garden thrones, which are mostly made of wood and portable. Cypress trees and fountains are two essential elements of the gardens. Cypresses were planted next to the walls of the garden, or they were creating walking spots, which are leading to a fountain. (Atasoy, 2011, 33-43) The pleasure scenes for the Ottomans is generally near a fountain or a river with cypresses and blossoming trees. Hence, it is not a limited notion of Paradise that they employ. Flowers, like the tulip, rose, crown imperials, anemones, lilies, white jasmine and fruit gardens were fundamental to Ottoman garden structure. Fruits and flowers were grown together in these gardens, and the surplus was sold to the public. As privy gardens were intended for the use of sultan, they have enclosed places with walls and cypress trees. These gardens were a haven of privacy, not a setting for ceremonies. They reflected the sense of privacy. (Atasoy, 2011, 50)

The zoo-like setting of Ottoman garden is very distinct, keeping kinds of animals, even wild animals in the garden. Also, there were stables for horses, which are used for sport like jeered or hunting.

In the 16th and 17th century, European gardens were deeply influenced by Ottoman garden and flowers. The flowers of various kind, crown imperial, hyacinths,

carnations, narcissus and tulips, laurel, syringa, day lily, white jasmine were entered to Europe which for the botanist William Stern resonated with the revolution in European gardens in the second half of 16th century. (Atasoy, 2011, 58) However, the reign of Ahmet III remarks a time when Ottoman started to buy flowers from Holland, even though it was the one who introduced it to Europe. After that period, European gardens influenced Ottoman Gardens in the 18th and 19th centuries. (Atasoy, 2011, 59)

Turkish Early Republican era followed the heritage of the Ottoman Empire in urban planning strategies. The urban planning was an inevitable component of the modernist project that Republic embraced. While for Ottoman, Istanbul was at the heart of urban planning, in Early Republican era, Ankara, as the new capital of Republic, became the focus of urban planning strategies. However, other cities were also subject to the radical modernist development project. The idea of the city was built upon that "the prosperity of Turkey is dependent on the advent of municipalities, as these municipalities would provide the citizens with civilized life." (Belediyeler Dergisi, 1935, cited in Tekeli, 2009, 114)

Between 1930-1935, new legislation is introduced regarding cities, such as *1580 Sayılı Belediye Kanunu, 1593 Sayılı Umumi Hıfzıssıhha Kanunu, 2290 Sayılı Yapı ve Yollar Kanunu, 2033 Sayılı Belediye Bankası Kuruluş Kanunu, 2722 Sayılı Belediye İstimlak Kanunu*, and *2763 Sayılı Belediyeler İmar Heyetinin Kuruluşuna İlişkin Kanu*n. The urban planning approach took its grounds from these codes since the 1980s. (Tekeli, 2009, 114)

The urban strategy of the Early Republican era was impressed by the 'garden city' concept of European modern city. The aim was to organize the city as a whole by privileging the aesthetic functions. That's why this approach was criticized not to handle the city along with its problems and economic and social conditions.

After World War II, the rapid urbanization caused the housing deficit in Turkey. The strategies of the Republic were insufficient to provide solutions, and this led to spontaneous solutions to emerge, such as *gecekondu*. The spontaneous solutions to urban problems generated two distinct areas in the cities. While the former areas were organized through the modernist project, and the latter was built as a response to the immediate needs coming from urban life.

In 1960, the effect of the new Constitution also reflected in urban policies. The state was claimed to be a welfare state and thus provide the citizens with fundamental material rights. Urban green areas were considered as a spatial component of the welfare of society. So, these places needed to be provided by public authorities and policies. In the 1970s, the institutionalization of social and economic planning brought about the social and economic aspect of urban planning. Between 1973-77, a new urban approach emerged as "New Municipality Movement" on the premises of democracy, productivity, and organization of consumption. This movement led to a new understanding of the municipality apart from the political parties.

After the 1980s, the purpose of the urban project shifted to the integration in the globalized world. In this manner, in the 1990s, Istanbul regained importance to be a global city. The city ceased to be the site of production; rather, it became a site of the service industry and consumption. The functions of regulation and organization came into prominence in urban policies.

This historical gaze of Turkish city is crucial to understand urban development. I argue that the development of the Turkish city demonstrates a similar development to European modern city, as it is a result of the modernist project, which is produced by and reproduces the capitalist mode of production. However, as the city is a social product, every society produces its own space. That's why I will try to understand Istanbul and Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı in its specificity.

2.8. Recent Studies and Concepts on Urban Public Space and Green Areas

In the post-modernist era, two veins came forward in urban green space theories; the first one is the ecological approach, and the second one is quality of life perspective and participative theories. I will firstly focus on the literature on urban green areas with a focus on the concepts of accessibility, urban justice, and spatial targets such as variety, social need, cultural diversity, and cultural and social sustainability. (Low et al., 2005) Then, with the concepts of city planting and parks as an extension of nature, I will strive to demonstrate the ecological aspect of recent studies.

2.8.1. Community Participation and Empowerment in Parks

Parks are important places for immigrants, working class, and disadvantaged people as they offer refuge from home. As middle class could go to other public areas such

as shopping malls, or have backyards, gardens or vacation homes, for disadvantaged people, it is more important to have these parks and green areas accessible.

As cities have become more ethnically diverse and more demographically and racially divided, debates of community participation and empowerment have been accelerated. (Gantt, 1993, cited in Low, et al., 2005, 11) Parks that served for relatively homogeneous white middle-class or working-class neighborhoods must now need to serve for the multicultural and multiclass population. (Low, et.al, 2005, 11)

There are urban programs, which used community participation and empowerment strategies for planning and design processes such as the "Charleston Principles" of Seattle, Washington. The program requires that any proposed change include a community cultural planning process should involve a large spectrum of community members—public agencies, civic and social groups, educators and students, business and economic interests, artists, community leaders, and cultural organizations of all types. (Low, et.al, 2005, 12) "Taking Action," is also a project that has produced a handbook for involving communities in heritage projects actively in Australia. (Johnston, Clarke, 2001, Low, et al., 2005, 12)

There are also other programs that indicate the inclusion of indigenous communities often excluded from park planning and administration and marginalized by local politics. Barbara Harrison tells the experiences of working with indigenous groups and researchers in North America, New Zealand, and Australia to develop collaborative working relationships in research and applied the practice. (Low, et.al, 2005, 12) These programs include the people who are the citizen of a state but not included in public life, such as immigrants, disadvantaged groups, and indigenous people. The citizenship of the person should include the participation of the community, regional affairs, as well as state affairs. Then, the exclusion of the groups can be eliminated to be a full member of the community.

Being a citizen often characterized by having a permit of residence, a right to vote, but instead, it should also include participation in decisions about places, services, and resources. Full citizenship then should consist of the participation of governance of their neighborhood and region. Citizens of a state should be involved in the management of their neighborhood community and daily life practices.

Immigrants, disadvantaged people need equal space and resources for work, home, and recreation as other citizens. Thus, if cultural diversity is utilized effectively, and immigrants, disadvantaged and marginalized groups are treated equally by means of urban public space, it would lead to more democratic spaces and peaceful relations. Accordingly, we need to keep in mind, the idea of full citizenship in this study, to understand the inclusion and exclusion that is felt by the interviewees in later chapters. Mostly because parks are important to place for the working class, poor or disadvantaged people as they offer a refuge from home as mentioned before.

2.8.2. Debates on Democratic Features and Accessibility of Parks

In the 21st century, the understanding of democracy has changed from being a melting pot to represent diversities. This has also affected the approach to urban public space. The debates around a democratic urban public space have changed its way, as urban public space is the place where the democracy and politics of democracy should be working out. As it is a part of daily life, urban public space and urban parks in particular play a vital role providing space for the expression of diversity, both personal and cultural; this raises issues of equal access to public space.

"The nineteenth century park, that quintessential expression of philanthropic but patronising urban planning, was designed as "a kind of democracy, where the poor, the rich, the mechanic, the merchant and the man of letters, mingle on a footing of perfect equality"" (Schuyler, 1986, p. 65) However, the idea of democracy was built on the concept of conformity, a united nation. In the 21st century, there is a need for a more sophisticated idea for the representational role of urban public spaces. As Ward Thompson (2002) suggests, we need to use the concept of salad bowl instead of the melting pot when we handle the functions and roles of the urban public spaces and parks nowadays.

Corraliza and De Berenguer (2000) made a research on preferences for "pathways" and "stay places"(such as parks) of people and he claimed that there are more opportunities to engage with other people and with the environment (shops, cafés, shady boulevards) in streets than in parks or plazas. He proposes that while urban public parks are becoming places for special categories of people, e.g., children, old people, etc., the street is the actual representative public open space.

The funding of the urban parks is another issue on democratic access as either urban authorities, volunteer groups such as “Friends of the Park” groups in US., or housing estates fund the parks, their agendas might not meet with the others who make use of the parks. (Thompson, 2002, 61)

Marc Augé (1995) proposed that in the controlled spaces of modern urban commerce and design — such as shopping malls, airports, and even on the high street— people have an assumption of guilt about anybody not engaged in purposeful consumer behavior. Public parks are often symbolized as a refuge, non-threating space, as spaces of freedom in contrast with other modern urban areas. But at the same time, certain groups, such as women and ethnic minorities, might find themselves excluded from urban parks, as they may fear being attacked.

“According to Low, three different dimensions need to be discussed to address injustice in the case of public spaces such as urban parks. While distributive justice focuses on the fair allocation of public spaces and related resources for all social groups, procedural justice relates to fair integration of all affected groups into the planning and decision process of public space. Finally, interactional justice is about the quality of interpersonal relations in a specific place, and if people interact safely without, e.g., discriminant behavior.” (Kabisch, Haase, 2014, 130)

2.8.3. Urban Green Areas as an Extension of Nature

The way social use of space interacts with the need for “natural” spaces is the one to think about parks, as parks are seen as a refuge to contact nature.

Chris Baines’ wild side proposes “loose-fit places” as an alternative to conventional urban green areas and parks. The practical value of such indeterminate areas of open space should be evaluated. These parks might be a suitable place for pre-adolescents to play, to break sticks and so on, and for adolescents a place of freedom without bearing in mind disapproval of the others. These wild parks might provide opportunities for interactions, which would be considered as vandalism or anti-social behavior in a conventional urban park for both children and adults. (Baines, 1999, cited in Thompson, 2002, 69)

Franck Dovey also introduces loose-fit spaces versus designed. Franck Dovey et al. have argued that “loose-fit” environments can allow for a variety of functions that designed spaces cannot. As they are unregulated, un-designed spaces they might

offer privacy to some people, comfort, and sense of freedom to marginalized people or immigrants that they would not feel in the conventional, well-designed urban parks. (Dovey et al., 2000 cited in Thompson, 2002, 69) While exploring Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) phenomenological approaches to space typology, Dovey has talked about the difference between rooted, fixed, constrained spaces and those that are slippery, unconstrained, nomadic or migrant. Dovey associates loose spaces with becoming, edge condition that shifts in quality and space. (Thompson, 2002, 70) These loose spaces are not necessarily without any rules. Despite that, they are spaces of constant reproduction of new regulations. Loose fit spaces can provide both adults and children with the opportunity of rich experience and escape.

We need to examine the human recreational habitat in a holistic way. Even though we need function-specific urban spaces and safe, decorative parks, we still need spaces where we can engage with natural processes, where we can intervene and change the landscape, and where we can watch things grow. In this sense, there is recognition of the value of wild spaces, informal, loose-fit, sometimes even messy places, that turn out often to be as crucial as the tidy and the formal.

"Ultimately, I see open space in cities as places to celebrate cultural diversity, to engage with natural processes, and to conserve memories. Urban open space must provide a place for the meeting of strangers and a place where one can transcend the crowd and be anonymous or alone. And in all of this, the urban park will continue to serve a central function in society's self-definition." (Thompson, 2002, 70)

2.8.4. City Planting

This is an important aspect of the new urban green area designing with ecological, economic, and recreational functions. Allotment gardens are places of growing one's own vegetables and fruits. These gardens are widespread in many European cities. They were built up as a part of urban planning strategies since the second half of the 19th century.

Early industrial city remarked the clear distinction between rural and urban areas so that agriculture was left to rural. Therefore, the issues of poverty and malnutrition spread in the 19th century. Also, as a part of the effort to make the city a healthy place, allotment gardens emerged firstly in the UK and USA and then in European cities.

Allotment gardens are still an important part of the urban green experience. They are connections to nature for the ones who come from rural areas and also a place of recreational for others. Over the last decade, there have been changes in the use of these allotments. They were mostly used for agricultural purposes before, but nowadays recreational and social functions are prominent. (Breuste, 2010)

New forms of allotment gardens emerged such as community gardens, guerrilla gardens, intercultural gardens, ecological gardening plots mostly in European cities. Their functions vary such as breaking the density and the monotony of housing areas, reducing noise and air pollution, being a shelter for flora in the city, places to feel nature, places for socializing and places for the psychological and physical health of residents. While intercultural gardens aimed to integrate immigrants to society in Germany, in Greece, mutual aid gardens communities were built. (Bell et. Al, 2016, 1-2) There are also examples of allotment gardens in Istanbul. For example, in Beylikdüzü there has been built an allotment garden recently, which the residents might join by lots. Also, in Edirnekapı, for a while, there have been community gardens organized by non-legal means used for economic purposes.

The allotment garden is important as it could engage some part of the society in the use of urban green areas, which would not otherwise. While people are sometimes in need of growing their plants as they see it as a recreational activity, some people need to grow their plants because of economic reasons. Some people could use them to grow their plant where they were living, if they immigrate from a rural area, community gardens and allotments will give include those people in the use of urban green areas. So, the city planting areas emerge as public spaces of diverse functions.

3. PUBLIC SPACE

The public character of urban daily life at the park is at the core of this study. The public character of urban green demonstrates a two-folded spatial appropriation, possession of people, and ownership of the state. The conflict between these forms of appropriation reproduces urban daily life. Urban green areas are on the one hand for 'public use' to be open to anyone; on the other hand, they are regulated through official decisions.

Based on the dual character of urban public space of conceived and perceived spaces, green areas are reproduced through conflicts, which reproduce the historical meaning, urban function, and spatial form. The clash between these spaces occurs in everyday life at and over the 'lived space.' The characteristic of public space, as a site of conflict, negotiation, and reproduction are examined in this chapter within modern and post-modern theories of space, place, and landscape. I will firstly introduce the concepts and theories of scholars then I will explain my intentions to employ these theories one by one.

3.1. Critical Urban Theory

Public space has been one of the essential concerns of urban studies on the grounds of its fundamental roles in urban life. So as to understand the importance of urban public spaces in the manner of spatial appropriation in the urban context, culturalist Marxist tradition of space and place theories should be examined. The critical urban theory highlights the dialectical relation between conceived spaces of capitalism and perceived spaces of inhabitants. Park and urban public space is a space of conflict between state power and the inhabitants of public space.

Critical urban theory deriving from the Frankfurt School emphasizes urban space, which is politically and ideologically constructed, and socially contested site rather than accepting the city in terms of trans-historical laws of social- economic

organization. “In short, the critical urban theory involves the critique of ideology (including social–scientific ideologies) and the critique of power, inequality, injustice, and exploitation, at once within and among cities.” (Brenner, 2009, 198) The city is seen as an actual outcome of power relations. Henri Lefebvre, Manuel Castells, and David Harvey as important scholars of the critical urban theory put forward a common concern to understand the city as sites of commodification processes. As they are sites for production, consumption, and circulation of commodities, they themselves become commodities by the restructurings to maximize profit making. Hence, they share the same understanding for the city to be scrutinized in regards to this role. (Brenner, 2012)

Brenner suggested four propositions for critical urban theory. Which are:

- To insist on the need for abstract, theoretical arguments regarding the nature of urban processes under capitalism while rejecting the conception of theory as a “handmaiden” to immediate, practical, or instrumental concerns;
- To view knowledge of urban questions, including critical perspectives, as being historically specific and mediated through power relations;
- To reject instrumentalist, technocratic, and market-driven forms of urban analysis that promote the maintenance and reproduction of extant urban formations;
- To excavate possibilities for alternative, radically emancipatory forms of urbanism, that are latent, yet systemically suppressed, within contemporary cities. (Brenner, 2009, 204)

I would like to start with Henri Lefebvre, who is a prominent scholar that laid the foundations for theories of space in social sciences and criticized prevailing urban theories of Chicago School. Lefebvre tries to “demonstrate active – the operational or instrumental role of space, knowledge, and action in the existing mode of production” (Brenner, 2009, 11). He applies Marx’s concept of production to space, as space is the focal point where the mode of production takes place.

Lefebvre is concerned with three interconnected elements for his theory of space, “first, the physical- nature, the Cosmos, secondly, mental, including logical and formal abstractions; and, thirdly the social.” (Lefebvre, 1991, 11) This triad shows itself in spatial terms as a spatial practice, representations of space, and representational space. These terms are necessary to understand the production of space. Spatial practices refer to the physical and material flows of individuals, groups

or commodities, circulations, and interactions, which occur within space. That is the association between daily reality and urban reality and networks that link up places for work, leisure, and private life. (Lefebvre, 1991, 38) The spatial practices are an organization of social relations, which are linked to specific places that produce and reproduce social life. We could give an example of kindergarten for its usage of child-care, or a shopping mall with its usage of leisure for society. Representations of space intervene by way of construction, way of architecture not solely as a building but as a project that reflects itself in a spatial context. (Lefebvre, 1991, 42)

Representations of space are the conceptualized space that denotes the mechanisms of control over space. It is "tied to the relations of production and to the 'order' which those relations impose, and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes and to 'frontal' relations" (Lefebvre, 1991, 33). This element is a system of signs and codes that the space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic sub-dividers, and social engineers focuses on. (Lefebvre, 1991, 39) According to Lefebvre, representations of space are about the history of ideologies (Lefebvre, 1991, 16)

Lastly, spaces of representations are spaces "as directly lived through its associations, images, and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users', but also some artists and perhaps of those, such as a few writers and philosophers, who describe and aspire to do no more than describe." Zieleniec (2007) evaluates spaces of representations as the spaces of everyday life where complex factors as mental and social interactions take place. Representational space is the space of inhabitants and users that are passively experienced space, and which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. (Lefebvre, 1991, 39) Lefebvre evaluates space as relational and relative rather than an absolute framework for social action that leads to the theory of the production of space.

By this threefold theory, Lefebvre aims to highlight the social-spatial practices rather than conceptual space. He evaluates the conditions of the second half of the 20th century in an urban context. Firstly, he mentions the planning and organizing functions of the state with the help of knowledge and technology. Secondly, he claims that the other force against the state mechanisms is the opposition that reasserts and transforms itself through struggle. (Lefebvre, 1991, 23) In other words, as space is a means of production, "it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power; yet that, as such, it escapes- in part from those who would

make use of it." (Lefebvre, 1991, 26) Thus, as Lefebvre states, social space is a social product, and every society, each mode of production, produces its own space. (Lefebvre, 1991, 46)

For Lefebvre, space is always, "a present space, given as an immediate whole, complete with its associations and connections in their actuality." That's why the production process and product cannot be separated from each other. (Lefebvre, 1991, 37) Thus, Lefebvre suggests lived space in the capitalist era, is the present space that is constituted every day through the dialectical relationship of conceived and perceived spaces. The idea of lived space is prominent in urban studies to demonstrate the importance of everyday life in the city. By employing the notion of lived space, this study tries to show what is lived in the park, in the intersection of conceived and perceived spaces. Parks and other urban green areas have been of great importance to state policies, regulations of local authorities in Ottoman westernization and also in Turkish Republic modernization processes as in modern European cities. I argue that late Ottoman city and Turkish city urban planning strategies should be evaluated along with the urban appropriation of the capitalist mode of production.

Moreover, I also agree with Lefebvre that social space is a social product, and every society, each mode of production, produces its own space. Therefore, the society of this era, the space of this era of this city creates its own product. This study is an effort to understand the particular social product of Zeytinburnu- Seyitnizam Parkı in 2019 in Turkey.

Then we might move to David Harvey, who has sought to make an extensive reading of Marx's texts to see what he might have said on the geography of capital accumulation, the production of space and of uneven geographical development. He is crucial to understand the urbanization of capital. He argues that urbanization played an essential role in capitalism's history and he questions the seemingly 'neutral,' or 'natural' or even 'obvious' knowledge in order to define a critical urban theory. Harvey examines urban space as an instrumental means to preserve political power. (Harvey, 2001, ix) Harvey claims that the social transformations of space, place, and environment are neither neutral nor innocent with respect to practices of domination and control. (Harvey, 2001, 185) Hence, he elaborates on the development of capitalism in line with urbanization.

“We are now only a decade away from the kind of modern state, with its technological and bureaucratic capacities, that can create and sustain an Orwellian control of the citizen's life. If we are to avoid the totalitarian systems, so chillingly depicted in Huxley's Brave New World and Orwell's 1984, the law as declared from the courts will need to be deployed ever increasingly to protect the individual's rights.” (Harvey, 2001, 32)

To Harvey, before World War II, geography discipline was weak as an academic discipline. A significant shift occurred after World War II in geography, a new style of university-based discipline emerged to contribute to 'the technics and mechanics of urban, regional, and environmental management.' Harvey explains the period of 1930 to 1970 as the foundations of the corporate state. The corporate state operates as a socio-political organization that transmits a set of behaviors individuals and groups with downwards, manipulates, and controls them. It uses political, administrative, legal, financial, military institutions for the sake of implementing the ethics of 'rationality' and 'efficiency.'

For Harvey, the historical geography of capitalism has shaped physical and social landscapes, and these landscapes should be, in turn, understood in terms of how capital become urbanized. (Harvey, 1985, 56-58) “Capitalism has to urbanize in order to reproduce itself.” (Harvey, 1985, 54)

Harvey claims that the circulation of capital is geographical movement in the sense of exchange. He seeks to demonstrate that geographical structures function as determinants of capitalism’s dynamic, and they are more than mere reflections of capital circulation. (Harvey, 1985, 19) To Harvey, the flow of capital creates both capital and labor surpluses. Capital surpluses denote to profit, and labor surpluses are gained through labor saving revolutions in production. (Harvey, 1985, 23) This over-accumulation generates the problem for absorbing surplus without destruction of capital and labor power. The tension between the need for production and the issue of surplus lays the foundation of the history of capitalist urbanization. Urbanization played an essential role in capitalism’s history, while the surpluses of capital and labor power transformed into commodity form. There were base assets of urban centers, which are oriented primarily to trade, political and military dominance and trade. These could be easily transformed into assets of capital accumulation. (Harvey, 1985, 27)

“The production of the physical and social landscape of capitalism was thereafter increasingly caught up in the search for solutions to the over-accumulation problem through the absorption of capital and labor surpluses by some mix of temporal and geographical displacement of surplus capital into the production of physical and social infrastructures.” (Harvey, 1985, 28) Thus, the industrial city is closely interrelated with the transition from the appropriation of surpluses through trade, monopoly, and military control to the production of surpluses. Urbanization was structured around the production of physical and social landscapes of accumulation. As the city became the centerpiece of accumulation and surplus production, it was also a unique place for interurban competition. This interurban competition remarked generalized capitalist system of uneven geographical development. (p.30, ibid) “The industrial city became in short, a concrete means toward the definition of abstract labor on the world market.” (Harvey, 1982, 422-26, cited in Harvey, 1985, 30) New urban politics centered on managerial concerns with the mind-set of growth, efficiency, accumulation, and innovation. The physical and social infrastructures of the city were used to support the reproduction of capital and labor power. Industrial city was the home for contradictory forces, which created it, the flows of people and goods, immigration, the problem of over-accumulation, and technical innovation. In the search for eliminating class conflict and social disintegration, industrial capitalism accepted responsibility for the social reproduction of working class in the areas of health, education, welfare, etc. by means of mass communication, police and especially the organization of space. (Harvey, 1985, 31) It is then vital to highlight the responsibility of capitalism also in the contemporary city, to build places as neighborhood parks for the working class and disadvantaged people to resolve the inner conflicts of capitalist city. As still, the city is the centerpiece of accumulation and surplus production; it is a site of conflict and also a site of regulation through the place.

Nevertheless, nowadays, what we see in cities is more than production and accumulation. The city is now the center of consumption and demand. It is also a space of social competition more complicated than a class-based struggle. Harvey explains this shift to the demand-led organization of the space with the trauma of World War II. He claims that Keynesian strategies of debt-financed fiscal management came forward, and it is reflected in urban politics as the demand-led

organization of the space. In the post-war city, how you spent money in the market became more important than the class position. The social competition shifted from class positions to struggles over space that represented status and prestige. For Harvey, at that time, control over social space came forward in urban life. The city became a site of consumption, of lifestyles. Harvey explains uprisings in cities in the 1960s in such a social context. He claims that these movements focused on distribution and consumption issues so that urban politics also had to shift from production-based strategies to redistribution issues. (Harvey, 1985, 40-41) That was a fight over social space, distribution, and consumption. The urbanization politics of the era then shifted to concerns like health, welfare, education, and transportation.

However, he claims that urbanization is not a passive perpetrator of the capitalist mode of production. It also creates contradictions that are more complex than solely class-based struggles. The roles of individuals vary from consumers, workers, women, political activists, and these are not necessarily in harmony. "But urbanization means a certain mode of the human organization space and time that can somehow embrace all of these conflicting forces, not necessarily so as to harmonize them, but to channel transformation." (Harvey, 1985, 54)

As the social movements of the 1960s, also social movements of the contemporary era highlights something more than class relations and production-based struggles, which is a demand of social space, consumption, and distribution. As the city is based on the premises of consumption and distribution, the demand has also shifted towards these premises. This critical shift in the appropriation of the city also reflected in today's claims to the city. For this reason, while elaborating on urban parks, the demands to space should also be evaluated in that sense. By making use of parks, benefiting from its blessings, people claim the right to consumption and distribution.

Certeau's theory is worth to note in the emergence of practices and activities of daily life in urban theory. He elaborates on the duality of urban fact and the city concept of the Western functionalist approach. Michel de Certeau, in 'Walking in the city' explains the concept of the city by looking down to the city from Word Trade Center. He thinks this totalizing glance to the city and the idea of reading city, as a text, is the core of the concept of the city. The city concept is a totalizing concept of Western urban development, which is used for socio-economic and political strategies. This

concept is founded by utopian, and an urban discourse, which has a threefold operation. Firstly, the production of its own space by repressing mental, political, and physical pollutions that makes the city. Secondly, it is a new system, which should substitute for traditions, scientific strategies, and tactics of users. Lastly, the city is a universal subject that is possible to attribute instead of different subjects such as groups, associations, and individuals. By linking the city to a concept, opaque past and uncertain future become something to be dealt with. It is handled as a unity, by thinking its pluralities and making these pluralities effective. Thus, the city provides a basis for understanding interconnected relations and administer them. It is a totalizing model as Hobbes's State as Certeau suggests. (During, 1999, 128-129) The functionalist organization of Western development privileges progress and time, rather than space. It tries to conclude by neglecting new attributes, space itself. The concept city is a subject, which is enriched by new attributes and an object of administration.

As the urban system tries to include city elements to make networks of order stronger, the administration is also combined with a process of elimination by speculative and classificatory operations. Administration both classifies reintroduces the parts and functions of the city, and also rejects everything that is not capable of being dealt with in this way and so constitutes the 'waste products' of a functionalist administration (abnormality, deviance, illness, death, etc.) The urban system tries to manage these deficiencies for the purpose of making networks more efficient. Besides, urban life continually admits the re-emergence of the elements that the urban project excludes. While Certeau points the urban projects of surveillance that are at the core capitalist urban, on the other hand, tactics of people opposed to the strategies. The ordinary practitioners make use of spaces, while powerful draw the map of spaces, construction of it.

There is, for Certeau, a contradiction between the administrative and individual re-appropriations. One could exemplify it in the case of the gentrification process, Gezi and the Olympics of 2004 in Greece. In the gentrification process and Gezi, we could see the tension between the administration, which defends itself by making the city more secure, or economically alive. At the same time, in Greece, with the claim of making Athens a global city, privatization process and sprawl of the city started. So, public spaces are taken from the hands of people, in the name of making the city

competitive. In these examples, we would recognize the tension between the rationalist concept of the city, and people who claim their right to use the space.

For Certeau, as the concept city fails to understand and organize the dynamics of the city, the discourse has changed to be catastrophic. He then proposes a new discourse, which is either based on progress and overlooking as the concept of the city would suggest, or again a totalizing catastrophic theory. Certau opens the stage for a new path, to understand singular and plural practices which urban system failed to suppress. The practices that developed themselves under the networks of surveillance, tactics for Certeau, are worth to analyze. As this study dwells around the lived space, Certeau's discourse of dialectic between strategies and tactics is important to be a bridge of Marxist approach to urban and post-modernist approach to localities.

3.2. Post-Modern Approach to Localities

Marxist approach to social and economic life fed space theories that are explained above. This approach is critical to understand the city within the modern context of the capitalist world. These theories laid the foundation to understand the city in the social, economic, political context.

On the other hand, a post-modern approach to the post-modern city has introduced us with the duality of global and local in the urban context. With the spread of globalization, the economic, social, and political context has changed, so does the city itself. The theories, which I will introduce in this chapter, are taking the foundations from critical theory; however, they focus on the dialectic relations of global and local and explain the place-specific processes in the intersection of new emerging context.

Zukin, as Harvey did, tries to demonstrate the processes which made up the city a vital part of new consumer society. In *Landscapes of Power*, she explains the relation between market and place starting from a 17th-century and 18th-century market in England and European cities. To her, markets of 18th century Europe cities defined the streets and rhythm of daily life. The interactions and exchanges of good offered the local communities with the material and cultural means for their social

reproduction. (Zukin, 1991, 6) At the time, market internalized the place; the market did not have distinct meaning apart from the place.

In the 19th century, entrepreneurialism emerged. The workplace shifted from home or shop to piece work in the name of cutting production costs. The factory towns are built with the social-spatial structuring of the market. The place started to internalize the market. Factory towns provided housing for workers, at the same time imposed moral life on worker-residents. They used moral education, urban planning strategies that would attach workers to employers permanently without social disorder. Zukin stresses the importance of organization of consumption with its function to lessen the contradiction of market and place. In the middle of the 20th century, low prices, credit helped individual purchases and created a new consumer society. (Zukin, 1991, 10-11) Renting and owning a home became the primary consumption that ties economic production to social life. Zukin claims that these processes generate tension between corporate power and labor-force. While large corporations try to remake the geography, the latter shows opposition to change. (Zukin, 1991, 13)

In the consumer city, global and local conflict becomes prominent. Homogeneity comes with the globalization and technical advancement, led the localities of the places to diminish. However, different economic and social activities reflect what makes up a place. The example here can be given for Istanbul and Turkey, where the city and country are two different places in the sense of amenities and economic activities. At the same time, a region in a city can also show a different path of development. Whereas Sultanahmet is an attractive site of tourism, it is a place of production and consumption as well. Zeytinburnu fails to develop the same output and consumption processes in the same city. As cities become more homogenous by globalization processes, cities also become more heterogeneous as places of such. At that point, she privileges place which theories of modernization underestimated. To her, local communities were found archaic; these were repressed with the concept of progression. Zukin states three meaning of the place. The first one is "geographical location, a point on a well-bounded map." (Zukin, 1991, 12) This explanation refers to territory with its own flora. The second meaning of place states local community and economic activities of a specific place. The example for it is Istanbul, Amsterdam. "Place in a third, broader sense is a cultural artifact of social conflict and cohesion… A useful concept in social theory, place expresses how a spatially

connected group of people mediate the demands of cultural identity, state power, and capital accumulation." (Zukin, 1991, 12)

She employs the concept of landscape to grasp a microcosm of social relations. The landscape represents both the local society's use of space and both the powerful's subordination. The landscape is a product of a society, which indicates both landscapes of the powerful and of the subordinate and the resistance. The landscape evokes a way of life and social controls. She claims that now contemporary landscapes hold both the country of the powerful and local's opposition together. (Zukin, 1991, 19)

Zukin argues that within this era of homogeneity and heterogeneity, the use of public space has also changed. The public space is now used in public and private manners so that in the postmodern landscape, the hybrid public-private cultural forms have emerged. (Zukin, 1991, 51-52) On the one hand, the public may use private spaces like stores, shopping malls as a public space; on the other hand, public spaces might be used as private space. As some people might use urban green areas as their own garden, performing informal behaviors, others might use a shopping mall as a public space to gather together and socialize.

Sassen introduces us with her global city concept, and she argues that cities are part of transnational urban systems detached from national economies. She claims that the economic activities of the global city are not hypermobile but rather embedded in place. "Emphasizing place, infrastructure, and non-expert jobs matter precisely because so much of the focus has been on the neutralization of geography and place made possible by the new technologies." (Sassen, 2005, 31)

As cross border networks are important, it is vital to seize the existence of these networks in the city. Besides, as the city de-nationalizes, it becomes the ground for new forms of power emerges at the sub-national level. (Sassen, 2005, 38)

The global city denotes a space, which is trans-territorial as it connects sites which are not geographically close. On the other hand, the global city is place-bounded as it contains disadvantaged populations of immigrants, people of color, disadvantaged women, and their demands to the city. (Sassen, 2005, 39) The city then emerges as terrain of new claims, rights to place in a context of global processes, and transnational economic and political formations.

Gospodini contributes to postmodern landscape theories by expressing the effects of postmodernity and intercity competitions in urban landscapes. While urban space had been mostly an outcome of economic growth of cities, the post-industrial city has become a medium of urban economic development. (Gospodini, 2006, 312)

The city image is vital in its function as a medium of urban economic development. The image of city prevails in the post-industrial era. The image of the city firstly raises place identity and "promotes the 'selling' of the city as a commodity to the 'flaneur,' or the pleasure-seeking 'urban voyeur,' a concept that is referring to both visitors and residents in the postmodern city." (Gospodini, 2006, 312) As for example, Istanbul's image promotes it to citizens with its appealing structures and experiences and enhances place identity; the image of the city also boosts the city for tourists. With the help of innovative design and built heritage, the city becomes attractive. Physical characters of place and functional components of it support individuals to attribute meanings to the place. By generating distinct landscapes in the city, the place-identity is supported. As distinct landscapes are built for different social, cultural, and economic groups of people with different physical and social features, new social relations are built in the urban context. Therefore, Gospodini gives the primary role to the distinctiveness of the place in the urban context.

Gospodini also points out the importance of presence in terms of relation to the place. The relations to place are defined by users' presence. The relations vary for an inhabitant, a frequent visitor or temporary user of the area. It is a significant aspect of space with respect to expectations and perceptions; I will also follow this crucial question in my study. (Gospodini, 2006)

3.3. The Right to the City

"The right to the *oeuvre*, to participation and *appropriation* (clearly distinct from the right to property), are implied in the right to the city" (Lefebvre 1996, 174, cited in Mitchell, 2003, 18)

The right to the city is an important concept in urban theory initiated by Lefebvre. The concept is built upon the city in the intersection of the relations of production and consumption in the capitalist era. However, the concept goes further by questioning the fundamental rights of the modern city and highlighting the

inadequacy of them in the urban context. The right to the city privileges an effort for the right for diverse groups of people.

Harvey questions the fundamental rights of private property and profit rate, which goes in hand with the accumulation of capital. He thinks that these rights cause more inequalities in urban life. Thus, he shares Lefebvre's working-class definition and suggests that the deprived ones of the modern city make up a new proletariat. This is a new class formation based on multiple needs and demands in an urban context which is of homeless, displaced, and underemployed or unemployed people. He argues that these multiple needs and demands in the city are the roots of the struggles and social movements in the city. (Harvey, 2012, xi-xii)

For Harvey, the development of the city as a new commodity is vital to understand the inequalities of the modern city. In order to dig in the rights to the city of the contemporary era, Harvey gives examples of the transformation of Paris in 1853 and the privatization process during Margaret Thatcher's reign. After the crisis of 1848, Bonaparte tried to find a solution for capital surplus and unemployment problem by giving Haussmann a duty to reshape Paris. Transforming the urban infrastructures in Paris, the city became "the city of light," a center of tourism, pleasure, and consumption with cafes, stores, fashion industry which created a new urban way of life. (Harvey, 2012, 7-8) So, urban life became a new commodity of consumerism, but just for the people who can afford it. Taking the roots from the privatization of housing in Margaret Thatcher's reign in London, Harvey points removing people with lower income and even middle – class from the urban center. (Harvey, 2012, 20) This is one of the prominent problems of the neoliberal city today when one tries to demonstrate the claims to a right to the city. In his words, "…we see the right to the city, falling into the hands of private or quasi-private interests." (Harvey, 2012, 23) Therefore, it is crucial for Harvey to examine the urban process for the different future possibilities in urban life from the daily urban lives of people. (Harvey, 2012, 66)

So, he comes up with a new right to the city, in which derivative rights of living a fulfilling life should come forward instead of unfair rights of private property and profit rate. He explains the right to the city not just as right to access to what already exists, but rather an active right to remake the city. (Harvey, 2003, 939- 941) The aim of the right to the city for Harvey is to empower and create new spaces in urban

while people seek meaning in everyday life, instead of accessing what is current in the city. Lefebvre similarly had the idea of tension of heterotopia and isotopy, in other words, of urban practices opposite to spatial order of capitalism. (Lefebvre, 1970, cited in Harvey, 2012, xvii-xviii) The city for them, is a site of creative destruction, and we are kind of urban architects who make up the city through our daily actions and the city, in turn, makes us. (Harvey, 2003, 939) Consequently, both of them believed in the power of daily urban practices for the right to the city.

Harvey thinks that commons could be used to appropriate public space and public goods. To him, the social practice of "commoning" is only possible when it is collective and not commodified. However, he argues that even if commons are not commodified at first, they can also be captured in the capitalist mode of production. He takes the example urban park and puts in a context that urban park could increase nearby residential property prices, and ceasing to be shared for inhabitants. (Harvey, 2012, 74)

Marcuse employed Lefebvre's (1967) slogan of "the right to the city is like a cry and a demand" to open up the question of the right to the city. He takes the idea of Lefebvre; of cry and demand as two separate terms. Marcuse firstly inquires whose right the right to the city will be. To this aim, he employs demand instead of cry and aspiration instead of demand. He explains the demand as coming from those who are deprived of fundamental material rights, and the aspiration from those who think themselves limited in life and unpleasant.

In order to comprehend the basis of demand and aspiration, he first defines positions both in the relations of production as:

- The excluded (not, in fact, an accurate term, for they are in fact a part of the system, without the protections won by the working class for labor, but they operate at its margins).
- The working class, the materially exploited (including what is euphemistically called the middle class, i.e. white- as well as blue-collar workers, skilled as well as unskilled, service as well as manufacturing workers, but underpaid and producing profit for others)– together with the excluded, we may speak of these two groups as the *deprived.*

- The small business people (the individual proprietor, the small entrepreneurs, the craftsmen).
- The gentry (including the more successful small business persons, professionals, the highly paid servants of the multi-nationals).
- The capitalists (owners and decision-making managers of large business enterprises).
- The establishment intelligentsia (including much of the media, academics, artists, and others active in the ideological aspect of the production processes).
- The politically powerful (including most of those in or aspiring to high public office). (Marcuse, 2009, 190)

Taking the above positions into account, the demand comes mostly from the excluded and working class in the search for materials rights. It is a demand for those who are underpaid and excluded from the benefits of urban life.

On the other hand, he makes an explanation of positions in cultural terms as:

- The directly oppressed (oppressed along the lines of race, ethnicity, gender, lifestyle, often called the excluded, but excluded only in this "cultural" sense, often included in an economic sense).
- The alienated (of any economic class, many youths, artists, a significant part of the intelligentsia, in resistance to the dominant system as preventing adequate satisfaction of their human needs).
- The insecure (a shifting group, varying with conjunctural changes, e.g., level of crisis, prosperity, including much of the working class and periodically some of the gentry).
- The hapless lackeys of power (including some of the gentry and some of the intelligentsia).
- The underwriters of the established cultural and ideological hegemonic attitudes and beliefs. (Marcuse, 2009, 191)

In a cultural sense, demand comes from the directly oppressed, and aspiration comes from the alienated. The alienated are the ones integrated into the system and sharing its material benefits but oppressed in their social relationship, limited in the sense of

opportunities of cultural-social life. These distinctions of economic and cultural positions are crucial to understanding these two distinct demands to right to the city. Marcuse thinks that even though the roots of the demand and aspiration are different, these need to be seen as complementary elements while examining the right to the city.

Marcuse handles the right to the city as a unitary right, exceeding the right to individual justice, but meeting the needs of both deprived and alienated in urban life. Marcuse offers the right to the city not only in terms of the right to consumption but also right to production. He thinks, people of urban life should be determinant of what is produced and should be in the process and production, as well as they enjoy the outcome of it.

Mitchell, on the other hand, focuses on restrictive procedures over the public space conducted in the name of security. He exemplifies these procedures within the state of post 9/11. He states that even before 9/11, "parks had been reconstructed and fenced, and special enclosed areas for children and their guardians had been established." (Mitchell, 2003, 1)

Mitchell claims that in the name of security site built upon the safety of middle and upper classes, undesired people like homeless, immigrants, political activists are excluded from public space. The surveillance makes the city and public space enclosed with cameras and police or security officers in favor of 'secured city' operating for middle and upper classes. Mitchell shows the ideas arose about public space in New York, eliminating those who are unwanted, especially homeless. He criticizes the opinions reflect that homeless sleeping in the park, surviving in there, seems like an occupation, damaging the order and civilization of the city. The discourse of safety for Mitchell would eliminate the idea of the city and its public spaces, where one makes his/her voice heard.

Mitchell interprets the right to the city of Lefebvre in the concrete sense that, now it is homeless' right to sleep or inhabit in a park, or someone's right to relax in a park, or someone's right to housing that is discussed in the name right to the city. He says if it is not guaranteeing the right to the city, it is a necessary step to achieve it. "The right to housing, the right to inhabit the city, thus demands more than just houses and apartments: it demands the redevelopment of the city in a manner responsive to the

needs, desires, and pleasures of its inhabitants, especially its oppressed inhabitants." (Mitchell, 2003, 21) It also means the right to a place for children to play, areas of relaxation, and so forth. "The right to the city implies the right to the uses of city spaces, the right to *inhabit*." (Emphasis in original, Mitchell, 2003, 19)

Mitchell follows the idea of representation instead of the logic of identity while elaborating on how public space is possible. Mitchell favors the logic of representation, as identity logic eliminates differences. The act of representing creates a space of representation. The 'public' space is not a given but becomes possible with an act of representation. "The production of public space-the means through which the cry and demand of the right to the city are made possible-is thus always a dialectic between the "end of public space" and it's beginning. This dialectic is both fundamental to and a product of the struggle for rights in and to the city." (Mitchell, 2003, 35-36)

3.4. The 'Public' of Public Space

The debate over the 'public' nature of a public space revolves around justice in society. The public sphere is thus worth to analyze as part of the above discussions.

In French, the concept of "l'espace public" is founded on two definitions: firstly as a physical location that creates social ties, namely the public space and as the collection of attributes contributing to the formation of public debate, namely the public sphere.

However, the explanations of the public sphere and how consensus is achieved is a problematic topic. Starting with Habermas (1989), the public sphere is defined as a space of democracy where all citizens have the right to inhabit, and all public communication takes place. He takes unity and equality on the basis of his idea. The function of the public sphere by deliberation is to attain a consensus on the common good. (Habermas, 1962) However, his idea of consensus through deliberation is criticized, as it might introduce inequalities and refer to the assimilation of practices that are not universal.

Fraser (2005) argues that what the common good is subject to debate and that the very definition of this common good indeed must be at the core of debates. Fraser notes that there have always been many publics and some of these publics, the

counter-publics. She introduces us with the concept of subaltern counter-publics that have contested the bourgeois public norms that have excluded them and elaborated alternative styles of political behavior and equally alternative public discourse norms (Fraser, 2005, 117). Fraser (1993) highlights that what appears to be consensus expressed by public opinion in reality masks the conflicts that appear throughout society, while at the same time legitimizing dominant power. Thus, she arrives at the conclusion that a plurality of publics is preferable to one singular public.

According to Habermas, public space and the public sphere are closely connected realms. Public space is a concrete entity and takes up an actual site, a place, and a ground where all types of different activities such as political or cultural occur (Habermas, 1991). As the public sphere is the network for communicating information, it needs public space to practice it for Schmidt. (Schmidt, Nemeth, 2010)

I will continue with the discussions of what conditions give a public space its public nature. Lynch defines public spaces as the places that are open to the freely chosen, democratic, and spontaneous actions of people (Lynch, 1972). Rapoport, on the other hand, questions the authority. He thinks that public space is only possible when inhabitants of a place can express themselves, and they are recognized. (Rapoport, 1977). For him, public space is possible when people can make use of the opportunities that are provided in place. Mitchell expresses the act of representing makes a public space possible. The representation refers to the meeting of various cultural qualities and ideas with each other in urban public space.

For Young, urban public space is a common ground for information exchange, communication. It should be open to all, inclusive and pluralist, tolerating difference (Young, 2000). It should be accessible to all, but not only in the sense of physical accessibility but, in the sense of access to activities and opportunities. Urban public space is representative of political activities. Public space provides a space of social interaction between different groups, different ideas, and the demands of users. Urban public spaces are accessible when they encourage interaction among diverse users, as well as providing variety, flexibility, and freedom to users. These indicators will be used to highlight real-life urban public space in this study.

We have to mention two different approaches to the presence of the public. One is defending that public characteristic of public space is decreasing as Mitchell, Habermas, and Harvey defend. This approach argues that the public space loses its value as being a representative of social and political demands in the modern city. Also, Sennett (1977) supports the idea with "the fall of public life." Sennett connects the loss of public space to the structuring of the modern city. He claims that modern city encouraged private comfort instead of the needs and demands of the whole population. It gave dominance to individualism and prevented social interaction. Thus, the city has lost its natural inclusiveness of difference and capabilities of public communication, interaction. The control over space has come to the front and evaluated diversity and uncontrolled encounters as a negative attribute. The idea of Sennett, Harvey, and Habermas evaluate the public space in the context of capitalism. That's why they express how capitalist mode of production has changed the public space in a way that it demolishes its public experience.

On the other hand, the second approach favors the transformation of public life. Zukin, by expressing microcosm of social relations opposes the fall of public space. She reveals that the postmodern landscape brought about a combination of public and private uses of public space has been extended to the level that hybrid public-private cultural forms are generated. (Zukin, 1991, 51-52) That perspective offers new emerging public spaces, especially in places that are privately owned. This postmodernist approach shed light on different demands, needs of different individuals and groups and claimed that homogenous public space is not possible.

Also, Crawford thinks that different demands are increasing to public space, and thus, public space is transformed into new forms. Different groups demand different rights to the city, and these are arising from lived experiences. So, she expresses that the clear distinction between public and private is blurred now, and this leads to a multiplicity of public spaces, multiple sites for expression. (Crawford, 1995) This approach brings a concept of public spaces that are not representing the whole homogeneous public life.

There is a third perspective on space, which is called parochial space that focuses on the intersection of public spaces with private spaces. Lofland deriving the concept of parochial space from Hunter explains three public spaces as "Private realm is the world of the household and intimate networks; the parochial realm is the world of the

neighborhood, workplace, or acquaintance network; and the public realm is the world of the street." (Lofland, 1989, 10). The parochial realm is at the intersection of public and private realms denotes to a space of where people start to interact with each other and create networks. These networks are mostly built within communities of a neighborhood or workplace. The neighborhood is a significant part of that space since people get together, children play together, women sometimes cook together, share some commonalities.

DeVault indicates that the legal attributions to space could be easily changed sociologically. For instance, a park which is seen as public space could turn into a parochial space by the people who live in there if people see it as an extension of the house. On the contrary, a private space could be public space when a home turns into a museum. (DeVault, 2000) If inhabitants start to see these places as an extension of their private life and experience it that way, these public spaces could turn into parochial spaces. For McKenzie et al., close ties with space as they own them, casual and informal behaviors are also important to make parochial space which is so different from the public realm of a square of encountering strangers. The parochial realm then becomes a rather intimate space than the public realm.

3.4.1. Neighbourhood Parks as a Part of Parochial Realm

Neighborhood parks are crucial public open green spaces as they are close to the households and a place multiple formal and informal activities. Mills states that neighborhoods are significant in urban life that they are including connections between the private spaces of houses and the public life of the streets (Mills, 2007). The neighborhood is also the residential space where close ties and relationships of daily life occur. Neighborhoods are notable examples of parochial realms as they consist of both spaces of public, transportation systems, public open green spaces, and private houses. (Ekinci & Ozan, 2006) Neighborhood parks are crucial urban public spaces for a neighborhood as they provide both physical and psychological wellbeing of the neighborhood, recreational facilities as well as building relations between users.

Moreover, these parks improve the lives of residents by being the closest refuge to nature in an urban area. Neighborhood parks then combine aesthetical, social, cultural, political, ecological, recreational functions of urban public space. For

women, the neighborhood could be the only place to socialize, and neighborhoods parks are the most important element of the neighborhood in this sense. “The cultural practice of neighborhood life is gendered, relying in part on traditional gender roles for women as wives and mothers which place them at home during the day” (Mills, 2007) Additionally, the neighborhood park is sometimes the only place to socialize and playground for children of disadvantaged people.

In urban life, access to neighborhood parks is significantly important for specific groups, and not all neighborhood parks are fully used or full-fill the needs of these groups. That’s why the functions mentioned above are critical to understanding the role of Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam Parkı, which is chosen for the aim of the study.

4. RECENT DEBATES ON URBAN GREEN AREAS

4.1. *Bostan*s and City Planting

Urban green areas in Istanbul are with various layers, and have been subject to tremendous transformations; one important component of them is urban agriculture, which I refer to as city planting. As I have investigated through urban green areas in a historical gaze, it is also important to highlight recent transformations and debates around urban green areas. To this aim, in this chapter, I will firstly explain transformations and recent oppositions and demands around *bostan*s as a part of urban agriculture. Secondly, I will analyze Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam Parkı as a part of urban green areas in Istanbul within the light of interviews.

At that point, the reason to discuss *bostan*s is that they are areas of resistance and regulation. The political aspect of urban green areas is very clear on the debates of *bostan*s. On the one hand, there are demands and needs of inhabitants; on the other hand, there are regulations, urban planning strategies, which resonate with social uprisings and conflicts as depicted in previous chapters. It is a crucial unit of clash of demands and urban design. The city planting areas emerge as public spaces of diverse functions in the urban context. They are connections to nature, a place of recreation, a solution to those who suffer from poverty, food insecurity, and the poor economic conditions with rapid urban growth and unsustainable urbanization. Recently, the social and political functions of these areas have become prominent. Beyond the multiple layers as urban public space, the city planting areas are the fields where people try to make their demands heard, their claim to 'the right to the city.'

Furthermore, as Marcuse claims, the right to city consists of two distinct demands based on economic and cultural positions. He claims that in terms of material interests, the demand comes mostly from the excluded and working class, *the deprived* in the search for materials rights. It is a demand for those who are underpaid and excluded from the material benefits of urban life. On the other hand,

in cultural terms, the demand comes from directly oppressed (oppressed along the lines of race, ethnicity, gender, lifestyle). The aspiration comes from the alienated (of any economic class, many youths, artists). The alienated and directly oppressed are the ones sharing material benefits but oppressed in their social relationship, limited in the sense of opportunities of cultural-social life. Marcuse thinks that even though the roots of the demand and aspiration are different, these need to be seen as complementary elements while examining the right to the city. At that point, I claim that the farmers in *bostan*s and the supporters reflect the demand in material terms, and also aspiration in cultural terms. That's why, in order to have a broad understanding of the right to the city, the demand of those who are deprived of material rights in *bostan*s, and the aspiration of those who support the community life in community gardens should be evaluated together.

4.1.1. Transformation of the *Bostan*s

Turkish traditional market garden, known as *bostan*, is a specific form of urban agriculture in Istanbul has a long history. From the Byzantine period to the twentieth century, *bostan*s satisfied the need for food in Istanbul (Kaldjian, 2004). A typical *bostan* produces 15-20 types of vegetables in a year, capable of feeding several hundreds of people. Some also had fruit trees, chickens, and cows for agriculture as sideline products. These gardens have been identified on a map dating back to 1786, but historical sources indicate that small-scale agriculture was present in the area not long after the UNESCO-designated city walls were built in the 400s. (Hattam, 2013)

In the 1900s, 102 *bostan*s were reported in the old city, and more than 1,200 vegetable gardens were reported in a larger area on both sides of Bosporus. In the 1950s map, within the city wall, 44 discrete areas of *bostan*s were found, each of which could be large enough to be divided into 10-20 individual gardens. Until the 1950s, the crops were produced mostly on small farms. In the 1950s, agricultural production faced a shift with Marshall Aid. (Aydın, 2010, 153). Between the 1960s and 1980s, the state started capitalization of agricultural production by using modern farm machinery, chemicals, artificial fertilizers, hybrid and genetically modified seeds, cheap credit and subsidies for both inputs and crop. (Turan, 2015, 88)

In the 1980s, *bostan*s were pushed to the periphery of the city due to the massive population growth, political corruption, and housing development (Keydar, 1999 cited in Turan, 2015). Thereupon, with the aim of political, economic and social stability, in collaboration with the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and the EU, agriculture policies had been directed towards the internationalization, modernization, and capitalization. The neoliberal policies have been speeded up since 1998 with the implementation of free-market policies. Transnational agribusiness firms came forward, and commercialization of agricultural production prevailed with these policies. (Aydın, 2010) These policies brought about the breakdown of traditional relationships in agriculture and endangered small local farmers, *bostan*s, and sustainable agriculture in Istanbul. Also, with the aim of promoting Istanbul as a world city, especially with the declaration of Istanbul as 'European Capital of Culture' in 2010, the process has been intensified. The image of the city shifted to be a center of tourism and real estate. (Turan, 2015, 100)

As a result of the government's neoliberal policies and of the many urban transformation projects, urban agricultural lands have been destroyed in the interests of gaining profit through building construction. Istanbul's *bostan*s largely disappeared under new roads, buildings for apartments and offices, shopping malls, and city parks. Both the number and the size of these *bostan*s have been constantly decreasing in recent years. Furthermore, during its period of governance, the AKP government furthered the neoliberal policies, which led to the transformation of urban agricultural spaces for construction. These policies, in terms of *bostan*s, marked the loss of *bostan*s in Istanbul. (Turan, 2015, 48-49)

These *bostan*s are on the UNESCO World Heritage sites list since 1985 as part of the historic areas of Istanbul. (Durgun, 2017) Even though they are officially protected as a part of UNESCO World Heritage Site, in practice they are subject to destruction by government policies both in archeological and agricultural terms. Nowadays, a few last long-term historic *bostan*s remain, namely the Piyalepaşa Bostan, the Gümüşçü Bostans, and the Yedikule Bostans. (Turan, 2015, 73)

In the next section, I will focus on spatial appropriation claims on the *bostan*s of the state and farmers and the communities of *bostan*s. Firstly, I will elaborate on

Yedikule Bostans, Kuzguncuk, and Gümüşdere Bostans as they are the few historic *bostan*s that remain. Then, I will introduce newly constructed community *bostan*s after the Gezi movement.

4.1.2. Spatial Appropriation Claims on Bostans

4.1.2.1. Historic Market Gardens

The Yedikule Bostans has been a site for cultivation for 1500 years. They are located around the Theodosian Walls, which were originally built in 412 A.D. by the Byzantine Emperor Theodosius II to protect the city of Constantinople (White, Shopov, & Casson, 2015, cited in Turan, 2015, 53) These *bostan*s provided the entire needs of the city for vegetables and fruits in Byzantine and Ottoman periods. (Istanbul Ansiklopedisi, 1994, cited in Kaldjian, 2004).

The gardeners were mostly immigrants from Albania, Bulgaria or Greeks and Armenians during the Ottoman reign. After the 1950s, with the rapid urbanization, and as a result, a major migration to Istanbul, people from Cide (Kastamonu) came to work in *bostan*s as seasonal workers firstly. When Armenians and Greeks left the lands, they kept on cultivating the lands since today. (Turan, 2015, 63) These lands have been crucial to providing these immigrants with employment and income after migration.

With a legal decision, the sites that include Yedikule Bostans were declared as an urban and archeological site and urban and historical site. Even though they had this official protected status, starting from 1995, they have become subject to urban planning policies. In 1995, the purpose was to build a parking lot, and in 2004, to make a football pitch, more *bostan*s were razed.

In June 2013, the metropolitan municipality started a project to transform the *bostan*s, titled *Yedikule-Belgrad Kapı Arasında Kara Surları İç Koruma Rekreasyon Projesi* (‘The Re-creation Project for the Area inside the Land Walls between the Yedikule and Belgrade Gates’). (Turan, 2015, 69) After the project was approved, the local municipality piled up the *bostan*s. As a result, 27 acres (*dönüm)* out of 60 acres were lost. In August, in Radikal newspaper, three projects of city parks were announced which would replace the *bostan*s. While the public oppositions started

against this project, Fatih municipality declared that the project arose from the issues of security in the *bostan*s. (Gürkan, 2013, cited in Kanbak, 2016) It was a project to make *bostan*s 'secured' as Mitchell argued for public parks in the US. The approach that the municipality was taking is a similar approach to what Mitchell explained. The idea behind making a place 'secured' is for the benefit of middle or upper classes and impoverishes disadvantaged people. The project also marks an approach against sustainable urban agriculture, and advantages profit-making neoliberal policies.

In this case, the public response to the demolition of the gardens inside the walls and continued petitions and legal challenges blocked the construction of the project. The project was challenged in the courts. *The Tarihi Yedikule Bostanlarını Koruma Girişim*i ('Initiative for the Preservation of the Historic Yedikule Bostans') was formed on the day of destruction through social media. The Initiative's aim was to inform the public about the destruction and its effects with the active use of social media, press statements, newspaper articles and academic articles, and the publication of the destruction of the Yedikule Bostans. This initiative working with the farmers who lost their lands tried to reinstate the lands that were destroyed and protect those that remained. This struggle and initiative were closely connected to the Gezi resistance, as the destruction also took place at the time when Gezi events took place. (Turan, 2015, 93) The initiative then formed an Association of Yedikule Gardeners. Mostly the gardeners who lost their *bostan*s joined the meetings. They craved for improving working conditions for farmers, assuring sustainable agriculture as well as protecting the remaining *bostan*s. The farmers who joined the meetings had a belief that being together would resist municipalities' unfair policies.

After that, the gardeners association have received a promise from the municipality that they might continue their agricultural work. However, the *bostan*s inside the walls became empty. In the *bostan*s of Yedikule, a total of 26 gardening families remained.

Also, the renovation project for the land walls demolished many fruit trees from the gardens for being too close to the walls or for blocking the view of the walls. As a part of this renovation, land walls were reconstructed as perfectly formed 'film set' castle walls. (Genç, 2013, cited in Turan, 2015, 104) In 2006, UNESCO warned

Turkey not to make any new development and reconstruction plans for the World Heritage area (the Report of the Joint ICOMOS / UNESCO Expert Review Mission to the Historic Areas of Istanbul World Heritage Site. 6th to 11th April 2006 cited in Turan, 2015)

As the association had a promise from the municipality, the destruction of *bostan*s in Yedikule created a local tension between residents. While some endorsed the destruction in the name of a better view, others supported the struggle to protect them. Yedikule gardeners claimed that the ones who supported Fatih municipality's project were the inhabitants of Yedikule Mansions who wanted to have a view of a park instead of the *bostan*s. However, after the *bostan*s were destroyed, the park project did not begin in the following two years.

Piyalepaşa Bostanı is the other historic market garden, which survived until today. It was also under the threat of construction in 2015. The metropolitan municipality announced an underground parking lot project with a city park on the surface. These projects fostered public opposition, and as a result, by the efforts of two historians, Istanbul Archeological Association and a right to the city group called Beyoglu Urban Defense, Piyalepaşa Bostanı was registered as cultural wealth. The registration remarks that any project that is planned for this site has to be approved by the Council for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Wealth. This registration does not protect the gardeners and their family or ensure farming. However, this protection has been a significant development for it is the first instance of a garden being registered as cultural wealth. (Durgun, 2017)

City planting is an act of resistance in various ways, and *bostan*s are socially contested areas. Firstly, it is a practice of resistance to the exploitative capitalist and neoliberal policies. As it bridges local production and consumption, it is a resistance to industrial agriculture. It contributes to environmental sustainability by means of local production with local seeds, minimizing plastic packaging and transportation and usage of heavy machinery. (Turan, 2015, 84)

City planting practice highlights the dialectical relation between conceived spaces of capitalism and perceived spaces of inhabitants. It is socially contested space at the intersection of strategies of the state power and tactics of people. On the other hand, the act of city planting bridges producer to the product eliminates the alienation of

the producer to production as Marx claimed. Consumers can get in touch with the product and production process. These *bostan*s demonstrate the resistance of the local, of the eliminated relations opposed to capitalist relations of production.

At the same time, *bostan*s have social functions as the activities are based on solidarity and mutual support. The Yedikule gardeners make use of traditional knowledge and farming practices, which is inherited from previous master gardeners. The *bostan*s and the city planting-act reproduce the traditional way of life as opposed to industrialization, commercialization, and globalization.

Also, urban agriculture in the *bostan*s is a form of resistance by virtue of the fact that the struggle to protect them is a resistance practice. It highlights the demands and needs of the inhabitants. City planting in *bostan*s questions whose right it is to the city. It reflects the spatial appropriation clash between the state and inhabitants, mostly for the deprived ones.

As Certeau argues, administration both classifies reintroduces the parts and functions of the city, and also rejects everything that is not capable of being dealt with in this way and so constitutes the 'waste products' of a functionalist administration (abnormality, deviance, illness, death, etc.) While the urban system tries to manage these deficiencies for the purpose of making networks more efficient, urban life continually admits the re-emergence of the elements that the urban project excludes. The ordinary practitioners of *bostan*s, in this case, make use of spaces, reproduces the space as opposed to the map of the powerful.

4.1.2.2. Community Gardens

An interesting aspect of city planting is building community through urban agriculture network (Kaldjian, 2000). City garden as a "resource to build community, foster social and environmental justice, eliminate hunger, empower communities, break down racial and ethnic barriers, provide adequate health and nutrition, reduce crime, improve housing, promote and enhance education, and otherwise create sustainable communities" will be investigated through the examples of community gardens in Istanbul. (ASLA, 2006)

The Kuzguncuk Bostanı is located in the neighborhood of Kuzguncuk, on the Asian side of the Bosphorus. The site for Kuzguncuk appears after the Byzantine era's city construction. However, the emergence of the lands as urban agriculture is related to the modern urbanization of the city. Historically, a Greek family owned the market garden for generations. (Durgun, 2017, 9) Later, the garden supported the immigrated minority to keep surviving in Istanbul. In 2001, the land property passed on to a wealthy family who currently owns the land. The new owners have proposed several times to build a hospital and a school to replace the empty land (Ergun, 2004 cited in Dong, Xia, 2010)

Kuzguncuk was zoned to be under the green belt in Istanbul's master urban plan. However, in 1986 it became subject to construction. Later in 1992 inhabitants needed to prevent the construction of a hospital on the site. These attempts of replacing the *bostan*s, resonated with the constitution of *Kuzguncuklular Derneği* ('the Association of Kuzguncuk Residents') in 1997 by the residents. Since then, the neighborhood residents are struggling to prevent the destruction of the *bostan* for the interests of urban transformation and gentrification projects. (Turan, 2015, 51-52)

Throughout the struggle, inhabitants turned the *bostan* into a communal space of celebrations, cooking with the crops they produce and eat together, organizing workshops. Thus, it has become a space of communal memory, shared culture, and a meeting point for residents.

In 2014, the Kuzguncuk Residents' Association carried out negotiations with the Municipality of Üsküdar because of the government's ongoing attempts to destroy the *bostan*. It is agreed that a part of the *bostan* would be left for vegetable growing as it is, while municipality proposed to rent the rest to a landscape gardening firm and devote to 'hobby gardening.' This agreement has caused a clash between the members of the Residents' Association and the residents. While Association and supporters argue that it is the only way to keep the *bostan*, the others criticized the association for accepting the 'hobby gardening' as it is evaluated as an apolitical act rather than politically-inspired food production. (Turan, 2015, 52) While this is a significant space for urban gardening, the *bostan* seems to lose its collective and political characteristic to the individualized and organized space of the state power.

The Gezi resistance marks a time when people questioned whose right to the city it should be. People contemplated on what kind of a neighborhood, city, or country they would like to live in. People questioned the capitalist production of space and commodification of space, which resulted in the organization of new *bostan*s.

The first example is the Gezi Bostanı, which was organized on the eleventh day of the Occupation in Gezi Park. People started to plant seeds of various crops, even olive trees in an area where several trees were demolished on 27th May. People worked collectively, and social relations were produced in the *bostan*. As people were planting, they were singing, chatting altogether feeling the sense of community. This community *bostan* was a part of Gezi Parkı resistance, which started with the aim of protecting the Gezi Parkı from state-held demolition. On 15th June, the *bostan* was destroyed by the police forces, and Istanbul municipality planted imported flowers in its place. (Turan, 2015, 57-58) The Gezi resistance and the experience of the creation of the Gezi Bostanı served the re-appropriation of urban green areas, parks, and *bostan*s by the public. While the state and municipalities implemented planning strategies in the name of making urban green areas 'public', 'sanitized,' and 'secured,' these new emerging *bostan*s claimed the right to the city, which in turn highlighted the seemingly neutral appropriation of public space by state mechanisms.

After the eviction of the Gezi Park Bostanı, some local residents who belonged to the Caferağa Solidarity Group (Caferağa is a neighborhood in Kadıköy) decided to create a *bostan*. They identified an empty plot in the nearby neighborhood of Moda. It was a way to resist urban transformation as in Gezi Bostanı. Caferağa residents and Solidarity Group members participated in the creation of the *bostan* as a public activity. Furthermore, the first planting was turned into a communal celebration for all residents. People from close neighborhoods brought seeds to support the *bostan*. The workshops were also set up on the *bostan*. The neighbors participated in watering crops and planting them and had the pleasure of eating crops that they had grown themselves. It has become a community-sharing place. The Gezi Bostanı shared the same destiny with other *bostans*; the metropolitan municipality initiated a project in the parking lot in the area. However, the residents and the members of the Solidarity Group stopped this attempt. The aim of this community *bostan* has been more likely to resist the state intervention to space and to keep the urban green space public. There are also other examples of community gardens as the İmrahor Bostanı

and Berkin Elvan Bostanı and Cihangir Roma Bostanı after the Gezi Park eviction. (Turan, 2015, 58-61)

All of these *bostan*s shared the same premises as being a resistance to capitalist relations of production, opposition to state appropriation of space, an act of solidarity, and the re-appropriation of public space by the public. The creation of *bostan*s was a representation of people's demand to live in a neighborhood, and in a city, where they could be free from capitalist social relations. The creation of new *bostan*s has been an attempt to reproduce the space as opposed to the authorities' attempt to produce spaces. They symbolized public opposition to the capitalist organization of space and social life. The organization of new *bostan*s in Istanbul can be evaluated as a continuation of the Gezi resistance because this action grew out of people's claiming the right to appropriate the environment for themselves. The social and political aspect of the creation of *bostan*s is very crucial to understand how people themselves formed new connections between each other and the public space.

4.2. Users' Perception of Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı

4.2.1. Socio-demographic Characteristics and Work Status of Informants

Out of 12 informants, 3 of them were male, and 9 were female. There was one person over 70 years old, 5 informants were over 50, 1 person was over 40 years old. Lastly, there were 3 informants over 35 years old. The youngest informant was 18 years old; the oldest one was 72 years old. 3 of them were graduates of high school, the rest of them either went to secondary school or left the school at an early age. The residency periods are diverse. The shortest has been for 1 year and the informant to live the longest has been in Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam for 35 years. About the work status, 2 of informants are on state-pension, 2 of them are unemployed, 6 of them are housewives, 1 of them is a worker, and 1 is an accountant.

4.2.2. Inferences of the Interviews

I came up with some themes to analyze the data that I gathered through semi-structured interviews. The aim of the interviews is to underline the different significations that this park has as an urban green area and public space.

4.2.2.1. Relationship Building

My hypothesis of the park as a space for building new relations was that it was a space for making new friendships, even at least temporary relations. This gave me the idea that a neighborhood park is more of a parochial realm than the public realm, as it provides the opportunity for people to be in a place with familiar faces. It is valid only to some extent. For some people, like my aunt, they can relate to people through some common activities, but for many people, this was not the case. When I asked my aunt if she built any relationships with people in the park, she told me:

"I mean, there is one lady, who is also animal-lover, Gülsüm, I can see her on some holidays, and also around 6, 6:30 when I walk my dog in the evening, we are chatting. Also, there is another lady named Serpil, who has two children, one with Down Syndrome, that we are chatting. With multiple people, I also chat with immigrants (meaning from Syria) in these last 2 years. But there, it is not like friendship, just with Gülsüm."

As she was walking her dog in this park, she met Gülsüm because she loved animals, that is the only friendship she told me. She also told me that Serpil has two children who want to play with her dog. She came to the park to walk her dogs and the relations she built evolve around her dog. The activity she does in the park was also reflected in her relationships in this park.

The 4th informant is female, 52 years old, and is unemployed for now. I interviewed her in the playground; she told me that she comes for her grandchildren to play in the park. She told me about the relations she had:

"There are ladies, friends who are coming with their children and grandchildren, I talk to them."

Again, she relates to people who come for the same purpose for the children. Additionally, for both informants, it is essential to note that they established connections with other women in the park.

On the other hand, other informants told me they do not build new friendships with whom they encounter in the park; they instead come to meet those they already know.

The 9th informant is 72 years old, male and retired, and he told me, “I come to the park almost every day, as I am retired. I mostly come on my own. But I have friends here, also from the mosque.”

He has friends of his age and retired as he is, in the park. He comes to the park for fresh air, “a bit of green” as he is bored at home. In fact, he has established connections with retired men there, chatting and socializing with them.

The 5th informant, who is female and 42 years old, is a housewife. About building relations and whom she comes to the park with, she explained:

“I come with my daughter. Sometimes my friends also come and sit here, but the environment here does not let us come so much. There is every kind of people here. That’s why women cannot be comfortable here.” She sometimes comes with her friends, but she doesn’t engage with other people, as she complains about the men’s population in the park. She doesn’t feel comfortable; she stated that “It would be better if this park were a place where women could stay comfortably.”

The 6th informant is male and a factory worker. He is a resident of Güneşli, another neighborhood for the last two years. However, he told me that he comes once a week to Zeytinburnu and to this park to meet his friends, as all his acquaintances are here, in Zeytinburnu.

“I already know people here; they are from my village in Giresun. They are in Zeytinburnu. Even the mayor is my fellow countryman.”

The 10th informant is female and an accountant. She told me that she doesn’t meet people in the park but rather: “I come here for my children to play, for them to be in the open air. I meet the mothers of my children’s friends in the park only. You cannot build a friendship here.”

Other informants told me they don’t chat with anyone here and they don’t even meet anyone. These informants were mostly there for the ‘fresh air.’

The 2nd informant, who is 18 years old and female, left high school, and she is not working. They arrived in Istanbul and Zeytinburnu 1 year ago as her older brother became a policeman here. She told me in the interview that, she comes to park with her sister and mother to sit in the open air and sometimes for her sister to play in the playground and she stated that she doesn’t talk to anyone else.

A 3rd informant, who is male and 64 years old, is unemployed. He comes for health reasons as he had lung cancer, he comes for fresh air and answered the question of meeting people as:

"I don't talk to anyone when I feel bored; I just leave. When I see this, (showing the bold areas without grass) everything is ruined for me. When they sit on the grass, I become sad. They ruin the grass, children, and themselves. They eat and throw the rubbish there while there is a rubbish bin. They pollute this park." Only this group does not build social relations with people in the park. The 3rd informant claims that he does not want to relate to anyone, as he is discontent about people in the park.

Therefore it can be said that there are 3 groups of people on the grounds of meeting and having a relationship with other people in the park. The first group consists of those who meet or chat with some people in the park, do joint activities such as walking a dog or taking a child to the playground. The park becomes a socializing place for those people who have the same interests or aims. The second group meets their friend in the park, mostly the neighbors whom they already know. The park becomes a meeting point for these people as well; it again provides a space for socializing. As the 9th informant stated, it both gives a chance to meet his friends; the park offers a public space to meet people, and still, he can see the familiar faces. The park could be evaluated as a parochial realm for these two groups of people who come to the park to see familiar faces. There are networks either built here or reproducing itself in this specific park.

The public character of public space is negotiable according to these interviews. While for one person, the park is a parochial realm of intimate relations, a meeting place with neighbors, such as home, for another person as a town square, it is a public realm of encountering strangers. However, the idea of the fall of public space is controversial. Even though some users come to park for aesthetic or health functions of the park, it shows that the park is not a homogenous public space. It is heterogeneous. The relations that are built in the park changes from one another and interactions still exist even though they are not merely positive ones. Therefore, it does not necessarily mean it is the end of public space; it is rather the beginning of public spaces.

4.2.2.2. Social and Physical Access

I asked the question of why the informants specifically come to this park and which park they go to the most, to underline the physical access to this park. All of the informants except the 6th informant told me this park is the closest urban green area to their house. Also, I asked them if they are feeling comfortable in the park, to understand the extent of social access together with the reasons for coming to this park. The answers to being comfortable in the park are crucial then to understand the accessibility of the park, not only in the physical sense.

I wanted to differentiate the interviews into two according to the place they were made as if in the small green lot or big green lot. That is because I recognized different characteristics in these lots of social access based on gender. We will start with the answers from the small green lot.

5th informant, woman, at the age of 42, saying:

"No, I don't feel very comfortable. For example, recently I brought my mom with me, the bench was empty, so we sat with my mom, a man came, and he told us "I went to buy a coke, why do you sit in my place?" and I told him this park is everyone's, is there any place that is mine, or yours here?, and then my mom said you are man, you can go and sit on the grass. So, there are different kinds of people; women cannot be comfortable. So, women are at home, or sometimes there (showing a smaller green lot). But we couldn't find a place to sit now."

7th informant stated:

"This is not a park, close to the road. We came here because of necessity. It is not comfortable for me, but we have this, we don't have any other opportunity."

10th informant expressed: "I am not comfortable, it is full of people, and I don't think it is clean. The way children talk, because I take my children with me, but I don't blame children, it is about their family, but I don't like it."

These comments of women in the small green lot pointed out that they are not comfortable as they think it is not a place for women. They come to the park because it is close to their household, but social accessibility of park for women is at stake. The physical aspect of access shows us this is the nearest urban green are to their home. On the other hand, the 5th informant said that she wanted to sit in the

small green lot, but as there are few seating opportunities, she needed to come to the big green lot even if she did not feel comfortable.

The 9th informant, male, said that "There are many strangers here, Afghans, Syrians. If you want to come with your wife, family, it is hard. What women wear, it distracts people here. It is not a comfortable place for the family. Women are not comfortable here. I brought my granddaughter, my daughter, and my wife with me recently, you know what my granddaughter said, "let's go, mom, people are staring at us weirdly." But it's good for me for a lot of people. People go to green areas on the seaside with theirs, as they cannot be comfortable here. As I said, I wish we had the culture, and we could come with our family. Can't you have a woman friend? It is not possible here. Look, the man is looking at us because they think wrong, they wonder what you are talking to me about now."

The 6th informant said, "I am okay; I am peaceful. But people around here do not come here a lot, only older people who are bored at home come here. And also, women immigrants come here. Young people go further."

The 6th and 9th informants are male; they stated that for them, the park is comfortable. However, they were conscious that it is not a place for young people, or 'a family' meaning coming with women. At this point, the distinctive point for me was the gender aspect of the access to the park. Whether men have full social access to this park is also questionable as the 9th informant said he would like to come with his family. But the underlying reason seems to be women's lack of access to the park. He expressed that women go to the small green lot. Also, the 5th informant, a woman, told me that she prefers to go to the small lot, but she couldn't find a place to sit.

The interviews on the bigger green lot demonstrated that there are visible differences between men and women concerning the access to the park. Gender inequality is at the forefront on the basis of social access to the park. While in the big green lot, men's presence is encouraged, women are excluded from equal access to the park.

Interestingly, the interviews showed me that it was not only the small road that separated between the small green lot and the bigger lot. The answers showed that the experiences of people also changed with regards to that physical separation. The women that I interviewed in small lot told me:

The 2nd informant, a woman, 18 years old, coming to the park with her sister and mother, expressed that: "I feel comfortable here; it is also secured for us."

Also, the 11th informant, who is a Syrian immigrant woman, at the age of 35, stated that:

"We come here (the small lot) almost every day with my family, my mother in law, children, and sisters in law in the afternoons. We sit here, we chat and drink tea, we feel good here."

Another informant, who was a Syrian immigrant woman, sitting on a bench, 22 years old, told me she comes for her children to play there. When I asked her if she feels comfortable, she was positive about the smaller green lot.

It was interesting to see this differentiation of experiences in these two lots even though they were parts of one park. The only small road that separated these two lots also makes the distinction for gender access to the park. There is a clear difference in women's interview on small and big green lots, and even men stated that women prefer to stay in the small green lot. Therefore, upon my observation and the 5th informant's statement, despite the fact that social access was clearly much better in the small green lot, it was apparent that physical access was limited. She expressed that she couldn't find a bench there, and other women I interviewed were sitting on the grass mostly.

I also observed that in the small green lot, women were the majority. The only men I saw were with their wives or family. That spontaneous separation of lots in a social sense was interesting to me. Even though I went to the park with my aunt a couple of times, I did not recognize until I had these interviews, we were also using a small lot with her. The park is organized as one park by the official decision even though there was one small road separating it. No matter what the strategy of the planning was, people reproduced the meaning of the park by living in there. Based on the lived experiences of users, now, it is more relevant to say, these are two separate parks.

4.2.2.3. Park as an Extension of Household

As mentioned before in the History of Gardens and Parks section, the garden had a function as a private area of secret assignations, an extension of the household, especially for women in the early modern period. (Samson, 2012, 15) Devault also

indicated that a public space could be a parochial realm. His example of the park, which is seen as a public space and could be reproduced as an extension of the house is important in this aspect. (DeVault, 2000) Some activities of users exposed similar attribute to urban park showing that for some users, parks can be an extension of the household.

The 11th informant, at the age of 35, coming to park with her mother in law, sisters in law and children stated that:

"We come here and sit on the grass. It is nice, refreshing. We have some Syrian neighbors; also, they come here, too. In the evenings, my husband comes, and we have *iftar* here in Ramadan. At other times, we bring our teapot, and stay here in summer."

She explained that in the afternoons, women sit there together, but in the summertime, in the evening, her husband comes to the park and they have *iftar* as if they are at home. If it is not Ramadan time, then they sit, chat, and drink tea.

On the other hand, the 2nd informant, who arrived in the neighborhood and Istanbul from Batman 1 year ago and comes to park with her mother and sisters, told me that: "We come here to sit in the open air. We are knitting here, drinking tea, and chatting."

Zukin argues that a combination of public and private uses of public space has been extended to the level that hybrid public-private cultural forms are generated in the neoliberal era. (Zukin, 1991, 51-52) The activity of knitting was interesting for me, as they carried this activity from their home to the park. Also, having *iftar* in the park should be evaluated differently than making a picnic. First of all, it is a religious activity; it is the dinner after feasting. Additionally, it is a proper course, not just like a picnic as bringing fruits or snacks to the park. These activities are both informal activities of the household, showing that park has a different meaning more than a formal public space for these people.

4.2.2.4. Park as a Site of Negotiation and Reconstruction

Mitchell argues that there are unwanted users of public space, such as homeless, immigrants, and political activists. Thus, by restrictive procedures on public space, the middle class want to eliminate these unwanted users to secure the public space.

(Mitchell, 2003) Additionally, I argue that in a public space, which consists of disadvantaged people, with limited access to public space, there occur new unwanted users based on the perceptions of the user.

The first instance has linked the usage of the park as an extension of the house. The park is a space of contestation in that sense, as the 3rd informant, male and 64 years old said:

"I don't talk to anyone when I feel bored; I just leave. When I see this, (showing the bold areas without grass) everything is ruined for me. When they sit on the grass, I become sad. They ruin the grass, children, and themselves. They eat and throw the rubbish there while there is a rubbish bin. They pollute this park."

Additionally, the 9th informant, male, retired, expressed that:

"The security cannot do anything to them, especially the immigrants. They lie on the grass, not just the children, even grown-ups. If you say to a child, why do you pick the flowers, the mother says it's not your business. We don't have an education. This security is symbolic for me. 3 years ago, the security was dwelling around the park, controlling people, now they don't even do that."

Both of the informants above were complaining about people, mostly immigrants who lie on the grass, as they thought they ruined the greenery of the park. They believe that the municipality and security should control the park. On the other hand, people who sit on the grass feel comfortable, their demand from the park is the comfort of a home, having fresh air, being in informal activities when are they are in the park. Even though the grass was hedged, not meant to be a place to sit by organizers of the park, some people used it in a new way. By making it an extension of the house, by bringing new activities to park, they reproduce the park. These could also be seen as tactics of users as Mitchell pointed out. (Mitchell, The Right to the City) While the municipality tries to control the park with the strategies, in this case, by security and by rules of the park, users find a way to appropriate it in different ways, in local ways.

As Zukin notes, the homogenous public space cannot be found in the neoliberal era. Crawford states that different needs and demands over the public space are raised. These different demands and needs thus transform the public space into new forms.

Public space is reconstructed through lived experiences. (Zukin, 1991; Crawford, 1995)

The 1st informant, a woman, aged 53, who walks her dog in the park, has offered another contestation. She told me:

"One day, the security told me that I could not bring my dog to the park. Then, the municipality also hung notice signs that dogs are not allowed in the park. I asked the security guard the reason; he told me Shiite residents do not want dogs as they believe it is not halal for them, as dogs pee on the grass and they sit on the grass. For a while, I could not go to the park; then we started to go with Gülsüm again, because it is our park, too."

When I asked users, if there are any changes, except the 1st informant, they did not mention the exclusion of dogs from the park. Then, I intentionally asked some of them if they know anything about it.

The 5th informant told me, "But they still bring their dogs here even though it is banned." The 7th informant also said, "They bring their dogs, they benefit from this park mostly." The 2nd informant, who is Shiite stated that:

"We don't want dogs, and we complain about them because they pee on the grass and we are sitting here. But people bring their dogs."

While an individual is emphasizing claims to exclude dogs from the park because of religious reasons also because she thinks it is not clean, make complaints to security, another user does not want people to sit on the grass as they ruin the greenery. The 2nd informant thinks it is her right to sit on the grass, while the 1st informant and her friend believe that this is the only place to bring their dog for a green area, so they also think it is their right to use the park in that sense. They are unwanted users of such for each other. The rights to public space are diverse — also, unwanted users of the park changes based on the perception of the user.

Thus, as seen within the interviews, the demands and needs of users are conflicted in some matters. Then, instead of a single public occupying the park, there are multiple "counter-publics" who creates various sites for public expression (Fraser, 1990).

5. CONCLUSION

The objective of this thesis has been to explore the layers of a neighborhood park and various significations that people brought to it as a public space. In this manner, this study explores the interrelated ties of historical significations of urban public space, urban planning strategies, and tactics, reproduction of the contemporary urban life of individuals together. I argue that these levels of public space and urban green areas cannot be separated.

The complexity of urban green areas and public spaces are examined through the interviews in various ways. The park is inherently a space of organization, regulation, and designation, as it is a part of neoliberal urban planning processes. was The municipality built it for recreational, social, and health purposes. It is the refuge to nature, the only public space to be for most users as the interviews demonstrated. The park is then a conceived space as Lefebvre argued. However, the interviews showed it clearly that this park is also a perceived space of users who even could change strategies of the officials by lived experiences. The park, which is separated in two lots physically but designed to be parts of one urban green area, is divided in two by users of park socially. Spatial appropriation of people is very apparent in this case by the experiences and perceptions of the users. The meaning-making activities of the users signified the park in different ways than the administrative look planned. The tactics of users came across with strategies of administration, and consequently, they reproduced the space different than what the officials have foreseen.

Another aspect of the park in the intersection of debates of public space is how it encounters counter-publics that are created in that specific place. The deliberation of a place as public space involves many aspects, as mentioned in previous chapters. The actual experiences of users showed that multiple relations are built in the park. These relations might be encountering strangers, meeting neighbors, or meeting new people based on the activities performed in that place. The presence reflected the relations of people to park. Besides, the demands and needs of the users are multiple,

thus making counter-publics in seemingly one public area. The diverse demands and needs of the users demonstrate the heterogeneity of public space. There is no consensus in many issues, such as sitting on the grass, taking a dog to walk in the park. The deliberation over the public space represents the heterogeneity of the public space. I argue that these counter-publics highlight new emerging public spaces, instead of the fall of the public space.

On the other hand, different demands are reflected in the interviews regarding the park. While some people thought they were limited in physical access to the park, others thought social access was limited, especially in terms of gender. Marcuse explained that demand comes from the directly oppressed, and aspiration comes from the alienated. The alienated are the ones integrated into the system and sharing its material benefits but oppressed in their social relationship, limited in the sense of opportunities of cultural-social life. At that point, I put these demands and needs of the users in the category of aspiration as Marcuse defined. Because these are the needs for a place to socialize or place to take a breath rather than material needs such as housing, nutrition. However, in light of the interviews, I claim that the aspiration could also come from the excluded or the working class, 'the deprived.' It is not necessarily from the ones who already have the material rights and directly oppressed by social and cultural means. The interviewees' profile is mostly unemployed, having low income, underemployed, which denote to the category of the deprived in Marcuse's terms. Marcuse defines this group's claims as 'demands' for the fundamental material rights. Nonetheless, I argue that the aspiration of social, political, and cultural claims come from the excluded in the case of Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı.

I also examined that the unwanted users of Mitchell of the middle class came forward in a different way in this park. Mitchell explained the unwanted users in terms of the middle class, such as homeless, young people, immigrants, and activists. Thus, by restrictive procedures on public space, the middle class want to eliminate these unwanted users to secure the public space. (Mitchell, 2003) Additionally, I found out that in a public space, which consists of disadvantaged people, with limited access to public space, there occur new unwanted users based on the perceptions of the user. Even though the working class and retired people also come to that park; the profile is far from being the middle class, which could be defined as the

disadvantaged people. Consequently, this study indicates a different kind of unwanted users, which is more complex than the middle class and bourgeoisie classifications of it.

That's why this study has demonstrated that this park is a public space with its multiple layers. While the study shows the interrelated ties of historical significations of urban public space, urban planning strategies, and tactics, reproduction of individuals of the contemporary urban life together, it also highlights that urban public space is a social product. A city, a neighborhood and a park is a social product as every society produces its own space. As each mode of production produces its own space, each place, the practices attached to that place produce its own product. This study was an effort to understand Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam Parkı in its own specificity as a product in its own context.

REFERENCES

Atasoy, Nurhan. 2011. **A Garden for the Sultan: Gardens and Flowers in the Ottoman Culture**. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

Bell, Simon, Runrid Fox- Kamper, Nazila Keshavarz, Mary Benson, Silvia Caputo, Susan Noori, Annette Voigt. 2016. **Urban Allotment Gardens in Europe**. Routledge.

Brenner, Neil. 2009. What is Critical Urban Theory? **City**. v. 13: 2–3. Routledge.

Brenner, Neil, David J. Madden, David Wachsmuth. 2011. Assemblage Urbanism and the challenges of critical urban theory. **City**. v. 15, no. 2. Routledge.

Brenner, Neil, Nik Theodore. 2005. Neoliberalism and the urban condition. **City**. v. 9,no.1: 101-107

Brenner, Neil, Peter Marcuse, Margit Mayer, eds. 2012. **Cities for People not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City**. Routledge.

Breuste, Jürgen H. 2010. Allotment Gardens as Part of Urban Green Infrastructure: Actual Trends and Perspectives in Central Europe. **Urban Diversity and Design**, 1st ed. Blackwell Publishing.

Carr, Stephen, Mark Francis, Leanne G. Rivlin, Andrew M. Stone. 1992. **Public Space**. London: SAGE Publications.

Certeau, Michel de. 1999. Walking in the City. **The Cultural Studies Reader**, 2nd edn. Simon During, ed. Routledge: 126-133

Cranz, Galen. 1982. **The Politics of Park Design: A History of Park Design in America**. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Conan, Michel, ed. 1999. **Perspectives on Garden Histories**. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

Corraliza, José, Jaime De Berenguer. 2000. Environmental Values, Beliefs, and Actions: A Situational Approach. **Environment and Behavior.** v.32, no.6: 832-848.

Crawford, Margaret. 1995. Contesting the public realm: Struggles over public space in Los Angeles. **Journal of Architectural Education**. v. 49, no. 1: 4-9.

DeVault, Marjorie. 2000. Producing family time: Practices of leisure activity beyond the home. **Qualitative Sociology**. v.23, no.4: 485–503.

Dijkstra, Lewis W. 2000. Public Spaces: A Comparative Discussion of the Criteria For Public Space. **Constructions of Urban Space**. ed. Ray Hutchison. Connecticut: Jai Press Inc.: 1-22.

Dong, Yao, Di Xia. 2010. **Bostans: Agricultural Generators for Istanbul's Urbanization**. Penny White Award Proposal.

Fischer, Hubertus, Volker R. Remmert, Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn eds. 2016. **Gardens, Knowledge, and the Sciences in the Early Modern Period**. 1st edn. Birkhäuser.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. Of other spaces. **Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism.** v.16, no.1.

Fraser, Nancy. 1990. Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. **Social Text**. no. 25/26: 59-79.

Gilles, Deleuze. 1986. **Foucault**. trans Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gospodini, Aspa. 2006. Portraying, Classifying, and Understanding the Emerging Landscapes in the Post-Industrial City. **Cities**. v. 23, no. 5: 311-330

Habermas, Jürgen. 1991. **Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere**. Cambridge: Translation MIT.

Harvey, David. 1985. **The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization**. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 2003. The Right to the City. **International Journal of Urban and Regional Research**. v. 27, no.4: 939-941.

_____. 2011. **Spaces of Capital**. New York: Routledge.

_____. 2012. **Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution**. Verso.

Herzog, Lawrence A. 2006**. Return to the Center: Culture, Public Space, and City-Building in a Global Era**. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Kabisch, Nadja, Dagmar Haase. 2014. Green justice or just green? Provision of urban green spaces in Berlin, Germany. **Landscape and Urban Planning**. v. 122: 129–139.

Low, Setha, Dana Taplin, Suzanne Scheld. 2005. **Rethinking Urban Parks: Public Space and Cultural Diversity**. USA: The University of Texas Press.

Low, Setha, Neil Smith. 2006. Introduction: The Imperative of Public Space. **The Politics of Public Space**. eds. Setha Low, Neil Smith. Routledge: 1-16.

Lynch, Kevin. 1972. Openness of open spaces. **City sense and city design: Writings and Projects of Kevin Lynch**. eds. Tridib Banerjee, Michael Southworth. The MIT Press.

Lofland, Lyn H. 1989. A social life in the public realm. **Journal of Contemporary Ethnography**. v. 17, no. 4: 453-482.

Malkoç, Yiğit E., Sönmez Türel. 2006. **İlkçağlardan günümüze Anadolu'da Açık Mekanın Evrimi**. Tekirdağ Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi, v.3, no.2

Marcuse, Peter. 2009. From Critical Urban Theory to the Right to the City. **City**. v.13: 2-3.

Mitchell, Don. 2003. **The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space**. Guilford Press.

Mills, Amy. 2007. Gender and mahalle (neighbourhood) space in İstanbul. **Gender, Place&Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography**. v. 14, no. 3: 335-354.

Pamay, Besalet. 1979. **Park Bahçe ve Peyzaj Mimarisi**. Istanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Rapoport, Amos. 1977. **Human Aspects of Urban Form: Toward a Man Environment Approach to Urban Form and Design**, 1st edn. Pergamon Press.

Samson, Alexander, ed. 2012. **Locus amoenus: Gardens and Horticulture in the Renaissance**. Wiley-Blackwell.

Sarkowicz, Hans. 2003. **Bahçelerin ve Parkların Tarihi**. çev. Ersel Kayaoğlu. Istanbul: Dost Yayınları.

Sassen, S. 2005. The Global City: Introducing a Concept. **The Brown Journal of World Affairs**. v.11, no.2: 27-43.

Schmidt, Stephan, Jeremy Németh. 2010. Space, Place, and the City: Emerging Research on Public Space Design and Planning. **Journal of Urban Design**. v. 15 no. 4: 453-457

Schuyler, David. 1986. **The New Urban Landscape: The Redefinition of City Form in Nineteenth Century America**. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sennett, Richard. 1977. **The Fall of Public Man**. New York: Knopf.

Stubbs, Naomi J. 2013. **Cultivating National Identity Through Performance: American Pleasure Gardens and Entertainment.** US: Palgrave Macmillan.

Şensoy, Nihan, Aybike Ayfer Karadağ. 2012. Konut Yerleşimleri Dış Mekân Kullanımlarına İlişkin Memnuniyetin Araştırılması: Atakent Sitesi Örneği. **Ormancılık Dergisi.** v. 8, no.2: 57-66.

Tekeli, İlhan. 1998. Türkiye'de Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kentsel Gelişme Ve Kent Planlaması. **75. Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık**, Bilanço 98. Tarih Vakfı: Istanbul.

Thompson, Catharine W. 2002. Urban open space in the 21st century. **Landscape and Urban Planning.** v.60 no.2: 59–72.

Tosi, Alessandro. [18.12.2018] "Gardens of Florence" https://brunelleschi.imss.fi.it/itineraries/itinerary/GardensOfFlorence.html

Tunç, Gülçin. 2003. **Transformation of Public Space: The Case of Migros Akköprü Shopping Center**. Department of Urban Policy Planning and Local Governments Master's Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Young, Iris Marion. 2000. **Inclusion and Democracy**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zukin, Sharon. 1991. **Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World**. University of California Press.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Interview Topics and Questions (English)

1. **Information about Background**

   - Could you please tell me about yourself? (age / gender / education / occupation)
   - Are you a local of Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam?
   - When did you come to Zeytinburnu-Seyitnizam?
   - Can you tell about the reasons to reside in Seyitnizam?

2. **Information about Use of Park**

   - Which urban green areas and parks do you go?
   - How frequently do you go to these urban green areas and parks?
   - How long have you been coming to this park?
   - How often do you come to this park and how long do you stay?
   - Which part of the day do you come to this park and why?

3. **Information about Physical and Social Access**

   - How far is this park to your home? Can you come easily?
   - Do you have access to a garden around your house?
   - Why do you come to this park and what do you do?
   - Do you feel comfortable here?
   - Do you feel safe here?
   - Does this park satisfy your needs and demands? What is not working for you? What demands would you have?
   - Has been there any changes in the park in positive and negative ways? What are these?
   - In what ways is this park useful for you?
   - In your opinion who comes to this park and for what?

4. **Information about Relationship Building**

- Whom do you come with to park? Do you come alone?
- Why do you come to this park, and what activities do you do?
- Do you meet and chat people here? Do you build relations?

Further comments

Do you have anything further you would like to add?

Appendix 2: **Mülakat Soruları ve Konuları (Türkçe)**

1. **Kişisel Bilgiler**

- Kendinizi tanıtır mısınız? (yaş / cinsiyet / eğitim / iş)
- Zeytinburnu Seyitnizam Mahallesinin yerlisi misiniz?
- Bu mahalleye ve İstanbul'a ne zaman geldiniz?
- Bu mahallede yaşama sebeplerinizden bahseder misiniz?

2. **Park Kullanımı Hakkında Bilgiler**

- Açık alanlara, parklara ne sıklıkla gidiyorsunuz? Açık alan olarak gittiğiniz park ve yeşil alanlar nerelerdir?
- Bu parka ne zamandır geliyorsunuz?
- Bu parka ne sıklıkla geliyorsunuz ve ne kadar vakit geçiriyorsunuz?
- Günün hangi saatlerinde parklara gidersiniz? Neden?

3. Sosyal ve Fiziksel Erişilebilirlik

- Bu parka kolayca gelebiliyor musunuz? Ne kadar mesafede oturuyorsunuz?
- Kendi bahçeniz var mı? Ya da başka bir açık alanı kullanma imkanınız var mı?
- Parka hangi sebeplerden geliyorsunuz ve bu parkta neler yapıyorsunuz?
- Kendinizi bu parkta rahat hissediyor musunuz ?
- Kendinizi bu parkta güvende hissediyor musunuz?
- Bu park sizi tatmin ediyor mu? Sizi memnun eden şeyler nelerdir? Eksikliğini bulduğunuz, olmasını istediğiniz şeyler var mı?
- Parkta olumlu veya olumsuz değişiklikler oldu mu? Bunlar sizce nelerdir?
- Bu park size nasıl bir fayda sağlıyor?
- Sizce kimler bu parka geliyor ve ne için geliyorlar?

4. Sosyal İlişkiler

- Burada tanıştığınız kişiler var mı ? Yeni ilişkiler kuruyor musunuz?
- Parka tek mi geliyorsunuz yoksa birileriyle mi gelmeyi tercih ediyorsunuz?

İlave Yorum

- Eklemek istediğiniz başka bir şey var mı?

CURRICULUM VITAE

Birth Date and Place: 1989 / Istanbul

Address **:** Beylikdüzü - Istanbul

E-mail **:** dilsadokcu@gmail.com

EDUCATION

2014 – Present
Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul
Faculty of Arts and Sciences
M.A., Humanities and Social Sciences
GPA: 3,93 / 4,00

2007– 2011
Istanbul University
B.A., Sociology
GPA: 3,18 / 4.00

WORK EXPERIENCE

2018 January –
Expedia Group
Market Associate

2017 Jan – 2018 Jan
Expedia Group
Lodging Content Associate