

CHARLES UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of Sociological Studies

Master's thesis

2021

Öykü Demirkır

CHARLES UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of Sociological Studies

Öykü Demirkır

**Solidarity Academies in Turkey: An analysis of
academic activism, parrhesia, and commoning
practices**

Master's thesis

Prague 2021

Author: Bc. Öykü Demirkır

Study Programme: Sociology in European Context

Supervisor: doc. Mgr. Martin Hájek, Ph.D.

Academic Year: 2020/2021

Bibliographic note

DEMİRKİR, Öykü. *Solidarity Academies in Turkey: An analysis of academic activism, parrhesia, and commoning practices*. Praha, 2021. 75 pages. Master's thesis (Mgr.). Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Sociological Studies. Department of Sociology. Supervisor doc. Mgr. Martin Hájek, Ph.D.

Abstract

This research seeks to interpret the academic activism of Academics for Peace in Turkey. It argues that the occurrence of the Academics for Peace results from the intertwinement of neoliberal and authoritarian ideology. The writer of this research suggests that Academics for Peace build networks of solidarity based on resistive critique and truth-telling practices. Solidarity (alternative) academies in Turkey are the seeds of this engagement in solidarity, self-adapting practices, activist truth, and parrhesia, and they appear as phenomena that carry out prefigurative-instituent practices. The research suggests that Solidarity academies can be evaluated as a ‘threshold’ cultivating our understanding of the ‘commons’ and ‘commoning practices.’

Keywords academic capitalism, academic activism, solidarity, critique, parrhesia, instituent practices, critical pedagogies, biopolitical production, emancipation

Title Solidarity Academies in Turkey: An analysis of academic activism, parrhesia, and commoning practices

Abstrakt

Výzkum se snaží interpretovat akademický aktivismus "Akademiků pro mír" v Turecku. Tvrdí, že vznik "Akademiků pro mír" je reakcí na vzájemné propojení neoliberální a autoritářské ideologie. Autorka se domnívá, že "Akademici pro mír" budují síť solidarity založené na kritice a praktikách mluvení pravdy. Solidární (alternativní) akademie v Turecku jsou počátkem této angažovanosti v solidaritě, přizpůsobení se, aktivistické pravdě a parrhesii a objevují se jako jevy, které s sebou nesou prefigurativně-institucionální praktiky. Diplomová práce přichází s myšlenkou, že Solidární akademie lze hodnotit jako „hraniční linii“, která kultivuje naše chápání „obecných statků“ a „praktik sdílení“.

Klíčová slova akademický kapitalismus, akademický aktivismus, solidarita, kritika, parrhesie, institucionální praxe, kritická pedagogika, biopolitická produkce, emancipace

Název práce Solidární akademie v Turecku: analýza akademického aktivismu, parrhesie a praktik sdílení

Declaration of Authorship

1. The author hereby declares that he compiled this thesis independently, using only the listed resources and literature.
2. The author hereby declares that all the sources and literature used have been properly cited.
3. The author hereby declares that the thesis has not been used to obtain a different or the same degree.

Prague, December, 2020

Öykü Demirkır

To my parents...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, doc. Mgr. Martin Hájek, Ph.D., for his continuous support, patient, encouragement, and constructive criticism. I would not be able to finalize this thesis without his guidance.

I wish to thank my dear friend Ayşe Mert for her endless and enduring support and belief in me. I also would like to express my gratitude to İpek Çınar, who always stands by me and motivates me during difficult times. I am also grateful to Nilüfer Altuğ for her love and friendship. Thanks to Ezgi Polat Tiercelin for brightening up my life in Prague and for her support throughout this process. I also would like to thank Seher Karadoğan for her valuable comments and guidance on my thesis. Also, a big thanks to Adam Dufek for always making me laugh and for his endless love. And thanks to my dog, Zeki, for all night long cuddlings.

Thanks to Jana Dufková and Jarmil Dufek for making my life easier in Prague and providing me with the best vegetables and fruits from their garden.

Lastly, I would like to thank my mother Şükran Demirkır, and my father Cemil Demirkır, for their love and support all these years. Their love and support mean the world to me. Very special thanks to my sister, Ezgi Luckhurst, for caring about me and guiding me at all times. My niece, Rüya Luckhurst, I love you with all my heart. Thank you for showing me that life is full of laughter.

Thesis Proposal

Introduction

After signing the declaration “we will not be a party to this crime,” that addresses the government to end the war in the Kurdish region, Academics for Peace have been exposed to many violations of rights such as dismissals from jobs, administrative investigations, denial of pension rights, and passport revocations.

Following these, different forms of solidarity and resistance were established and developed mostly by “Academics for Peace” who were dismissed from their jobs, current academicians in solidarity with them, students, and dissident citizens. In this context, “Solidarity Academies” have been launched by the academicians who have been suspended or dismissed. For instance, one of the solidarity academies, called “Street Academy” had its first lesson in Turkey’s capital city, Ankara, in December 2016. One of the founders of Street Academy, Yasin Durak, commented about their initiative and told that:

“We have thought of the Street Academy as a workshop that is primarily organized by suspended academicians. At these workshops, different academicians will be giving lessons at different places each week. We are going to continue these street lessons under the current conditions as long as we can. Academy (in Turkey) is under great pressure. You are not able to do the work you want and contribute a scholarly output. So, we’ve decided to take academy to the street. It is a way of saying ‘there is no limit to scientific contributions.’ Those who think they can restrict it are wrong; we are ready to produce scholarly output even on the streets” (Daily, 2017).

In the interview that I made with Yasin Durak for my thesis proposal, he emphasized that the participants of the Street Academy define it as a maneuver; and as an attempt to create a maneuver space. He explained that they aim to establish a mutual relationship with their followers that offers continuity. He also added that although the street academy is a new establishment, their total experience throughout this year and its symbolic reflections suggest that this mutual relationship based on dialogical bonds with the participants and followers will be sustained, and developed next year. He highlighted that the lectures initiated by the Street

Academy this year made the collapse in the academia in Turkey visible and demanded its own place in the public space.

Research Question

My research will aim to analyze the ways, and the methods of the “expected” dialogical ground that is established between the academicians, activists, organic intellectuals through Solidarity Academies and to observe if they succeeded to become visible and develop various organized solidarity and resistance formations.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

In “Homo Academicus,” one of the few studies that analyses (masculine) academy, Bourdieu describes academia as a conservative institution that reproduces and empowers social class divisions (Bourdieu, 1988). Academia, as a space where knowledge production takes place is not independent of power relations. If academia has to be defined with reference to particular social relations, it is likely to emphasize its feature as an ideological apparatus of the state. Therefore, it should be evaluated as a space more than an independent place but rather as a place reflecting the dominant modes. In the case of Turkey, where the autonomy of the universities is decreasing day by day, and where the performance criteria are appreciated with the values of the market system and the ideology of the dominant party, the space that is supposed to produce the critical knowledge by the academicians is becoming more narrow. Therefore, it is not wrong to say that academia as a social space is used as a hegemonic apparatus in Turkey. In this research, the university as an institution will be taken as a sovereignty space that is established by men and governed by men and at the same time as a space that is controlled and disciplined by discursive hegemony. In this respect, I will take Foucault’s theory of the subject as a product of discourse and subjects emanate from discourse as the main reference point.

One of the aims of this research will be to analyse the academic precarization that results from the intertwining of neoliberal and authoritarian policies in Turkey. In this respect, the

significance of Academics for Peace organization will be elaborated based on an assumption that Academics for Peace “uncovered the correlation between the local circumstances and dynamics of neoliberalism” (Vatansever, 2017). In line with this view, academic labor will be examined with respect to its activist dimensions in Turkey and will interrogate the argument that “the decision to sign the petition was motivated by deep anger and pain caused by bearing witness to the exploitation of vulnerability” (Vatansever, 2018).

Academics for Peace, as an activist-academic organization; and solidarity academies as alternative knowledge production spaces will be examined with respect to following notions: ‘critique’ (Lorey, 2009; Raunig, 2009b), ‘parrhesia’(Foucault, 2001 [1983]), and ‘instituent practices’(Raunig, 2009a).

I will suggest that the political performances spring from the practices of solidarity academies are crucial because they come to life in the affective knowledge that is being produced during the performance and set the imagination free by creating new body-time-space commons (Firat & Bakçay, 2012). In this respect, I will primarily analyze solidarity academies as “commons” that prioritizes the principles of critical knowledge production and critical pedagogies. I will suggest that critical pedagogies are capable of displaying the social power relations and of revealing the origins of the conflicts. In other words, I will analyze solidarity academies as maneuver spaces that “encourage to differences to meet and to create grounds of mutual awareness” (Stavrides, 2016: 41); and create “forms of social relations through which collective subjects of commoning are being shaped” (ibid.: 49).

Methodology

The research will be based on a qualitative research design and will benefit from the vocabulary of the ‘commons’ literature. In order to examine academic activism and the ways this form of activism develop networks, I will mostly benefit from the interviews, social media findings, and video recordings of the lectures. As the origin of this particular phenomenon derives from a call for peace, I will also draw on the critical researches conducted by human rights advocacy organizations and groups.

Expected Results

In this respect, my research aims to reveal that the conditions that led to the emergence of the solidarity academies can be analyzed with respect to the neoliberalization of academia and the precarization of knowledge workers. Secondly, my goal is to reveal that academics for peace have become a prominent organization in Turkish society as they take the courage to tell and spread the truth. Thirdly, I would like to demonstrate that solidarity academies in Turkey are crucial spaces where peace education and critical knowledge production take place. Lastly, I would like to present that solidarity academies help the other movements and the social struggles in Turkish society and make them more visible. This point, I suggest, positions them as ‘breathing spaces’ where new forms of relationships and cooperation take place.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. US: Stanford University Press
- Daily, B. (2017, June 11). BİRGÜN. Retrieved from: <http://www.birgun.net/haber-detay/suspended-and-dismissed-academics-of-turkey-launch-street-academy-138191.html>
- Fırat, B. Ö., & Bakçay, E. (2012). Çağdaş sanattan radikal siyasete, estetik-politik eylem. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 41-62.
- Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless Speech*. California: Semiotext(e).
- Lorey, I. (2009). Attempt to Think the Plebeian: Exodus and Constituting as Critique. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 131-139). London: MayFlyBooks.
- Raunig, G. (2009a). Institut Practices: Fleeing, Instituting, Transforming. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 3-11). London: MayFlyBooks.
- Raunig, G. (2009b). What is Critique? Suspension and Re-Composition in Textual and Social Machines. In G. Raunig, & R. Gene, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (p. 126). London: MayFlyBooks.
- Stavrides, S. (2016). *Common Space: The City as Commons*. London: Zed Books.
- Vatansever, A. (2017, May 3). *Critical Turkish Studies, Lecture Series, Dr. Aslı Vatansever: Turkey's Academic Sweatshops*. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ToabgoiZoFU&ab_channel=Institut%C3%BCrTurkistikUniversit%C3%A4tDuisburg-Essen
- Vatansever, A. (2018). Academic Nomads. The Changing Conception of Academic Work under Precarious Conditions. *Cambio*. Vol.8, n. 15: 153-165.

Preliminary scope of work

Abstract

1.Introduction

2.Theoretical Framework

i. Governmentality: Academic capitalism and precarization of knowledge workers

ii. Academic Activism

iii. Critique

iv. Parrhesia

v. Constituent Practices

3. Research Questions

4. Methodology

i. Research tools

5. Reflexivity

6. Findings

i. Academic Activism in Turkey

ii. Academics for Peace as ‘parrhesiastes’

iii. Solidarity Practices within Academics for Peace

7. Conclusion

8. Bibliography

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1

Introduction	1
--------------------	---

CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Framework.....	9
----------------------------	---

2.1. Governmentality: Academic capitalism and precarization of knowledge workers	9
---	---

2.2. Academic activism as a form of resistance against academic capitalism & authoritarian politics	17
--	----

2.2.1. (Institutional) Critique	17
---------------------------------------	----

2.2.2. Parrhesia.....	18
-----------------------	----

2.2.3. Institutent and Prefigurative Practices	23
--	----

CHAPTER 3

3.1. Research Questions	27
-------------------------------	----

3.2. Methodology	28
------------------------	----

3.3. Reflexivity	29
------------------------	----

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS	31
----------------	----

4.1. Activist groups and initiatives in Turkey	31
--	----

4.1.1. Academics with No-Campus (Kampüssüzler)	31
--	----

4.1.2. Off-University	33
-----------------------------	----

4.1.3. TİHV Academy	36
---------------------------	----

4.1.4. Street Academy	38
-----------------------------	----

4.2. Academic Capitalism and Authoritarian Government in Turkey	44
---	----

4.3. Solidarity Practices within and for Academics for Peace	47
4.4. Academics for Peace (and Solidarity Academies) as Parrhesiastes	54

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion	59
-------------------------	-----------

BIBLIOGRAPHY	62
---------------------------	-----------

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

After the election in June 2015, Turkey experienced one of the most challenging times in its political history. According to the letter that was written in February 2016 by the People's Democratic Party Vice co-Chair for Foreign Affairs Hişyar Özsoy:

“The indefinite, round-the-clock curfews that the AKP government has declared in Turkey's Kurdish provinces since the 16th of August, 2015, continue to deepen the emergency situation that undermines basic human rights and freedoms in the region, including the right to live and personal safety. This curfew policy directly and clearly violates imperative provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey as well as basic principles of international humanitarian law, first and foremost the provisions of the Geneva Convention for the protection of civilians in war and conflict zones” (Özsoy, 2016).

As an Amnesty International (2016) report indicates:

“In July 2015, a two-year ceasefire ended as a tentative peace process between the armed Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) and the Turkish state collapsed. Unlike previous phases of the decades-long conflict, during the following ten months, armed clashes took place not in rural areas of the south-east but in the region's cities and towns. Until now, an estimated 2,360 people have died, including at least 368 people who were unarmed residents. It is likely that at least half a million people have been forcibly displaced by the violence, large-scale destruction of property and by ongoing curfews in areas across the south-east” (Amnesty International, 2016).

Following these events, a group of activist academics, Academics for Peace (AfP), have become signatories of the petition called “We will not be a party to this crime [Peace Petition]” This petition-declaration points out these mentioned violences that took place towards the Kurdish citizens by the Turkish government. The petition's main concern was to “draw attention to the plight of the Kurdish population”, and it requires “the Turkish government to abide by the laws, end the state violence against its Kurdish citizens, and resume peace negotiations” (Esra & Akın, 2019: 6). In the first paragraph of the declaration, the events are explained, resulting from

the curfews in some districts belonging to Southeastern Anatolia like Sur, Silvan, Cizre, and Silopi. The second paragraph highlights the fact that these recent events are human rights violations according to domestic and international law. The third paragraph summarizes the immediate preventions that should be taken by the government and calls for peace as follows:

“We demand the state to abandon its deliberate massacre and deportation of Kurdish and other peoples in the region. We also demand the state to lift the curfew, punish those who are responsible for human rights violations and compensate those citizens who have experienced material and psychological damage. For this purpose, we demand that independent national and international observers be given access to the region and be allowed to monitor and report on the incidents” (Peace, 2016).

The fourth paragraph, “demands the government to prepare the conditions for negotiations and create a road map that would lead to a lasting peace that includes the demands of the Kurdish political movement” (Peace, 2016).

Meral Camcı, an academic who was dismissed after the Peace declaration, asserts that the petition directly addresses Turkish President Erdoğan. She argues that during the process of creating the text, the primary and most important motivation was to increase the language’s effect; that is why the title itself unbosoms and reveals a ‘crime’ (Camcı, 2016). Therefore, it is relevant to argue that the declaration appears as an example of a political critique that aims “to reveal the figures of power that operate in dominant discourses or ideologies” (Hardt, 2011: 19).

Now I would like to mention the Academics for Peace organization and the violation of rights towards them right after the declaration publicized in January 2016.

Academics for Peace are the signatories of this petition and it:

“[Academics for Peace] was founded in November 2012 in the aftermath of a statement that supported Kurdish prisoners’ demands for peace in Turkey, which voiced through a hunger strike. The statement was signed by 264 academics from over 50 universities. In their first meeting in December 2012, Academics for Peace decided to work for a peace process in Turkey and to contribute to it by producing knowledge and information on topics like processes of peace and conflict, practices of peace-making, women’s role in the peace process, education in native languages and the destruction of the environment

through war. Between the years 2013 and 2016 Academics for Peace signed petitions, organized meetings and published reports on their activities. The members of Academics for Peace also contributed to the peace process by writing in newspapers that compared Turkey's process with other cases in the world and have at numerous times announced their willingness and readiness to actively participate in the process" (Peace, n.d.).

On the 11th of January 2016, the declaration was published with 1128 signatories, and the possibility to sign the petition ended by the 20th of January 2016 with 2212 academicians support in total. The signatories of the declaration belong to 433 different universities, and while 102 of these universities are from Turkey, the rest are from abroad. One-third of the signatories are the academicians that work in universities abroad (Sözeri, 2016). The percentage of women academics among the signatories is 54 percent, with 1189 academicians, and the most common three departments that they belong to are Economy, Political Sciences, Educational Sciences, and these departments are followed by Sociology and Communication departments. Thirty Nobel-winning academics who support the Peace Declaration work in the fields of Chemistry and Medicine. According to Albayrak, the purge waves taking place on social sciences was not contingent: "The AKP government was never happy with academia out of its control, and sought to interfere in this realm ever since it came to power" (Albayrak, as cited in Hürtaş, 2017, para. 5).

There are four universities from Turkey that fall within the first 500 universities globally; Middle East Technical University, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul Technical University, Bilkent University. As Efe Kerem Sözeri underlines, most of the signatures used to belong to the mentioned universities (almost 85 percent) (Sözeri, 2016). Besides that, some Turkish academics have signatures in the declaration that work in the best universities in the world; there are 15 signatories from Harvard University, eight signatories from the University of Oxford and four signatories from Yale, and Cambridge universities.

Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan called for the signatories to be punished following the declaration was publicized. Right after this call, as Uğur makes it clear, "the judiciary initiated public prosecutions under Turkish anti-terror law alleging defamation of the Turkish state and accusing the signatories of spreading 'terrorist organization propaganda'". (Uğur, 2016, para. 2) As he puts, "after an emergency meeting, Turkey's Higher Education Council (YÖK) ordered university rectors to commence disciplinary investigations" (Uğur, 2016, para. 2). Within one week after the declaration, at least 20 universities initiated disciplinary

investigation over 109 academics; 13 academics were dismissed, and two academicians' contracts were repealed (BİA Haber Merkezi, 2016, para. 4). The number of investigations and dismissals has increased day by day, and especially after the coup attempt that took place on the 15th of July in 2016, they reached enormous amounts. With the statutory decrees, many academics were removed and banned from public service. Currently, there are 549 academics that were removed and banned from the public service with the decree-laws, and this number includes the academics who were dismissed, resigned, and retired (Peace, n.d.). Five hundred five academics have faced disciplinary investigations, and 70 were taken under police custody; 822 academics were put on trial. Within this period, 138 academics have been sentenced to 15 months in prison with a suspension of the judgment's pronouncement. Simultaneously, academics have encountered other violations of rights such as; "denial of pension rights and welfare and healthcare services, denial of access to employment in the public sector and seizing of their passports" (Agmon, 2019: 2). Together with the actual and judicial violations of rights, there also emerged incidences of threatening, and menace, especially in the universities in the small cities where the conservative management is dominant.

We should also point out that, although the recent dismissals have started when the petition called 'we will not be a party to this crime,' the process after the AKP government came into power was giving us clues about the purge waves. As Odman discusses, either on the micro university scales or the national/YÖK (The Council of Higher Education) scale, the micro authoritarian structures have to batten their employees by taking their pragmatic or cowed consent long before the 11th of January 2016 (Odman, 2018a).

According to Yasin Durak, the founder of Street Academy in Ankara, one of the signals before the purge waves was Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's speech about the academicians who wrote an open letter to Angela Merkel in 2015 (Durak, 2017a). One hundred academicians wrote this letter during the general election campaigns and after a short time from the most bloody terror attack in Ankara on the 10th of October 2015. In the letter, they argue that the German politician's visit to Turkey may be evaluated as an act of political support for President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and the following election on the 1st of November 2015. After their statement, President Erdoğan expressed a harsh discontent towards the academicians. He stated that "our nation has already been aware of those who are not with their own country and people but standing by the side of terrorist organizations. We are following the efforts of those so-called academicians to stalemate the government with great sadness. I call those kinds of attempts '*mankurt*'" (Diken, 2015). According to the Turkish Language Association, '*mankurt*' is used

to describe the people who are being alienated from national identity. Also, the word evokes nationalist roots; therefore, Durak emphasizes that President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan indicated the first message of the Turkish nationalist-Islamist alliance with '*mankurt*' expression. He asserts that for the first time since 2003, we witnessed the usage of the word by Erdoğan, and it was towards the academics and intellectuals (Durak, 2017a). He also underlines that the attacks towards the universities in Turkey have started after Gezi Protests when the students belonging to democratic youth movements got arrested or expelled from the schools. For this reason, he recognizes that academic discharges have started with the students (Durak, 2018). He also adds that two years before the attacks/purge waves to universities occurred, he attended a forum organized by the Turkish Social Sciences Association where the academicians discussed "what to do" towards forthcoming possible discharges in academia in Turkey (Durak, 2017b).

As I argued, the academics' indictment is "making propaganda for a terrorist organization" based on Article 7/2 of the Turkish Anti-Terror Act and Article 53 of the Turkish Penal Code" (Kural, 2017). After 3,5 years and 2306 trials, the Constitutional Court has ruled that the penalization of Academics for Peace with the mentioned accusation violates their freedom of expression. This decision rules that the indictment towards the Academics for Peace is a violation of freedom of expression. Following this decision, the first acquittal took place in September 2019 and the current number of acquittals is 622 (Peace, 2020).

Solidarity academies established in Turkey under such circumstances of dismissals of the academics and interruption of the academic knowledge production and academic freedom are "experiences that convert urgent needs to the virtue" as described by Aslı Odman (Odman, 2018b). In their online platform, the struggle and aims are as the following:

"We aim to relate academic knowledge production to the prioritization of peace, nonviolence, and justice in the socio-political sphere. We aim to continue such knowledge production processes in the non-university spheres. We aim to maintain our relationship with the dare-to-knowledge that requires courage to produce and share knowledge, prioritizing peace vis-a-vis the authoritarian structures. In doing so, we aim to produce and share knowledge with references to equality, freedom, and solidarity that are excluded from the university sites" (Academies, 2018).

The first practice of solidarity academies in this period was held by the solidarity classes in Eskişehir, and it is followed by the “Academics with No-Campus” in İstanbul. The first organized example of the solidarity academies took form in September 2016 by Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity (KODA). KODA was established by the initiative of 19 signatories of the ‘we will not be a party to this crime’ petition who were dismissed from Kocaeli University and was launched on the 28th of September 2016. It has organized regular seminars once a week and biweekly training programs. In February 2018, they introduced a two-year educational project called ‘The School of Life.’ As it is emphasized in their self-reflective article:

“One of the main aims of the program is to break down the hierarchical structure of the established academy and complex character of faculty-student relations. The general aim is to sustain education and research not only by KODA academics, but also with students, researchers, and other academics in the city and across the country” (Bakirezer, Keskin Demirer, & Yeşilyurt, 2018: 239).

This alternative school comprising lectures from different disciplines has finalized its first semester with a total of 22 classes such as Critical Media Literacy, Labor and Art, History of Labor, Urban Transformation in Kocaeli, Cultural Heritage and Right to the City, Gender and Women’s Labor Force, Medical Science as Social Responsibility, Modernization in Turkey, Fundamental Rights and Freedom. KODA comes to the forefront with the characteristics of knitting up with the local city, producing knowledge of the local region and coming together with the laborers in the region; including this local knowledge in production and circulation knowledge (Koçak, 2020). As Koçak puts it, they announce all the events, lectures, and seminars that take place within KODA to the unions, mass organizations, and platforms. They exert effort to include the local platforms within the academy’s activities. For this reason, he highlights, their overall struggle can be understood as work towards the production of critical and local (regional) knowledge.

Kültürhane (Cultural Center in Mersin) was founded in June 2017 in Mersin by three academics dismissed by the governmental decrees and one activist to introduce a common space to the people living in the city. It is serving as a public library and as a café. It continues to contribute to the cultural and scientific development outside the university walls with various events. It hosts many talks from various disciplines such as urban, ecology, cinema, and literature. It has a special event series called “hope talks” that are carried out with the participation of many academics on a regular basis. It intends to cultivate the city Mersin’s common identity with a

bookshelf reserved for the books on the city, and this way, they aim to commonize culture that includes solidarity, hope, and friendship.

As of today, together with KODA, which is now in the form of an association and Kültürhane, which took the form of a culture/commerce private company, the rest are Ankara Solidarity Academy, BİRARADA, Academics with No-Campus (Kampüssüzler), Antalya Solidarity Academy, Dersim Solidarity Academy, Eskişehir School, İzmir Solidarity Academy, İstanbul Solidarity Academy, Mersin Solidarity Academy, Street Academy (Ankara), TİHV Academy founded by The Human Rights Foundation of Turkey, and Off-University as an alternative digital platform where people can reach free education offered by academics. We should note that all the solidarity academies, following a year of their establishment, have organized in the forms of cooperation and association. The reason the actors of the solidarity academies have tried and managed to ‘institutionalize’ the solidarity academies should be understood as a link between the persistency to continue the knowledge production process and to create a solution for the vital needs (BİRARADA, 2019). Therefore, we can say that a solidarity economy dimension, to meet the life-sustaining needs, the ‘needs’ that resulted from unemployment, lawsuits, investigations, the cancellation of health insurance of the academics; has been introduced within the resistance of the solidarity academies (BİRARADA, 2019). As a result of the institutionalization, and introduction of a solidarity economy dimension, the notion of solidarity and resistance within the AfP struggle, has gained a more diverse and enriching structure. This structure appears in line with ‘reproduction of life.’

According to the presentation text that has been written by BİRARADA for a social sciences congress, Solidarity Academies have carried out four charrettes during the time of organizing their work. Each charatte has the characteristics of the past working and common labor, and the decisions taken during the charrettes contributed to the collective achievement of the solidarity academies. The text indicates that through charrettes, the solidarity academies achieved to build a relationality with each other. Briefly, the decisions that have occurred through the common and mutual work with the fourth charette include following principles; the practices and knowledge production activities that take place and actualized within the solidarity academies will be understood as an anti-capitalist ‘intervention’ to the academy, and to the communal living in general; Solidarity academies will adopt the feminist acquisitions and will be attentive to provide the persistency of the culture that has been established with these acquisitions; Solidarity academies will stand up to the forms of relations that the conventional institutional academy imposes on our lives, and, also, will insist on reproducing counter-relations that

grounds on a comprehension and affection that prioritizes collective and dual relationships (BİRARADA, 2019).

To summarize what this research has discussed so far, Turkey's political environment that the Peace declaration took place, and the demands of the declaration and Academics for Peace organization have been elaborated. Then the violations of rights towards the academics for peace and the Turkish government's attempt to control and suppress the dissident voices and knowledge production within the academia have been highlighted. Finally, solidarity academics that had been established under mentioned circumstances have been introduced with respect to their general discipline as sites of critical, resistive, and activist knowledge production.

In the following chapter of this research, I introduce the concept of academic capitalism and precarization of the knowledge workers briefly. Then, I refer to some of the government's applications in Turkey in the sphere of higher education. I aim to illustrate the neoliberal and Islamist policies in Turkey within the universities to resemble that the Turkish government has been giving the signals of the recent purges and eliminating critical knowledge production before the Peace declaration has been publicized.

Within the theoretical framework of this research, academic capitalism based on neoliberal governmentality techniques and its effects on the precarization of knowledge workers will be illustrated. In the following part, the notions of 'critique,' 'parrhesia,' and 'instituent practices' will be discussed.

The first part of the findings chapter introduces the groups and initiatives which I think provide instituent, activist repertoire in line with the theoretical framework of this research. Second part of this chapter provides a general overview of the intertwinement of neoliberalism and authoritarianism with respect to its reflections in academia in Turkey. Then, respectively, discussions and analysis take place as solidarity practices within and for Academics for Peace and Academics for Peace (and alternative academics) as 'parrhesiastes.'

The conclusion chapter appears as an outcome of the AfP's and solidarity academics' mentioned practices where I propose to evaluate alternative academics as 'threshold spaces' with respect to the literature on 'commons.' Therefore, the conclusion chapter attempts to reveal the 'potentialities' and 'opportunities' that result from this particular experience.

CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Framework

2.1. Governmentality: Academic capitalism and precarization of knowledge workers

In Turkey, neo-liberalization of academia goes hand in hand with political conservatism and Islamism. Islamist ideology represents “the political-ideological needs of the AKP as the ruling party as well as the need to use the coercion in effecting a social transformation” (Önal, 2012: 125) Therefore, it is safe to claim that the integration of universities into the global market during the AKP period has been consolidated with authoritarianism and Islamist ideology. I will go into details of this argument in the findings chapter, but first, I would like to draw attention to the neoliberal transformation of higher education and the effects of this transformation in the form of labor exploitation within the intellectual and cultural professions. That is why, in this part, I will focus on a general evaluation of the internalization of neoliberal politics within the universities and the effects of this transformation in the form of academic labor. While acknowledging that neoliberal transformation of higher education, so to say ‘academic capitalism,’ and the transformation of higher education that results from the intertwinement of authoritarianism and neoliberalism have essential differences, and apparent unique outcomes, a general introduction on academic capitalism and precarization of knowledge workers would be beneficial in terms of presenting the main motives of the Peace declaration and the construction of Solidarity Academies. As Vatansever puts it, “the significance of Academics for Peace lies in the fact that it uncovered the correlation between the local circumstances and dynamics of neoliberalism” (Vatansever, 2017).

My first observation is that the occurrence of the Peace declaration and following construction of solidarity academies are not solely the effects of authoritarianism, but they are at the same time the forms of resistance towards the effects of the internalization of neoliberal ideology. The second observation points out to the effects of neoliberal precarization on the struggle of Academics for Peace. On the other hand, reversely, we should note that the recent dismissals of academics have taken place with the active involvement of the university administrations, rectorates, and colleagues (Vatansever, 2017), which I think is a result of neoliberal precarization that shows itself as an erosion of occupational ethics and insecurity. Therefore, the issue of vulnerability here will be analyzed as a factor that stands out both as one of the reasons of the resistance within AfP and as a technique of neoliberal ideology in creating

passive subjects. Therefore we should note that the ‘vulnerability’, in this context, has contrasting and discrete reflections within different subjects and groups of people.

The first analysis results from the following arguments: First argument is related with the solidarity academies being alternative knowledge production spaces that adopt critical pedagogy and struggles against the neoliberal applications within academia such as privatization and commodification and works for more democratic and free education. One of their motives is to build and remind the core of the universities’ very first occurrence for their emancipatory and collaborative knowledge production space characteristics. We can argue that the motivation of the constituents of the solidarity academies has been to persist the existence of these alternative academies even if they would return to their previous positions in institutional academia. Additionally, their work to reflect the ethics that have been gained within solidarity academies to the institutional universities stand as two main pieces of evidence to this argument. The second reason derives from the idea that the decision to sign the Peace petition reveals the ‘vulnerability’ and ‘insecurity’ of Academics for Peace. Moreover, this vulnerability is not only a reflection of living in an authoritarian country but also a response to anxiety, worry, and uncertainty that is not independent of neoliberal politics, relations of production, and power relations. Therefore, it can also be evaluated as a strategic quest for inequality, domination and, discrimination.

The foundation of my second analysis, so to say the university staff’s active involvement or passive silence in the Peace academics’ dismissals, comes from the view that the ongoing applications of neoliberal policies within higher education have created occupational and existential insecurity that is imposed upon human labor. This situation created a rather rigid academic environment in which employability is highly challenging. We can say that commodification of academic labor leading to political and economic insecurity resulted in political intimidation and political inactivity (Vatansever, 2017). Therefore, many academics who have not been a part of the declaration did not oppose the dismissals of their colleagues and preferred to remain silent. And some of the university staff showed an active involvement in the dismissals.

To summarize, this vulnerability and insecurity as a result of precarization and commodification of skilled labor have shown itself in two different veins: The first vein reveals that this vulnerability has been a nurturing part of the resistance for some groups such as academics for peace, and their supporters, who chose not to stay silent. The second vein shows the deforming

impact of precarious work reflecting political submissiveness within the university administrations. Therefore, I conclude that such analysis, specific to Turkey, might enable us to contemplate the importance of the groups of people who take the courage to step aside from the predetermined roles and illuminate its surroundings and show the possibility to live within the truth (Havel, 1992 [1978]). In this respect, I think Turkish academia is a substantial laboratory to observe the “incalculable consequences of that illumination” (Havel, 1992 [1978]: 147).

With the transition from Keynesian to a neoliberal mode of regulation, the universities' autonomy function has decreased, and they became one of the critical institutions of power. This transition to governmentality, the flexible production necessitated labor power that has multiple skills, which caused a transformation in the universities' education function. With neoliberalism, universities required people and researchers that are described with the terms such as entrepreneur and competitive. As Sarı suggests, knowledge, like capital and labor, became a factor of production, and its proportion on the created value is increasing gradually. According to them, this process implying knowledge commercialization has caused an essential change in terms of the university's function of knowledge production, and therefore, universities have started to perform knowledge production under the guidance and purpose of the market (Sarı & Sarı, 2014). As Nicola and Roggero argue, “the mechanisms of valorization, devalorization, declassement and segmentation of the workforce are based on the knowledge and the control of knowledge production” (Nicola & Roggero, 2011: 36). They continue highlighting how capitalism measures knowledge production depending on specialized units of measures such as “the copyright and patent systems, student credits, the accumulation of social and human capital, and the writing of references for researchers and teachers” (ibid.: 36). These measures, the excessive intellectual property regimes, are blocking the creativity in cultural production (Lemmens, 2017). This performance-oriented measurement of knowledge production is an example of the universities characterized by an expansion of governmentality and by flexibilization of the labor market, which in the end results in precarization of work and labor. As Miller underlines, this kind of governmentality results in the research being animated more and more by corporate needs, and that it addresses students as consumers of education and both cases increase hierarchization (Miller, 2009). That is to say, the current crisis of the university is directly related to the crisis of the reproduction of the capital-labor relationship. It is the primary concern of cognitive capitalism and the way it functions. According to Restakis, “cognitive capitalism refers to the process by which

knowledge is privatized and then commodified as a means of generating profit for capital” (P2P Foundation, 2015: 33). He argues that, although in the past, capitalism was mainly interested in the “commodification of the material”, in our time, capitalism necessitates “the enclosure of the immaterial like knowledge, culture, and even ideas” (ibid.: 33).

As İnal suggests, “neoliberal ideology aims to privatize and globalize education in order to train the workforce that is needed for the highly globalized markets” (İnal, 2012: 18). We can claim that it achieves this end through marketization, and education becomes subordinated to the needs of the capitalist market (Önal, 2012). Önal suggests that we can observe a dual purpose within the higher education in capitalist society: “It provides the bourgeoisie with a necessary amount of suitably skilled labor, and it reproduces and disseminates the ideology of the ruling class to the educated strata of the public” (Önal, 2012: 126). According to him, the prominent trends in the transformation of higher education are “privatization” and “open adherence to the labor needs of the bourgeoisie” (ibid.: 127-129). His problematization of ‘privatization of universities,’ refers to “a shift in the behavior of higher education institutions so that they become similar to, and in time indistinguishable from corporations” (ibid.: 127), and this does not solely consist of private institutions in higher education. He problematizes this issue so that “under neoliberal economic policies, public universities too had to act like corporations” (ibid.: 127). He analyses this issue with respect to institutional autonomy, autonomy from the government, not from the capital. So to say, the transformation through privatization of higher education is sort of a transformation that results in universities that are “autonomous from the government in the sense that it has to create and manage its revenues, but not from its new financiers” (ibid.: 127). Therefore, he argues that, within such context,

“[N]eoliberal ideology contends that the student gains access to higher-paying jobs through his/her education; therefore, the cost burden of the education should be borne by him/her. The high unemployment ratio of educated worldwide belies this, but as the competitive and consumerist ideology of this proposition takes hold tertiary education becomes the necessary qualification of ‘employability’, not even ‘employment’” (Önal, 2012: 128).

According to Önal, the second category, “open adherence to the labor needs of the bourgeoisie”, can be analyzed with the “quantity over quality” model. This refers to the programs and profession-oriented universities that are designed to be “‘vocationally relevant’ and as short as possible, with each course consisting of ‘modules’ corresponding to specific vocational skills”

(ibid.: 128) and as an example of these programs, we can mention “community colleges, adult and continuing education programs, and distance learning programs” (Johnstone et al. 1998, 3, quoted in Önal, 2012).

As the universities prioritize the system’s benefits instead of the people, academic labor is increasingly being subjected to new forms of control and surveillance. It is not wrong to claim that today’s academic labor is a part of precarious labor, and academics are precarious knowledge workers. Briziarelli and Flores identify academic labor as “being characterized by a contradictory class location and a valorization that relies on a continuous negotiation for the better exchange rate between intellectual and financial capital” (Briziarelli & Flores, 2018: 115). According to the authors, the salaried knowledge workers’ ambiguous class position comes from the fact that they do not “own all the means of production but still exercise extensive control over such production as in teaching and the writing process” (ibid.: 118). Therefore, they “move within different positions; between prerogative and coercion, privileged and oppressive power” (ibid.: 118). This endless and continuous cycle of movement within different positions is the cycle of corporations that resembles how capitalism attempts to reproduce consent. In other words, the new spirit of capitalism, as we borrow the term from Boltanski and Chiapello (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2007), provides academicians to manage their academic and research career by presenting the ‘opportunities’ such as “Manage Your Own Career” workshops, or by presenting new contacts to practice and expand their networks (Kremakova, 2016). However, all the attempts that new spirit of capitalism can be characterized as ‘stimulating’ expect their ‘customers’ to “demonstrate their efficiencies in the relevant recognizable vocabulary ‘code’” (Kremakova, 2016: 47), as well as it expects them to be more efficient and productive. To summarize, this neoliberal vocabulary wants the individual to be “an ‘entrepreneur of oneself,’ maximizing himself or herself as ‘human capital’ in competition with all other individuals” (Lazzarato, 2009a: 111).

The new spirit of capitalism uses three different characteristics as a method of legitimization and justification of capitalism. These notions, excitement, security, and fairness, are used “in order to secure the involvement of protagonists, capitalists, and wage earners to capitalism” (Kazmi, Leca, & Naccache, 2015: 2). I will not go into the details here in which the neoliberal governmentality uses these tactics, in general, to justify itself. However I think they are related to the issue of precarization. These tactical displacements are related to capitalism’s concern to make participation meaningful by designing the work as it provides opportunities such as security and autonomy. In that case, it also imposes the individuals a representation of reality,

such as they are an active part of any configuration that concerns themselves. This issue also relates to the notion of responsibility, as the individuals now think that they should take the full responsibility of their lives to govern and control themselves, and this can only be done through participation. According to this view, the notion of responsabilization should be understood in the sense of personal investment. In the article “Governmentality and Self-precarization”, Isabell Lorey presents her interest in the forms of hegemonic subjectification as constituent elements of autonomy and freedom. This article’s focus point is “on the extent to which ‘self-chosen’ precarization contributes to producing the conditions for being able to become an active part of neoliberal political and economic relations” (Lorey, 2009b: 187-188). She explains self-chosen precarization with reference to Foucauldian term “art of governing”. As Foucault writes, “if one wants to analyze the genealogy of the subject, one must take into account not only techniques of domination but also techniques of the self” (Foucault, 1997: 177). The issue that is being interrogated here is on the extent to which the individual appropriates the command and with this establishes themselves as an ethical subject, and she/he transforms both the command and themselves. As such, we can understand that the command here might no longer be perceived as oppressive as it functions rather tacitly. As Lorey suggests, the art of governing “is not the question of regulating autonomous, free subjects, but instead, regulating the relations through which so-called autonomous and free subjects are first constituted as such” (Lorey, 2009b: 191).

We can claim that one of the abilities of the power and that of governmentality occur when the individual applies the techniques of self-governance in order to be realized since now the individual is convinced that only their choices, their actions, and their decisions determine their identity and existence. According to Foucault, this is a tacit law of the truth that wanders within our daily lives, and this “truth” determines and categorizes the subjects in front of the power. The notion of responsibility of one’s own, as Lorey suggests in the mentioned article, while commonly used in neoliberal restructuring, dwells within this “liberal force line of possessive individualism and actuality and only functions additionally as a neo-liberal interpellation for self-governing” (Lorey, 2009b: 193). She furtherly elaborates this discussion as follows:

“Governmental self-government takes place in an apparent paradox. Governing, controlling, disciplining, and regulating one’s self means, at the same time, fashioning and forming one’s self, empowering one’s self, which, in this sense, means to be free. Only through this paradox can sovereign subjects be governed. Precisely because techniques of governing one’s self arise from the simultaneity of subjugation and

empowerment, the simultaneity of compulsion and freedom, in this paradoxical movement, the individual not only becomes a subject, but a certain, modern ‘free’ subject. Subjectivated in this way, this subject continually participates in (re)producing the conditions for governmentality, as it is first in this scenario that agency emerges. According to Foucault, power is practiced only on ‘free subjects’ and only to the extent that they are ‘free’” (Lorey, 2009: 193).

An analysis of self-precarization can be made with regards to one of the assertions of (academic) capitalism that “people meant to flourish in life will only do so by demonstrating market ambition, financial self-reliance and entrepreneurial spirit” (Gahman, 2016: 73) I think the essential aspects reflected by the neoliberal conducts are self-governance, risk-taking individualism, responsibility, and autonomy. While Lorey brings forward the idea of self-precarization, for instance, she refers to the promotion of entrepreneurship and its extension to each line of work, including that of cultural producers’. Decidedly, the issue of entrepreneurship comes within that of a managerial discourse and business literature. With the rise of entrepreneur discourse; self-governance, responsibility, and risk-taking individualism become essential to succeed. They are now taken as the promise of freedom, and these features play a crucial role as a motivation for individuals to commit themselves to capitalism. For example, Boltanski and Chiapello, while attributing to the spirits of capitalism arising from a managerial discourse, refer to “great man” and “unworthy man”. They indicate, at the beginning of the chapter “The Formation of the Projective City,” that:

“In a connexionist world, a natural preoccupation of human beings is the desire to connect with others, to make contact, to make connections, so as not to remain isolated. To succeed, they must trust and be trusted, know how to communicate, discuss openly, and also be capable of adjusting to other people and situations, depending on what the latter demand of them, without being held back by timidity, rigidity or mistrust. This is the price of co-ordinating themselves in mechanisms and projects” (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2007: 111-112).

These features of what they call ‘connexionist world’ are presented by its so-called implementers. They make a distinction between the great man and little people. According to Boltanski and Chiapello, the great man in the connexionist world is active and autonomous, and these features of him do not arise from obedience (ibid.). The greatness of the symbolic power in the era of what they call the third spirit of capitalism comes from the great man’s success. In

a similar line, Lorey, bringing forward the idea of self-precarization discusses the “figure of entrepreneur relies on one’s life as the enterprise of oneself and thus becomes responsible to provide for both the means of production and reproduction of one’s own human capital” (Lorey 2015; Gordon 1991, quoted in Diaz & Gielen, 2018b: 171). Consequently, “the entrepreneur is responsible for self-controlling, self economizing, self-rationalizing his or her own labor time” (Bröckling 2015, quoted in Diaz & Gielen, 2018b: 171). These conducts, government of the self, the subjectivity promoted by the entrepreneur self, offer an insight where the success is confined to and only achievable through the personal (self-)investment.

In a similar line with the above-mentioned arguments, Hall suggests that the decreasing autonomy of the academic worker through the fetishizing of the notions such as diverse capabilities concerning human capital, entrepreneurship, and employability leads to the proletarianization of the academic labor. He argues that this results in the internalization of productivity-based performance production and leads to an overall feeling of insecurity, anxiety, and alienation. In his article, he interrogates the possibility of a re-evaluation of academic labor for its societal meaning. Within this framework, he draws on the concept of mass-intellectuality. As he puts it, mass-intellectuality refers to an apprehension of alternatives in which academics and students use their capacities, actions, and knowledge jointly (Hall, 2018). Such apprehension is based on rebuilding the subjectivities of academics and students around prefigurative cooperative actions as a part of the whole social struggle.

According to Hall, “relating academic labor to its moment of alienation might act as one critical side in the social struggle to recuperate the general intellect” (Hall, 2018: 107). He argues that the value of mass-intellectuality derives from its ability and potential to expose, criticize, and abolish alienated labor. What is crucial for this evaluation is that the abolition of alienated labor solely might be done if we can place the reproduction of academic labor into the framework of an intersection with other struggles. He suggests, therefore, the fundamentals of the struggle should be redefined in an intersectoral manner. As he underlines, such struggles have the potential to interrogate the nature of the academic labor and enable to envisage the meaning of the university and pedagogy concerning the mass-intellectuality and societal benefit (Hall, 2018).

Together with the concept of mass-intellectuality as a factor that helps to establish an apprehension of alternatives in contrast to the attempts of neoliberalism in producing forms of actions that are estranging the individuals from collectivity and solidarity, we should also give

close attention to the concept of ‘vulnerability.’ Confronting neoliberalism’s attempt to use precarization as a hegemonic tool, and as a result its aim to conduct the governmentality techniques based on fear and insecurity with the shared vulnerability might stand out as a resistance and a departure from an ‘imposed’ form of life. ‘Vulnerability’ as in a sense Butler regards it, a form of subjectivity which has a unifying and reviving power (Butler 2004, quoted in Vatansever, 2018a) can be deployed here as an attempt to invent an authentic form of life. The research that has been made by Vatansever analyses precariousness as a possible source of subjectification and this work focuses on the shared experiences of insecurity and vulnerability as well as to subjectification under precarious conditions. She claims that “the force of the negative should not be underestimated in the subjectification process” (Vatansever, 2018a: 162), and she regards the declaration ‘we will not be a party to this crime’ as a reflection of such perception of ‘collective vulnerability’ (ibid.: 162). She analyses that “the current situation which the decreed peace academics find themselves in is the outcome of their collective reaction to the state violence aimed at exploiting this vulnerability of human life” (ibid.: 162), and “the decision to sign the petition was motivated by deep anger and pain caused by bearing witness to the exploitation of vulnerability” (ibid.: 162). Vatansever indicates that “building networks of solidarity based on shared precarity and vulnerability is a method of resistance” (ibid.: 163). In other words, “a common precarious condition becomes a starting point from where to start testing new collective identities and forms of organization, creative platforms of resistance and more collaborative social forms [which brings us to principles of commoning and commonism]” (Diaz & Gielen, 2018b: 174).

2.2. Academic activism as a form of resistance against academic capitalism & authoritarian politics

2.2.1. (Institutional) Critique

In this part, I will give references to the ideas of Foucault, Lorey, and Raunig on ‘critique’ and ‘parrhesia’ and try to outline that both nurture each other and yield to a larger assemblage of activities for different forms of resistance. According to Foucault:

“[The critique] should be an instrument for those who fight, those who resist, and who no longer want what is. Its use should be in processes of conflict and confrontation, essays in refusal. It does not have to lay down the law for the law. It is not not a stage in a programming. It is a challenge directed to what is” (Foucault, 1991: 84).

We should note that the critical approach and critique appear as a refusal that turns out to be a productive practice as it allows recomposition and invention (Lorey, 2009a). I suggest that critique might function as a possibility for alternative politics and that critical thinking and action results from political responsibility. Therefore, the critique comprises the “affective dispositions that are required for political responsibility, such as outrage, indignation, desire, and hope” (Butler & Athanasiou, 2013: 66). In this respect, it can be viewed as a ‘desire to a political otherwise’ (ibid.), and it carries the concerns both the individual has about herself and about the others.

As Lorey recalls Foucault in her text on critique, it is “always principally thinking the possible disappearance of certain relations of government” and therefore it “is the ongoing questioning of the way of being governed” (Lorey, 2009a: 131). In the process of questioning the way of being governed, what is essential here is the “transformations as ways of escaping from the arts of governing and lines of flight” (Raunig, 2009b: 5). According to Raunig, we need to focus transforming the arts of governing and subjectification that do not occur arbitrarily. He offers that we need to think about the emancipatory transformations and their transversal quality. The latter term refers to the effects that “extend beyond the bounds of particular fields” (Raunig, 2009b). I think two requirements for critique to have transformational and transversal effects are the ‘self-questioning’ and ‘self-reflection’ practices. Only through self-questioning and self-reflection we can carry out ‘extra-disciplinary investigations’ as “a critical return to the departure point, an attempt to transform the initial discipline, to end its isolation, to open up new possibilities of expression, analysis, cooperation, and commitment” (Holmes, 2009: 54).

2.2.2. Parrhesia

The role of the intellectual in Foucault’s and Deleuze’s understanding, I think, is relatable to the notion of militant research, which can be described as “the place where academia and activism meet in the search for new ways of acting that lead to new ways of thinking” (Bookchin et al., 2013: 4). According to Emmelhainz, mentioned theoreticians assign the intellectuals a responsibility “of organizing struggles that goes beyond representation and class consciousness”. He says that “they posited militanism as a matter of denouncing, speaking out, finding targets, and creating tools to fight different forms of power and oppression” (Emmelhainz, 2016, para. 8). We can say that, when the militant research meets the critique in the terrain of a struggle to alter a specific truth regime, the intellectual work becomes an attempt that interrogates the possibility of the construction of a new politics of truth. This type of work

does not deal with or contemplates finding an ideology that can accompany the science practice. This type of critique, having the courage to tell the truth in the face of the authoritarian, is what he [the authoritarian] fears. As Butler notably puts, “what the authoritarian fears is that open discussion in a university seminar will move the outside those walls” (Butler, 2018: 6). This thought, I think, is in line with Havel’s question: “Why is the truth suppressed more severely than anything else?” His answer to this problematization is: “[because living with the truth] has an ambiguous political dimension. If the main pillar of the system is living a lie, then it is not surprising that the fundamental threat to it is living the truth” (Havel, 1992 [1978]: 148). Butler continues, “once the unjust character of those regimes is openly demonstrated and discussed, once public life is given to those forms of intellectual critique, people may well identify and oppose unjust rule and rise up to demand the end to justice” (Butler, 2018: 6). Accordingly, Havel also stresses the importance of the open discussion of the truth and living in the truth with regards to its incalculable power as omnipresent that grows within the hidden sphere and finds its potential, the potential for communication (Havel, 1992 [1978]: 148). What is essential here is pointing out the potentiality of unraveling the truth and making the critique open to the public and revealing it for the public.

This discussion brings us to the notion of ‘parrhesia.’ Foucault analyses the concept of parrhesia within the text ‘Fearless Speech,’ which consists of the tape recordings of the six lectures delivered by him in the fall semester, 1983, at California University. He highlights that “the word parrhesia appears for the first time in Greek literature” (Foucault, 2001: 11), and it can be “translated into English by ‘free speech’” (ibid.: 11). We can understand the meaning of the word as having the courage to tell the truth. Apart from the nominal form of the word ‘parrhesia,’ there is also the word ‘parrhesiastes,’ which refers to “the one who uses parrhesia, the one who speaks the truth” (ibid.: 11). Foucault develops the latter term and argues that “parrhesiastes is someone who says everything he has in mind: he does not hide anything, but opens his heart and mind completely to other people through his discourse” (ibid.: 12). That is why, he argues, the word parrhesia can be understood as a form of a relationship between the speaker and what they say. He also argues that the parrhesiastes knows that he is telling the truth, and this belief comes from the fact that what he says is actually the truth, and he demonstrates that “there is always an exact coincidence between belief and truth” (ibid.: 14).

Foucault indicates that the words of the parrhesiastes reflect their own virtue and character. He highlights that parrhesia is composed of virtue and personality: it, at the same time, is a duty that the parrhesiastes demonstrate their competence by using parrhesia. And lastly, he says, it

is a technique, a procedure. He attributes this to the practice of parrhesia regarding multiple levels of human relations. Admitting diverse forms, he mainly emphasizes parrhesia as a practice that takes place within individual groups and community life. The second form of parrhesia practice realizes itself within public life, and the last instance occurs and is experienced through individual relationships. However, all in all, it derives from a moral obligation and “it is clearly a moral act, not only because one must pay dearly for it, but principally because it is not self-serving: the risk may bring rewards in the form of a general amelioration in the situation, or it may not” (Havel, 1992 [1978]: 153).

Foucault reminds us of the criticism function of parrhesiastic act, and he anchors it in a place beyond solely telling the truth. As Luxon puts it, Foucault recaptures us the questions that do not stem from a political doctrine, yet the ones that interrogate the politics and thus hope to retake a sense of critical political speech (Luxon, 2004). What is striking and most relevant to our phenomenon, Academics for Peace as parrhesiastes, as we will cover in the following chapter, is his problematization of parrhesia with respect to danger and risk factors. According to him, “someone is said to use parrhesia and merits consideration as a parrhesiastes only if there is a risk or danger for him in telling the truth” (Foucault, 2001: 15-16). For him, it is the parrhesiastes’ “specific relationship to himself” as he chooses to be a truth-teller instead of a “living being who is false to himself” (ibid.: 17). This danger of the truth arrives from the fact that the said truth can hurt or anger the interlocutor (ibid.). He continues with the following words: “the parrhesia involved, for example, may be the advice that the interlocutor should behave in a certain way, or that he is wrong in what he thinks, or in the way he acts, and so on” (ibid.: 17). The risk dimension is involved at this point because the interlocutor might get angry at him and even might punish him. Foucault’s argument, that is, truth-telling activity of parrhesiastes is a specific relation to himself because he chooses to be a truth-teller instead of being a person who is false to himself, goes hand in hand with Havel’s problematization living within the truth. He recognizes that this activity occurs on “the level of human consciousness and conscience, within the existential level” (Havel, 1992 [1978]: 149). Moreover, he suggests that the truth that occurs within the hidden sphere, ‘solid ground of individual’s own identity,’ rather than “on the level of real, institutionalized, quantifiable power which relies on the various instruments of power” (ibid.: 149), and “surfaces into the light as an assortment of shocking surprises to the system” (ibid.: 149). That is why he highlights, it is being punished and is being evaluated as a threat by the power-holders: because it spreads out “in the hidden aims of life, in human beings’ repressed longing for dignity and fundamental rights, for the realization of their

real social and political interests” (ibid.: 149). Therefore, the truth, that is verbalized by human consciousness “might cause incalculable transformations in social consciousness which in turn might one day produce political debacles unpredictable in their consequences” (ibid.: 150).

According to Foucault, the parrhesiastic act always occurs in a situation, “where the speaker or confessor is in a position of inferiority with respect to the interlocutor” (Foucault, 2001: 18). It “comes from ‘below’ and is directed towards ‘above’” (ibid.: 18). This problematization of the ‘position’ or ‘status’ of the truth-teller can also be seen in the work of Vaclav Havel. Havel suggests that the motives of the individuals who attempt to live within the truth derive from “existential (returning humanity to its inherent nature), noetic (revealing reality as it is), and moral (setting example for others) dimension” (Havel, 1992 [1978]: 147-148). Accordingly, he attributes that pursuing a life that is not based on lies; the quest for a life in which the individual shatters the world of appearances might appear solely in the existence of these dimensions. Therefore, he arrives at an analysis that is similar to Foucault’s arguments on the status of the parrhesiastes. Such analysis sets an example for the potential questions such a ‘what is the difference between standard political critique and parrhesia’? and ‘how can we determine if one is a parrhesiastes’? First of all, as I emphasised, parrhesiastes is the one who is in a position of inferiority as against the power-holder. As Havel highlights while writing about the power of living in truth: “this power does not participate in any direct struggle for power; rather, it makes its influence felt in the obscure arena of being itself” (ibid.: 149). Furthermore, he argues, “the hidden movements it gives rise to can issue forth something visible: a real political act or event, a social movement, a sudden explosion of civil unrest, or simply an irrepressible transformation in the social and intellectual climate” (ibid.: 149-150). He adds:

“if such activities ultimately grow beyond the area of living within the truth (which means they are transformed into various parallel structures, movements, institutions, they begin to be regarded as political activity, they bring real pressure to bear on the official structures and begin in fact to have a certain influence on the level of real power), they always carry with them the specific hallmark of their origins” (Havel, 1992 [1978]: 152-153).

As per the subjects of these “potentials”, so to say parrhesiastes”, they are the ones who take part in the independent, democratic, and equal life of the society (ibid.). As Havel says, “everyone who shares this independent culture and helps to spread it; people who, using the means available to them, who try to extricate themselves from manipulation and live their own

life” (ibid.: 178). Therefore, the determinant of the parrhesiastes and the act of parrhesia and its disjunctive feature from the standard political critique is the provided hope, responsibility for the self and the others, “a new experience of being, a renewed rootedness in the universe, a newfound inner relationship to other people and human community” (ibid.: 210). As Havel suggests, “these factors clearly indicate the direction in which we must go” for the foundation of a better society (ibid.: 210).

To summarize with Foucault’s own words:

“parrhesia is a kind of verbal activity where the speaker has a specific relation to truth through *frankness*, a certain relationship to his own life through *danger*, a certain type of relation to himself or other people through *criticism* (self-criticism or criticism of other people), and a specific relation to moral law through *freedom* and *duty*. More precisely, parrhesia is a verbal activity in which a speaker expresses his personal relationship to truth, and risks his life because he recognizes truth-telling as a duty to improve or help other people (as well as himself)” (Foucault, 2001: 19).

Raunig recognizes that we need “parrhesia as a double strategy: as an attempt of involvement and engagement in a process of hazardous refutation, and as self questioning” (Raunig, 2009b: 10). Without doubt, the occurrence of parrhesiastic act is a result of a self-reflexive activity. Reflexivity, in this sense, can be characterized as individuals’ attempt to denominate the situations they are included in and living through, and the mediums (knowledge, techniques, and methods) they are animating in quest of generating a solution for themselves and society. Self-appraisal, the particular position of truth-tellers, the way they understand and perceive the world, and their determination in telling the truth, the courage, and endurance locate the AfP as collective parrhesiastes. Furthermore, this also provides us the “need for individuals to avoid dependency on authorities and trust that their daily practices bear on truthfulness” (Luxon, 2004: 477). In this respect, this model proposes a different kind of relationship with the authority both for the parrhesiastes and the audience. At this point, it operationalizes a process of (non-hegemonic) political subjectification where individuals can act differently and gain an intertwined formation with one another. Luxon’s ideas on the objective of truth-telling resonate with the idea of ‘formation’ I am trying to build here. As she suggests, “the objective of this truth-telling is the fashioning (formation) of a certain manner of being, of a certain manner of acting, of a certain manner of conducting oneself alone or with others” (Luxon, 2004: 478). She, therefore, relates the objective of this act with the ethos of the individual. This thread

reminds me of “constructing the self as a work of art” described by Foucault; “it was a question of knowing how to govern one’s life in order to give it the most beautiful form (in the eyes of others, of oneself, and of the future generations for which one might serve as an example)” (Foucault, 1988: 259). After all, we can summarize that parrhesia “allows us to distinguish analytically those relations that produce individuals (to fit a specific mold) from those that educate individuals for autonomy (such that they are the result of their own design)” (Luxon, 2004: 464-465).

To conclude, the importance of the concept of parrhesia comes with a concern for the self, and others, and it can be regarded as an essential aspect of creation. Foucault regards intellectual labor as aestheticism, meaning transforming oneself. He conceptualizes that an individual's attempt to transform themselves with knowledge is quite relatable with an aesthetic experience. Hence, we can argue that the effect of parrhesiastic act, which results in a transformation with the aid of knowledge, comprises an aesthetic ethos, and as a matter of fact, the aim of this practice is not independent of an individual's ethos. Here, it might be beneficial to reiterate this chain of thought with what Foucault says in *The Ethics of the Concern for Self as a Practice of Freedom*: “extensive work by the self on the self is required for the practice of freedom to take shape in an ethos that is good, beautiful, honorable, estimable, memorable, and exemplary” (Foucault, 1997: 286).

2.2.3. Instituent and Prefigurative Practices – a theoretical framework

As I have already emphasized, the establishment of recent solidarity academies in Turkey can be analyzed as the seeds of academic solidarity and self-organization. Solidarity is the prerequisite of any kind of immaterial and affective production. Therefore it is immanent to the appearance of the commons and production of counter-subjectivities. Self-organization, if we take it as “refusal of the modes of governing” and an alternative production in-the-make; “the power of invention to create worlds” (Raunig, 2010) reveals the intentions of bio-power. As Graeber underlines, hopelessness is not natural; it needs to be produced. He says that the bureaucratic apparatus provides the creation and maintenance of hopelessness and destroys any sense of possible alternative futures. For him, the issue with the vast number of apparatus in our lives is to create a climate of fear, despair and suggesting that the thought of changing the world is an idle fantasy (Graeber, 2008). On the other hand, I suggest that, political critique, and the political imaginary that comes with it, can delineate the functioning of neoliberal

hegemony, break the produced hopelessness, and might enable us to designate an action repertoire that prioritizes prefigurative-immediate action.

As Raunig emphasizes, “concept of instituent practices marks the site of a productive tension between a new articulation of critique and the attempt to arrive at a notion of ‘instituting’ after traditional understandings of institutions have begun to break down and mutate” (Raunig & Ray, 2009: xvii). He puts the concept instituent as the conceptual unraveling of the institutional critique and, it expresses an exodus. Instituent represents the practices that are not framed with institutionality, practices that are not enclosed, and at the same time represents the practices that do not focus on the “power” but on the actual practices. He conceptualizes instituent practices as the “practices that conduct social criticism; practices that do not distance themselves to institutions; practices that are self-critical; practices that do not cling on their fixation on institutions and the institution, their own being-institution” (Raunig, 2009b: 10-11). As suggested, “instituting requires persistence, duration, recurrence and it therefore implies a new institutionality and the development of orgiastic state apparatuses, that is, of state apparatuses that stretch, overstretch, breach the principle of representation” (Nowotny & Raunig, 2016, para. 4). According to them, the new and orgiastic form comes from when “sense of political action is not determined in terms of their compliance with established institutional forms, but according to their capacity to give a new sense to social experiences and challenges and to provide this new sense with perseverance” (Nowotny & Raunig, 2016, para. 4). Raunig emphasises that the cruciality is pointing out to “the practical testing and stuttering invention of machine that tend to elude structuralization” (Raunig, 2009a: 175). Accordingly, he argues that; “a ‘progressive’ institution would be one which conducts –counter to the initially static quality of the term institution – a moving practice of organizing” (Raunig, 2004, para. 3). He explains this as a “movement of flight which preserves the instituent practices from structuralization and closure from the start, preventing them from becoming institution in the sense of constituted power” (Raunig, 2009b: 8).

In the preface of the book “Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique”, we see a frame for the “institutions of exodus”, a concept the authors employ to analyze the conditions for critical and resistant institutions. They suggest that “exodus is not a naïve exit ‘out of every kind of institution,’ but refers instead to the deliberations and actualizations of ‘institutions of exodus’ (Raunig & Ray, 2009, xvi). Lorey also analyses the immanent character of resistive critique as an immanent exodus, not as entering outside of power relations (Lorey, 2009a). As Fraser writes, “with each attempt to evade the limits of

institutional determination, to embrace an outside, we expand our frame and bring more of the world into it. But we never escape it” (Fraser, 2005: 104).

Raunig recognizes that we need instituent practices that are exercising the forms of parrhesia, and this way “will impel a linking of social criticism, institutional critique, and self-criticism” (Raunig, 2009b: 11). He suggests that “this link will develop from the direct and indirect concatenation with political practices and social movements” (ibid.: 11). His thesis is that “in certain situations, it makes sense to not strictly set movement and institution against one another or dissolve them into each other, but to process their relationship in terms of a monstrosity” (Nowotny & Raunig, 2016, para. 5). He says that, “it is betraying the rules of the game through the act of flight: transforming the arts of governing”; “as participation in the processes of instituting and in political practices that traverse these fields, the structures, and institutions” (Raunig, 2009b: 11).

As instituent practices conceive a new form of production with regard to the capital, state, and dominant institutions, we can claim that they represent the characteristics of prefigurative activist repertoire. As Maeckelbergh puts it, prefigurative politics opens up a space to comprehend “the possibility for another world exists” (Maeckelbergh, 2009). As she argues, it breaks down the distinction between means and ends in political action, and it presents the ideals that we construct in our mind in the present (ibid.). She epitomizes the word prefiguration as it “holds the ends of political action to be equally important as the means, and has the intention (over time, or momentarily) to render them indistinguishable” (Maeckelbergh, 2009: 88). In this respect, locating prefigurative modes of organization leads to construction of new imaginaries that reflects the society of the future. Therefore, it is essential to emphasize that prefigurative politics is not aimed at achieving the end; it should instead be evaluated as prioritizing the means to actualize the future we want to have. Accordingly, they embody a criticism which in turn brings resistance to “determinism, fatalism, and hopelessness” (Amsler, 2012). Therefore, these practices are the ones that struggle for emancipation, which appears as a process, rather than a final destination.

Solidarity academies as instituent practices problematize the formal methods and bring about deviations and distractions to the conventional knowledge production methodologies. The intersectionality of theory and practice [as a political attitude] is a vital element of their militant research agenda. The apprehension on engaging critically and openly and depiction of the bio-power corresponds in the practices beyond criticism of the education system. Their rejection of

any sort of hierarchy provides us a space to observe the changing and fluid positions of learners and lecturers. Because of this fluid setting, the issues to be discussed are also determined by multiple actors; therefore, it is different from any form of formal institutional settings such as universities, schools, or NGOs. The local knowledge and the cities' problems (that solidarity classes take place) are being interrogated by the actors from unions, mass organizations, and autonomous networks that often work in the field of human rights advocacy. For this reason, knowledge production as an empirical practice that takes place within the solidarity academies becomes an archive and a disruption to conventional methodologies. This situation enables academics to practice their professions first hand. They start to be more involved with their research areas, and their professional identities are articulated with activist identities. This relationality is reflected in solidarity academies as instituent practices; as practices which are self-critical, self-reflective. As a part of militant activist research, they collaborate in producing self-critical knowledge that directly emerges from the struggle through communitarian collective writing. We can argue that solidarity academies as instituent practices become prominent with developing new pedagogical strategies that do not set the resistance and being an (alternative) institution against one another.

CHAPTER 3

3.1. Research Questions

Based on the above theoretical analysis, this research asks and aims to interrogate the following questions:

- In what forms can we observe the resistive activist repertoire of Academics for Peace in neoliberal authoritarian Turkey? Does academic activism in contemporary Turkey manifest elements of parrhesia and solidarity?
- How can we provide a framework of the solidarity academies as alternative knowledge production spaces based on their instituent and prefigurative activist repertoire?
- What are the practices of solidarity academies that attempt to give a new and independent meaning to academia? Can we observe their practices as a reflection of their work to alter conventional academia by constructing the required practices for such alterations in the present?
- Can instituent practices within Solidarity academies nurture the commoning practices? Can we observe the invention of different social bonds and practices that we might evaluate solidarity academies as our commons?
- In what ways do the commons we produce appear as phenomena that resist exploitation? Can we observe, through commons, a prefiguration of a new mode of production in contrast to capital and state?
- What are the fragments of the neoliberal authoritarian regime in academia as a producer of precarity and unequal relationships? How can we interpret the notions of ‘political responsibility’ and ‘vulnerability’ within such fragments?

3.2. Methodology

This research is based on a qualitative research design with an in-depth study of the establishment process of Solidarity Academies in Turkey. The theoretical part of this research attempts to provide an outline to understand the methods and action repertoire of Academics for Peace for an illustration ‘how political disadvantage can be turned into nurturing practices’? To this end, neoliberal authoritarian governmentality in the field of higher education and counter-struggles against these effects have been explained with reference to notions such as critique, parrhesia, and instituent practices. That is why it can be said that the first part of the research concentrates on revealing the zones of difference in terms of the relationship between power-holders and dissidents. The selection of mentioned concepts provided a sphere for the writer of this research in which she can think about the politics of commons and solidarity academies as ‘commons.’ In other words, an inductive approach has been used with a body of knowledge that aims to arrive at the vocabulary of commons. That is why this research is influenced by the commons literature and attempts to think about the politics of commons with respect to the questions ‘why do we need commons in authoritarian countries’? and ‘what is the importance of the commoning practices while struggling for Peace in the society’? In pursuit of these questions, this thesis interrogates the essentiality of solidarity acts and parrhesia as practices through individuals and groups develop different and strong bonds compared to dominant institutions.

The primary instruments of this research include social interactions, social media findings, video recording of the lectures, participant observation, self-reflexive works of Academics for Peace, and interviews. Almost all solidarity academies have their own social media platform where they publish and archive their solidarity practices, events, and lectures, and this thesis focuses on the practices vis-a-vis their emancipatory and critical pedagogical aspects. Other than this, this work consists of interpretations and discourse analysis of the interviews made with Academics for Peace and has been published in dissident channels and media and other self-critical works that have been conducted by Academics for Peace. On the other hand, the author of this research has attended some of the lectures held by Street Academy and conducted interviews with some of this academy’s members. As the reader will notice, as a distinctive feature, Street academy appears as a learning platform in which we observe the prominent guerilla repertoire within other academies. Therefore we should note that each solidarity academies have their unique characteristics and structures. They have been elaborated

according to their distinctive features on the one hand, and holistically on the other, to provide a better understanding of academic activism in Turkey. Apart from these, this research has collected data from the collaborative research made by AfP, especially within the context of the Human Rights Foundation of Turkey. These researches are prominent as the subjects of this particular struggle have conducted them. These works can be categorized under self-reflective collaborative research of Academics for Peace, which I drew on to a great extent. These points I have mentioned show this research's attempt to build a framework where the author attempts to confront epistemology, data, and method with one another in a systematic way. As this whole experience of AfP started with a call for peace, a demand for peace, this research also benefits from the works of other independent organizations that work in the field of human rights advocacy and peace building.

3.3. Reflexivity

Before I moved into the Czech Republic, I spent six years of my youth in the Turkish academic environment. I studied Political Science at Middle East Technical University in Ankara, where I accumulated many friends and experiences. At the beginning of the Gezi uprising in Turkey, I was taking a class on Social Movements and the situation of Turkey at that time was like a social laboratory of that course. When the Suroç attack happened in Turkey, which I have also mentioned in this research, I was sitting in a class where we were covering Fascism. Then the bloodiest terror attack happened on the 10th of October in Ankara, the city where I was living at that time, where we have lost many colleagues who want the best and struggle for peace in the country. After that incident, my mom told me “Öykü, I don't want to see you (living) in Turkey anymore”. When I was contemplating moving to another country, the coup attempt occurred, and we witnessed one of the longest and horrifying nights in our country. Then I have made up my mind about moving out from Turkey and tried to manage all my visa and school applications under a state of emergency, which resulted from the coup attempt. I managed to get my visa and move into Prague, yet I was still struggling from these memories and leaving my country, family, and friends behind. Therefore, I can say that my personal history consists of witnessing a struggle for peace, a “nostalgia” for a better world. These experiences occur as dynamics and reasons behind writing this thesis. On the other hand, the concept of solidarity has always been the most powerful dynamic in our lives in Turkey through which we nurture ourselves and each other. Therefore I can say that the articulation of solidarity, struggle for

peace, and my history within Turkey's academic environment have yielded me to choose this phenomenon.

I should also note the limits of my research. When I came up with this topic for the first time, I was assuming that I would be able to physically attend a 'desirable' amount of classes offered by solidarity academies. I could not achieve this end due to personal and emotional obstacles. Therefore, I should note that while I was planning to establish a 'field research,' I could not succeed in it. Secondly, I could not get in touch with students who attend these classes, and therefore, the critical pedagogical side of the solidarity academies are not elaborated from the point of view of the attendants (students). Thirdly, I prepared my interview questions based on the notions and theoretical framework I intend to study, which I believe made sense for the interviewees however I could not collect the answers from many of the attendants. Of course, this has multiple reasons, which I have mentioned throughout the research, not least the academics' frustration due to the conditions they have been forced to live through. I am aware of the insecure and frustrating conditions over the academics; that is why I tried to balance this part of the research with the social media findings.

CHAPTER 4

Findings

4.1. Activist groups and initiatives in academia in Turkey

The sample of observed groups and initiatives has been purposively selected based on the instituent-parrhesiastic-activist action repertoire. Specifically, I elaborated on all the solidarity academies and chose the ones that we can observe the most explicit examples of instituent practices that result from (institutional) critique. In other words, I aimed to reveal the practices we can observe an invention of new forms of instituting and solidarity academies' methods to link these practices with one another. At the same time, I focused on the practices where we can see the fusion of reinvention of new practices that focuses on emancipatory transformations. By doing so, I aimed to show the transversal quality of the mentioned reinvention effects; which go beyond the particular limitations of single fields. I focused on showing the practices which yield to new forms of (activist) subjectification. This newly established activist academic subjectification has tried to find a ground to apply new expression forms throughout their struggle. I aimed to expose the practices which give rise to new forms of discussion, cultural affinities, and friendships. For this reason, I mainly aimed at following the practices that consciously orientates and works for the emancipatory transformations. Such a line of thought has motivated me to interrogate the political dimension of critical pedagogies and the possibility and ability of critical pedagogies to disseminate the knowledge to other social practices that have been produced throughout the struggle. The key concepts that I have been concentrated on while going through the practices were militant research, joint research, autonomy, reappropriation, self-organization, solidarity, self-reflexivity, and biopolitical production.

4.1.1. Academics with No-Campus (*Kampüssüzler*)

Academics with No-Campus was established in 2016, April, even before the dismissals that took place following the statutory decrees. Their primary purpose was centered around the question: 'how can we make a different academy possible'? Academics from different fields are the members of the organization, including sociology, nano-technology, physics, biology, and architecture, and that is why it has a supra-disciplinary structure. Academics with No-Campus rejects a disciplinary distinction; they try to conduct their production process on a supra-disciplinary level based on a principle of joint-lecturing. The mentioned supra-

disciplinary aspect of Academics with No-Campus has a structure that puts forward the proficiency and skill in a specific field. Therefore, we can say that it has partial and autonomous characteristics, it does not drive forward the centralized knowledge-theory production. In other words, the theoretical production does not depend on any kind of recognition of established regimes. In this respect, the supra-disciplinary and autonomous aspects resemble the characteristics of what Foucault mentions with respect to 'specific intellectual.' The specific intellectual, who attempts to emancipate the subordinated knowledge, the knowledge which occurs in the power hierarchy of science, and uses it as a tool that can help to intervene, challenge, and traverse the established norms (Foucault, 2000). Therefore, it is safe to claim that this knowledge production that the new specific intellectual carries out brings a new meaning to the relationship between theory and practice. The critique, which is exercised as a knowledge production, now gains a new meaning in which the local people can express themselves and create the conditions of their own lives (Keskin, 2000).

Within their initiation called 'Academics with No-Campus Joint Lectures,' the academics conduct the lectures collectively. Together with determining the lectures' subjects jointly, each academic carries out a discussion on the same topic. It means that each academic, from their own discipline, evaluates the topic and narrates it from this specific field's perspective. Beyond doubt, such an approach and practice allow the audience to understand the issue holistically and helps them to construct the relationalities. Apart from the joint lectures, they hold 'Postgraduate working groups' in which the academics become the shadow advisors of the postgraduate and master's students. Sevim highlights that they see that these students are the ones in need, and thus they leave them determining what they need. Therefore, academics do not decide on students' needs; on the contrary, the students come to them for advice and they collectively make decisions. The students lost their supervisors during this process, or their thesis topics interfered, they have encountered a series of problems. Therefore they believe that they can seek alternatives only by the students' recommendations on a particular topic (Sevim & Sayın, 2017).

4.1.2. Off-University

Off-University is an initiative based in Germany, Berlin, and registered as a charitable organization according to German law since 2017 (Off-University, 2018). It was established for and by academics from Turkey; however it addresses itself to academics all around the world: “academics who have been purged from their institutions, forced to resign, who are legally and politically persecuted and even imprisoned because of their opinions and research titles” (Off-University, 2018). They introduce themselves as academics and students in danger or who are in exile and dream about a different education system. The Off-University aims to bring together the individuals and institutions who commit to global peace ideals and who have an academic vision that prioritizes less hierarchic, more democratic, and free academia. Off-university builds itself as a digital commons and constitutes an online education model for the researchers and students whose mobility is restricted due to multiple reasons. Therefore, it is an open-source pedagogic platform highlighting the crucial functionality of peer-to-peer critical education with a “mission based on its commitment to peace in the world and living together in diversity” (Off-University, 2018). It offers a virtual classroom including chat options, livestream, a virtual blackboard, and document management tools, and at the beginning of each term, they make an open call where they invite the academics to lecture in the platform who are either discharged from their positions or persecuted or forced to the retirement from all around the globe.

Off-University drives forward the principle ‘participatory learning process’ as the constitutive element of their understanding of the critical pedagogical practice. Çekiç, the founder of Off-University, highlights that it concentrates on the projects and creates projects as such, which could establish a ‘community’ within the students (Kölemen, 2020). Strutz, on the other hand, argues that they do not collect any information from the students without their knowledge. They do not have any intention, such as controlling the students or gaining a kind of information about what they are doing on the platform while they are online. They perceive the participant as an adult individual who pursues to learn and as an ‘equal’ whom they can collaboratively contemplate and discuss the issues (Kölemen, 2020). Strutz expresses that, under the roof of the conventional online learning platforms, a surveillance mechanism has been established with a so-called motive of ‘developing the experience of the user,’ which is why they decided to constitute their own platform (Kölemen, 2020). Off-university functions over a platform called ‘Coworking Squares’, which provides independent learning, independent from any kind of control mechanisms. If we consider the reason and dynamics of the appearance and foundation

of Off-University, that is to say, the state oppression and surveillance, we can see why they are especially evaluating the user privacy as one of the vital elements of this platform, and we can understand such motivation. For this reason, the platform provides users with an alternative to register with a nickname. The learners have an option to keep their identities confidential both from one another and from the academics.

The organization has expanded its network by joining the Communication Congress in Leipzig and accumulated knowledge about a series of innovative ideas on the technological level. As they argue, “these lively discussions also contributed to us engaging in a more creative and skeptical discourse on the interaction between technology and society in general” (Off-University, n.d.). At the same time, they are building a different form of solidarity during the times of pandemic for the academics and teachers who have just stepped into the arena of online education. The platform supports and helps the academics and teachers with an “online education guide” to help others achieve their needs in the pursuit of a more democratic and free online education.

The first research collaboration of Off-University, ‘Tough Questions about Peace,’ was an online conference held in October 2017. According to the data taken from their website, 10,000 active participants participated in the discussions (Off-University, 2018). The conference organizers have categorized the presentations under four different categories, and each academic has presented their critical peace discussions and research based on their own professional fields. The four categories include the following topics: the existence of the war, the possibilities of the peace, the necessity of the peace, and voices for peace. This conference’s importance can be understood in the attempt to socialize and advance the critical peace approach and highlighting the fact that the reason for the wars traces back to the societal power relations (Richmond, 2010). Furthermore, emphasizing the cruciality of peace education; it also indicates the academics’ determination not to give up what they have said in the declaration, that ‘they will not be a party to this crime.’ In this respect, we could argue that they establish social relationships on the exact place-discourse where the state has attempted to exploit the wealth and productivity, “impedes its expression, to silence it, to disembody it, to eliminate it and take away its properties” (Negri, 2007: 66).

To illustrate their collaborative learning process and the practice of making knowledge production a commoning activity, we can mention the research they have conducted on ‘mediums of online education.’ With this research, they asked the public to express their

opinions and experiences on the articles, books, videos, blogs, power-point presentations used during online education. This call aimed to bring different sources and education models together and discuss them with the individuals from different backgrounds and professions. Therefore, we can say that this research was inclusive because it aimed to aggregate a multitude of singularities to constitute an active and dynamic creation.

Another collaborative work project of Off-University's is called "Reflection Series". According to their own description of the reflection series, "it attends to and brings together different ways of understanding and generating knowledge – scholarly analyses, artistic expressions, activist practices, lived experiences, and testimonies. It aims to create a participatory and open-ended debate around diverse concepts" (Off-University, 2019). They hope to find alternative ways of thinking on the conception "off" and "invite the contributions that reflect on the off-condition from academic, literary, artistic, and activist perspectives in any format such as articles, essays, images, videos, and sounds" (Off-University, 2019). This work project started at the end of 2019, and an online exhibition took place in March 2020. Although this is a new project and we do not know if it will achieve persistence, we can consider the activity as an instituent practice as it yields to open up a space to contemplate and self-reflect on activist and critical ways of generating knowledge. I think this self-reflection series reflects the organization's attempt to reveal the cruciality of accumulating and generating knowledge by learning-by-doing, so to say it encourages the participants and public to contemplate on their own practices that they have gained and witnessed during and from the struggle. That is why it is fitting to say that this process fosters a "reciprocal growth" (Ciancio, 2018) where diversity of practices are connected, and ideas and political intersections are developed.

To summarize, it can be said that the general practices of Off-University are an example of militant research in the sense that they try "to generate a capacity for struggle to read itself" (Situaciones, 2003). In other words, the research that is being conducted within Off-University provides both a continuity on knowledge production and the research being made is self-reflective; focuses on creating a space of maneuver to intervene to the conventional hierarchical forms of knowledge production. In this respect, it provides the academics to reflect on their practices and struggle, and therefore, the process of knowledge production itself becomes a process of struggle for critical knowledge production.

4.1.3. TİHV Academy

TİHV Academy was established under the Human Rights Foundation of Turkey's roof, and it is a research, education, and advocacy community. TİHV, as an academic form [TİHV Academy], appeared during the Human rights foundation's first project (2017-2019) called "Supporting Academics as a Human Rights Actor in a Challenging Context" (Network, 2019). The project aimed at protecting and empowering the academics who have been dismissed from their job positions and suffered oppression. To achieve this end, the academy has published an open-source Human Rights Guide for the academics who have faced human rights violations; they have built an international solidarity network and have updated their website journals periodically to make the violations of rights visible. The second purpose of the project was catalyzing the academic work and increasing academics' participation to the struggle for human rights and for this aim, the academy has organized 15 seminars open to the public with a theme: 'thinking with the rights'; and they organized, with the non-governmental organizations, a 'Human Rights Education Programme.' The other purpose of the project was to increase human rights actors' potential through cooperation with academics. Lülüfer Körükmez, a Peace academician, who also has participated in this project, states that: This endeavor for documentation and the diligence of taking part in their own process allows them both being an actor and part in their own process and enables the academics to practice their own profession to an extent. Together with these workings, their academic identities are articulated with human rights advocate identity. They started working directly on the human rights field; they started practicing it first hand. These efforts unveiled a couple of things, as she suggests. They realized that teaching a subject, lecturing it, and conducting research are notably different from being a part of it. However, this difference, at the same time, has given them a chance to transform their own academic activities. Therefore, their pursuit of a perspective that could bring academia and activism together is still in progress. She emphasizes that this whole process has been nourishing even though it covers tensions and frustrations. It accommodates a capacious potential (Körükmez, 2020).

We should emphasize that the Human Rights Foundation of Turkey was founded by 32 human rights advocates in 1990. Its foundation is based on a quest that seeks to rehabilitate the people who exposed to torture following the coup that has taken place in 1980. In this respect, they conduct researches on areas such as rehabilitation studies, holding the subjects accountable for torture and violence, and advocacy. As we can see, together with the violation of rights towards the academics in Turkey, they have appeared as one of the prominent spaces and have managed

to articulate its own social accumulation with this resistance. In this respect, their program, and actions have been altered and rearranged and thus gave rise to the invention of new social relations and socialites. Moreover, beyond doubt, their own unique form on human rights advocacy has been reflected and become support within the resistance and mutual aid of the academics and continues to aid the academics in a way “to recapture the advances of their own social practices” (Situaciones, 2003) that has been accumulated over more extended period.

TÍHV Academy becomes prominent with collaborative work, and collective writings, and the issues resemble the intersectionality of diverse aspects and practices of human rights advocacy. They create a space for the civil actors to help them continue practicing their methods and strategies. On the other hand, it presents education programs. One of the programmes is devoted to the young researchers and academics and aims to encourage the mentioned group for academic knowledge production in the field of human rights. Through this programme, the academics within the scope of TÍHV Academy support the young researchers as supervisors and attempt to provide the conditions to bring the young researchers within the scope of the non-governmental organizations relevant to their projects. Other education programs are a series of seminars open to the public, human rights education programme for civil society workers, and an education module for the attorneys that aims to develop a human rights perspective within their own practice. To summarize, its practice divides into three aspects: research, education, and advocacy.

This collaborative work, and composition of multiple networks, from political and union activists to a variety of professions, has the potential to create different friendship networks and affinities which might be read as a ‘potential of the struggle,’ and “the process of constituting multiplicity” (Lazzarato, 2009). If we refer to Corsani, it would be useful here in order to understand the potentials of the collaborative work:

“The question of how to make the concept of the multitude ‘operative in the field’ can only find satisfactory answers by planting itself firmly in the analysis of the terrain on which the connections are in the process of being made, the possible connections that imply homogeneity but rather multiple assemblages – by ‘manufacturing intelligence of heterogeneous as heterogeneous, in which each term is an opportunity for others to experiment a bit differently with their positions’” (Corsani, 2006, para. 9).

I think that the biopolitical premise of this particular resistance appears here in a threefold direction: developing struggle that works for enhancing the awareness and consciousness about the exploitation through joint research; prefiguring a transversal capacity that gives the possibility to the construction of new political subjectification who has the power to build their own ideals that pursues to alter the institutions; and opening up an “injection of new beginnings in public” (Amsler, 2012) creates a “commons” and its inalienable nature on which we can build democracy (Negri, 2007).

4.1.4. Street Academy

Street Academy was established in December 2016 in Ankara, Turkey, and it was founded by two academics, Yasin Durak and Mehmet Mutlu. Durak states that the theoretical foundation of Street Academy derives from Samira Makhmalbaf’s movie, ‘Blackboards,’ in which teachers’ stories are being narrated who are walking from village to village with a blackboard on their backs and delivering lectures (Durak, 2020). Street Academy is a platform that circulates the knowledge and ideas in a public arena, mostly in streets and public parks, provides an environment for collaborative knowledge production, and makes the dismissals and state violence visible in the public’s eyes. Having the lectures in the parks, we can say, has this very first idea of a heterogeneous collaboration between different social classes and interests. It tells us that it is not enough to struggle for control over the means of production; it is equally important to struggle over the deconstruction of ideas and beliefs. In this respect, we can argue that Street Academy works to alter the public sphere’s conventional conceptions. Yasin Durak states that they had to meet with the students as their most potent political influence is on the students, and they had to find the formulas on how to continue the lectures with the students. The lecturers are mostly the academics who have been dismissed from their jobs, and the participants comprise of the peers, students, trade unionists, and activists. We can claim that it constructs itself upon the realization of the expression of political opinion and demands academic freedom all together by prioritizing solidarity.

Before the first lecture, Street Academy identified and introduced itself with the following sentences:

“We are the academics who are extorted from academia or who are targeted. We have been dismissed from our universities since we criticize the government’s oppressive

politics and practices. Those who are still active in the universities are trying to produce knowledge under the shadow of the government in power.

The universities in Turkey have been transformed into semi-custodial prisons. The domination over the students and academics is increasing day by day due to the paranoia of the government. Free thought and production of knowledge have been embanked through bureaucratic oppressions and terrorisations, investigations, punishments and dismissals.

While many students and academics were dismissed from the universities, the capital, police forces, and the gangs connected with the government were invited to the schools with the gilded invitation cards.

With The Council of Higher Education (YÖK) regulations, our lives have fallen apart; the university rectors and administrators emasculate the universities with the torpedo. They dismissed science from the universities in order to ingratiate themselves with the government. They stamped out the paintings and sculptures. They even got rid of the cats and birds from the campuses. They banned the students from entering the school with a musical instrument; they got rid of the songs.

We have an objection to the current situation! We, as dissident scholars, are protesting this systematic violence in our universities with our students.

Against those who eradicate science and life from our campuses; we are carrying academia in the middle of life, we are carrying it to the street. We will lecture the knowledge and the ideas that we produce for the people in the streets. We are starting the first course period of Street Academy” (Akademisi, 2016, my translation).

The first lecture of Street Academy was held on the 4th of December, 2016. This lecture’s topic was ‘Hegemony and Counter-Hegemony,’ and it was lectured by the founders of Street Academy, Yasin Durak and Mehmet Mutlu. The lecture was held in Kuğulu Park, one of the prominent public squares, in Ankara. After this time, Street Academy held 22 lectures in Ankara in various public spaces, mostly in public parks with political and historical importance.

The topics of the following lectures are as follows: ‘Conspiracy Theory: What is Conspiracy theory and what does it do?’, ‘Epic Intervention’, ‘Class and Identity’, ‘Pirate Lecture: What is İbiş?’; ‘Resisting with the Narratives’, ‘What is Class Struggle’, ‘Feminist Politics’, ‘The Crisis

of the Education'; 'Force, Consent, Constitution'; 'Lecture on Discrimination Against Children and Adults'; 'Football from the eyes of Crowds'; 'Media during the State of Emergency'; 'Prison and Science'; '*Mekan-kırım*'; 'Post-truth'; 'Anarcho-Syndicalism'; 'Secularism'; 'Understanding the Human through Literature and Cinema'; 'Violence against Women and the Law'; 'Prison and Resistance'; 'Tango during the State of Emergency'; 'Cult vs. Community'; 'Academic Purge and Students.' Together with these lectures, Street Academy also holds the following events and open lectures under a new establishment called "Biraradayız [We are Together]." This platform is a form of solidarity where the two alternative platforms converge: Street Academy and other organizations in Ankara. Under 'We Are Together,' two open lectures have been held: 'Suicides that can be prevented' and 'QUEER.' Other than these two lectures, movie screenings, various workshops, and meetings took place.

Street Academy records each lecture and shares them with the public through social media. The lectures' video format also contributes to the visibility of the struggle and consolidates the political activism by vocalizing it, broadcasting it, and visualizing it. This media circuit, which has been "designed with the aim of influencing the public sphere," might also revive "new segments of reference on the forms of knowledge and ways of conceptualizing the social situation" and can be perceived as "intellectual-analytical laboratories" (Nómada, 2008). It can be said that archiving is a crucial element of the activist-collective project of Street Academy.

Now, I would like to refer to the action repertoire of the Street Academy. I suggest that the action repertoire of Street Academy provide us examples where we can observe the intersectionality of political protest and knowledge production: confronting power relations through critical pedagogies. In Street Academy, a collective identity achieves itself partly with a guerilla repertoire and as well as with a 'merry opposition' technique. Key notions of the non-hegemonic subjectivity production within the practices of Street Academy may be creativity, self-engendering, aspiration, and conviviality. As Bora claims, the practice of 'merry opposition' became a current issue in Turkey's activist agenda, especially after the 1980s, for the leftists who consider an intellectual and practical renewal was necessary. The strategies aim to respond to the state's almighty attitude and point out a pursuit to realize the dissident's potential while constructing itself as emancipatory activities ensuring the learning process (Bora, 2010).

We need to highlight that Street Academy's aspiration to convey the knowledge to the public spaces goes hand in hand with the lectures' formats. For instance, the lecture, 'Prison and

Science’ took place in the garden of Sincan Prison, Ankara. This lecture was dedicated to Nuriye Gülmen, and Semih Özakça has been held on the 81st day of their hunger strike when Nuriye and Semih were under arrest in Sincan prison. In terms of the lecture’s topic and the space that it occurred, we can see that it is a combination of a political protest and knowledge production. As the narrator of the lecture indicates to the author of this thesis, “we can see a beautiful expression of the notions such as the actualization of the idea that knowledge can be produced in every single environment and social knowledge, in its entirety, is an ideological phenomenon”. At the same time, producing and spreading the knowledge in a place where the context of the lecture is associated with contextualizes this particular space in an unconventional manner. As Stavrides claims, “spatial arrangements interact with social experiences both by giving them concrete context and by supporting representations of those experiences” (Stavrides, 2018: 346); in this respect, we can claim that the practices of Street Academy by performing the space aim to transform an existing space and reproduce the meaning of that particular place.

Another lecture, which is called ‘*mekan-kırım*’; a notion that could be translated to English as ‘Urban-cide’ sheds light on the events that took place in the Kurdish region, in this respect; it can be evaluated as the continuation and persistence of what academics have said in the declaration ‘we will not be a party to this crime.’ The lecture brings up and evaluates the Turkish state’s actions in Kurdish geography regarding the relationship between the space and its usage as a field of sovereignty. It emphasizes that the Turkish state in the region, just as a regime of apartheid, deterritorialized the local people and forced them to immigrate to the bigger cities. Half of the lecture has been held in the Kurdish language, signifying that the topic is primarily concerning the Kurdish people, and education in mother tongue is a human right.

I posed the following question to the narrator of the above-mentioned lecture: ‘Did the publicity affect your lecture? Did the reason of your lecture (as solidarity and resistance) affect your lecture’?. I received the answer: “Although it is exciting to narrate a lecture, a problematic appertaining to the country’s agenda to the ordinary citizens; unavoidably you think of the other aspects. You ponder the forthcoming reactions; your mind is preoccupied if someone is going to interrupt the lecture, if someone is going to abuse you or even attack you. Police, for instance, were coming to space consistently, and they were taking photographs”. The following quotation reveals the risk factor of the publicity of the lecture: “It was certainly risky however we took the chance and we challenged the state with our discourse for what the state has done to us. In this respect I have not applied any kind of self-censorship; rather I propagandized my own

political tradition. I have given the lecture with a rosette of Nuriye and Semih on my chest in order to increase the awareness regarding the fact that they are in prison.”

The topic of the third lecture of Street Academy derives from Brecht’s notion “Aesthetic Distance” and is called “Epic Intervention”. Throughout the lecture, the narrator highlights that this notion can be adapted to every single social process and motivates the participants to contemplate on the recent political situations in Turkey, yet therewith she emphasizes that we need to comprehend the events fully and we need to interrupt, intervene in the processes. The lecture urges the participants that we should not identify ourselves with the recent situations; we should not fall for the stories; we should not believe in the heroes. The narrator encourages the participants by emphasizing that we can all intervene in the processes, and we should say we do not want to think with this mind and reason. Thus, in this context, it is relevant to say that the narrator uses personal parrhesia and describes the forms of biopolitical power. In this sense, she suggests and inspires the participants to make a self-criticism and appears as an authority, positioned in a stage, intending to affect their practices and their relationship with the world.

Lastly, I would like to mention the lecture called “Tango during the state of emergency.” This lecture-workshop reflects some dynamics precedent to convivial-merry opposition. The narrator of the lecture, speaking of Tango’s origins, mentions that Tango arises from the community festivals and is an integration of various local dances. He signifies that it arose as a response to the insulting attitude of the Argentinian bourgeoisie and then invites participants to the stage, introducing some of the figures. He motivates the participants to make the moves in the manner that they are fighting against the ground. He illustrates the relationship between the follower and leader regarding the idea that followers can change the leaders, and they can become the leaders. He puts that within the instantiation, present tense, past tense, and future tense are all connected to each other; we can observe an awareness, persistence in movement, and transformation within the couples’ accord.

As Holmes suggests, “intellectual work becomes intensive when it is unmoored from the normalizing framework; acted out as a social experiment” (Holmes, 2007: 41). What makes it intensive is its persistence in becoming an open source movement despite the state of emergency when the collective aggregation in public spaces was prohibited. It takes courage and examines the techniques applied by the state, and shares them with the public and reveals the system’s disguise. It can also be read as an open call to the public in which the academy

invites individuals to join their resistance, share ideas, create knowledge and a collective memory out of the struggle, and commonize solidarity. Therefore, it is an excellent example of confronting domination relations through critical pedagogies and transforming them into the aspects that defend life. At the same time, it aims to create an environment where individuals can turn into communities by attempting to establish an emotional bond between them.

As Dikeç highlights, space and spatial thinking have a paradoxical role in universalizing a struggle. He argues that the importance of the ‘space’ emerges when it is used as a medium to describe the territory of the struggle (over the enclosure) and when it becomes a tool to determine the ‘object of the struggle’ (the enemy) (Dikeç, 2016). Therefore, in the case of Street Academy, the usage of the public space makes the political action more visible and highlights that the activity of knowledge production can take place anywhere. Ranciere writes:

“Political activity is whatever shifts a body from the place assigned to it or changes a place’s destination. It makes visible what had no business being seen, and makes heard a discourse where once there was only place for noise; it makes understood discourse what was once only heard as noise” (Rancière, 1999: 30).

This collective subjectification occurs as autonomous and independent from the totalizing and individualizing aspects of hegemonic subjectification. It can give the individuals a chance to organize their lives in desired, consciously chosen ways. That would be the point that we could see a social transformation that brings about an abundance of the old hierarchies. As Fırat and Akçay highlight, aesthetical-political performances are crucial because they spring to life in the affective knowledge that is being produced during the performance and set the imagination free by creating new body-time-space commons. For them, this discussion is worth continuing to propound that imagination is a political faculty inherent to everyone (Fırat & Bakçay, 2012). As one of the interviewees puts:

“I have learned a lot after the dismissals from the activities of Street Academy and other alternative academies. I met many beautiful people and it made me proud that we were tarred with the same brush. It gave me the strength and I did not give up in the darkest days. We were breaking the institutional hierarchies and we felt more equal, we became friends. We have witnessed the fields of specialization of our friends who were expelled from the universities, we listened to them, we have obtained knowledge about their professions”.

4.2. Academic capitalism and Authoritarian Government in Turkey

As I have emphasized before, the neoliberal transformation of higher education in Turkey has started to go hand in hand with political conservatism and Islamism, especially after the 2000s, following the AKP regime. It can be argued that “the changes in Turkey’s educational apparatus have become traceable with reference to the political economy of Turkey and the social policy regime of Turkey” (Yücesan Özdemir & Özdemir, 2012: 15). However, it is essential to note that the process of the dependence of academia on the state has been accelerated, especially after the 1980s. It is safe to say that after the 1980s, the social transformation with the neoliberal economic policies and neoliberal governmentality has been observable, and we witness the applications of neoliberal mechanisms in the construction of society and almost every single sphere of life. The educational policies, and the universities specifically, also received their share from this totality.

The significance of the universities creating public values, grounding on public interest and as spaces where the culture of critique is developed was warped and the notion ‘public’ is now taken as a concept as the things that belong to the state (Hamzaçebi, Akçay, Kocagöz, & Adaman, 2015). The primary circumstances that led to such changes in Turkey are the 1980 Military Coup and the following foundation of the National Council of Higher Education (YÖK) in 1981. After the military coup in Turkey that took place on the 12th of September in 1980, the state of siege had dramatically affected every stage of the social and political life. Many institutions, associations, and foundations had been shut down, and new standardized and centralized institutions and organizations had emerged. The foundation of YÖK on the 6th of November in 1982 with the 2547 law number provided universities to be dependent on the political authorities. As a result of this, academic research was defined by the law as an activity that should take place with respect to the interests of national unity.

As Ersoy and Keskinok emphasize, the main aim of YÖK shape around regulating the universities under the tight control of the state and liquidating the public service sphere of the social state by opening it to the market. (Ersoy & Keskinok, 2011) The main reason for the introduction of YÖK was to dominate universities with more conservative policies and dismiss the leftist academics to protect and develop the nationalist-conservative ideology of the military regime. (Sarı & Sarı, 2014) After the foundation of YÖK, with the martial law no. 1402, 71 college employees were dismissed from their jobs in 1983 who were considered ‘problematic’ for the military regime, and 4891 public personnel were unseated.

When we look at the transformation of universities under the AKP rule, so to say after 2002, we can observe two phases. 2002-2011 period is more characterized by the introduction and enhancement of neoliberal policies. The period starting from 2011 and onwards indicates a consolidation of conservative and religious amendments that influence all structures of education. The market-oriented approach to education has been inserted in the Ministry of National Education's official documents and educational policies such as 'quality,' 'product,' 'marketing,' and 'customer' (İnal, 2012). İnal analyses the usage of language of economics within educational apparatus with respect to the prominent 'performance system' in which "efficiency and effectiveness in education are solely based on the performance of teachers and students" (ibid.: 21). He contends that this performance system is "multi-dimensional, from the employing of staff to training and development activities, to career planning, to an incentive system based on rewards and encouragement" (ibid.: 21). He further elaborates that the AKP has gained its support from the mentioned policies by introducing them as student-centered pedagogy as the necessary functions, which will result in an increased role of the students. The increased number of profession-oriented universities and vocational schools have also brought about the "delivery of standardized, vocation-oriented modules compatible with labor market expectations" (Önal, 2012: 129). According to Önal, this point reveals the transformation of the educational system with respect to an open adherence to the bourgeoisie's labor needs and in turn transforms the academic staff into "putative experts in standardized quantitative methods of performance" (Levidow 2002, quoted in Önal, 2012: 129).

As a significant feature of the intertwinement of neoliberal and conservative aims of the AKP government, we should mention the increase in the number of private universities. Birler claims that "the most influential policy change that eased the establishment of private universities occurred in 2008, whereby the prerequisite of founding a faculty of sciences or humanities was eliminated" (Birler, 2012: 146). Accordingly, "26 private universities were established in less than four years" (ibid.: 147), and the effects of this increase are visible in the university administrations. As she highlights, "external funding agencies began to be a major source for research projects, and this paved the way for both the internalization of research funds and the intensification of market-oriented project agendas" (ibid.: 147). With the increased number of private universities, we see the commodification of the higher education system, and maybe even more importantly, the increasing role of the private universities as a contributor to the agenda of political conservatism and Islamism of AKP hegemony. Birler contends that this role of private universities comes from Islamic foundations' growing involvement in the private

higher education system. She highlights that “since 2000, while the composition of the board of trustees has remained mainly intact, the most visible change has occurred with the introduction of private universities with Islamic foundations” (ibid.: 147). As a result of this, we can say that political Islam holds its organizational activities within universities, and this contributes to the goal of the ruling party in terms of raising an Islamic youth in Turkey.

After the Justice and Development Party came into power in 2002, the number of universities in total has increased from 66 to 183, and the number of academicians have increased from 66.000 to 180.000, and the number of the students have increased from 1.223.000 to 7.000.000 (Odman, 2018). Most of the newly established universities have been founded by separating the existing universities’ vocational schools of higher education in the neighboring provinces with limited sources (Sözeri, 2018). According to research conducted by Sultan Kavili Arap, the practices of establishing new universities since the 1970s in Turkey are mainly related to the issue of ‘political gain,’ and the new establishments are taken with their contribution to the local economy (Arap, 2010). Dörtlemez emphasizes that the policy of AKP government “1 university to every province” is not determined in terms of the necessities of the province but rather the aim is to construct universities under the sovereignty of a particular ideology and to provide a political consolidation through academic and administrative staffing (Dörtlemez, 1995).

Didem Doğan analyses the legal amendments within the higher education institutions in Turkey after 2006 in terms of the establishment’s political and economic reasons. She supports Dörtlemez’s determination about the political reasons of the establishments. She argues that the quantitative increase in the universities results from mentioned political reasons leads to a comedown in the country. In this research, she reveals the problems of the academics that are working in the new universities established after 2006 in terms of academic precarization. According to the findings of the research, the problems of the instructors in general alongside with education and administrative problems are the inadequacy of the research and projects supports; scientific problems, problems related with bureaucracy, economic problems, administrative problems, and the fact that academic publications are being made to gain a title (Doğan, 2013). We can say that this performance system and performativity brought about more rigidity in the educational sphere, especially in terms of the academic research and academics’ relation to their research. This system stands out as a factor that eliminates the content and the value of research because each project is now being evaluated in terms of its ‘utility,’ especially for the market and industry. Therefore, it is not wrong to argue that after AKP came to power,

we are witnessing the birth of a new ‘sector’ which is not capable of measuring the contextual quality of scientific production and which prioritizes the ‘performance’ system; where the scientific production is made for the industry and market. Accordingly, we came to witness a period of the rise of business manager-academician figures (Odman, 2018).

4.3. Solidarity Practices within and for Academics for Peace

The fact that power relations infuse in all areas in our lives, so does solidarity; therefore, like power, solidarity is not present solely within a particular area. As the AfP community is not only concerned with commoning the knowledge production, but it also advocates human rights, the collective solidarity examples we are going to analyze are multiple. When we look at the solidarity practices of alternative academics and solidarity practices of the AfP, we can illustrate these based on two veins. The first vein is the solidarity that has been shown to the AfP and Solidarity Academies, and the second one is inner solidarity practices of the AfP and solidarity academics. The first form of solidarity practices I will mention here comprises the outer circle such as activists, unions, non-governmental organizations, media organizations, and students. This category is slightly external to our phenomenon yet can give us clues on building up a line of thought that solidarity and reappropriation attempts might lead to a construction of “‘relational politics’; strategies of political intersection that challenge the spaces at the ‘intersection of oppressions’” (Corsani, 2006, para. 9).

When we look at the solidarity practices in Turkey for the AfP, we see the students and student organizations. According to Bianet media, 137 student groups have launched a campaign titled ‘University students desire peace’ and publicly shared their contact addresses for those who want to join the campaign (University Students Desire Peace, 2016)

From the intellectual and activist sphere, various working groups have supported the declaration, and they became the signatories to the mentioned petition by publicly announcing it in front of İstanbul Çağlayan Courthouse (Desk, 2016d).

Within the first ten days after the declaration became public, 611 academics who have not previously signed the petition announced their involvement in the struggle by signing the petition (Desk, 2016c).

A group of academics who were previously dismissed from their jobs after the foundation of YÖK in 1984 has also shown their solidarity with the *We will not be a party to this crime*

declaration. They have signed the petition called “we declare that we stand with the academics calling for peace” (Desk, 2016b). Institutions, organizations, and the unions who have showed their solidarity with criminalized academics include but not limited to Education and Science Workers’ Union (EğitimSen), Health Workers’ Union (SES), the Labor and Democracy Powers, The Confederation of Public Laborers’ Unions (KESK), Human Rights Association (İHD), Civil Rights Defenders, Truth, Justice and Memory Center, Reporters without Borders, Amnesty International, Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (TMMOB), Turkish Medical Association (TTB), History Foundation, Türk Psikologlar Derneği, Toplumdal Dayanışma için Psikologlar Derneği (TODAP), and prominent LGBTI association in Turkey, KAOS GL.

Also, cultural workers from different professions and the fields of human rights advocacy created umbrella organizations in order to defend peace and freedom of expression and show their solidarity with the Academics for Peace. Among these, we see Theater Workers for Peace; Litterateurs for Peace; The Initiative of Writers for Peace; Photography Artists who demand peace; Publishers for Peace; Feminists for Peace. There are also support from journalists, legists, and film-makers.

Peace Bloc, an organization that came together in 2015 with the call of Peoples’ Democratic Congress (HDK) to defend peace in Syria has also addressed their concerns regarding the Academics for Peace and highlighted that they reject the restriction on freedom of thought (Desk, 2016a). Peace Bloc is known for its diverse structure composed of many political party members (such as Peoples’ Democratic Party [HDP], and Republican People’s Party [CHP]), also many leftist organizations, institutions and civil society organizations.

When we look at the international forms of solidarity, we see a petition called “call for targeted academic boycott of Turkey” formed by Academics for Peace – UK, France, Germany, Switzerland, and North America (Academic Boycott of Turkey, 2017). Other organizations and institutions that supported the struggle with solidarity declarations and public texts include but not limited to Scholars at Risk, New University in Exile Consortium, The New School for Social Research, The American Psychological Association, Committee of Concerned Scientists, International Consortium of Critical Theory Programs, International Association of Women’s Museum, Middle East Studies Association.

Also, many academics from abroad “have reported themselves to the Attorney General's Office in Ankara” (Chomsky, 2019). And “30 Nobel prize winners have signatures on the declaration issued by the International Human Rights Network of Academies and Scholarly Societies supporting academics in Turkey” (Desk, 2016e). Blog of the APA has produced a text highlighting the “seven ways you can support academics in Turkey”. The text has been written out by Chad Kautzer have also the characteristics of the forms of solidarity that has been shown throughout the whole time; solidarity in the form of hosting/hiring an academic currently at risk in Turkey; motivating the institutions to become a part of Scholars at-risk network and “supporting their work through annual membership dues”; reviewing joint research projects, grants to “be used as leverage to pressure institutions in Turkey to respect academic freedom”; organizing “political actions and lobbying campaigns directed at Turkish officials”; staying connected with the others on individual and organizational level who care about this issue; asking institutions to “publish a statement supporting academics in Turkey” and addressing it to officials in Turkey and in the government the institution belongs to; signing petitions and open letters (Kautzer, 2016).

As an example of the internal solidarity practices, firstly, we need to mention the Academics for Peace Solidarity Group and the website that has been composed in order to inform the public about the solidarity activities of signatories of the Peace declaration. This website functions as a digital platform that shows and categorizes the latest news on the issue, declares announcements regarding the developments on the lawsuits and indictments, publishes the reports of the recent collaborative works of the academics regarding the processes such as comprehensive summaries of dismissals, the history of academics for peace and also publishes the academics for peace solidarity reports and pieces the solidarity activities and events together. This digital platform is crucial as it makes the struggle process more coordinated, and it stands as an archive and documentation of the processes, practices while seeking the truth. Therefore, it can be regarded as a digital platform where the documentation of memory is being kept.

Another solidarity group is called Academics for Peace Lawsuit Coordination is a component of Academics for Peace Solidarity Group, and its efforts mainly concentrate on the lawsuit processes. According to a report published by TİHV Academy, the coordination is conducting an effort that annihilates the isolation and works to reinforce solidarity and togetherness during the course of trials. It records the violation of rights towards the AfP and transfers them to the future generations; compiles reports that reveal the signs of progress and knowledge of cases

(Network, 2019). One academic, Demir, from the committee, emphasizes that the Coordination records the time and sessions of the lawsuits for the people who would like to attend and show solidarity so that they know where and when to go. He says that they meet with the international and national observers, journalists, and academics before each session and inform them about the processes and help with the translations. He adds that they also prepare the press release in the context of the week's agenda and release instant information from hearing rooms on their Twitter address. Another committee member and academic, Odman, on lawsuit processes and litigation, argues that documentation of collective memory and chronicle is already one of the practices inherent to their professional identities, and they apply and practice this in this situation that they are encountering with as well. She signifies that the declaration was also documentation in this respect declaring that human rights violation exists, has existed and that they do not want this anymore. Seeing that the state is attempting to divide us, she adds, making us feel alone, abnormal, perpetrator and betrayer; this solidarity we are building here is our response (Demir, Aık, Odman, & Dikbař, 2018). Odman analyzes this process during a webinar series that has been organized by the AfP, the process in which the AfP pursues a lawsuit, the solidarity they show during, before, and after the trials and, the manner that they follow the trials as a process of articulation, in the sense that production of meanings. She recognizes that:

“This whole process has been a way to understand, evaluate, and interpret the AfP's own position both as a group and the individuals belonging to the group. It is a process of interpretation as it is a different experience than conducting research or delivering a lecture: it resembles the determination of the AfP to establish a voice also beyond the borders of academia. It is also an interpretation of the discourse the government is pursuing, the strategy of the government which inclines to label each dissident as a terrorist, and it is an interpretation of that discourse and strategy, a struggle against it. In this sense, we have been able to mirror the relationship between unjust treatments and social benefits. We have ensured that other unjust treatments from other spheres are heard too” (Odman, 2020, my translation).

We can argue that the collective dynamism of the AfP has been aiming to reproduce the voice of the other struggles with the power of coordination and solidarity, and this mostly results from the considerable amount of time they spent in the courthouses. They came together with the other groups of people during the time in the courthouses who have faced different violations of rights, watched and followed the trials, and attempted to intertwine the knowledge of their

own struggle with other violations of rights incidents and other resistances. Their taking over other struggles' voices and getting involved with them reveals the activist truth of the AfP. The constituent will and the practices that highlight the urgency and need for documentation of memory, making a resistance out of the trials, manifest itself in other struggles and emphasizing the “‘nowness’” of immediate action” (Amsler, 2012). As an example of these forms of solidarity, we see a solidarity event of the AfP group that took place in İstanbul, Kadıköy, Kalkedon Square. It occurred as support of the AfP group to one academic and one teacher, Nuriye Gülmen and Semih Özakça, that have been discharged from their jobs for other reasons than being a signatory of the Peace declaration and went on indefinite hunger strike as a result. The solidarity act of some members of the AfP group has started as a rotational and temporary hunger strike implying that “we are taking over your resistance”. A public announcement has been made on the square. The notice started with the words, “we are side with life, not with death” and in this respect shows their attitude on the defense of life. This notice has been given to three fractions: to the state, to the public, and to Nuriye and Semih, and has become the voice of unjust statutory decrees and, most importantly, has called for Nuriye and Semih to end their hunger strike (Desk, 2017).

As Amsler underlines, “crisis occupies a central role in the history of critical thought and politics because it is regarded as an intellectually and affectively motivating force” (Kompridis 2006; Stahler 2008, quoted in Amsler, 2012: 14). Resistance and solidarity occur during the times of uncertainty as well, and when we start to think about how to transform this uncertainty to the alternatives with our resources. Production of the commons also goes hand in hand with the times of crisis; they are also generally developed “at the point of division within the struggling body precisely because it is a proactive creation to resist the division of the social body” (De Angelis, 2007: 239). Our resources, when all the other means of production have been taken away from our hands, consist of self-adapting values that are based on commoning practices: such as self-governance, self-organization, and the acts of solidarity in which the new meanings can emerge. These self-adapting notions enable us to “experience ruptures as moments of possibility rather than merely as threats to our existence”, and they, therefore, become our tools in which “we distance ourselves to the dominant sources of meaning” (Amsler, 2012: 14). Therefore, these alternatives we re-organize within a collective consciousness now become the means of our survival. These means of survival, our labor, and the acts of solidarity within the process of production of meanings are also vital as they reveal the opportunities. As long as we maintain to grasp these uncertain times of crisis and rupture as

times of opportunities within an aggressive system, we might turn these values and our own labor against the system. Thus, I suggest that the values we invent through solidarity practices provide us with the means of survival, but most importantly, they propound the “opportunities”. An academic, from the AfP group, for instance, even says “thank you” in her plea. She says that “I can even say thank you to this situation we are encountering, I can almost recommend it! It is a precious experience witnessing and being part of the solidarity which has become multi-dimensional” (Akbal, 2018).

We should recognize the most important feature of the concept of solidarity in the phenomenon we observe. I think both the solidarity practices AfP produces within itself, and the external practices, whether in the form of a political declaration, a press conference, or a petition campaign; the fundamental importance is beyond revealing us a sentimental communion uniting around unjust treatments or similar concerns. I suggest that we can view and analyze these (solidarity) practices as a production: biopolitical production of social relationships and political subjectivities. These forms of solidarity can be understood as a reaction to the bio-power that infuses within the individual bodies through politics of war and ‘security.’ Accordingly, these practices can also be evaluated as labor, immaterial labor that ponders and contemplates how to succeed and achieve a collective better life. The immaterial nature of solidarity production implies an increasing potential for political self-organization (Lemmens, 2017), as it consists of “the labor of the general intellect, and liberates itself from the relations of subjection” (ibid.). As it is based on communicating and exchanging knowledge, we can describe the solidarity practices as a production that brings about an endeavor to appropriate labor instruments. Only by examining these collective labor processes “where the conditions of labor produce opportunities for understanding what it means to work in common but also to produce commons” (Angelis & Stavrides, 2010), we can grasp the ideas and affectivities of the knowledge produced through the solidarity acts, and we can be able to read the ‘knowledge of the resistance.’ The knowledge of resistance, when we think about the internal and external solidarity practices, points out to a social knowledge economy. Each individual, group, organization, union by showing solidarity with the AfP and solidarity academics achieve these practices in pursuit of a good living. Each contributes to the struggle with the knowledge that has been accumulated over the years of struggle and helps to the cultivation of a culture of cooperation for the advancement of social aims.

We can suggest that the practices of collective solidarity within our phenomenon provide the framework of a political intervention that sustains its existence and values through the social

criticism, parrhesia, “reappropriation” as a “clear example of the idea of recovering something you have lost” (Diaz, 2018a: 255), and self-organization. These practices are the constituent factors of the solidarity practices, and we can suggest that these practices present the “transversality” of the struggle as an analytic method that cuts across multiple fields (Guattari & Genosko, 1996). As Guattari puts it, transversal practice “sought to make discernable a domain that was neither that of institutional therapy, nor institutional pedagogy, nor of the struggle for social emancipation, but which invoked an analytic method that could traverse these multiple fields” (Guattari & Genosko, 1996: 121). I think the solidarity as a biopolitical production in our case, which takes place with the implementation of mentioned practices, reveals a transversal struggle’s characteristics. As Kanngieser interprets what Kelly says on transversality, [transversality] is also linked to notions of production as it produces subjectivities and “self-engendering practices that seek to create their own signifiers and systems of value” (quoted in Kanngieser, 2011: 129). The resemblance of solidarity within the AfP also occurs as an attempt that nestles multiple fields rather than reaching a final destination. It is an intervention to the cracks within the system, and that is why it can be evaluated as a biopolitical production.

The recomposition of intellectual and immaterial labor develops itself in a network and creates “a system of communication in which values of cooperation in the full sense, both productive and political are formed” (Negri, 2007: 67). Corporeally, this combination and collaboration represent itself in the engagement of academia and activism. Solidarity, while enabling ‘a new politics in the making’ and trying “to guarantee forms of networks for the future democracy” (Negri, 2007: 67), provides us the potentialities of academic activism. The primary motivation of the production of solidarity, we can say, is twofold: obtaining academic freedom through building a culture of cooperation and providing forms of networks for future democracy.

All in all, we can argue that solidarity is the constituent and unifying factor of the struggle of the AfP. Through the acts of solidarity, we witness the increased visibility on the violation of rights in Turkey; we understand the essentiality of documentation of human rights violence and collective memory, we see the rise of the new forms of friendships and how it has become an essential motivation for the AfP. In this respect, it appears as an intervention towards the knowledge that Turkey’s authoritarian state has imposed upon society.

4.4. Academics for Peace (and solidarity academics) as Parrhesiastes

As emphasized before, the declaration itself is a refusal of the war, and it calls for peace. It is a response towards the government's ongoing violent actions, and it carries an apprehension and worry, which amounts to a defense of life. It tells the truth, a truth that needs the courage to be told loudly since there is a risk factor. The individuals who are declaring the truth take a risk as they made the interlocutor angry and did not refrain from further developing the truth. The act of telling the truth, here, takes place as a duty. If we seek to consider the declaration as a scholarly production, it can be assessed as a convergence between academic freedom and freedom of speech in general. Its occurrence is public and collective; therefore it is safe to claim that it can be understood as an act of collective parrhesia. I think we can claim that the practice of parrhesia meets, in some way, in the terrain of an evaluation of emancipation. I think situating the AfP as collective parrhesiastes in a place where the care of the self meets with care for the others come into existence in an emancipation process where we can define "community": "an open political process, through which the meaning and the forms of living together are questioned and potentially transformed" (Stavrides, 2016: 32). To the extent that our understanding of community refers to a "domain of relational modes, the domain of how free individuals who are self-aware as being part of the social body in which they are also related each other, articulate their co-production" (De Angelis, 2007: 242), we can see the cruciality of co-creation, collaborative defense, developing the methods solidaristically within a self-organized collaboration. I think that the AfP has initiated the first step in building a community and has endeavored to find the answers to the question: "how are we going to build our lives after this point?". This fundamental question has enabled the construction of various relationships within the subjects that are enclosed under the authoritarian rule in Turkey and the AfP as a powerful civil society group managed to enrich the meaning of the declaration and stratify the "truth" with various actors from the legal, union, professional and human rights sphere. This experience contributes to our understanding on the intersectionality of politics-education and academy-activism.

Foucault relates parrhesia to freedom and duty. He claims that "in parrhesia, telling the truth is regarded as a duty" (Foucault, 2001: 19). However, he highlights that this duty should not occur to yield to a parrhesiastic utterance under force. He argues, for instance, "a criminal who is forced by his judges to confess his crime does not use parrhesia" (ibid.: 19). To perform a parrhesiastic act, the orator should speak voluntarily, "out of a sense of moral obligation" (ibid.: 19), he underlines. That is why this point relates to what I have mentioned before, "parrhesia is

a verbal activity in which a speaker expresses his personal relationship to truth, and risks his life because he recognizes truth-telling as a duty to improve or help other people (as well as himself)” (Foucault, 2001: 19). When we look at the accusation against the AfP and the lawsuits, we see that it comprises ‘responsibility’ and ‘duty’ of academicians about how they should write or speak. So to say, it imposes academicians a mission because of their academic status. In the accusation, we see this passage: “Due to the particular role of the academics as scientists, the academics, in particular, should be careful about the criticisms they are conducting towards the state”. The accusation brings forward the idea that the academics should have a discourse that pays attention to the Republic’s dignity, pride, and reputation. The accusation claims that academics have a different responsibility when it comes to freedom of speech. The general idea of freedom of speech, which was designed by the law, is somehow different from the other citizens’ rights. The AfP opposes such a perspective that positions themselves as citizens who should have rather limited freedom of speech, and they insistently depict that academics have a responsibility, a duty to address the problems in society and reveal them publicly. The coordination within the AfP during the lawsuits, the written manifestos that defend themselves in the courts, archiving and activist journalism show that they have shown practices towards the trials and accusations in which they discuss the academic freedom, the ‘responsibility’ that is imposed on the academics, and freedom of speech in general. Therefore, we can claim that the later practices have followed what they have initially highlighted: the construction of peace and academic freedom and propagating the knowledge that has been gained during the trials. We can say that the main motivation of the AfP, with these practices, consists on revealing their perspective on the duty of the academics, the duty of confronting the state with its violent policies and spreading the ‘truth.’

As I have already suggested, solidarity academies, as an inseparable part of the AfP, carried out the truth that has been revealed by the declaration and multiplied it, managed to apply it as an intensifier within their general practices. In other words, they became the intensifier of the truth and carried this out with the critical knowledge production-pedagogy. By doing so, they revealed, interrogated, and enriched the meaning of academia in Turkey, being an academic and student, by focusing on the practices that aim to contribute to peace and achieve a public good. The discussions that have been held within solidarity academies that contemplates on alternative academy, what kind of academia do we want?, critical pedagogy, and self-reflective practices, we can say, contributes to the creation of new relationships and forms of thoughts and in a way ‘intervenes’ to the conventional-old methods of education. I think that the main

role of the solidarity academies in which we can contemplate them as continuation of truth-telling practices is their work towards ‘democratization of memory.’ The prominent characteristics of Solidarity Academies in Turkey that are associated with the democratization of memory mostly lie on the solidarity practices, revealing the experiences publicly of the people who have been faced with a violation of rights and showing the motives of perpetrators. These attempts, truth-telling practices, contribute to the emancipation of the people who have faced violation of rights, on the one hand, and they are important to establish a democratic, human-rights-centric discourse in the society, on the other. Therefore, we can say that the motivation of solidarity academies with truth-telling practices, revealing the truth, making it more accessible, is associated with the ideal “what kind of world do we want to live in?”. Therefore, these efforts can be named as the democratization of memory as opposed to government’s memory engineering techniques.

Another critical aspect of the truth-telling practices within solidarity academies is that they test the theory and practice of “peace” and show us how the theory affects the practices, and vice versa. We can argue that they reveal to us that the road to peace is a road of struggle, and this road can be enriched through critical pedagogies as critical pedagogies are capable of displaying the social power relations, so to say they can reveal the origins of the conflicts. Therefore, we should highlight one of the crucial aspects of the AfP and solidarity academies here: their endeavor to include the large fractions of society in the process of construction of peace, their attempt to introduce “peace education” and “peace language” in the society, their motivation to inject “peace education” within the institutional education policies, and memory activism. These are essential points as one of the conditions to establish long-term peace can be achieved through locally produced, decolonized, and accessible knowledge.

They carry out a potential that shows that the relationship that we build with our own labor can be different from the authoritarian forms they try to impose upon us, and that there is always hope when there is solidarity and a struggle for reappropriation. Solidarity academies, as maneuver spaces that “encourage to differences to meet and to create grounds of mutual awareness” (Stavrides, 2016: 41); and create “forms of social relations through which collective subjects of commoning are being shaped” (Stavrides, 2016: 49). As I have emphasized, solidarity academies have the potential to achieve these mentioned ends as they provide a bearing surface, a space for maneuver both for the commoner subjectivities and for the ones who would like to contribute to the production of critical knowledge and politics. I think that their volition of creation constitutes a question based on ‘how to combine all the elements in

our repertoire during a struggle'? This volition reminds me of what Harvey says in *Spaces of Hope*: "If capitalism cannot survive without deploying all of the repertoire in some way, then the task [for socialism] must be to find a different combination of all the elements within the basic repertoire" (Harvey, 2000: 211).

These points that I have mentioned address the anticipated positive effects of parrhesiastic truth, the "importance of having parrhesiastes" (Foucault, 2001: 172) for the individuals and the society. I think that the parrhesiastic truth that has been developed by the AfP and solidarity academies differ from the conventional forms of political critique. The main difference can be observed through the application of self-reflective knowledge, namely the knowledge that has been gained and produced throughout the struggle, in wider contexts, in everyday life, and in the ways of the usage of this knowledge to affect the institutional bodies. This truth differentiates from the conventional forms of political critique because it constructs a robust base for communication and cooperation and creates tools for new ways of acting and thinking that aims to lead to a transformation in social consciousness. More importantly, through this struggle, we have seen that truth-telling practices that take place within the moment of labor alienation might lead to the creation of necessary conditions for a resistance which focuses and struggles for the real meaning of academia, and knowledge production which should be generated for the benefit and emancipation of the society. Therefore, solidarity academies contemplate on creating "forms of collective struggle that match collective emancipatory aims, forms that can also show us what is worthy of dreaming about an emancipated future" (Angelis & Stavrides, 2010). This can be achieved by "reclaiming human capacities from direct capitalist exploitation and restoring communication as the ground of human community, meaning that by restoring the potentiality inherent to those capacities" (Stavrides, 2018: 348).

As Foucault says, "parrhesiastic practices imply a complex set of connections between the self and truth" (Foucault, 2001: 107) and that we should "use political practice as an intensifier of thought and analysis as a multiplier of the forms and domains for the intervention of political action" (Foucault, 1983). Therefore, I think if we can be persistent about maintaining critical knowledge production, we can multiply our interventions to reproduce our lives in spite of all the difficulties, and we can invent profound relationships and culture. This beautiful formation of life, I think, is a matter of resistance that requires solidarity, reciprocity and truth-telling. And the care for self "implies complex relationships with others insofar as this ethos of freedom is also a way of caring for others" (Foucault, 1997: 287). Foucault concludes that "the care of the self also implies a relationship with the other insofar as a proper care of the self requires

listening to the lessons of the master. One needs a guide, a counselor, a friend, someone who will be truthful with you” (ibid.: 287).

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

I suggest that solidarity academies provide instituent practices; "practices that conduct social criticism; practices that do not distance themselves to institutions; practices that are self-critical; practices that do not cling on their fixation on institutions and the institution, their own being-institution" (Raunig, 2009b: 10-11); and they exercise the forms of parrhesia and critique, and therefore they open up new spaces for empowerment and mutual collaboration. The potential of Solidarity Academies on expanding the framework of the politics of knowledge derives from the commoning practices. As an example of their commoning repertoire, we can refer to non-hierarchical modes of engagement, participatory learning process, coordination, learning-by-doing, fellowship, and reciprocity. These dynamics, while being reinvented within the solidarity academies and constructing a space for critical knowledge production, also establish the base of the desired academia. Therefore, they can be evaluated as forms of practices that try to reflect on the conventional academia in Turkey. In this respect, they are prefigurative, as they intend to form the transformation of the conventional academia in the present, outside the (institutional) academia. This attempt of transforming does not consist of arbitrariness; rather, it is a matter of "forming collective agencies of enunciation that match the new subjectivity, in such a way that desires its own mutation" (Deleuze & Guattari 1984, quoted in Lazzarato, 2009b: 163). Therefore, what we see through the Solidarity Academies is that if we have forms of collective reproduction based on a defense of life, we can reach the founding elements of emancipation and care for each other.

The transversal quality of solidarity academies challenges the borders of performance-based, marketized, highly hierarchical academia by linking a variety of instituting events such as activism, parrhesia, and solidarity. At the same time, they reflect on the problems of the institutions and state apparatuses in general, and in a sense, they attempt to construct a non-state public sphere in which differences are encouraged, and mutual awareness is prioritized. In this respect, it is safe to suggest that they are "social artifices" where people experience an exceptional collective experience [communitas] in which they forget about the differentiations, ignore them, omit them, and challenge them (Stavrides, 2016). In this sense, the alternative methods of knowledge production are determined while the new connections are being made, so to say, with the actors from various struggles. Of course, this does not mean that solidarity

academies achieved to find itself a terrain that consists of ‘multitudes’ or they succeeded to include all the precarized figures in the society who contribute to societal production in their struggle or they managed to become a space where we can see all the intersections of oppressions in the Turkish society. And this does not mean that we can perceive them as the spaces where an abrupt and fundamental transformation takes place. Rather, I suggest that we need to approach solidarity academies as a phenomena of a transformation process, especially in terms of the application and socialization of the principles of critical pedagogies; in which collaborative and creative knowledge production takes place. Therefore we need to draw attention to the ‘potentialities’ of solidarity academies that aim to create friendship networks, incorporate networks of different political and union activists into their structures.

In light of this information, I suggest that we evaluate the solidarity academies as ‘threshold’ spaces. They pave the way for encounters and they create a ground for the people to get to know each other, and learn from each other. They aim to generate such politics that lead to a collective reproduction. They commonize knowledge production and solidarity, making it more accessible for people to reach knowledge. They contribute to the critical knowledge production, and they put it into practice in the communal living with its subjects. They have the competence to understand the other struggles, learn from them, and translate their knowledge to their own struggle. They vocalize the other struggles, make them more visible, spread solidarity, and that is why they appear as spaces of hope in which people can restore their hope towards their life and labor. In this respect, solidarity academies are our commons; threshold spaces and breathing spaces function as defense and counter-attack lines.

We have seen through this local experience; precarity and vulnerability “as a point of articulation” and as “a negative moment of insubordination” (Diaz & Gielen, 2018b), in a collective experience might yield to emerging subjectivities of commoning where people give a new sense to their experiences and lives. Therefore, it is important to disseminate the point of articulation and production of new meanings that solidarity academies build during this course of time as a transformative and political power towards the authoritarian forms. In this respect, it is crucial to interpret the achievements that we have learned from the politics of commons and solidarity. The practices of commoning within the solidarity academies revealed to us that we can grasp the strategic character of the neoliberal politics towards our life with the politics of commons. Therefore, the subjects of the commoning should be conscious of this power and potential and generate a politics in which we accept this neoliberal and conservative mind and transform it. If we are aware of this mind, we can well analyze the reasons for these multiple

interventions towards our lives, and we can develop counter-politics. Transformative actions can occur when the social movements from different categories can discover the intersectionalities between each other and translate them into their own maneuver spaces. By discovering and revealing the intersectionalities, new cooperation can take place. As Angelis suggests, one of the reasons why it is critical to become aware of the commoning practices is: “they make it possible to raise debates not only about the aims of the different concrete struggles but especially how to articulate these aims across different issues and subjects” (Angelis, 2003: 1-2). Therefore, the wealth that has been produced throughout this struggle is something to be aware of and should be valued at the center of organizing the collective reappropriation. (Federici, 2018).

If the other struggles intersect and articulate, share the knowledge and experiences we can discern the opportunities and problems. Therefore, the principle of relationality should be highlighted as this notion can channel the cooperation of different and even opposite political realities. As Firat and Akçay argue, the publicity generated through relationality not only makes the marginalized problems visible and aggregate the concerned people but also give room to a new political sphere that works for finding alternatives via socio-spatial and affective practices (Firat & Bakçay, 2012). They argue that such reproduction can be possible through encounters that strive to overcome and extend the borders of public opposition and defeat the identities that these borders impose upon us. I think threshold spaces have the potential to generate this relationality by increasing the encounters and these encounters could activate the “linkages between critique, hope, and social transformation into life” (Amsler, 2012). Solidarity academies, cultivating our understanding of the ‘commons’ and ‘commoning practices by “bringing critical theory, critical pedagogy, and critical-political practice into conversation with one another” (Amsler, 2012), are notable examples of “threshold” spaces.

All in all, the experience of solidarity academies revealed that non-hegemonic and critical knowledge can be reproduced in its “moment of alienation” (Hall, 2018). To have the reverberations of this experience within other struggles, commoning the critical knowledge that is co-produced is highly crucial. The spatiality that the critical pedagogies generated, by enabling a surface, a ground, a threshold, creates the conditions for the emergence of commoning subjectivities. To the degree that these emerging subjectification, emancipation, and commoning practices experienced and generated within the solidarity academies affect the outside, we can talk about the articulation of struggles and even the socialization of the principles of ‘commons.’

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academics for Peace. (2017, February 11). *Rights Violations Against Academics for Peace*. Retrieved from Academics for Peace: <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/314>. Accessed March 20, 2020.

Academies, S. (2018, May). *Who Are We?* Retrieved from Solidarity Academies: <https://dayanismaakademileri.org>. Accessed June 4, 2018.

Academic Boycott of Turkey. (2017, June). *Call For Targeted Academic Boycott of Turkey*. Retrieved from Academic Boycott of Turkey: <https://academicboycottofturkey.wordpress.com/>. Accessed March 25, 2020.

Agmon, I. (2019). *On the Civil Struggle of Academics in Turkey: the Peace Petition Signers*. Retrieved from Humanities Common: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/qyt1-p863>

Akademisi, S. (2016). *Sokak Akademisi - I. Ders*. Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/events/1765022397156459/>. Accessed May 5, 2020.

Akbal, Z. T. (2018, June 21). *Akademisyen Yargılamaları: Zeynep Tül Akbal'ın Beyanı*. Retrieved from Bianet: <http://bianet.org/bianet/ifade-ozgurlugu/198378-zeynep-tul-akbal-in-beyani>. Accessed June 25, 2020.

Amnesty International. (2016). *Displaced and Dispossessed: Sur Resident's Right to Return Home*. London: Amnesty International Ltd.

Amsler, S. (2012). *Taking great pains: critical theory, affective pedagogies and radical democracy*. American Sociological Association annual conference. Denver.

Angelis, M. D. (2003). *Reflections on alternatives, commons and communities*. The Commoner, 1-14.

Angelis, M. D., & Stavrides, S. (2010, June). *On the Commons: A Public Interview with Massimo De Angelis and Stavros Stavrides*. (A. Architektur, Interviewer)

- Arap, S. K. (2010). *Turkey Meets its New Universities: New Universities in Turkey and the Rationale Behind their Foundation*. Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi.
- Bakırezer, G., Keskin Demirel, D., & Yeşilyurt, A. (2018). *In Pursuit of an Alternative Academy: The Case of Kocaeli Academy for Solidarity*. *tripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 16 (1), 234-240.
- Baumgarten, B., & Ullrich, P. (2012, April). *Discourse, Power and Governmentality*. Social Movement Research with and beyond Foucault. Discussion Paper SP IV 2012-401 . Berlin, Germany: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- bianet. (2016, January 18). *Bildirinin ardından bir hafta: 109 soruşturma, 33 gözaltı, 2200 imza*. Retrieved from bianet website: <http://bianet.org/bianet/ifade-ozgurlugu/171232-bildirinin-ardindan-bir-hafta-109-sorusturma-33-gozalti-2-bin-200-imza>. Accessed April 24, 2020.
- BİRARADA. (2019). Turkish Social Sciences Association Congress - Presentation text. Ankara, Turkey.
- Birler, Ö. (2012). Neoliberalization and Foundation Universities in Turkey. In K. İnal, & G. Akkaymak, *Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey: Political and Ideological Analysis of Educational Reforms in the Age of the AKP* (pp. 139-150). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2007). *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. Verso.
- Bora, T. (2010). Muhalefet, Protesto, Gösteri, Gösteriş. In T. Bora, *Sol, Sinizm, Pragmatizm* (p. 116). Istanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Briziarelli, M., & Flores, J. L. (2018). Professing Contradictions: Knowledge Work and the Neoliberal Condition of Academic Workers. *TripleC*, 114-128.
- Butler, J. (2018, May 27). *The Criminalization of Knowledge*. Retrieved from The Chronicle of Higher Education: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Criminalization-of/243501/>. Accessed March 21, 2020.
- Butler, J., & Athanasiou, A. (2013). *Dispossession: The Performative in the Political*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Camcı, M. (2016, February 29). Meral Camcı: Akademisyenler hakikati söyledi, şimdi sıra verili üniversiteyi sorgulamakta. (Sendika, Interviewer)
- Chomsky, N. (2019, July 15). *Noam Chomsky on co-signing Turkey's 'Academics for Peace' appeal*. Retrieved from Open Democracy: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/noam-chomsky-on-co-signing-turkeys-academics-for-peace/>. Accessed July 23, 2020.
- Ciancio, G. (2018). When Common Becomes Official Politics: Exploring the Relationship between Commons, Politics, and Art in Naples. In N. Dockx, & P. Gielen, *Commonism: A New Aesthetics of the Real* (pp. 283-296). Amsterdam: Valiz.
- Collective, U. (2018, April 30). *Undercommoning within, against and beyond the university-as-such*. Retrieved from Roar Mag: <https://roarmag.org/essays/undercommoning-collective-university-education/>. Accessed May 26, 2020.
- Cook, D. (2013). *Realising the Co-operative University-A consultancy report for Co-operative College*.
- Corsani, A. (2006, April 01). *Knowledge production and new forms of political action: The experience of the intermittent workers in France*. Retrieved from transversal.at: <https://transversal.at/transversal/0406/corsani/en>. Accessed June 6, 2020.
- Desk, B. N. (2016a, January 13). *Peace Block: Academics' Freedom of Thought and Expression Cannot Be Restrained*. Retrieved from Bianet English: <https://bianet.org/english/freedom-of-expression/171062-peace-block-academics-freedom-of-thought-and-expression-can-t-be-restrained>. Accessed July 18, 2020.
- Desk, B.N. (2016b, January 15). *Support for Academics from Colleagues Dismissed During Coup*. Retrieved from Bianet English: <http://bianet.org/english/human-rights/171161-support-for-academics-from-colleagues-dismissed-during-coup>. Accessed July 18, 2020.
- Desk, B. N. (2016c, January 18). *611 Academics Worried about 1,128 Academics Signing Declaration*. Retrieved from Bianet English: <http://bianet.org/english/human-rights/171240-611-academics-worried-about-1-128-academics-signing-declaration>. Accessed July 18, 2020.

- Desk, B. N. (2016d, January 19). *Activists, Intellectuals Informing against Themselves to Support Academics*. Retrieved from Bianet English: <http://bianet.org/english/human-rights/171262-activists-intellectuals-informing-against-themselves-to-support-academics>. Accessed July 18, 2020.
- Desk, B.N. (2016e, January 26). *Support for Academics from 30 Nobel Prize Winners*. Retrieved from Bianet English: <https://bianet.org/english/human-rights/171489-support-for-academics-from-30-nobel-prize-winners>. Accessed July 18, 2020.
- Desk, B. N. (2017, May 05). *A group of Peace Academics Go on Hunger Strike for Gülmen, Özakça*. Retrieved from Bianet: <https://m.bianet.org/english/print/186212-a-group-of-peace-academics-go-on-hunger-strike-for-gulmen-ozakca>. Accessed July 18, 2020.
- De Angelis, M. (2007). *The Beginning of History: Value Struggles and Global Capital*. London: Pluto Press.
- Demir, Y., Açık, A., Odman, A., & Dikbaş, N. (2018, October 01). Çağlayan yollarında hakikat arayışı. (M. Erol, Interviewer)
- Diaz, L. G. (2018a). Induced Legality and the Art of Building Common Infrastructures: An Interview with Santiago Cirugeda, Recetas Urbanas. In N. Dockx, & P. Gielen, *Commonism: A New Aesthetics of the Real* (pp. 253-264). Amsterdam: Valiz.
- Diaz, L. G., & Gielen, P. (2018b). Precariat-A Revolutionary Class? In N. Dockx, & P. Gielen, *Commonism: A New Aesthetics of the Real* (pp. 170-181). Amsterdam: Valiz.
- Dikeç, M. (2016). Siyaset Üzerine Düşünme Tarzı Olarak Mekan. *cogito*, 45-68.
- Diken. (2015, October 19). *Erdoğan Merkel'e açık mektup yazan akademisyenleri 'mankurt' ilan etti*. Retrieved from Diken: <http://www.diken.com.tr/erdogan-merkele-acik-mektup-yazan-akademisyenleri-mankurt-ilan-etti/>. Accessed March 25, 2020.
- Doğan, D. (2013). Problems of Newly-Founded Universities and Solution Offers. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 108-116.
- Dörtlemez, Ö. (1995). Yeni Açılan Üniversiteler. In *İkinci Üniversite Kurultayı Bildiriler Kitabı* (pp. 125-135). İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi.

- Durak, Y. (2017a, March 10). İhraç edilen imzacı akademisyen: Barış ve ekmeğimiz kadar 'Hayır' için de çalışmalıyız. (A. Sancar, Interviewer)
- Durak, Y. (2017b, November 22). İhraçlar ve Direniş. (Ö. Gençlik, Interviewer)
- Durak, Y. (2018, April 10). KHK ile ihraç edilen akademisyen Yasin Durak: Eskişehir'deki saldırı çürümenin göstergesi. (Y. Aydın, Interviewer)
- Durak, Y. (2020, October 25). Üniversitenin ötesinde dayanışma, mücadele ve arayışlar. (T. Yaltrık, & L. Doğan, Interviewers)
- Emmelhainz, I. (2016, January 1). *Geopolitics and Contemporary Art, Part I: From Representation's Ruin to Salvaging the Real*. Retrieved from E-Flux: <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/69/60620/geopolitics-and-contemporary-art-part-i-from-representation-s-ruin-to-salvaging-the-real/>. Accessed May 20, 2020.
- Ersoy, M., & Keskinok, Ç. (2011). YÖK'ün Tarih İçinde Üniversitelere İlişkin Gelişme Politikalarının Değerlendirmesi. *5. Üniversite Kurultayı-Bildiriler*. Ankara: ODTÜ.
- Esra, E., & Akin, K. (2019). Emergent Repertoires of Resistance and Commoning in Higher Education: The Solidarity Academies Movement in Turkey. *South Atlantic Quarterly* vol. 118 (1), 145-163.
- Federici, S. (2018). *Re-enchanting the World: Feminism and the Politics of the Commons*. PM Press.
- Fırat, B. Ö., & Bakçay, E. (2012). Çağdaş sanattan radikal siyasete, estetik-politik eylem. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 41-62.
- Foucault, M. (1983). Preface. In G. Deleuze, & F. Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foucault, M. (1989). The Concern for Truth. In S. Lotringer, *Foucault Live: Interviews, 1961-1984*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (1991). Questions of Method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 73-86). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Foucault, M. (1997). Sexuality and Solitude. In P. Rabinow, *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* (pp. 175-184). New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997). The Ethics of the Concern for Self as a Practice of Freedom. In P. Rabinow, *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* (pp. 253-301). New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2000). *Entelektüelin Siyasi İşlevi*. Istanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless Speech*. California: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M., Kritzman, L., & Sheridan, A. (1988). *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, A. (2005). From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique. *Artforum*.
- Gahman, L. (2016). Zapatismo versus the Neoliberal University: Towards a Pedagogy against Oblivion. In S. Springer, M. L. de Souza, & R. J. White, *The Radicalization of Pedagogy: Anarchism, Geography and the Spirit of Revolt* (pp. 73-100). London: Rowman & Littlefield International Ltd.
- Graeber, D. (2008). *Hope in Common*. Retrieved from The Anarchist Library: <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/david-graeber-hope-in-common>. Accessed June 5, 2020.
- Guattari, F. (1996). Institutional Practice and Politics. In G. Genesko, *The Guattari Reader* (p. 121). Blackwell.
- Guattari, F., & Genosko, G. (1996). *The Guattari Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Hall, R. (2018). On the Alienation of Academic Labour and Possibilities for Mass Intellectuality. *tripleC: Communication, Capitalism and Critique*. 16 (1), 97-113.
- Hamzaçebi, E., Akçay, E., Kocagöz, U., & Adaman, F. (2015). *Sosyal Bilimler Ne İşe Yarar?* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Hardt, M. (2011). The Militancy of Theory. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 19-35.
- Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Havel, V. (1992 [1978]). *The Power of the Powerless*. In V. Havel, *Open Letters: Selected Writings, 1965-1990* (pp. 125-214). New York: Vintage Books.
- Holmes, B. (2007). Continental Drift: Activist Research, From Geopolitics to Geopoetics. In S. Shukaitis, D. Graeber, & E. Biddle, *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations // Collective Theorization* (pp. 39-43). Oakland: AK Press.
- Holmes, B. (2009). Extradisciplinary Investigations: Towards a New Critique of Institutions. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 53-61). London: MayFlyBooks.
- Hürtaş, S. (2017, February 13). *The collapse of Turkish academia*. Retrieved from AL-MONITOR: <https://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2017/02/turkey-academics-purges-collapse-of-academia.ac.html>. Accessed March 16, 2020.
- İnal, K. (2012). The Educational Politics of the AKP: The Collapse of Public Education in Turkey. In K. İnal, & G. Akkaymak, *Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey: Political and Ideological Analysis of Educational Reforms in the Age of the AKP* (pp. 17-30). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kanngieser, A. (2011). Breaking Out of the Specialist "Ghetto": Performative Encounters as Participatory Praxis in Radical Politics. In B. Ö. Fırat, & A. Kuryel, *Cultural Activism: Practices, Dilemmas, and Possibilities* (pp. 115-136). Leiden: Brill.
- Kautzer, C. (2016, August 04). *Seven Ways You Can Support Academics in Turkey*. Retrieved from Blog of the APA: <https://blog.apaonline.org/2016/08/04/seven-ways-you-can-support-academics-in-turkey/>. Accessed May 7, 2020.
- Kazmi, B. A., Leca, B., & Naccache, P. (2015). Is corporate social responsibility a new spirit of capitalism? *organization*, 1-21.
- Keskin, F. (2000). İktidar, hakikat ve entelektüelin siyasi işlevi. *Entelektüelin Siyasi İşlevi*. İstanbul, Turkey: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Kocagöz, U. (2015). *Rationality of the Politics of Commons*. Turkey: Istanbul Bilgi University.

- Koçak, H. (2020, October 25). Üniversitenin ötesinde dayanışma, mücadele ve arayışlar: KODA, Sokak Akademisi ve Kùltürhane ile Söyleşi. (T. Yaltırık, & L. Doğan, Interviewers)
- Kölemen, A. (2020, April 20). *Off-University ve uzaktan eğitim: Sorunlar ayrı, çözüm ortak*. Retrieved from taz: <https://taz.de/Off-University-ve-uzaktan-eitim/!5679280/>. Accessed June 29, 2020.
- Körükmez, L. (2020, July 13). *Barış Akademisyenlerinin İnsan Hakları Mücadelesi*. Retrieved from Barış İçin Akademisyenler - Youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aTtvCt0EVS4>. Accessed July 18, 2020.
- Kremakova, M. I. (2016). The "New Spirit of Academic Capitalism": Can Scientists Create Generative Critique from Within?. *Theory of Science*.
- Kural, B. (2017, December 14). *47th Hearing Held in Trial of Academics*. Retrieved from <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/483>. Accessed June 05, 2020.
- Lazzarato, M. (2009a). Neoliberalism in Action: Inequality, Insecurity and Reconstitution of the Social. *Theory, Culture&Society*.
- Lazzarato, M. (2009b). The Political Form of Coordination. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 161-170). London: mayfly.
- Lemmens, P. (2017). The Conditions of the Common: A Stieglerian Critique of Hardt and Negri's Thesis on Cognitive Capitalism as a Prefiguration of Communism. In G. Ruivenkamp, & A. Hilton, *Perspectives on Commoning: Autonomist Principles and Practices*. London: Zed Books.
- Lorey, I. (2009a). Attempt to Think the Plebeian: Exodus and Constituting as Critique. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 131-139). London: MayFlyBooks.
- Lorey, I. (2009b). Governmentality and Self-Precarization: On the Normalization of Cultural Producers. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 187-202). London: mayfly.

- Luxon, N. (2004). Truthfulness, risk, and trust in the late lectures of Michel Foucault. *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, 464-489.
- Maeckelbergh, M. (2009). *The Will of the Many: How the Alterglobalisation Movement is Changing the Face of Democracy*. Pluto Press.
- Miller, T. (2009). Governmentality and Commodification: The Keys to Yanqui Academic Hierarchy. In T. E. Collective, *Toward a Global Autonomous University* (pp. 72-80). New York: Autonomedia.
- Negri, A. (2007). Logic and Theory of Inquiry: Militant Praxis as Subject and Episteme. In Shukaitis, Steven, & D. Graeber, *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations // Collective Theorization* (pp. 62-72). Oakland: AK Press.
- Network, A. f. (2019, 04). Supporting Academics as a Human Rights Actor in a Challenging Context. *Academic Activism under Extreme Conditions: Turkey's Academics for Peace*. Izmir, Turkey: HRFT Representative Office of Izmir.
- Nicola, A. D., & Roggero, G. (2011). Eight Theses on University: Hierarchization and Institutions of the Common. In *Dispatches from the Ruins: Documents&Analyses From University Struggles, Experiments in Self-Education* (pp. 36-41). 1,000 Little Hammers.
- Nómada, U. (2008, May). *Mental prototypes and monster institutions: Some notes by way of an introduction*. Transversal - European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies Journal. Retrieved from transversal.at:
https://transversal.at/transversal/0508/universidad-nomada/en?hl=instituent#_ftnref13. Accessed May 15, 2020.
- Nowotny, S., & Raunig, G. (2016, May). *Instituent Practices: New Introduction to the Revised Edition 2016*. Vienna: transversal texts (Verlag). Retrieved from transversal texts: <https://transversal.at/blog/Instituierende-Praxen-Introduction>. Accessed May 18, 2020.
- Odman, A. (2018a, April 30). Barış Bildirisi ve Dev-Şirketin Yeni Akademisi -I.

- Odman, A. (2018b, February 2). *Dayanışma Akademileri: Yakıcı ihtiyacı erdeme dönüştürmek?* Retrieved from birartıbir: <https://birartibir.org/siyaset/46-dayanisma-akademileri-yakici-ihtiyaci-erdeme-donusturmek>. Accessed March 17, 2020.
- Odman, A. (2020, July). *Barış Akademisyenlerinin Hukuk(la) Mücadelesi*. Retrieved from Academics For Peace – Youtube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EkJiP0cSBLA&ab_channel=Bar%C4%B1%C5%9F%C4%B0%C3%A7inAkademisyenler. Accessed August 15, 2020.
- Off-University. (2018). Retrieved from Off-University: <https://off-university.com/en-US/page/code-of-conduct>. Accessed April 5, 2020.
- Off-University. (2018). *Off-University*. Retrieved from Off-University: <https://off-university.com/en-US/page/vision>. Accessed April 6, 2020.
- Off-University. (2018). *Off-University*. Retrieved from Off-University: <https://off-university.com/en-US/page/association>. Accessed April 5, 2020.
- Off-University. (2019). *Reflection Series 1 - Off-Condition: Experiences, Imaginations, and Practices*. Retrieved from Off-University: <https://off-university.com/en-US/News/Detail/reflection-series>. Accessed April 10, 2020.
- Off-University. (n.d.). *Off-University goes 36C3 - Impressions from the 36th Chaos Communication Congress*. Retrieved from Off-University: <https://off-university.com/en-US/News/Detail/impressions-from-36c3>. Accessed May 7, 2020.
- Önal, N. E. (2012). The Marketization of Higher Education in Turkey (2002 - 2011). In K. Inal, & G. Akkaymak, *Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey: Political and Ideological Analysis of Educational Reforms in the Age of the AKP* (pp. 125-138). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Özsoy, H. (2016, February 21). *Urgent Call: Don't Let Tomorrow Be Too Late for Sur!* Retrieved from People's Democratic Party: <https://www.hdp.org.tr/en/statements/urgent-call-dont-let-tomorrow-be-too-late-for-sur/8878>. Accessed June 8, 2019.

- P2P Foundation. (2015). *Commons Transition: Policy Proposals for an Open Knowledge Commons Society*. Retrieved from Commons Transition: https://commonstransition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Commons-Transition_-_Policy-Proposals-for-a-P2P-Foundation.pdf. Accessed June 12, 2019.
- Peace, A. f. (2016, January 10). *We will not be a party to this crime!* Retrieved from Academics for Peace: <https://www.barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/63>. Accessed March 20, 2020.
- Peace, A. f. (n.d.). *About Us: Academics for Peace*. Retrieved from Academics for Peace Website: <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/1>. Accessed March 20, 2020.
- Peace, A. f. (n.d.). *Rights Violations Against "Academics for Peace"*. Retrieved from Academics for Peace: <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/314>. Accessed March 20, 2020.
- Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Raunig, G. (2004, April). *The Double Criticism of parrhesia. Answering the Question "What is a Progressive (Art) Institution?"*. Retrieved from transversal texts: https://transversal.at/transversal/0504/raunig/en#_ftn3. Accessed March 16, 2020.
- Raunig, G. (2009a). *Instituent Practices, No. 2: Institutional Critique, Constituent Power, and the Persistence of Instituting*. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 173-185). London: mayfly.
- Raunig, G. (2009b). *Instituent Practices: Fleeing, Instituting, Transforming*. In G. Raunig, & G. Ray, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 3-11). London: MayFlyBooks.
- Raunig, G. (2009c). *What is Critique? Suspension and Re-Composition in Textual and Social Machines*. In G. Raunig, & R. Gene, *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (p. 126). London: MayFlyBooks.

- Raunig, G. (2010, October). *Intensifying Theory Production: The School of the Missing Teacher*. Retrieved from European Institute for Progressive Cultural Politics: https://transversal.at/transversal/1210/raunig/en#_ftn3. Accessed April 7, 2020.
- Raunig, R., & Ray, G. (2009). *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique*. London: mayfly.
- Richmond, O. P. (2010). A Genealogy of Peace and Conflict Theory. In O. P. Richmond, *Peacebuilding: Critical Developments and Approaches* (pp. 14-38). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bookchin et al. (2013). Introduction. In Bookchin et al, *Militant Research Handbook* (pp. 4). New York: New York University.
- Sarı, E., & Sarı, Ç. K. (2014). Öğrenciler için Üniversitenin Anlamı: "Bizim Düşlediğimiz Üniversite...". *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 35-65.
- Sevim, E., & Sayın, G. (2017, October 3). KAMPÜSSÜZLER - DAYANIŞMA AKADEMİLERİ. (webiztv, Interviewer)
- Situaciones, C. (2003, September). *On the Researcher-Militant*. Retrieved from transversal texts: <https://transversal.at/transversal/0406/colectivo-situaciones/en>. Accessed May 12, 2020.
- Sözeri, E. K. (2016, January 28). *Evrensel değerler ve milli yalnızlık: İki bildiri, iki akademi*. Retrieved from PLATFORM FOR INDEPENDENT JOURNALISM: <http://www.platform24.org/guncel/1320/evrensel-degerler-ve-milli-yalnizlik--iki-bildiri--iki-akademi>. Accessed June 5, 2019.
- Stavrides, S. (2013). Re-inventing Spaces of Commoning: Occupied Squares in Movement. *QuAderns-e*, 40-52.
- Stavrides, S. (2016). *Common Space: The City as Commons*. London: Zed Books.
- Stavrides, S. (2018). The Potentials of Space Commoning: The Capacity to Act and Think through Space. In N. Dockx, & P. Gielen, *Commonism: A New Aesthetics of the Real* (pp. 345-358). Amsterdam: Valiz.

- Stavrides, S. (2019). *Towards the City of Thresholds*. Common Notions.
- Theodore, N., Peck, J., & Brenner, N. (2012). Neoliberal Urbanism: Cities and the Rule of Markets. In G. Bridge, & S. Watson, *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Turner, D., & Pirie, E. (2016). Problems of Involvement and Detachment: A Critical Approach to Researching Live Event Experiences. In I. R. Lamond, & L. Platt, *Critical Event Studies - Approaches to Research* (p. 25). London : Palgrave Macmillan.
- Türkiye İnsan Hakları Vakfı (Human Rights Foundation of Turkey). (2019). *Akademisyen İhraçları: Hak İhlalleri, Kayıplar ve Güçlenme Süreçleri*. İzmir: Türkiye İnsan Hakları Vakfı Yayınları 127.
- Uğur, M. (2016, April 17). *Academic freedom under threat in Turkey*. Retrieved from Academics For Peace: <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/196>. Accessed March 20, 2020.
- Uğur, M. (2016). Denial of Academic Freedom Exposed: The Case of Academics for Peace in Turkey. Greenwich Political Economy Research Centre (GPERC).
- University Students Desire Peace (2016, January 18) BIA News Desk. Retrieved from Bianet: <https://bianet.org/english/human-rights/171221-university-students-desire-peace>. Accessed April 5, 2020.
- Vatansever, A. (2017, May 3). *Critical Turkish Studies, Lecture Series, Dr. Aslı Vatansever: Turkey's Academic Sweatshops*. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ToabgoiZoFU&ab_channel=Institut%C3%BCrTurkistikUniversit%C3%A4tDuisburg-Essen. Accessed October 22, 2020.
- Vatansever, A. (2018a). Academic Nomads. The Changing Conception of Academic Work under Precarious Conditions. *Cambio*. Vol.8, n. 15: 153-165.
- Vatansever, A. (2018b). Partners in Crime: The Anti-Intellectual Complicity between the State and the Universities in Turkey. *The Journal of Interrupted Studies*, 3-25.

Yücesan Özdemir, G., & Özdemir, A. M. (2012). The Political Economy of Education in Turkey: State, Labor, and Capital under AKP Rule. In K. İnal, & G. Akkaymak, *Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey: Political and Ideological Analysis of Educational Reforms in the Age of the AKP* (pp. 3-16). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.