The Others, Public Space and Art Initiatives in Turkey

Barış Yılmaz

Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Fine Arts, Bodrum/Muğla, Turkey

Abstract

Othering is a concept of the sovereign power of the people and taken out of their system and identify groups that are not included in the system. Human communities that we call the other, continues its presence also sometimes make feel it, and search for ways to achieve their own activities. This action and activity 'PUBLİC SPHERES' carried out in the area called. Other independent from the current hegemony of the public space, where artists can perform the installation from the hierarchy of creation outside of the control mechanisms emerge as the venue can be stripped.For "the other", independent from the current hegemony to perform the artistic production, outside of the control mechanizm, also we find it as a place, the artist wriggle out from established hierarchy. In Turkey, in this sense, called "the other" who can not life within the current goverment and dominant capital are perform their own initiatives, we witness that. This is explaining for desire to "the other's" presence feel and stand against a capitation.

Keywords: Public; Capitation; Sovereign; Art initiatives

1. Introduction

The art and creativity like freedom and impositions, forced dictates are the concept that artists stand opposite to them, these are impediment to arts freedom and creativty. Whereas with historical process, human difficult to make in the arts, going to dominant policy, hierarchy and control mechanizms lines out. The system that accept one section and exclude the other section, it allowes different searches with public policy and capitals directions. At this point 'Public Sphere' has been present the others own initiatives.

II. What is the Public Sphere?

The public sphere and private area are the indicator, as human sociality seem and policy practising mean, the goal to direct towards, which format has been designed. In this context the public sphere and private area designs and drawn distinctions are configure content in different formats depending on politic imagination.

We define a part of social life with 'Public sphere' concept, we create an area which simular with public opinion. Most important speciality the public sphere is being accessible. Accordingly, person in public sphere are act neither businessman or profecionallys nor submissive to the public order.

Public sphere and at the same time private area concepts has been subject to Hannah Arendt and Jurgen Habermas'es researchs. German political scientist and philosopher Hannah Arendt, explains the public sphere as self-realized, unclassified, visible political activities.

Arendt says "Work and labor activities are in the spacial area, and action is in the public sphere, becouse it is the political activities area. Action can not predict before, and it's a product among people, than this is a condition for move away from violence activity and becouse of politics. Action assumes people pluarity as an

activity among people, and people pluarity has two different speciality, that equality, diversity. People are equal, becouse they can understand eachother, people are different, becouse they are speaking and acting to keep clear himself" (Arendt, 1994, p.258).

Thus, public sphere is a scene, speec and action exhibited on it. Again, Henry Kressel (American engineer and scientist) as emphasized this speciality about public sphere : "Public spheres define us as a comity, we contact with look like us and not look like us in the public sphere. We are all equal and we feel like our home in public spheres. We also can speek free and we can do meeting freely, we can do political criticism freely in public spheres" (Kressel, 1998, p.78).

In discussions about public sphere, different models suggested in modern era. This models various about public-private area , state-religion or social capital of public sphere. Depending on the changing society and thoughts of modern era, J. Habermas was made the first analysis about being reshaped public sphere. He has a major role of public sphere concept was taking place in the liberal arts agenda. Therefore, both, suggested this concepts for rapidly changing society of modern era and new thoughts of focused to concept take into account J. Habermas. Therefore, researching bourgeois public sphere analysed by Habermas and the other modern era public spheres assessment together and determination for common basic principles are important. German sociologist and philosopher in the tradition of critical theory and pragmatism. He defines the public sphere as "an area as open to everybody, possibility to all kinds of communication, an organ all national participation, seperate from the state, even doing criticism against the state" (Habermas, 2005, p.18). Habermas says in his book "structural transformation of the public sphere" "People reasoning a common issue about themselves, entered into a rational debate and after all public opinion." (Habermas, 2005 p.20)

Habermas analysed public spheres historical transformation with a depth sociological perspective, to emphasis that a stabilizer civil debate area against power mechanisms, public spheres have a vital importance for a democratic social structure. But, as a free and autonomous area state-society seperation not enough in neither historical format , nor present society models conditions. Espacially Frazer's explanation about conflict with the present day welfare state is an important emphasis. " … if section out of the bourgeois can access easly the conditions disrupted and this is a social problem and polarized Eventually when come up mass democraciy in welfare state, state and society pass mutually intertwined. Critical inquiry of state mean (publicity) staged shows via media, has been public opinions production and manipulation" (Fraser, 1991, p.56-80).

Public sphere theory, to take hand again by historians, the activities of the various groups and to maintain the difference of each group, is trying to figure out how they were in relationship with each other. Public sphere is only not into place acceeible, can be conceptualized as an area where there is a struggle between different public too. The theory of the public sphere, is also associated with the acquisition of social identity Nancy Fraser says "Public spheres are not the only places where the creation of a number of discourses, the emergence of social identification and implementation takes place in these areas" (Fraser, 1992 , p.125).

Social identity, value of the social environment in which the individual belongs to, norms, the reasoning, art, language, religion, traditions and expresses a sense of belonging developed against customs and other institutions. Individuals similarities between their society and other societies, contradictions, conflicts within the meaning recognizes the limits imposed on the social identity and develop an action strategy in this direction. Individuals will participate in practical life through social identity. Social identity, often people all the assets, meaning installation, ruled that the decision-making and activities. But the identity of the community or outside the system judges that do not meet many pleasant or observed by the monitoring mechanisms of the system. It

should be the role of the individual is actually imposed. Erik Erikson says "with what he wants to be the meeting point of the identity of the things that allow people to be in the world. What conditions nor the desire alone is decisive. In this sense, in an environment formed by the intersection of desire and identity conditions where people hold" (Sennett, 2002, p.148).

We live in this age of identity and age full of noise and fury. Search for identity divides and separates. Identities are determined largely by the identity lawmakers. Historical, cultural, ethnic has many roots and roots that form the majority. However, some of the factionalizes. As Jonathan Friedman pointed out, in our globalized world, "If there is something that does not happen, it is composed of the borders are disappearing. Conversely, every neighborhood of the decline of our world seems to be sewn on the edge of every new street corner." (Friedman, 1999, p.241).

III. Who is "the Other"?

Many comments were made about who the other. Philosophy of psychology, literature, politics and the arts, many studies' focuses on the other, constructions and meaning. With the clearest way 'we' are not the personification of the 'other' incorporates many described.

"Many forms of Latin origin of European languages in the" Other "for Alius (ali and aliud) words are used. The most striking aspect of the word, alien in English (foreign) is the origin of the word. Another Latin "Other" if the word is ceterus and "remaining (other) means. Another indicating non-Romans "Other" in the word, is even today continues the legacy of this otherness Barbariae. The Greek allos (άλλος) The word for word with the same meaning as in Latin Alius. Allos and Alius words of my idea of a common feature of the opposite (Lat.) And idios (Gr. Ἴδιος) means "the same" is the word. Thus, in terms of culture deeply affecting Europe "Other" also represents a sharp difference. The Turkish "other" is the Latin ceterus (from Eng. The rest) or "rest" is less" (Nahya, 2011, p.29).

'We' various opinions about the causes of a way to design at least take precautions were necessary to be afraid of the other humanity since the beginning of history are available. For example, Julia Kristeva people tracing it tries to foreigners in reference to Freud's description of themselves. According to him live in us reveal our foreign and alien consciousness occurs when each of our differences, if anyone is lost in self-evaluate as foreign. On the other hand, Alois Hahn increasing isolation and individualism in modern society with reference to the case where all of the other and the foreign 'other the generalization that' argues and argues that it forms a basis of universality. Both Kristeva both Hahn'n the output path from the individual and the individual's own in solitude emphasis is important, it is not only an internal situation to some unfortunate however, and they feel it every moment of social life. Therefore, as claimed by Hahn is difficult to say that there is a basis of universality.

From another angle, when viewed in terms of the structure of matter and the nature of man, the relationship between me and the other necessarily a relationship seem connects me to the other. Because human nature and to the structure shows a universality. His needs are almost always the same and varies according to the conditions of space needs also to correct format. This means that, to satisfy the needs of a community of people using the same tools, on the other hand will be another group of people who will go using other tools. Because no individual, does not have the power and opportunity to correct their needs on their own. Both for the satisfaction of needs, as well as the Camus, fate can not be a natural thing as joint action with the people who are the same. Because the creation of human need, is in need of the fellow being. Human may continue natural existence only through others. That makes it necessary to be in the nature of people's solidarity. Solidarity is

also a question of intentionality is a mutual relationship between the form and the other in such a relationship with me.

In psychoanalytic plane Lacan, the other will discuss three main topics:

First, as a result of a mirror stage, "symbolic other" : From the moment he first saw himself in the mirror of a child starting to build as a break from me and we summarize the biological identity.

Second, non-subjective, which is the basis of our legal rules are entirely social existence: We realize that this plane Leibniz ethics as an absolute God.

Third, potentially dangerous for everyone, outside of us, another or another the other.

To sum up the "Other", one or more persons, by culture or society, with reference to past or current relationships, vertical (class) or horizontal (ethnic, etc.) With a differentiated and separated, person, group, class, people and so on defined as. To define "The Other" such an essential element, the operational status of the social dimension; This is "otherness".

The presence of the realization of the society and the formation of order is important. There are many reasons to create a political community at the expense of the freedom of the people by the political theorists always seeking is from this order. Therefore, it is assumed that the formation of the consent of the individuals constituting the society. Human communities that make up the scheme has to comply with these norms. Already it is to draw the boundaries of the written and unwritten laws are available. Laws, traditions, social norms, culture, it is included.

'Perception of the Other, and' we 'is distorting the most important feature in terms of layout that defines him. 'We' how much that will bring instability, allowing the reproduction of the scheme and therefore matches the objectives of the society if we had formed, 'Other' in breaking that order, bringing instability, tradition which the functioning of the scheme, the law is having the potential to discharge norms, He is dangerous.

'The presence of the other is seen as the cause of social problems and the' other 'is seen as the cause of this problem. This is a binding element for the presence of other groups. According to Dominique Schapper; "Throw someone on your own challenges, is a defense mechanism that allows individuals and groups to resolve internal conflicts. The presence of the external enemy, known to contribute to the cohesion of how a group" (Schnapper, 2005, p.137). 'Other' is a danger to the public sphere. But it also enables the union. 'We' the formation of perception 'is explained by the other's presence and formation.

'Other' definitions go to making generalizations. Constructed features are generalizable to the entire group. This is a bias comes from maintenance. Prejudice can not be considered independent of the need for people to categorization. Although the categorization is due to the need to facilitate daily life, initiates the process as a set of values or ignore certain groups. Categorization is a state dominated by human behavior. Some groups within the public sphere ignores some of these systems and to incorporate into their own exclusive.

IV. Orientation for "the Other" to Art in Public Sphere

In the 18th century, and that the power of the place, change the state of the public to make them invisible visible desirable to have increased the importance of public space. The concept of the invisible, or we do not want to know to make known the existence of the "other" has led to the concept of thinking. Public space has an area of freedom due to the nature that everyone is accessible from this perspective. Art in public places, in some respects, which could be accessed by all segments of society, unrestrained, the art is to be independent. Art, mualif and protest feature, it has been forced to move out of the various control mechanisms, galleries, museums

tool such systems has been hampered to reach the public with their most essential purpose. This public space creates a sense of being the best exhibition venue.

"Other" also provides our marginalized and devalued groups or different discourses as a marginalized communities in the public space that everyone can live together. He reveals creation in this medium. Boosted the amount magnifying the problem and the other is art. Protest and mualif structure is focused on the problems that his unseen or ignored. As art is known, the critical gaze of those who are, "It could be like this," is the field. Paul Eluard with the word "artist creating power, takes its incompatibility with what surrounds him." At the time the present governments without the artist's identity, the divine power shedding creativity, freedom offered descendants but also perceived as a structure that absolutist position against to blocked discipline and social power. Therefore, either the power of art can be made to the backyard "sterilized" as far as it is the affirmation flats, clearing land of sweeping power of the rest is taken as a serious purpose.

Art is questioning. The questioning face, look from different angles, the smash and rebuild. Applications generally known and floor systems, examines the mechanisms of art. Memorization disrupt existing ones. With Marcuse's words "Not something to identify, disrupt the magic of something that already exists. Outside the scheme of things, this is the entrance to the established order! " Thus, the 'other' and 'art' are united in a common denominator. In a way this；"Screaming in the other's system and the "I also recognize my existence" is carried out with cries of art. Imprinted is, in the eyes of the dominant disciplines of art that can not be devalued and marginalized groups, to support each other in this way would be. 'Other' presence throws with art, is' not willing to be ignored or devalued to the other.

V. The "Other" and Public Art Projects

Activities of "Art in public Sphere" started as an opposition art activity to standards and status qua in accordance with discourse and style against the system. In the context, artists chose this adventure to explain "others" in "public area", in the middle of system, which separates its disclosure.

Artists have looked for alternative areas in order to take an attitude towards branding, conversation in source of prestige, cultural commercialization and instrumentalization of art by capital and they used open public areas, where they can more often communicate. These projects provided direct participation in activities on understanding existing problem of groups excluding "others", rejecting bureaucracy and discipline in art.

Criticizing and uncovering the sovereignty trigger activation of art in public area. Artists, interfering in public area with political relations, develop their projects by relations with participants. They present the "others" reality to government and capital. From alienated groups due to gender selecting, rational or ethnical discrimination to groups due to social and economical stratum, artists present this "others" reality and use the public, discourse as a communication instrument. Decoding negativities of sovereign and capital is possible with public areas.

Actually "others" aren't functional in authoritative systems. Panoptic observation idea in public area and Foucault's view isn't consisted of stabilization and locating of an individual. This view doesn't accept objectivation for government and capital. Thus, art tries to go beyond the limits of panoptic area.

5.1 Public Art Laboratory

Today, most of urban are included in consumption and marketing system as public areas, thus there are interferences in it due to marketing strategies. While capitalist specification of motivation beyond these interferences penetrate in structural characteristic and tissue of city, cities in the process of rearranging and

reforming have a sectional structure. This sectional structure provides comfortable and habitable areas in consumption systems of city and develops strategies in order to move others away to backstage areas. In this regard, "the use of land in the area sterile rendered by the feature can not be consumed by the poor people out of the property and creating the identity, temporary or permanent cultural practices and the nature of representation in the open spaces in these areas, the subclasses keep away exclusionary psychological, invisible walls are knit" (Yardımcı, 2005).

In 1980's, art in cultural policies went into private sector. So, relation between art and politics disappeared completely. Companies reformed "art" according to interests. Thus, art last its dependency. Public Art Laboratory started to produce new arts in 68-78's.

Public Art Laboratory organized an activity against 12. İstanbul Biennial to protest Koç Holding's sponsorship. They mentioned that they didn't want the main sponsor Biennal Vehbi Koç to be sponsor for an art activity. The stratchcards, in which the letter of Vehbi Koç to Kenan Evren the symbole of the protocol for aliened groups in order to make authority dominant in Turkish politics.

In 13. İstanbul Biennial, an art activity was organized for alienated ones by urban transformation and capital. Main problem of protestors was art-capital relationship. They were T-shirts textured "Emek Sineması", "Taksim" and "Tarlabaşı", which are the focuses of urban transformation. They covered "Koç", "Sabancı" and "Eczacıbaşı" posters.

5.2 Sulukule Platform

In Eastern and Western Europe and Turkey, main alienated minorities are Gypsies. They are considered as lazy, dirt and prone to crime. Gypsies, experiencing exclusions and racist attacks, also experience discriminations by capitalist government. Gypsies, forming the bottom of society, can be evicted from the region they live in Sulukule. They are evicted so that the rich people of capital system live in luxury.

In 2006 Association of Developing Gypsy Culture and Solidarity was established. Even though there was no project, they decided to organize "40 Days and 40 nights Sulukule" activities with non-governmental organizations, after they heard that buildings would be destructed 40 days later. Sulukule Platform informed about "40 days and nights" activity as following: "… we realized this organization with great participation or volunteers. We did advertisings by radio, TV, we held exhibitions, concerts, conversations. And we go on. Activities aimed at preventing extinction of the culture of society. It attracted people and had positive effect on public opinion. And it helped local community to have a positive look on future. This activity aimed at preventing socio-cultural lacks and making sustainable, creative urban transformation possible. It's a platform rather than an activity. It was aimed to gather people and establishments together to increase support, to form a creative urban transformation development model" (40 days 40 nights, 2007).

Gypsy identity of Sulukule provided the project to take its place both in national and international agenda. European Parliament UNESCO and International Gypsy Associations wrote letters to presidency and Fatih City.

5.3. Other Artists Initiatives and Collectives

Other Artists Initiatives and collectives started to occur in 1990's İstanbul. The reasons for these initiatives are the aim of creating art and artist environment of capital and market and attempts to break domination of group others. It Hanru explains this as following:

"Central powers like dominant ideology formed by global art and art centers determine the limits of present art and spread this ideology as universal reality. Resistance against this hegemony is inevitable" (Hanru, 2003).

But artists, occurring in current art environment since 1980, are different from preceding. Sociolog and art historian Pelin Tan describes the reason of art centers' establishment in Istanbul: "Private museums (in accordance with Eastern Modernism) and art galleries attacked to public area and they opened this art environments to privatization, thus many young artist and curators needed to take place in trans-local and international together with other artists" (Tan, 2007).

The fact that establishments don't want to take place in bureaucracy and they want crate an alternative environment away from this hegemony affected formation of initiatives and collectives. Artists have sought for independent environments, where they can develop themselves. This is the need for autonomous area, where the artists can create and produce away from hierarchy and capital.

Examples of the initiatives collectives are Atıl Kunst, established by Gülçin Aksoy, Yasemin Nur Toksoy and Gözde İlkin and Oda Projesi, Depo, Amber Platform and Hafriyat.

VI. Conclusion

"Other" societies, excluded by public, seek for alternative ways away from control mechanisms of system and authority. Public area provides them to realize their independent activities. Public areas are places-, where they can communicate with all society and feel the capital less.

Initiatives and collectives, acting separately from hierarchy in galleries, museums and politics, realized their activities as a result of alienation. Alienated ones made their existence feel though platforms they established and they moved the problems to public area.

References

[1]Habermas, J. (2005). Kamusallığın Yapısal Dönüşü, (Trans. Bora – Sancar), İletişim Press, İstanbul.

[2]Fraser, N. (2004). Kamusal Alanı Yeniden Düşünmek: Gerçekte Varolan Demokrasinin Eleştirisine Bir Katkı, Kamusal Alan, s.103-133, Hil Press, İstanbul

[3]Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. Habermas and the public sphere (ed. Craig Calhoun). Cambridge: MIT Press.

[4]Sennett, R. (2002). Kamusal İnsanın Çöküşü, (Trans. Serpil D., Abdullah Y.), Ayrıntı Press, İstanbul.

[5]Friedman, J. (1999). The hybridization of roots and abhorrence of the bush", Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash (der.), Spaces of Culture, Londra.

[6]Schnapper, D. (2005). Öteki ile İlişki,(Çev. Ayşegül Sönmezay), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Press, İstanbul.

[7]Nahya, Z.N. (2011). İmgeler ve Ötekileştirme: Cadılar, Yerliler, Avrupalılar, Atılım Journal of Social Sciences, volume1, number1, page.29

[8]Yardımcı, S. (2005). Küreselleşen İstanbul'da Bienal Kentsel Değişim ve Festivalizm, İletişim Press, İstanbul.

[9]Hanru, H. (2003). Initiatives, Alternatives: Notes in a Temporary and Raw State. How Latitudes Become Forms, Art in a Global Age içinde. Minneapolis: Walter Art Center & New York:DAP.

[10]Tan, P. (2007). Sanatçı Kolektifleri, İnisiyatifler ve Sanatçılar Yönetimindeki Mekanlar. H. Altındere & S. Evren (Ed.), Kullanma Kılavuzu: Türkiye'de Güncel Sanat, 1986- 2006 (p.130-134) içinde, İstanbul: Art-ist Press. 40 days 40 nights. (2007). http://40gun40gece-sulukule.blogspot.com.tr/.