

TERRITORY OF RESEARCH ON
SETTLEMENTS AND ENVIRONMENT
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF URBAN PLANNING

32

Embracing Public Space and Urban Cultures: Understanding and Acting on Complexity of Contemporary Cities

Federico II University Press



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI
DI NAPOLI FEDERICO II
CENTRO INTERDIPARTIMENTALE L.U.P.T.



fedOA Press

Vol. 17 n. 1 (JUNE 2024)
e-ISSN 2281-4574

TERRITORIO DELLA RICERCA SU INSEDIAMENTI E AMBIENTE



WoS (Web of Science) indexed journal <http://www.tria.unina.it>

Editors-in-Chief

Mario Coletta, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Antonio Acierno, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Scientific Committee

Rob Atkinson, *University of the West of England, UK*

Teresa Boccia, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Giulia Bonafede, *University of Palermo, Italy*

Lori Brown, *Syracuse University, USA*

Maurizio Carta, *University of Palermo, Italy*

Claudia Cassatella, *Polytechnic of Turin, Italy*

Maria Cerreta, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Massimo Clemente, *CNR, Italy*

Juan Ignacio del Cueto, *National University of Mexico, Mexico*

Claudia De Biase, *University of the Campania L. Vanvitelli, Italy*

Pasquale De Toro, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Matteo di Venosa, *University of Chieti Pescara, Italy*

Concetta Fallanca, *Mediterranean University of Reggio Calabria, Italy*

Ana Falù, *National University of Cordoba, Argentina*

Isidoro Fasolino, *University of Salerno, Italy*

José Fariña Tojo, *ETSAM Universidad Politecnica de Madrid, Spain*

Francesco Forte, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Gianluca Frediani, *University of Ferrara, Italy*

Giuseppe Las Casas, *University of Basilicata, Italy*

Francesco Lo Piccolo, *University of Palermo, Italy*

Liudmila Makarova, *Siberian Federal University, Russia*

Elena Marchigiani, *University of Trieste, Italy*

Oriol Nel-lo Colom, *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain*

Gabriel Pascariu, *UAUIM Bucharest, Romania*

Domenico Passarelli, *Mediterranean University of Reggio Calabria, Italy*

Piero Pedrocco, *University of Udine, Italy*

Michèle Pezzagno, *University of Brescia, Italy*

Piergiuseppe Pontrandolfi, *University of Matera, Italy*

Mosé Ricci, *University of Trento, Italy*

Samuel Robert, *CNRS Aix-Marseille University, France*

Michelangelo Russo, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Inés Sánchez de Madariaga, *ETSAM Universidad de Madrid, Spain*

Paula Santana, *University of Coimbra Portugal*

Saverio Santangelo, *La Sapienza University of Rome, Italy*

Ingrid Schegk, *HSWT University of Freising, Germany*

Franziska Ullmann, *University of Stuttgart, Germany*

Michele Zazzi, *University of Parma, Italy*



Università degli Studi Federico II di Napoli
Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca L.U.P.T. (Laboratorio
di Urbanistica e Pianificazione Territoriale) "R. d'Ambrosio"

Managing Editor

Alessandra Pagliano, *Federico II University of Naples, Italy*

Corresponding Editors

Josep A. Bàguena Latorre, *Universitat de Barcelona, Spain*

Gianpiero Coletta, *University of the Campania L. Vanvitelli, Italy*

Michele Ercolini, *University of Florence, Italy*

Maurizio Francesco Errigo, *University of Enna, Italy*

Adriana Louriero, *Coimbra University, Portugal*

Claudia Trillo, *University of Salford, SOBE, Manchester, UK*

Technical Staff

Tiziana Coletta, Ferdinando Maria Musto, Francesca Pirozzi,

Ivan Pistone, Luca Scaffidi

Responsible Editor in chief: Mario Coletta | electronic ISSN 2281-4574 | ©
2008 | Registration: Cancelleria del Tribunale di Napoli, n° 46, 08/05/2008 |
On line journal edited by Open Journal System and published by FedOA (Fe-
derico II Open Access) of the Federico II University of Naples

The Commoning Practices and Transforming Spaces: Examples from Türkiye and Spain

Gülşah Tırış, Hilal Erkuş

Abstract

The concept of “common” connotes a partnership established on a resource or goods. However, this concept also covers all material and non-material forms of the living space of a community or group. This study aims to reveal the transformations that social movements have created in urban space and the ways of using space, focusing particularly on “the right to the city and commoning practices” after the 2008 crisis. By focusing on urban social movements after 2008 crisis, case study areas are chosen based on commoning practices from Turkey and Spain. We employed a qualitative research design by collecting a secondary data from articles, websites, and interview articles for analysing natural, urban, and system commons with content and document analysis. The movements we focused on are urban social movements in which their achievements against private or state interventions against the natural (ecological) commons, the urban commons, and the commons as systems. One of the main conclusions we reached is that spaces shaped in line with the demands of social movements can be a guide for a fair and participatory urbanization processes.

KEYWORDS:

commons, commoning practices, space transformation

Pratiche comuni e spazi di trasformazione: Esempi dalla Turchia e dalla Spagna

Il concetto di “comune” indica una partnership stabilita su una risorsa o su un bene. Tuttavia, questo concetto comprende anche tutte le forme materiali e non materiali dello spazio vitale di una comunità o di un gruppo. Questo studio si propone di rivelare le trasformazioni che i movimenti sociali hanno creato sullo spazio urbano e sulle modalità di utilizzo dello spazio, con un’attenzione specifica al “diritto alla città e alle pratiche di commoning” dopo la crisi del 2008. Concentrandosi sui movimenti sociali urbani dopo la crisi del 2008, sono state scelte aree di studio basate sulle pratiche di commoning in Turchia e Spagna. Abbiamo utilizzato un disegno di ricerca qualitativa raccogliendo dati secondari da articoli, siti web e interviste per analizzare i beni comuni naturali, urbani e di sistema con l’analisi dei contenuti e dei documenti. I movimenti su cui ci siamo concentrati sono movimenti sociali urbani che hanno ottenuto risultati contro gli interventi privati o statali nei confronti dei beni comuni naturali (ecologici), dei beni comuni urbani e dei beni comuni come sistemi. Una delle principali conclusioni a cui siamo giunti è che gli spazi modellati in linea con le richieste dei movimenti sociali possono essere una guida per processi di urbanizzazione equi e partecipativi.

PAROLE CHIAVE:

beni comuni, pratiche di commoning, trasformazione dello spazio

The Commoning Practices and Transforming Spaces: Examples from Turkey and Spain

Gülşah Tırış, Hilal Erkuş

1. Introduction

According to UN DESA (2018), 57% of the world's population lives in cities and cities tend to spread with the increase in the urban population. Urban sprawl stemming from population increase affects mainly public spaces, urban forests, urban agricultural areas, coasts, rural areas, and the city, which are called as common areas or commons. The fiscal crisis that occurred in 2008 led to an increase in privatization practices implementing varying methods for different countries. The emergence of these practices in urban space is embodied by more construction and more spatial transformation processes. These processes result in urban expansion which impacts not only the periphery but also in public spaces called common uses or commons, urban forests, urban agricultural areas, coasts, rural areas, and the city.

After the 2008 crisis, many social movements emerged in the USA, Greece, Spain, the Middle Eastern countries known as the "Arab Spring" and urban social movements in Turkey (Tilly and Wood, 2020). The fact that Turkey and Spain are the countries where the demands for the protection of the commons and the right to the city are most intense, that both countries are in the Mediterranean Basin, and that they show similarities in basic sectors such as tourism, service, and agriculture, as well as in areas such as housing, construction, and public services, are the main factors to make comparative research with these countries. Therefore, this study aims to compare the social movements formed against the enclosure of "common spaces" after the 2008 crisis in Spain and Turkey and to explore whether these movements created an "alternative common space" as a spatial gain. From this point of view, this study investigates whether the movements that emerged after 2008 have created a new commoning practice in terms of forms of enclosure, type and level of action. By focusing on urban social movements from Turkey & Spain, it discusses the achievements of the following movements against private or state interventions (urban enclosure) towards natural (ecological) commons, urban commons, and commons as systems by taking the cases Validebağ Grove Struggle, Düzce Hope Workshop Housing Cooperative, Gerze Thermal Power Plant, Ciudad Meridiana Neighbourhood Housing movement, Can Battlo Occupation Factory, CERCS Village Waste Incineration Plant.

By comparing the above cases, the spatial transformation created by social movements and the changing meanings of spaces, the changes in the way of using space after the struggle, and the reflection of these changes on space in terms of daily life practices will be evaluated with a qualitative content and document analysis by using the secondary

data we got from keyword research from articles, websites, and interview articles. Based on the results, it was found that while the forms of enclosure took place in the form of “privatization, commodification and displacement” for both country cases, they differ in period for spatial gains and the level of action between different organization scales.

2. Literature review

2.1 Roots of Enclosure Discussions

The origins of the concept of the commons can be traced back to the enclosure movements that started in rural England in the 17th century and were called primitive accumulation. The transformation in the agricultural production process and the discovery of mobile and productive labor and rent by landowners aiming to ensure the continuity of accumulation led to the enclosure of more agricultural land. The enclosure movement in England started with the closure of common areas in rural areas by state power and the placement of local institutions in fenced areas. In this sense, with practices such as market economy, wage relationship, reducing the effectiveness of the church, which is a local mechanism, and integrating many rural issues into the parliamentary system, the processes in the space were rationalized and the process of transforming/enclosing these spaces in favour of the market and the state was facilitated (Turner, 1984). This process also represents the transition from feudalism to the modern state and capitalist social structure (Wood, 2003: 156).

The concept of ‘commons’, developed through the concept of ‘commoning, common problems’, has emerged as a concept that positions itself against the forms produced by neoliberalism and proposes ‘alternative forms’ regarding the management of all goods, resources and public services (Dardot and Laval, 2018: 8). The commons define a network of existential, economic and ecological relations. Therefore, struggles for the commons show the ways and practices of ‘living together’ in a way that includes all life (Weber, 2015).

The concept of the commons was first discussed academically in 1968 with the article ‘The Tragedy of the Common’ written by Garret Hardin. According to Hardin, those who use the common goods defined as oceans, streams, forests and pastures in an unsustainable manner should bear the cost of the negative impact caused by the overuse of these goods. In this study, Hardin uses the allegory of the shepherd and the pasture to make a discussion on common areas. The pasture area is a common area and if each shepherd prioritises his own interests in grazing his animals in this area and wants to graze more, the destruction of these areas will be inevitable. For this reason, Hardin argues that these areas should be nationalised or privatised for sustainable use (Hardin, 1968: 1243). Elinor Ostrom, an economist, disagrees with Hardin’s views and argues that the users of the commons have developed their own local methods and that the users of these spaces have created a place-specific control mechanism. At this

point, according to Ostrom, the problem related to the commons arises when a stranger arrives from outside or when there is an external intervention in the space (Ostrom, 2002). Ostrom sees the commons as spaces where those who use that space can claim rights and make decisions about the space themselves, and which are open to the use of everyone (De Angelis & Harvie, 2017). Therefore, in Ostrom's perspective, there is a limited spatial category outside of private and public spaces. The theoretical approaches that are positioned against Ostrom's 'limited' spatial categorisation and address socio-spatial practices are based on Lefebvre's (2015) concept of 'transformation of life through the transformation of the city' and the concept of 'right to the city', which is the basic demand of society and society as the constructor of space (Caffentzis & Federici, 2014; De Angelis & Harvie, 2017; Stavrides, 2019).

Today we can see that the enclosure process continued in 17th century England. However, the tools used in the enclosure process have changed. The economic crises of the 20th and 21st centuries and the political and economic practices used to overcome the crises, as well as new spatial forms and neoliberal policies implemented through these forms, exemplify this change. With the transition to neoliberal policies because of new political processes in the 1970s, it is necessary to consider the transformations created by forms of "enclosure" with spatial, class and political characteristics in a holistic manner (Hall, et al., 2013: 14). During the 20th and 21st-century economic crises, there have been changes in the tools of the enclosure process:

- Restructuring geography: waves of enclosure - spatial inequality,
- Classical expropriation of lands (in the first stage),
- Introducing a mobile army of immigrants into the global economy,
- Patenting of nature and local knowledge - intellectual property (seeds patent ban on producing local seed)
- The commodification of labor and immaterial qualities (Jeffrey, et al., 2011).

When we look at concepts such as land and land use, the common/common resource is seen as an important qualification in determining the meaning of space. In the theories on the production and reproduction of urban space, it is emphasized that capital moves by using land to continue its accumulation, and in each land use, it both increases the pressure on common areas and produces only "capital space" without considering social demand (Harvey, 2011: 372). Today, in parallel with the mobility of capital, the expansion of urban space has accelerated and the pressure on common areas has increased. This pressure has become visible through enclosure practices in many areas such as agricultural areas, forests, pastures, coasts, construction, tourism, mining and energy, water, seeds, and genes (Foster and Iaione, 2022). Among the ways to reduce this pressure on common spaces, there are discussions on the restructuring of capital and geography (Smith, 2017; Brenner & Theodore, 2002). Another important route is to reconstruct the existing space through a socio-spatial transformation by questioning the connection between urban space and social space. For this, it is necessary to redefine

the subjects of space. This reconstruction process should include ensuring the relationship of “belonging” that establishes the relationship between urban space and social space, assuming responsibility for the living space through space, and implementing the principle of democratic participation in the production processes of space (Stavrvides, 2019; Dardot & Laval, 2018; De Angelis, 2014; Federici, 2011). At this point, examining the concept of the commons, which is positioned in critical theory, on the city paves the way for a new alternative urban space debate alongside the restructuring of capital or geography (Brenner, 1998: 16; Smith, 2017).

The right to the city, which includes a collective demand for the recovery of the common space that is constructed by social practices and transforms social practices after this construction, is a democratic right that not only reclaims life or space, but also shows the ways of collective decision-making and togetherness (Mitchell, 2003; Harvey, 2008). It also refers to the right to access urban services and spaces, the right to obtain these rights, and the right to regain these rights in case of usurpation of these rights (Lefebvre, 2015). Another right that includes the reclamation of space and the recreation, transformation, and design of the city as an “urban citizen” after this reclamation is the right to *Oeuvre*. This right implies city ownership and active participation in the spatial organization and management (Purcell, 2013: 145). In this sense, the right to oeuvre emphasizes the new subjectivities formed in spaces that enable co-existence beyond nation-state citizenship. This new form of subjectivity is defined as “urban citizen” (Jeffrey, et al., 2011). In this new form of subjectivity, seeing the city as a commons involves resisting the destruction of infrastructure, urban memory spaces, urban green spaces and rural areas to meet urban needs (Park, et al., 2024). These new forms of subjectivity can be observed in “commoning practices” that reclaim space. Weber (2015) discusses a dialectical form of the commons. According to him, if we do not see the planet as a dichotomy between humans and ‘natural resources’, the ‘boundary’ between what is distributed (natural resource discourse) and those who use it becomes blurred. In this case, there would be no need to discuss ideas such as fair and equitable distribution. This can be seen in the basic motivation underlying commoning practices today. In new forms of subjectivity, the perception of belonging can be linked to being part of a community.

2.2. Enclosure of the commons, rationalization process and social movements

Edward Soja (2000) points out that in today’s cities, many things are standardized to create a global city image, and that we are increasingly creating “cities of simulacra” that resemble each other, but where the reality is known that this is not the case. The resulting simulacra society blunts the experience of a *Fleaur* wandering around the city and obscures his urban-spatial memory (Benjamin, 2012). At this point, it causes the urbane to be alienated from the city and to experience the (in)practicality of everyday life without experiencing the city. Today, this form of alienation in big cities has a quality

that leads to the disintegration of social togetherness and individualization instead. The means to achieve this is through the enclosure of urban space. Before the enclosures, the real value of spaces was determined by the spaces where collective practices took place, such as meeting points, walking areas, or spaces of urban memory. The enclosure process is implemented through mechanisms that include and transform all collective spaces. Through markets, legalities, police surveillance (control), and design/planning, enclosures are physically and hegemonically enforced through a process of social regulation and indeed rationalization/normalization of the situation (De Angelis, 2022; Caffentzis and Federici, 2014).

To ensure rationalization in the process of enclosure of commons, firstly, these spaces are included in value practices, secondly, spatiality is regulated through social control through a control mechanism representing power, and finally, space is intervened through certain regulatory regimes at different scales and at other times (Sevilla-Buitrago, 2015). There are also other forms in the rationalization processes of enclosures in commons (Hodkinson, 2012; Runge and Defrancesco, 2006; Sevilla-Buitrago, 2015). These forms are as follows:

- Public-private partnerships (build-operate-transfer models in local governments),
- Privatisation of urban infrastructures (privatization of energy, water, and sanitation, etc.),
- The restructuring of city centers and urban housing markets in the form of gentrification through secure mega-development projects (e.g. large shopping malls or paid thematic parks, gated luxury estates) (Runge and Defrancesco, 2006),
- Clearance/conversion of public housing and other low-rent accommodation (such as slums) (urban regeneration, gentrification projects),
- The local being influenced by global market forces and the relocation of businesses through special zoning incentives in new regional development strategies (Hodkinson, 2012). (This often leads to paving the way for new enclosures through city administrations. For example, the relocation of Organised Industrial Zones to the urban periphery and the zoning of fertile agricultural lands on the periphery, the zoning of ecological areas for large projects such as Expo, etc.)
- Privatisation and intensive control of public spaces (Sevilla-Buitrago, 2015) (such as the reduction of urban squares with spaces such as car parks and cafés in favour of large projects, or limiting their use to appeal to a certain segment of the population),
- The creation of customized spaces for the consumption of the wealthy through social control and customized security systems (Mels, 2014). (Street designs with luxury brands and restaurants, security checkpoints at the entrances of public spaces, etc.).

3. Design of the case study & methodology

This paper aims to answer whether the movements that emerged after 2008 have created a new commoning in terms of forms of enclosure, type and level of action? To an-

swer these questions, qualitative research design is applied to analyse and to compare our cases which uses secondary data. The collected secondary data from cases covers declarations published by established organizations (local organization web pages, social media of organization, etc.), news from the local and national media, published interviews with citizens participating in the organizations, and legal documents in places where legal gains have been made. In addition, national publications of both countries are scanned, and prominent movements were discussed. The study analyzed these documents using the document analysis method, classifying and examining primary and secondary documents (direct interviews, news and interview articles). The documents are also analyzed using the content analysis method, through categories and case examples (Yin, 1994). The keywords “protest, struggle, urban movement, environmental action” are used while scanning the media. In addition, search is also made for the words “resistance, action, activists” as synonyms of these words. As a result of these scans, the prominent movements were discussed, and the web pages of these movements, articles, and books containing interviews published about the movements are examined. To evaluate urban, spatial, and environmental protests between 2008 and 2023, the following keywords “action, urban protest, ecological protest, resistance, commoning,” are scrutinized in total.

In determining the areas examined within the scope of the study, a media scan is conducted from three different newspapers with “liberal, radical and right-wing” tendencies, which are published daily in the Turkish and Spanish media, considering the impartiality of the research. Newspapers such as El-Pais, Catalan News and The Olive Press from Spain and Birgün, Sabah and Milliyet from Turkey were scanned to determine the scope of the study. As a result of these scans, movements in Turkey and Spain whose demands were met, which were urban, where the use of space was active, and which stood out in public opinion were selected. While making this selection, priority was given to movements that fit the categories determined in the theoretical framework.

We examine the selected movements in three different categories “urban, natural, and systemic” commons. The main reason for this is to reveal the basic motivation of the so-called “common” practices and conflicts, not only as a physical form, but also in the coming together of multiple forms of existence, and to examine the reflection of this motivation on space (Hardt and Negri, 2009). Urban commons include parks, urban green spaces, housing, infrastructure, transport, areas representing collective memory and meeting places (streets, avenues). Natural resources and assets, water, forests, coasts, mountains, and rural settlements are included in the category of natural (ecological) commons. Finally, commons as systems include culture, values, local knowledge, traditions, forms of social relations, collective memory, digital systems and the Internet. The main reason for taking the 2008 crisis as a paradigm in this study is to analyse the transformative effects of crises. While the most important element of this effect for capital and the state is the increasing privatisation and austerity policies, the most important element for society is the defence of the commons and the spatial gains achieved after this defence. The selected movements are not the (liminal) spaces (Varvarousis, 2022)

created at the peak of social movements, but the permanent spaces created after these peaks.

4. Commoning practices in Turkey

4.1 Validebağ Grove Struggle - İstanbul

As an urban, natural and system common, The Validebağ Grove is one of the last groves in the city of İstanbul, which is known for its dense housing development that has preserved its natural structure and is a first-degree natural and historically protected area. This case is important both for social memory and as the last remaining green area in İstanbul. There have been discussions about the grove since 1998, and projects for a Hyde Park, a religious building, and a car park have been planned since 2009, but these projects were canceled due to social opposition. In 2018, the grove was opened for construction, and it was announced that a people's garden, a mosque, and a car park would be built in the area (Akyıldız, 2019). These projects include the 'privatization' of various public uses and the 'commodification of public space for tourism'. Thanks to the growing social movements in 2018, these projects were canceled in 2023. At the beginning of the 25-year struggle for the Validebağ Grove, the responsible public administration institution was from a right-wing party which stimulated private investment more. In 2019, when the left-wing party won the local elections, the responsible local administration, The İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality also involved in the struggle to end the project process. As a result of the legal process and social movements, it was decided to keep the grove as a green area. This process, which began as a grassroots movement, involves civil initiatives and is supported by local authorities. The spatial achievements of this movement are to protect the area as green space which can be evaluated as urban commons in terms of ensuring the continuation of public use of the space, natural (ecological) commons in terms of ensuring the protection of the different ecosystems of the grove, and systemic commons in terms of ensuring the protection of elements of cultural memory in the grove.

4.2 Düzce Hope Workshop Housing Cooperative - Düzce

An earthquake disaster occurred in Düzce on 12 November 1999. After the earthquake, while there was some state support at the national level for earthquake victims who were homeowners, there was no support for earthquake victims who were renters. It became difficult to find affordable housing due to the decrease in housing stock. In this process, the tenant earthquake victims faced the process of "displacement" due to both the earthquake and the inadequacy of the social policies implemented after the earthquake. The tenant earthquake victims started a struggle for housing and formed a cooperative in 2003 which started a legal process to demand the right to housing from the state. While permanent residences were being built for the beneficiaries in the earthquake zone, a lawsuit was filed to implement the principles of Law No. 775 regar-

ding the transfer of the remaining lands to housing building cooperatives. The case was won in 2012, and in 2014 the land for the construction of the houses was transferred to the Housing Development Administration. Thanks to the participatory and lengthy dialogues that took place during the planning and design process, alternative site plans and interior designs for the houses were created with the participation of experts from various disciplines (Gümüş, 2017). By 2023, the construction will be completed and the housing applications will be started. This struggle went on for 13 years. The involvement of the Housing Development Administration, which is part of the central government, in the process after the civil initiative actions to win the rights of the place. After the completion of the legal process, the right to housing was won by the power of the struggles as an example of urban commons. The spatial gain for this case is to protect housing rights as an urban common.

4.3. Gerze Thermal Power Plant - Sinop

As part of the thermal power plant project in Gerze, Sinop Province, it is planned to cut down around 16,000 trees in the region, which is both a nature reserve and a forest area as a natural common. For this project, the owned lands of many people in the region were purchased by the company that wanted to implement the project and many people in the region were dispossessed. There are also people in the region who make their living from fishing, and there is also a first-degree archaeological site in the project area (Kaymaz, 2017). Through an organisation established in the region, information on the impact of the thermal power plant on the region and the land was discussed in various meetings (Aldemir, 2016). As a result of the opposition of the people of the region to the Gerze thermal power plant project between 2009 and 2015, the project was canceled by a court decision on 23 February 2015. The region celebrates the day “23 February” every year and supports environmental struggles in nearby towns. The Sierra Club lists the Gerze resistance as one of the five most important struggles in the world. Two years after the gained struggle, Gerze was granted the status of ‘Slow City’. Throughout this 6-year struggle, left-wing local governments were both supporters and organisers of the struggle. The scale of organisation in this struggle covers both local, national, regional and global levels, and thanks to this support during the legal processes, the central government backed down and cancelled the Thermal plant project. The spatial gain of this case is to protect forest areas and rural settlements which shows the natural (ecological) commons in terms of protecting forest areas and preserving the nature of rural settlements.

5. Commoning practices in Spain

5.1 Ciudad Meridiana Neighbourhood Housing Movement - Barcelona

Ciutat Meridiana is one of the poorest districts in Barcelona. Located in the north of Barcelona and inhabited by the poor and immigrant classes, this neighborhood lacked

urban services such as infrastructure, transport, and telecommunications. Before the 2008 crisis, many immigrants bought houses in this neighborhood because of widespread mortgage lending practices in Spain. To repay these loans, the rooms in the houses were rented out. After the 2008 crisis, evictions began in this neighborhood for the first time. However, an important social movement developed against this (Palomera, 2013). An association called The Neighbourhood Association of Ciutat Meridiana (AVCM) was formed, which worked with organisations such as LaPah and 15M. After many acts of civil disobedience, public authorities and private banks were forced to provide affordable housing. In 2013, the city council planned to build a ‘factory laboratory’ in the area, but after the occupations, the area was reclaimed and used as a food bank and housing for migrants. The food banks, producer and consumer cooperatives and community gardens established in the area point to a new network of spatial relations and a shift in socio-spatial networks (Blanco and Leon, 2016). This is an illustrative case for urban commoning practice which has housing and infrastructure spatial gains.

5.2. Can Batlló Occupation Factory - Barcelona

Can Batlló was a weaver founded in 1880 in the Sant district of Barcelona. The factory closed in 1964 after the textile crisis in Spain and was included in the General Plan of the city in 1976. In this plan, the area was defined as a green space where social housing was to be built, but no activity was carried out in the factory area for 40 years. Various negotiations were held to transform the factory area, a place of social memory for the residents of the neighbourhood, into a green area and social living space, but no results were achieved (Asara, 2019). After the occupation, the factory was transformed into a social center and the Can Batlló civic platform movement, formed by the neighbourhood during the occupation process, was granted a 50-year concession in 2019, legalizing all activities in the factory area (Peña, 2020). Today, the factory site is home to a variety of public uses, including various cooperatives, workshops, a library, a solidarity cooperative called Coopolis, meeting and concert spaces, and children’s playgrounds. This case is important in terms of the spatial gains of the urban commons, in terms of securing affordable housing demands after social struggle and carrying out participatory processes in the design of these houses.

5.3. CERCS Village Waste Incineration Plant – Cercs Town

As a natural common CERCS Village Waste Incineration Thermal Plant, which began operating in the 1970s in the town of Cercs, Barcelona, under a build-operate-transfer policy, was found to have committed “environmental crimes” because of protests and lawsuits by local people and farmers due to health problems in the area, increased acid rain and the gradual disappearance of ecological areas. Although the use of low-carbon coal was subsequently switched, the environmental damage continued and the plant’s operations were completely shut down in 2011 after further court cases, protests, and complications regarding European Union directives and the ownership of the plant.

With the closure of the plant, the ecosystem in the region has been revitalized. In 2019, local and regional governments have created various incentives for different economic sectors to revitalize the economy of the region. With these incentives, the company EM Spain Waste & Treat SL wanted to carry out a project called Ecocercs Energy, which aimed to generate energy by burning industrial waste using the infrastructure of the old thermal power plant (Barat-Auleda ve Domenech, 2022). The project was opposed by the local community, farmers, activists and 28 of the 32 municipalities in the region. A multi-stakeholder organization was formed for the region and the demands were presented to the Catalan parliament. These organizations state that the pollution caused by the incineration process of the proposed plants will affect both public health and the ecosystem and that agricultural production and the newly launched practices of ‘ecological and sustainable tourism’ in the region will be damaged by the plant. These organizations formed a platform called the Cercs Anti-incineration Platform (PAIC) and organized their action processes with community initiatives. As a result of social movements, court cases, and conflicts in parliament, the Catalan government reversed the decisions. After the reversal of this decision, in 2023, the company created a new project, a “green hydrogen power plant”, a museum, a restaurant, a hotel, and an amusement park, using the infrastructure of the old thermal power plant. This project was attempted through a process that was not transparent and did not include participatory practices. Objections have been raised to this project because the presence of public uses next to the factory and hydrogen storage is harmful, hydrogen energy will lead to excessive water consumption and affect agricultural activities in the region, and social movements have intensified again (URL 1). The project is currently in the environmental impact assessment phase, and local people and activists are actively using the site through vigils in the area. This case is an important example in terms of natural (ecological) commons, in terms of preventing the ecological damage that the waste facility may cause and the problems that may arise in rural settlements after social struggles.

6. Discussion & Conclusion

Enclosure practices are important to ensure the continuity of capitalist accumulation processes. Although there are different practices in different places, all these practices are aimed at ensuring the continuity of profit. The social movements and spatial gains studied for different countries that have different forms of governance are important for revealing the uniqueness and differences between commoning practices. After the crises of the capitalist system, its impact on geography led to significant transformations in ecological and urban areas, and these transformations have qualities that ignore the ‘public good’. Crises’ are seen as a rationalising theme to legitimise the policies implemented. While crises create a state of exception for interventions in the commons, they can also be an important flashpoint for social opposition. The main reason for choosing the 2008 crisis in this study is the emergence of creative, destructive and transformative effects in both situations. The creative and transformative effects were analysed in the

Tab. 1 – Selected commoning practices from Turkey and Spain

Country	Commoning Practices	Types of urban commons in each case	Forms of Enclosure	Level & Type of Action
TURKEY	Validebağ Grove Struggle-Istanbul	Urban Common, Natural Common, Common as cultural systems	Privatization, Commodification	Local and national <u>Civil initiative</u>
	Düzce Hope Workshop Housing Cooperative- Düzce	Urban Common	Displacement	Local, regional, and national <u>Civil initiative</u>
	Gerze Thermal Power Plant-Sinop	Natural Common	Privatization, Accumulation through dispossession	Local, regional, national, and global <u>Civil initiative</u>
SPAIN	Ciudad Meridiana Neighbourhood Housing Movement- Barcelona	Urban Common	Displacement, Exile, Accumulation through dispossession	Local, regional, and national <u>Civil Disorder</u>
	Can Batllo Occupation Factory - Barcelona	Commons as Cultural Systems and Urban Commons	Expropriation, Alienation, Exclusion	Local, Regional, National, and Global <u>Civil Disorder</u>
	CERCS Village Waste Incineration Plant – Cercs Town	Natural Commons	Privatization, Commodification	Local and Regional <u>Civil initiative</u>

examples studied and the traces of an alternative spatiality were followed. The forms of struggle seen in these examples, the participatory processes carried out for the space and the forms of sociality established within the space offer ways for democratic forms of spatial intervention.

For this reason, in this study, we have examined the practices from two different countries, in different spaces which show different commoning types (see Table 1), the social movements against these practices, and the spatial gains of the movements.

As can be seen from Table 1, forms of enclosure differ for the two countries. In Turkey while forms of enclosure practices are seen as privatization, commodification, displacement and accumulation through dispossessions, in Spain forms of enclosure vary from privatization to commodification, displacement, alienation and exclusion. Among the cases treated under the category of urban commons, getting back of housing rights in Düzce and Ciudad Meridiana, the preservation of the quality of public space in Validebağ, and the creation of a new urban commons in the case of Can Battlo are important examples of spatial gains. In the cases treated under the category of natural (ecological) commons, the enclosure processes were initiated by the private sector after facilities provided by the central governments for the energy production projects in Gerze and Cercs town, and the projects for the opening of the green area with rich ecosystem in Va-

lidebağ grove for construction. Thanks to the social movements, the risk of destroying the forest areas and the risk of displacing the rural population has been stopped and protecting the integrity of the ecological systems is considered an important spatial gain. The Validebağ Grove Struggle and the Can Battlo Occupation Factory, which are considered as systems under the category of commons, were wanted to be closed down by different administrative units and the private sector. However, the projects in these spaces were stopped and the spaces were reclaimed thanks to social movements that aim to protect spaces that represent common memory and systems such as tradition, culture and values that contain historical elements.

In Spain, processes of enclosure occur when the administration (municipality or autonomous government) directly encloses an urban land, plot, or building and renders it dysfunctional - privatized it. In Turkey, enclosure processes are shaped by central government decisions at the national level. The nature of the actions differs between Turkey and Spain. In Turkey, all enclosure practices are civil initiatives, whereas in Spain, enclosure practices are characterized by civil disobedience (Table 1).

These findings from Turkey and Spain show us that urban enclosure processes have similar forms such as privatization and commodification. However, it also differs in its process of gaining due to the differences between types of states. In the examples from Turkey, the central government's policy of prioritising economic development paved the way for enclosure processes. It is relatively more difficult for local governments to have a word against to central government in these processes because of their centralised structure. In local governments where left-wing parties were in power, social movements were supported. In local governments where right-wing parties were in power, it depended on the size (or massiveness) of the social movements and their impact on public opinion. Because of Spain's federal structure, the processes of enclosure have mostly emerged through the facilities that regional governments have offered to investors to promote economic development. However spatial gains are made in joint processes supported by local governments and national and local initiatives for both countries.

REFERENCES

- Akyıldız, S. (2019). Yeşil Alan mı İbadethane Alanı mı? Dil, din, pratik ekseninde Validebağ Direnişi. *Journal of Sociological Research*. Vol.22(1): 1-31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18490/sosars.559086>
- Aldemir, E. (2016). Eleştirel Halkla İlişkiler Bağlamında Ekoloji ve Kadın: Gerze Direnişi Örneği. Unpublished master's thesis. Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Asara, V. (2019). The Redefinition and Co-Production of Public Services by Urban Movements. The Can Batlló Social Innovation in Barcelona. *Partecipazione&Conflitto Special Issue on: Social Movements and the Third Sector*. Vol.12(2). DOI: [10.1285/i20356609v12i2p539](https://doi.org/10.1285/i20356609v12i2p539)
- Barat-Auledai, O. ve Domenech, M. (2022). Stop burning garbage! Exploring an anti-waste-to-energy social movement and its effects on local politics in Spain. *Energy Research&Social Science*. Vol.92 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2022.102772>

- Benjamin, W. (2012). Pasajlar. A. Cemal(Çev.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Blanco, I. ve Leon, M. (2016). Social innovation, reciprocity and contentious politics: Facing the socio-urban crisis in Ciutat Meridiana, Barcelona. *Urban Studies Journal*, Vol. 54(9): 2172-2188. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098016659044>
- Brenner, N. (1998). Global Cities, glocal states: global city formation and state territorial restructuring in contemporary Europe, *Rewiev of International Political Econom.* Vol.2(1): 1-37. DOI: 10.1080/096922998347633
- Brenner, N. and Theodore, N. (2002) 'Cities and the geographies of actually existing neoliberalism', *Antipode* 34(3), pp. 349–379. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8330.00246
- Caffentzis, G. ve Federici, S. (2014). Commons against and beyond capitalism. *Community Development Journal*. Vol. 49(1): i92-i105. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsu006>
- Dardot, P. ve Laval, C. (2018). Müşterek. (çev. E. Sarıkartal ve F. Taylan). İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- De Angelis, M. (2014). Social Revolution and the Commons. *South Atlantic Quarterly*. 113(2): 299-311. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-2643630>
- De Angelis, M., & Harvie, D. (2014). The commons. *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*, London: Routledge, 280–294
- De Angelis, M. (2022). The City as a Commons Diffused Governance for Social and Ecological Reproduction. in *Post-Growth Planning*. (ed. F. Savini, A. Ferreira, K.Schönfeld). Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003160984>
- Federici, S. (2011). Caliban ve Cadı. Çev. Ö. Karakaş. Otonom Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Foster, S. R. ve Iaione, C. (2022). Co-Cities Innovative transitions toward just and self-sustaining communities. *Massachusetts Institute of Techonology*, Cambridge.
- Gümüş, H. (2017). Toplumsal Mekân Üretiminde Müşterekleştirme Pratikleri: Düzce Umut Evleri. Master thesis from: Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar University, İstanbul.
- Hall, S., Massey, D., Rustin, M. (2013). After neoliberalism: analysing the present. *Soundings*, 53(53): 8-22. DOI: 10.3898/136266213806045656
- Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243–1248. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.162.3859.1243>
- Hardt, M. ve A. Negri (2009) *Commonwealth*, Cambridge: Belknap.
- Harvey, D. (2008). The Right to the City. *New Left Review*. Vol. 53, ss: 23-40. Retrieved From: <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii53/articles/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city> , date of access: 09.05.2023.
- Harvey, D. (2011). The Future of the Commons. *Radical History Review*, Vol.2011(109): 101-107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/01636545-2010-017>
- Hodkinson, S. (2012). The New Urban Enclosures. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*. Vol.16(5): 500-518. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2012.709403>
- Jeffrey, A., McFarlane, C., Vasudevan, A. (2011). Rethinking Enclosure: Space, Subjectivity and the Commons. Vol. 44(4): 1247-1267. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00954.x>
- Kaymaz, C. (2017). Neoliberalizm ve Çevreci Hareketler: Sinop-Gerze Termik Santral Örneği. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Akdeniz University Institute of Social Sciences, Antalya.
- Lefebvre, H. (2015). Şehir Hakkı. (Çev. I. Ergüden). Sel Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Mels, T. (2014). Primitive accumulation and the production of abstract space: 19th century mire reclamation on Gotland. *Antipode*, Vol. 46(4): 1113-1133. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12083>
- Mitchell, D. (2003). *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. Guilford Press, New York.
- Ostrom, E. (2002). Reformulating the commons, *Ambiente&Sociedade*, 10: 5-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-753X2002000100002>
- Palomera, J. (2013). How did finance capital infiltrate the world of the urban poor? Homeownership and social fragmentation in a spanish neighborhood. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Vol. 38(1): 218-235. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.12055
- Park, B. G., Lee, J. H., Han, D. K. ae, Lee, S., Paek, Y., & Shim, H. (2024). Enabling infrastructure: seeing infrastructure as the urban commons. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2024.2321337>

- Peña, D. (2020). Beyond guerrilla urbanism: Can Batlló and the slowness of knowing, managing, and making. *Urban Design International*, Vol. 25. ss: 126-136. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41289-019-00080-y>
- Purcell, M. (2013). "Possible Worlds: Henri Lefebvre and the Right to the City". *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1), 141-154. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12034>
- Runge, C.F. ve Defrancesco, E. (2006). "Exclusion, Inclusion,, and Enclosure: Historical Commons and Modern Intellectual Property". *World Development*. Vol.34(10): 1713-1727. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2006.02.002>
- Sevilla-Buitrago, A. (2015) "Capitalist Formations of Enclosure: Space and the Extinction of the Commons", *Antipode*, 47 (4): 999-1020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12143>
- Smith, N. (2017). *Eşitsiz Gelişim Doğa, Sermaye ve Mekânın Üretimi*. (Çev. Esin Soğancılar). İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.
- Soja, E. (2000). The city and spatial justice. in *Justices et Injustices Spatiales*, ed. B. Bret, P. Gervais-Lambony, C. Hancock, F. Landy. Presses Univeritaires de Paris Ouest, Paris. ss: 55-74.
- Stavrides, S. (2019). *Müşterek Mekân*. Çev. Cenk Saraçoğlu. İstanbul: Sel Yayınları.
- Tilly, C. ve Wood, L. (2022). *Toplumsal Hareketler 21. YY'a Giriyor. içinde Toplumsal Hareketler 1768-2018*. ed. C. Tilly, E. Castaneda, L. J. Wood. Çev. O. Düz. Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Turner, M. E., (1984). *Enclosure in Britain 1750-1830*. The Macmillan Press, London.
- UN DESA (2018). *Revision of World Urbanization Prospects*. Erişim Adresi: <https://population.un.org/wup/>, Erişim Tarihi: 16.10.2023
- URL 1 (2023). *Projecten una inversió de 125 MEUR a la tèrmica de Cercs per fer un parc de natura i una planta d'hidrogen verd*. 3Cat News. Retrieve from: <https://www.ccma.cat/324/projecten-una-inversio-de-125-meur-a-la-termica-de-cercs-per-fer-un-parc-de-natura-i-una-planta-dhidrogen-verd/noticia/3215509/?s=08>
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Varvarousis, A. (2022). *Liminal Commons, Modern Rituals of Transitions in Greece*. Bloomsbury Academic, Britain.
- Weber, A. (2015). *Reality as Commons, A Poetics of Participation for the Anthropocene*. in *Patterns of Commoning*. eds. D. Bollier & S. Helfrich. Amherst, MA: The Commons Strategy Group/ Off the Commons Books, pp. 369-391. Retrieved From: <https://patternsofcommoning.org/>
- Wood, E. M. (2003). *Kapitalizmin Kökeni*. Çev. C. Aşkın. Epos Yayınları, Ankara.

Gülşah Tırış

*Akdeniz University, Faculty of Architecture
Department of City and Regional Planning, Antalya, Türkiye
gulsahtiris7@gmail.com*

Gülşah Tırış, a PhD student at Akdeniz University Faculty of Architecture, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, has worked on urbanization policies, political ecology, social movements and sustainability. In her doctoral thesis, she studies commoning practices in Spain and Turkey.

Hilal Erkuş

*Akdeniz University, Faculty of Architecture
Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Antalya, Türkiye
herkus@akdeniz.edu.tr*

Hilal Erkuş is a full Professor at Akdeniz University (Faculty of Architecture, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Antalya, Turkey). She is specialized on urban and regional economic development, (political) economic (tourism) geography, tourism development, tourism clusters, networks, tourism value chains, urban tourism governance, economic homogenization and diversification in tourism firms, tourism firm survival, fictional expectations.