THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF FEMINIST ACTIVISM: CREATING A TEMPORARY SAFE SPACE FOR WOMEN AT THE FEMINIST NIGHT MARCH IN BEYOĞLU, İSTANBUL

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖZNUR UŞAKLILAR

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 2022

Approval of the thesis:

THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF FEMINIST ACTIVISM: CREATING A TEMPORARY SAFE SPACE FOR WOMEN AT THE FEMINIST NIGHT MARCH IN BEYOĞLU, İSTANBUL

submitted by **ÖZNUR UŞAKLILAR** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Science in Gender and Women's Studies, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Sadettin KİRAZCI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences _____

Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut BEŞPINAR
Head of Department
Department of Gender and Women's Studies _____

Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut BEŞPINAR
Supervisor
Department of Sociology _____

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Hanife ALİEFENDİOĞLU (Head of the Examining Committee)
Eastern Mediterranean University
Department of New Media and Journalism _____

Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut BEŞPINAR (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Sociology _____

Prof. Dr. Ayşe GÜNDÜZ HOŞGÖR
Middle East Technical University
Department of Sociology _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Öznur UŞAKLILAR

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF FEMINIST ACTIVISM: CREATING A TEMPORARY SAFE SPACE FOR WOMEN AT THE FEMINIST NIGHT MARCH IN BEYOĞLU, İSTANBUL

UŞAKLILAR, Öznur

M.S., The Department of Gender and Women's Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut BEŞPINAR

September 2022, 246 pages

This study centers around the interrelation between space and gender. It aims to explore how women's intersecting identities, including but not limited to gender, and the *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu shape the research participants' spatial experiences and motivation to attend the Feminist Night March therein. Based on participant observation and semi-structured in-depth interviews with 22 participants who self-identify as women, this study endeavors to understand how women's participation in the march forms their perceptions of safety, attitudes, and actual behaviors in Beyoğlu, through a feminist methodology. In order to better analyze the march's role, the study covers the participants' everyday life experiences. In both contexts, they benefit from opportunities in this symbolic and fluid place while facing multiple constraints. Accordingly, Beyoğlu triggers the participants' fear, anger, trust, and hope. The study reveals that women create a temporary safe space for themselves on their own terms in the city through feminist activism. As part of feminist activism in Turkey, the march appears to be a resilient movement where women take up space in the streets of Beyoğlu after it gets dark, to some extent, at the cost of transgressing the borders of "a woman's place" in the city. Eventually, findings indicate the transformative power of feminist activism together with the possibilities of *thirdspace*

that shift participants' everyday fear of verbal, sexual, and physical violence into trust and hope. Nevertheless, regarding their sociodemographic characteristics, the march maintains the research participants' fear and anger.

Keywords: Beyoğlu, feminist activism, Feminist Night March, placemaking, thirdspace.

ÖZ

FEMİNİST AKTİVİZMİN DÖNÜŞTÜRÜCÜ GÜCÜ: İSTANBUL, BEYOĞLU
FEMİNİST GECE YÜRÜYÜŞÜ'NDE KADINLAR İÇİN GEÇİCİ GÜVENLİ
ALAN YARATMAK

UŞAKLILAR, Öznur

Yüksek Lisans, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut BEŞPINAR

Eylül 2022, 246 sayfa

Bu çalışma, mekân ve toplumsal cinsiyet arasındaki karşılıklı ilişkiye odaklanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı, tez katılımcılarının toplumsal cinsiyetleriyle sınırlı olmayan kesişen kimliklerinin ve Beyoğlu'nun *üçüncü mekân* boyutunun Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ndeki mekânsal deneyimlerini ve yürüyüşe katılma motivasyonlarını nasıl şekillendirdiğini anlamaktır. Feminist metodolojiyi benimsediğim bu çalışma, kendilerini kadın olarak tanımlayan 22 katılımcıyla yaptığım yarı-yapılandırılmış derinlemesine görüşmelere ve katılımcı gözlemime dayanarak, Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nün kadınların Beyoğlu'ndaki güvenlik algıları, tutumları ve davranışları üzerindeki etkisini ortaya çıkarmaya yönelik bir çabadır. Çalışma, yürüyüşün rolünü daha iyi analiz edebilmek amacıyla katılımcıların gündelik yaşam deneyimlerine de yer verir. Her iki bağlamda da katılımcılar, akışkan ve simgesel yer olarak tanımladığım Beyoğlu'nda birtakım kısıtlarla karşılaşmakta ve mekânın imkânlarından yararlanmaktadır. Dolayısıyla Beyoğlu, toplumsal bir aktör olarak, katılımcıların korku, öfke, güven ve umut duygularını tetiklemektedir. Bu çalışma; kadınların, feminist aktivizm vasıtasıyla, koşullarını kendi belirledikleri şekilde, kentte kendileri için geçici güvenli alan yarattıklarını ortaya koyar. Feminist

aktivizmin Türkiye'deki sebatlı bir örneği olan bu yürüyüşte, katılımcılar "kadının kentteki yeri"yle ilgili kabul görmüş kültürel kodları kırmak pahasına, hava karardıktan sonra, Beyoğlu'nun sokaklarında, belli bir dereceye kadar yer kaplamaktadır. Nihayetinde, çalışma *üçüncü mekân*ın olasılıklarıyla feminist aktivizmin kadınların gündelik yaşamlarında deneyimledikleri sözlü, cinsel ve fiziksel şiddete maruz kalma korkusunu güven ve umuda dönüştürme potansiyeline dikkat çekmektedir. Ancak, bu yürüyüş, sosyodemografik özellikleriyle ilişkili olarak, katılımcıların korku ve öfke hissetmelerine neden olmaya devam etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Beyoğlu, feminist aktivizm, Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü, mekân yaratmak, üçüncü mekân.

To my grandmother, *Ümmühan*, from whom I learned the joy of walking in the wilderness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> [Walking lays] claim to the city. Especially if you are a woman [and] an LGBTI+ individual, walking [as a form of political protest] in the streets, where you are ignored, excluded, exposed to violence, or live with the threat of violence and fear, [gives] confidence and power through the presence of other women and LGBTI+ individuals. It asserts, "This is not your patriarchal, heterosexist, dominant gaze's [place], but my territory—living space—." When you walk in a street, you make it yours (Eralp, 2022, 3:04).[1]

Beyoğlu means a lot to my individual memory and the history of feminist activism in Turkey. At first glance, it frightened 10-year-old me because I encountered a sea of strangers in İstiklal Street. Then, it fascinated me when I saw thousands of women walking with confidence by chanting feminist slogans in the same street, whereas media coverage imbued my childhood memories with a victimized image of women sexually assaulted by men on New Year's Eve in Taksim. The first Feminist Night March (FNM) in İstanbul took place in İstiklal Street in 2003. After hosting several social movements for years, the street has become a forbidden place for FNM participants among other activists and protesters: Since 2019, the Governor's Office's ban on meetings and demonstrations in İstiklal Street has constrained the FNM participants to appropriate different routes: Sıraselviler Street in 2020 and 2021 and Cihangir Street in 2022.

Nevertheless, Beyoğlu pursues its importance. It interconnects Mis Street, Tel Street, Bayram Street, Gezi Park, Taksim Square and other symbolic places to which the FNM

---

[1] [Yürümek] bi yandan da kente dair başka bi talep. Özellikle kadın olduğun zaman, LGBTİ+ olduğun zaman; yok sayıldığın, dışlandığın, içinde şiddete uğradığın ya da şiddete uğrama tehdidiyle yaşadığın, yürürken tedirgin yürüdüğün sokaklarda yanında başka kadınların, LGBTİ+'ların varlığıyla; güvenle ve güçle [bir protesto biçimi olarak] yürümek, "Burası işte sizin patriyarkal, heteroseksist, egemen bakışınızın değil, benim de alanım, benim alanım! benim hayatımın alanı" diye bi iddia taşıyo. Yürüdüğün zaman o sokağı kendine de ait kılıyosun.

participants feel attached while it has been regarded as the redline of the Justice and Development Party (abbreviated officially AK Party) government. That's why Beyoğlu is involved in this study as *thirdspace,* that bears traces of counter meanings attributed by different actors. In the form of *thirdspace*, Beyoğlu shapes spatial experiences as one of the social actors rather than a stage or an empty container of social activities. Its fluidity allows socially disadvantaged groups to make room for themselves on their own terms and be collectively visible. Accordingly, I describe the FNM in Beyoğlu as a mode of women's physical and symbolic placemaking in the city. Although they encounter limitations in their everyday lives while using urban public spaces, women create their own chance to push the limits of their assigned borders in the city, by means of feminist activism. I assert that women's perceived vulnerability and fearful representation—gender role beliefs in general—undermine their use of public spaces, particularly at night. However, women challenge this portrayal as agents—organizers and participants—of feminist activism through feminist solidarity and alliance. Women attend the FNM, wherein they ease their gendered fear of violence, enlarge the boundaries of their mental map of safety, and consolidate their right to the city, to some extent. In the scope of this study, the FNM—an enduring fragment of collective feminist activism in Turkey—appears to be an assertive strategy. In line with this, this study aims to explore how women's characteristics and participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu forms their spatial experiences[2] in this fluid and symbolic place. Furthermore, it is an endeavor to understand how their intersecting identities[3] and the multidimensional structure of space[4] shape these women's claims to Beyoğlu, as part of feminist activism in Turkey.

---

[2] Here, women's "spatial experiences" refer to their perceptions (thoughts and interpretations), attitudes (emotions), and actual behaviors about their use of Beyoğlu.

[3] including but not limited to their gender identity

[4] Based on Soja's (1996a) spatial theory, I assert that Beyoğlu is a *thirdspace* (real-and-imagined space) that is with diverse meanings and functions attributed by different actors who aim to realize their ideologies and make visible their own cultural identities therein.

1.1.   Background and Context

The Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) *Index 2021/22* indicates the latest global trends between 170 countries on gender equality. Norway holds first place in the gender equality ranking of the WPS Index that gives information about community safety: the percentage of women ages 15 and older who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or in their neighborhood. An earlier version of the WPS Index indicates that 49.9% of women feel safe walking alone at night in Turkey (WPS Index 2017/18, 2017, p. 48). In Norway, women's community safety perception rate is 81.2% (p. 51). In the WPS Index 2021/22, Turkey appears with the "worst country score" on the perception of community safety in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia by 37% (p. 21), while this rate rises to 89.5% in Norway (p. 76). Although current data shows a considerable decrease in women's perception of community safety in Turkey, it does not indicate the gap between women and men's perceptions in any country. The previous version captures data between 2010 and 2016 and represents the author's estimates of the gender gap in 2017. According to these estimations, almost 52% of women and 70% of men would feel safe walking alone at night in Turkey, while the gap was expected to be around 5% (almost four times narrower) in Norway (the WPS Index 2017/2018, 2017, p. 43).

Whether it is a part of the Middle Eastern or Nordic region of the world, which are supposed to stand at opposite poles in gender equality, there is a gender gap of community safety in all countries. Women are less likely to report safety walking alone at night, and "Perceived safety in the community affects women's mobility and opportunities outside the home" (WPS Index 2021/2022, 2021, p. 15). Accordingly, mostly women experience public spaces at night with fear. Bearing in mind that there are different forms and experiences within gender identities, women's fear in public spaces mainly derives from the gendered organization of space and gender role beliefs that inculcate women with cultural codes of the street. For example, as a member of women population in Turkey, I have experienced the eyes on women's appearance, voice, and behavior. I was invited to keep up with the cultural expectations: Sometimes

I was forced or suggested to control my laughter[5], wear bolero or bodysuit[6], and prevent from chewing gum or smoking in the street because of my gender.

Yaşam Memnuniyeti Araştırması, 2021 – Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TÜİK) [The Life Satisfaction Survey, 2021 – Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT)] provides information specific to Turkey about people's safety perceptions of their spatial use by sex[7] between the years of 2003 and 2021. According to this survey, the percentage of women who feel very secure while walking alone at night diminishes from 5.4 to 4.5, and the percentage of men's safety perception decreases from 11.6 to 11.1 in 19 years. Also, the rate of women feeling very safe at home alone rises from 12.1% to 12.7%. It increases from 17.3% to 20.3% when it comes to men's perception. Although total data shows a slight decrease in the perception of safety in public spaces at night and a mild increase in the perception of safety at home, men double women's safety perception in both places of the urban context.

The most relevant research, specific to Turkey, on LGBT[8] individuals' spatial experiences from housing to social participation was conducted in 2014. Based on a survey and focus group interviews, the research asserts that respondents are constrained to live in specific locations in the city. As respondents state, they endeavor to find safe spaces in the city because they want to eliminate violence based on their gender identity and sexual orientation (Yılmaz & Göçmen, 2015). As part of their urban struggle, fear leads them to employ negotiation strategies in the city. Another research on urban mobility in the national context takes a more representative image

---

[5] I was once warned by an old man because my two friends (she/her) and I were laughing on the bus. He said "Girls do not laugh in public. Laughter spoils your soul." It happened days after Bülent Arınç's, the Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey, speech in 2014, in which he said "Woman needs to know what is *mahram* and what is non-*mahram* [off limits]. She should not laugh in public and be attractive in her attitudes." Then, I encountered this idiom several times in the media and in the street.

[6] There was a bolero and bodysuit trend in which women cover their *avret yerleri* [body parts, by religious law, that must be covered] in my living space in 2010s.

[7] The survey is based on the gender binary and individuals' assigned genders rather than their self-identified gender identities and sexual orientations.

[8] as stated in the study

of socially disadvantaged groups into consideration but in a narrower context: Hatiboğlu-Kısat and Odabaş (2020) argue that fear of crime limits not only women but also LGBTI+ individuals, elders, and disabled bodies in the scope of their mobility in Çankaya, Ankara. Regarding these urbanites' emotional and practical reactions, the researchers explore that fear causes them to avoid particular places; thus, it prevents them from accessing the city center and urban opportunities. Similarly, the *FRA Europa Survey (2020)*[9], in the context of the EU-28 then, asks LGBTI[10] individuals about their perception of urban safety and fear of violence. It explores that lesbian women (57%), bisexual women (52%), and transgender women (51%) avoid being open about their gender identities and sexual orientations for fear of being threatened, harassed, or assaulted in the street and in other public spaces. Nevertheless, they are exposed to physical or sexual attacks in these places by; respectively, 46%, 41%, and 52%. Regarding their hate-motivated harassment experiences, these women (82%) identify the perpetrator(s) as male.

As indicated by these statistics, mainly women and LGBTI+ individuals experience public spaces—particularly at night—with fear of being exposed to violence committed by men. Since women are exposed to harassment because of their gender identity and sexual orientation, fear of violence appears to be a gendered emotion. Women, whose urban mobility is surveilled and limited because of fear of violence, need safe spaces. Therefore, they sometimes avoid certain places or locations and particular time periods. However, they sometimes reclaim safe spaces through feminist solidarity and alliance by handing out a purple needle[11], meeting to sleep in parks[12], or

---

[9] In this study, relevant statistics represent average numbers indicated in all EU-28 countries.

[10] as stated in the study

[11] "Purple Needle Campaign" was created in Turkey in 1989 to raise awareness of street harassment as a limitation on women's urban mobility and bring an end to unwanted sexual attention (see https://catlakzemin.com/2-kasim-1989/).

[12] Meet To Sleep Ally was planned in 2008 and held in 2014 in Delhi, and yet still continues as a collective action in which women "meet to sleep, to fight fear, warnings and blame that [they] have long been taught to carry. [They] meet to sleep for the right to live defenseless" (see https://www.blanknoise.org/aboutmeettosleep).

gathering for collective marches like Take Back the Night (TBTN). In this study, I focus on the FNM as a form of feminist activism in which women[13] create a temporary safe space and transform Beyoğlu through their spatial practices—ass well as themselves—where they experience fear of violence in their everyday lives. So, the FNM emerges as an assertive strategy that women employ to reclaim their right to public spaces at night, which is an extension of their right to the city, while asking for other aspects of gender equality.

1.1.1. Walking for Women's Right to Urban Public Spaces

While the notion of public space seems inclusive, it prioritizes some actors while excluding others. Since the division between public space and private space embraces the gender binary, it mainly indicates men and women urbanites. Although women and men are not homogenous gender identities, men and masculinity are assigned to public spaces. In contrast, gender role beliefs confine women to private spaces. Despite the gendered reorganization and secluded structure of public spaces, women have been demanding their human rights and protesting various forms of gender inequality between borders: From the beginning of the 20th century to the current decade, women have demanded and achieved their rights at marches and political demonstrations (Tekeli, 1988, p. 114). From suffragettes demanding their right to vote in Washington, D.C. in 1913 to the women protesting Jîna Mahsa Amini's[14] murder by the morality police in Iran in 2022, women have used the street as a political platform. Streets and squares have become a venue where women have shown their disapproval of gender inequality and challenged it in some respects through their space appropriation and placemaking in the city.

---

[13] Although the march is not limited to women's participation in İstanbul, I limit the subjects of this study to self-identified women with different backgrounds because of limitations that I will elaborate in the methodology chapter.

[14] Jîna Mahsa Amini, a 22-year-old woman, was detained by the "morality police" in Iran during their street patrol for allegedly violating the hijab law. She died in custody because of police brutality. Her death caused anti-hijab protests in which women walk to reclaim their rights in the streets of Iran, cut their hair, burn their hijabs, and protest Sharia Law that compels women—over the age of nine—to wear a hijab that covers their hair, neck, and shoulders.

Women continue to protest the facets of gender inequality and demand their rights in different contexts in the street. Following these marches, which are against the practices that curtail women's rights, women also walk to reclaim public spaces and take back the night. Although the United States (the US) and the United Kingdom (the UK) were the countries where women collectively began to reclaim the night and the street in the 1970s, this demand's scope is getting expanded day by day, region by region. The marches, including the TBTN in the US and Reclaim the Night (RTN) in the UK, aim to foster solidarity among the subjects who genuinely feel scared walking alone at night of sexual assault and violence.

On the other hand, there are many campaigns, programs, and movements with different names but the same intention around the world: Women Who Walk has been a part of Victoria Walks in Australia since 2019. It is a small-scale project that aims to gather women on Tuesday nights in Princes Park to create a safe space not only for women but for everyone: As it states, "Streets that feel safe for us [women] and our daughters will be streets that are safer and more appealing for everyone" (Victoria Walks, para. 2). Also, women have been organizing nighttime walks called the Why Loiter Campaign and the Women Walk at Midnight Project, where women meet and stroll around streets, sleep in parks, and claim the night and public spaces for women in India. That is to say, the organized versions of the marches, at which women stake a claim to urban public spaces, originated in the US and the UK; however, they spread out the continents and cultures where women have been experiencing spatial and timewise limitations on their right to the city. Eventually, women have formed feminist solidarity and alliance to make room for themselves—and other socially disadvantaged groups—in the city by walking in the streets, at night.

As part of urban social movements in the context of feminist activism in Turkey, the FNM acts with similar demands. It meets the characteristics of a demonstration where women lay claim to the city while demanding their right to be in the street at night without fear. This study asks whether feminist activism enables women to make room for themselves in the city. Accordingly, I aim to explore if the FNM allows its participants identified as women to exercise power and gain spatial confidence by organizing and participating in this march. So, I try to find out whether it turns their fear of verbal, sexual, and physical violence and anger deriving from their unsatisfied

political demands into trust and hope with the presence of other women and LGBTI+ individuals in Beyoğlu, İstanbul.

1.1.2. The Feminist Night March (FNM) as Part of Feminist Activism in Turkey

Space is a gendered entity that functions with limitations. Women are tolerated to go out of their assigned borders under some conditions. As a time period attributed to men and the risk of their sexual violence, the night is one of the ostensible menaces that women are assumed to escape in Turkey.[15] As an initial condition, "respectable" women are expected to avoid nighttime walks (Guano, 2007). Otherwise, women's nighttime presence in the street is characterized as dangerous and uncanny. However, the FNM embodies women's opposition to their assigned borders. It is framed as an endeavor to demand women's right to appropriate urban public spaces without fear at night. At the march, participants protest gender inequality in the street—particularly after it gets dark—where and when they are supposed to transgress their ascribed borders. That's why the FNM is at the heart of this study since it is inherently a protest about the spatial and timewise control over women's urban mobility and a consistent fragment of feminist activism in Turkey.

Women's movements in Turkey have their origins in women's political struggle in the late Ottoman period (Çakır, 1994; Sancar, 2012; Zihnioğlu, 2022 [2003]); from establishing women's literature, including magazines, newspapers, and journals, to forming political circles. Yet, the history of collective feminist activism within the context of street protests in Turkey goes back to 1987: Hundreds of women walked against domestic violence—"women's battering," as it was named then—in the streets of Kadıköy, İstanbul. It was the first permitted street demonstration that women organized and participated in the Republic of Turkey after the 1980 military coup. The reduced sentence for those who raped sex workers[16] was another issue that women protested by walking in the street. Until 2003 when the FNM began to be organized in

---

[15] Women in Turkey, as it happens in all settings of the urban context in similar forms yet different levels, are blamed whether they travel at night by themselves, wear something "tempting," laugh, etc., when exposed to street harassment.

[16] Until 1990, the Turkish Criminal Code (Article 438) provided reduced sentences for perpetrators of rape and abduction where the sufferer was proved to be a sex worker.

8

Turkey, women also tried to walk for March 8—International Women's Day—. Although their first march in Bağlarbaşı in 1989 was permitted, women faced violence and custody when they demanded to gather in Taksim Square.

Then, feminist activists emphasized that "Kişisel olan politiktir" [The personal is political]. They challenged the representation of home as a safe space for women and were organized in order to ease their fear in the street. In the late 1990s and 2000s, the campaign entitled "Bedenimiz Bizimdir; Cinsel Tacize Hayır" [Our Bodies are Ours, Say No to Sexual Harassment] gave room in which women laid a claim on urban public spaces: The Purple Needle Campaign—one of the iconic attributions in the main campaign—was suggesting a "defense tool" and an "efficient weapon" ("Mor İğne Satış Metni," 1989, p. 21) to challenge women's fear of sexual violence by pricking a needle with a purple ribbon into the molester who potentially limits women's mobility in the city:

> This world, this country, this city is not just for men. The streets and nights of this world, this country, and this city, are not just theirs. In this world, in this country, and in this city, we, women, deserve more than the houses, kitchens, stoves, washbasins, washing machines, irons, and diapers. Not only our houses, but also the streets where our houses open into are ours. That's why we oppose those who make the streets and nights unbearable for us. Against the men who made us regret that we stepped out of the house, by gazing, catcalling, touching and—even when they find the opportunity—raping us; we raise our voice against all kinds of institutions that lead and allow them to behave like this, condone, and pat them on the back. The purple needle is the expression of this ("Haykır Susma, İğneyi Batır," 1990).[17]

The public and private dichotomy, which serves to keep women in "their place" in the city, has been a central issue of feminist activism in Turkey. In the scope of this umbrella campaign, women also occupied some *kahvehane*s [coffeehouses], *birahane*s [beerhouses], and *meyhane*s [taverns] in order to reclaim public spaces and take back Beyoğlu:

---

[17] Bu dünya, bu ülke, bu şehir yalnızca erkeklerin değil. Bu dünyanın, bu ülkenin, bu şehrin sokakları, caddeleri, geceleri, yalnızca erkeklerin değil. Biz kadınlar, bu dünyada, bu ülkede, bu şehirde evlerden, eviçlerinden, mutfaklardan, ocak, çamaşır leğeni, çamaşır makinası, ütü ve çocuk bezinden daha başka şeyleri de hak ediyoruz. Sadece evlerimiz değil, evlerimizin açıldığı sokaklar da bizim. Bu yüzden, sokakları, caddeleri, geceleri bize dar edenlere karşı çıkıyoruz. Bakarak, laf atarak, elleyerek, daha da fırsatını buldular mı ırzımıza geçerek bizi evden dışarı adım attığımıza bin pişman eden erkeklere karşı; onları böyle davranmaya yönelten, böyle davranmalarına izin veren, göz yuman, sırtlarını sıvazlayan her türlü kuruma karşı sesimizi yükseltiyoruz. İşte mor iğne bu sesin ifadesi.

> … we think of doing something that will unsettle men's occupation over nights and streets to some extent: Walking around Beyoğlu in groups, then a little visit to birahanes and meyhanes where women cannot enter ("Kadınlar! Cinsel Tacize Karşı Dayanışmaya," 1989, p. 15).[18]

Mainly women and transgender individuals[19] walk to call the government to prevent gender discrimination and take legal measures for violence against women at the FNM. Although it began in İstanbul, today it is being organized in many cities. However, this study focuses on the FNM in Beyoğlu, where Turkey's current politics crystalize in the urban context. Although its route has changed several times, the FNM has been performed in Beyoğlu since the first day. Accordingly, the FNM participants attribute special meaning to Beyoğlu—particularly İstiklal Street—, which echoes in a slogan: "Bütün kara parçalarındayız, İstiklal [Caddesi] hariç değil" [We are in all pieces of land, not excepting İstiklal [Street]].

The march has been considered under the title of the Feminist Night March (Akdemir, 2021), the 8 of March Night Parade (Altuntaş, 2019), and the Feminist Night Walk (Baytok, 2014), in academia. When I consider its reflection in the field, it has been called Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü, which I prefer to translate as the Feminist Night March, "gece yürüyüşü" [night march], and "8 Mart Yürüyüşü" [the 8th of March Parade]. In academia and in the field, the FNM is regarded as a feminist movement that asks for women and LGBTI+ individuals' right to be visible and heard. Although it was not yet studied under the title of women's right to the city and their placemaking effort in Beyoğlu, this study is a part of the relevant literature since one of its aims is to understand women's physical and symbolic placemaking in the street at night. As Yardımcı and Bezmez (2019) consider the role of the Pride Parade in queer and disabled bodies' spatial experiences in İstiklal Street and Baytok's (2014) master's thesis centers around the "Gezi Uprising" and finds out the importance of reclaiming public spaces for women's liberation, my research promises to contribute to the studies

---

[18] … erkeklerin geceler ve sokaklar üzerindeki işgallerini biraz olsun sarsacak bir şey yapmayı düşünüyoruz: Gruplar halinde Beyoğlu'nda dolaşıp, kadınların giremediği birahane, meyhane türü yerlere küçük bir ziyaret.

[19] İstanbul Feminist Kolektif (İFK) [The İstanbul Feminist Collective]—one of the prominent organizers of the Feminist Night March in İstanbul but repealed itself—appealed to both women and transgender individuals many times.

that aim to explore how social movements remake the built environment and transform social structure in Beyoğlu.

1.2.   Major Theoretical Debates and Theoretical Framework of the Study

Men are assigned to public spaces, while private spaces are regarded as women's innate place in the city: Space is a gendered entity that is constantly reproduced within the dynamics of the gender binary: The relevant literature indicates that women's mobility in urban public spaces is mainly considered uncanny, dangerous, and "out of place." McDowell (1999) clarifies the situation as follows:

> Because of the strong associations between women and the home, those interior spaces of domesticity, feminist investigations of public spaces have often focused on the problems and dangers that women experience 'outside' compared with an assumption that men may take for granted their freedom in and dominance of these spaces (p. 148).

Nonetheless, private spaces do not provide women with total control. As the prominent scholars of the subject—feminist geographers, urban sociologists, architects, and urban planners (e.g., Bondi, Hayden, Massey, McDowell, Rose, Spain)—have studied before, women's limited mobility in the urban context was firstly comprehended as a matter of built environment, which is still supposed to be cured by better street lighting. However, it was then understood that urban planning and urban design are only two dimensions that function together with gender role beliefs and cultural expectations. Earlier studies problematized housework as it describes women within the borders of their houses and causes them to keep away from public spaces. Consequently, scholars thought to tackle it by focusing on gender mainstreaming so that they might build non-sexist (Eichler, 1995; Hayden, 1980), women-friendly (Greed, 1994), and eventually feminist cities (Kern, 2019). Some of them aimed at understanding the transformation of the built environment and took *cohousing*, which is about common spaces and shared house chores, into account (Vestbro & Horelli, 2012). Likewise, Hayden (1981), in *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, classifies the material feminists with their claims on collective housekeeping and cooking in public kitchens and socialization of domestic work for equal treatment of men and women residents in the city. In addition to these scholars' thoughts on the relationship between women's caregiving and their limited mobility in the city, Castells (1978) argues that

11

women's unpaid care not only defines them within their houses but prolongs the whole urban structure:

> … the feminist movement is threatening the very logic of the urban structure, for it is the subordinate role of women which enables the minimal 'maintenance' of its housing, transport and public facilities. In the end, if the system still 'works' it is because women guarantee unpaid transportation… repair their homes, … make meals when there are no canteens, … spend more time shopping around, … look after others' children when there are no nurseries, and … offer 'free entertainment' to the producers (p. 177-178).

There are also others (e.g., Falú, 2014; Novella Abril & Sánchez de Madariaga, 2021; Ortiz Escalante & Gutiérrez Valdivia, 2015, etc.) who focus on participatory urban planning to understand the role of women's involvement in the urban planning and urban design in shaping women and other socially disadvantaged groups' mobility and choices in the city.

The relevant literature indicates that the public/private divide and the men/women binary result in the social construction of two images: public man and domestic woman. Accordingly, women and men are assumed to experience the city and its services in different ways and levels. The oxymoron-like representation of their experiences in the city prevents women from appropriating public spaces in the urban context, which has been predominantly studied through their socially constructed fear of violence. Thus, the issue of women's urban mobility goes hand in hand with women's perceptions of safety. In the context of women's spatial access and use of urban public spaces, scholars (e.g., Hollander, 2001; Koskela, 1997, 1999, 2000, 2005; Pain, 1991, 1995, 2001; Solnit, 2002; Stanko, 1996; Valentine, 1989; etc.) insist that women's fear is derived from the sexualized and marginalized connotations attached to their out-of-place situation in the street, especially at night. Although not all women experience fear evenly, both statistics and narratives show that women more than men have a fear of being exposed to violence in public spaces because of their gender identity. Fear was mainly studied as it limits the boundaries of women's mental maps (e.g., Başdaş, 2010; Deniz, 2020; Rodó-de-Zárate, 2014; Valentine, 1989), prevents them from having spatial confidence (Koskela, 1997; Rai & Rai, 2020; Rainero, Rodigou & Pérez, 2006; see also van der Burgt, 2015), and finally hinders their right to roam (Solnit, 2002) and participate in everyday life (Beebeejaun, 2017; Fenster, 2005) in the city.

12

Although fear causes women to employ negotiation strategies that mainly prevent them from appropriating urban public spaces, feminist activism has been studied as a *tactical choice* (Coe & Sandberg, 2019) in which participants gain spatial control, ease their fear, and feel empowered (Wooden, 2000). In the scope of the theoretical framework of this study, the FNM appears to be an important fragment of feminist activism in the context of street protests in Turkey. From the departure of Koskela's (1997) conceptualization of *bold walk* and Hamdan-Saliba and Fenster's (2012) understanding of *pro-active tactics,* the FNM emerges as a venue in which women aim to appropriate particular places of Beyoğlu, be collectively visible, and make their demands heard therein. As indicated in the relevant literature, participants of the FNM imbue some places of Beyoğlu (e.g., İstiklal Street, Sıraselviler Street, and currently Cihangir[20] Street) with their *physical*: bodily (Çağatay, Liinason & Sasunkevich, 2022) and vocal (Akdemir, 2021; Vanlıoğlu Yazıcı, 2020) and *symbolic* existence. In this study, I assert that women's physical and symbolic appearance (placemaking) in Beyoğlu provides them with a sense of ownership and spatial confidence. The march is implicitly about the participants' claims on Beyoğlu and its symbolic meanings. Thus, the FNM transgresses the characteristics of what Stanko (1995) calls *defensive maneuvers* for women's coping strategies for sexual assault prevention: self-control on where to live, where to walk, what to wear, and when to go out. On the contrary, the FNM appears to be an assertive strategy that asks for a safe space for women and their right to public spaces at night in the city. Unlike placemaking approaches in urban planning and urban design, placemaking in this study means appropriating and transforming Beyoğlu where the research participants consolidate their attachment to this symbolic place and feel confident during the march more than ever by means of feminist activism.

In the context of literature tackling safety issues in the city, spatial confidence appears as a sense of having the power to use and stake a claim to space. From a similar perspective, in this study, I aim to explore if feminist activism paves the way for women's appropriation of Beyoğlu at night and enables them to exercise power and ownership through their participation in the FNM. I aim to understand whether

---

[20] Because of the strict police blockade, the FNM participants, for the first time, could meet in Cihangir Street in 2022.

women's involvement in the FNM alleviates their everyday fear as they form feminist solidarity and alliance. Since women arrange meetings and make plans to manage the march, I assume that these women's affiliation with the FNM gives them a chance to feel able and have a say in the city. From giving directions about the closed paths to each other to enriching their invisible borders while discovering new places, the march enables women to perform agency, *albeit* temporarily in the city.

Lefebvre (2015 [2014]) and Soja (1996a), depict space through trialectics in which power is not absolute but reproduced and used by different actors. Their representation of trialectics indicates a site of struggle, where there is a possibility for socially disadvantaged groups to demand their rights and make room for themselves in the city. In the conjunction of different dimensions of space—*firstspace, secondspace,* and *thirdspace*—Soja's spatial theory shows that constraints and opportunities coexist in the city. *Spatial triad* and *trialectics of spatiality*, which Lefebvre describes with *perceived (spatial practice), conceived (representations of space),* and *lived space (spaces of representation),* while Soja identifies *firstspace (real space), secondspace (imagined space),* and *thirdspace (real-and-imagined space),* illustrate how space is a multidimensional terrain that brings about engendered urban experiences. In that vein, I consider Beyoğlu as one of the *real-and-imagined spaces*: It illustrates that public space, which keeps hosting various social movements as the symbolic place, has become "the focus and the locus" for diverse political forces (Batuman, 2015). It was clarified in some studies (e.g., Kocabıçak, 2003; Yurdadön-Aslan & Yavan, 2018) that Beyoğlu, in the scope of Taksim Square and İstiklal Street, is beyond physical features and symbolic meanings attributed by a single actor. On the contrary, it resembles a compilation formed with different layers of political ideologies and diverse political actors. In the framework of this study, *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu paves the way for women's placemaking, although opponents might keep challenging their efforts therein.

Soja's term, entitled *thirding-as-othering,* transforms the idea of *either/or* into *both/and also* (Soja, 1996b). It rejects the existence of a fixed space where power is total and monopolized. At this point, Soja (1996a) represents the city of differences and opportunities in the context of metropolises. Although their approaches do not originate from Soja's *thirdspace*, Elkin (2018) takes Paris, New York, Tokyo, Vienna,

and London into consideration and Kern (2019) focuses on Toronto and London as *cities of possibilities*[21] that shape women's socio-spatial experiences and serve them a way for walking and taking up space in the city. Because İstanbul is a city hosting almost 16 million people, it best fits the metropolis definition in Turkey. So, it is one of the core research niches in the relevant literature. In a narrower context, Beyoğlu has been serving the ideologies of several governments and their discontents in the history (Batuman, 2015), which generates a need to understand what has made it a place of social interactions and sociopolitical contradictions.

Two national studies deal with İstiklal Street and Gezi Park in the scope of trialectics without particular consideration of gender: Kocabıçak (2003) studies the Saturday Mothers' political identity formation and İstiklal Street through the conceptualization of *thirdspace*. This study cares about how the mothers gained political identities due to their sit-in protests in İstiklal Street. However, the thesis cannot illustrate the current ideological state and physical transformation in İstiklal Street as it was written in 2003. Yurdadön-Aslan and Yavan (2018), consider Beyoğlu through an examination of the spatial triad. In their article, Gezi Park and Taksim Square appear to be contested spaces where the struggle served both the government and the protesters during "the Gezi Park Event"[22]. Similarly, in my thesis, Beyoğlu takes the form of *firstspace*, *secondspace*, and *thirdspace* where its physical, symbolic, and social organization resembles a palimpsest consisting of various ideologies that include or exclude some actors; so, it gives an explanation for women's problematized urban experiences and opportunities available to them in the city.

1.2.1. Gendered Fear of Violence and Women's Urban Mobility

Women's fear of violence in the city has been mainly addressed in the late 1980s, by feminist geographers (Sandberg, 2011, p. 23-24). As these scholars explored first, fear limits women's choices and preferences in the city. Based on the relevant literature, women's fear stems mainly from the risk of being subjected to sexual violence. Mainly

---

[21] Here, the word "possibilities" implicates "potentiality" rather than having opportunities only.

[22] as stated in the study

women are subjected to sexual assault. Thus, they generate fear that constrains their behaviors. Such triggers prevent them from using certain places, especially public spaces in the city. So, women have a tendency to appropriate places they consider safe. In other words, women walk and exist in the city with safety maps in their minds, which are shaped according to their intersecting identities and social affiliations.

Gender role beliefs, which are woven into the fabric of the city, put pressure on the shoulders of women and limit their urban mobility. Within the scope of women's experiences in the city, fear of violence is an essential niche: It appears to be a constituting emotion (Ahıska, 1992; Hollander, 2001; Kern, 2019; etc.) of women's spatial experiences. Although statistics and their lived experiences show women are mainly exposed to violence in their houses by familiar men, the fear of violence is related to public spaces and stranger men (Valentine, 1989; Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, Çavlin & Ergöçmen, 2015). There is a growing literature showing that fear shapes women's urban mobility patterns and identifies the boundaries of their mental maps by leading them to avoid particular places and time periods in which they expect to be exposed to male violence. Eventually, fear is framed as part of women's self-control mechanisms that prolong women's elimination of public spaces and undermine their ability and desire to participate in the activities therein. Consequently, fear of violence results in women's elimination of public spaces, especially streets at night. Accordingly, this study focuses on fear of violence as a spatial and timewise reflection of patriarchy that bothers women's right to the city.

Spatial confidence, a subtheme which I encountered while doing the data analysis for this study, is not one of the major concepts of relevant debates in academia. However, there is an emerging interest in using the concept for studies tackling women's mobility in the city. Rai and Rai (2020) ask if the fear of sexual assault undermines women's spatial confidence in the city. Although they do not give detailed information about women's avoidance practices, they ensure that women lose their spatial confidence by taking their previous assault experiences and the threat of victim blaming into account. I formed my research question in contrast to what Rai and Rai mention in their article. This study explores women's assertive yet complicated spatial experiences by centering on their everyday life and marching experiences at the FNM in Beyoğlu, İstanbul.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore how the FNM, as part of feminist activism in Turkey, shapes the research participants', who are self-identified women, spatial experiences in the symbolic place—Beyoğlu—, İstanbul. In line with this, I examine the mutual relationship between women's lived experiences in Beyoğlu (perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors) and the gendered reorganization of space. In the relevant literature, gender role beliefs indicate an image of women as fearful users of the city. Since women's perceptions of safety in public spaces are correlated with their fear of violence, women are supposed to use the city with limitations and employ some coping strategies to alleviate their fear and the risk of violence. Because coping strategies mainly result in women's prevention from appropriating public spaces—particularly at night—they strengthen men's privileged position in the city (Koskela, 1999; Rader, 2008; Valentine, 1989) while undermining women's right to access to the street and use public spaces in their everyday lives (Beebeejaun, 2017; Fenster, 2005).

On the contrary, scholars regarded women's active participation in the city in terms of their *bold walk* (Koskela, 1997) and involvement in feminist activism as a *tactical choice* (Coe & Sandberg, 2019), on which I built my thesis. The FNM is the largest gathering of its kind left in Turkey. In the scope of street protests, it is an assertive strategy in which participants call the government to end male violence against women, become collectively visible in the street at night, and reclaim the past, the present, and the future. Thus, I conceptualize the FNM as an effort for women's physical and symbolic placemaking in Beyoğlu where they temporarily take over the symbolic place and gain spatial confidence through feminist activism, even though they are depicted as the fearful subjects of urban public spaces in their everyday lives.

Since I have attended the FNM in different cities, I began with my own marching experiences and narratives of women whom I walked together. Regarding our feelings and behaviors, my main assumption of the role of feminist activism was about the emotional shift from fear to trust before conducting the fieldwork. Although I considerably explored what I assumed, I encountered a complex network of findings in the field. I noticed that confidence means more than walking through potential perpetrators—mainly cisgender heterosexual men—: Women's spatial confidence

deriving from their participation in the FNM is about placemaking for women and other socially disadvantaged groups in Beyoğlu: taking up space and making a change in the symbolic place which is one of the social actors defining the boundaries of "a woman's place." In order to understand this reciprocity, I use Soja's (1996a) *thirdspace* conceptualization that potentially opens the way for socially disadvantaged groups to create room for themselves on their own terms in the city. Since *thirdspace* promises to confute the myth of absolute power in metropolises, it consolidates the image of space as a social actor rather than a container of social activities. Eventually, in this study, I aim to position the participants' fear in the city and their limited use of urban public spaces in the socialization context rather than locating it into "the nature of woman" while framing feminist activism as an assertive strategy in which women take an active role in enlarging the space they can take up in the city.

1.3.1. Problem Statement and the Research Questions (RQs)

Cities are sites of inequality since some actors make use of public spaces while others are excluded or controlled therein. In the context of this study, as indicated in the relevant literature, they are organized as organic spaces for men with privileged identities besides their gender identity. So, men are supposed to produce, control, and reorganize public spaces. On the other hand, women's gender identity *per se* cuts off the tie between their access to city centers and their urban mobility. Gender role beliefs, which inculcate women with the mystification of home as a safe space and the risk of sexual violence out there, threaten women's right to urban public spaces due to fear. As a result, men, whose identities fit in authorities' perceptions, experience public spaces with privileges. Then, what is left for the "others" is to use strategies to reach forbidden places and create a space of their own. In parallel with this argument, the thesis focuses on how women, as the excluded actors of public spaces, employ feminist activism as an assertive strategy for appropriating Beyoğlu. In the study, I aim to explore how women's characteristics and participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu forms their spatial experiences therein. Thus, I aim to learn the social characteristics and spatial dimensions of Beyoğlu in the formation of women's emotional and practical reactions before and during the FNM. Furthermore, this study is an endeavor to understand how their intersecting identities and the multidimensional structure of space shape these women's claims to Beyoğlu, as part of feminist activism in Turkey.

The rhizomatic structure of the urban gives room for those pushed into the periphery. Wilson (1992) argues how the city itself is a liberating space for women. She points to the advantages that the city enframes: urban anonymity, spontaneity, and freedom. However, this perspective and the city's ambiguity are being challenged considerably. Technology consolidates surveillance in cities through city surveillance cameras, closed-circuit televisions (CCTVs), etc. On the other hand, Wilson's perception does not glorify the city with pure liberalism for women. In comparison with the studies that define the city as centralized, limited, and hostile, Wilson's perception considers the city and public spaces in between possibilities and constraints. Cities too often ratify familiar gender scenarios but may also provide opportunities to resist them (Garber & Turner, 1994, p. x). In the same vein, I consider Beyoğlu within ambiguous power relations. Beyoğlu—especially with the existence of İstiklal Street—carries imagined meanings that both the centralized power and its opponents attribute to it. As a result, it, which simultaneously becomes a fluid place for hegemony and resistance, meets the characteristics of Soja's (1996a) conceptualization of *thirdspace*. In this study, I aim to understand in what aspects women find a way for placemaking in Beyoğlu, whereas the government reorganizes and controls it. Since women have multiple identities, their experiences and reactions can vary. Accordingly, I also try to find out if their heterogeneity leads them to experience different practical and emotional reactions at the FNM in Beyoğlu, that is a terrain of contested ideas and identities.

Research Questions:

RQ1: How do women's characteristics and participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu form their spatial experiences in this fluid and symbolic place?

RQ2: How do their intersecting identities and the multidimensional structure of space shape these women's claims to Beyoğlu, as part of feminist activism in Turkey?

Sub-questions:

SQ1: How do these participants experience Beyoğlu in their everyday life?

SQ2: How do women's perceptions of safety, attitudes, and actual behaviors take form during and after their participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu?

SQ3: What are the social characteristics and spatial dimensions of Beyoğlu?

1.3.2. Contribution of the RQs and Significance of the Study

Since the study discusses the city through its potential, it does not invent the wheel. Also, it restates that the public/private division is an issue that results from social construction. However, the FNM that was not yet studied in Turkish academia through the conceptualization of women's placemaking in the city, fear of violence, and *thirdspace* is the original line of this study. When I began studying this issue in 2019, it was the only endeavor. However, Akdemir (2021) in *Listening to Possible Worlds: The 2019 İstanbul Feminist Night March and Its Acoustic Conflicts,* studied the FNM through a focus on President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's claim: "Women whistled the call to prayer on March 8." However, my study promises to fill the gap in the literature by exploring not only the conflict between participants and the government. It frames feminisms and feminist groups under the title of intra-group contestations. Moreover, in this study, Beyoğlu appears to be "more than a stage." As an "all-in-one" space, it constructs women's spatial experiences, and women's spatial practices therein transform Beyoğlu back. Accordingly, this study aims at exploring a multilayered pattern of women's spatial experiences depending on their distinct characteristics and backgrounds. In line with this, this study promises to reveal the reciprocity between space and gender.

Feminist activism in Turkey has mainly been represented through "women's movements." In this study, I aim to contribute to the representation of feminist activism in Turkish academia. I had to limit the participants to women. However, I do not consider the FNM under the title of "women's movements" but a fragment of feminist activism. Accordingly, this study has the potential to update the image of feminist activism as part of feminist placemaking and history-making in the city. Since cities and marches have their own rhythms, the thesis cannot promise to represent a general view of the FNM in Turkey. I think the thesis will serve participants and researchers who deal with women's right to the city and feminist activism within the context of İstanbul, Turkey. Moreover, it will illustrate a research conducted by me as the participant researcher. So, the thesis can generate methodological questions. Hence, it can lead other researchers to think about the tension between academia and activism.

Since there are different dimensions of activism, I need to clarify the boundaries of feminist activism in the scope of this study. Feminism is one of the core issues that activism is linked to. Feminist activism, as a type, also has inner dimensions and exfoliates into different forms. In this study, I take the FNM into consideration as part of feminist activism in Turkey. As feminism is being criticized because of curtailing different feminist approaches, this study invites readers to call feminisms, which brings us to the issue of diversity and heterogeneity in feminist activism. From a parallel perspective, I identify the FNM as a feminist activism method that endeavors to make the night and public space available for women who are supposed to step back and avoid using public spaces at a particular time according to gender role beliefs. Although the FNM did not emerge like the Gezi Park protests, it traces back to women's right to the city. That's why feminist activism in this study is conceptualized through the FNM with a focus on women's mobility in the city at night. In addition to walking in the street, meetings and the after-party are important parts of the FNM because they enrich women's spatial experiences and pave the way for their placemaking opportunities. From my point of view and ethical standing, feminist activism is not limited to cisgender heterosexual women. So, this study centers around subjects who self-identify as women.

Besides the academic significance of this study, there are some personal motivations: My spatial experiences in the city are deeply gendered. As a woman, I make sense of how my gender shapes the boundaries of my mobility through the city: It forms my preferences and choices available to me. Although I mainly prefer not to step back but walk through fear, it sometimes makes me change my route and silences me since I am not an exception among women who carries a mental map of safety and danger in their minds. I grew up in Bergama, the biggest but the off-centered municipality of İzmir that resembled more of a town than a small city until now. Thus, it brought me surveillance and control of a village in the city center and urban anonymity in the periphery. Whenever I strolled around the streets, I encountered relatives or friends of my family. The power of surveillance has always bothered me. My parents never asked me to inform them about where I was going, with whom I was strolling, what I wore, and the time of my walks. As I understood later, they were comfortable as they could spy on me through their friends' gaze. As my father admitted later, his all-male friends watched me just in case something "inconvenient" happened. Also, as my father

imagined, I was an *erkek fatma* [tomboy] who could cope with male harassment. When I wanted to go outside at night, I would have no problem if my mother and father were at home. However, when my father was on the night shift, my mother always tried to prevent me from going out. She profoundly felt the pressure of the "duty" she took over from my father, then came up with ideas like calling friends for a sleepover or staying overnight at the friends' houses.

I already recognized the home's gendered entity. When I began to identify as a feminist, I began to make connections between gender role beliefs and the invisible borders of the city for women. When my father called me *oğlan çocuğu* [the boy] when I came back at 2:00 AM home from one of my nighttime walks, reality slapped me in the face: Although many familiar women were being exposed to violence of their male partners and acquaintances in their houses, my parents defined the street as a demonized place where strange men are potentially harmful but still the *landlords* and women are potentially at risk and fearful, especially at night. To refute this paradox, I aim to explore whether women play an active role in the street at night through assertive strategies. In this context, the study prioritizes women's participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu and aims to explore whether their involvement in the FNM shifts their gendered fear of violence into spatial confidence in Beyoğlu.

1.4.   A Brief Overview of the Methodology and Research Design

In order to answer the research questions, I conducted qualitative research. Accordingly, I employed semi-structured in-depth interviews and participant observation as part of qualitative data gathering methods, while I used thematic analysis (TA) to make sense of the data. Since I center the study around the reciprocity between women's spatial experiences in public spaces and the characteristics of space, I made a research design in which units of analysis include individuals—the FNM participants—and symbolic places of Beyoğlu. Regarding the level of analysis, this study offers a glimpse into the experiences of FNM participants as a group. Since it is not possible to define the exact population of the participants, including the proportions of sub-groups, 22 participants' experiences cannot make a complete reflection of the field. So, in this study, I admit that I offer a pattern of reality that has

the risk of representing the researcher bias yet introduces different and similar trends between 22 self-identified women who are a part of the participant population.

I used purposive, snowball, and quota sampling in order to reach the research subjects. Therefore, the procedure ended up with non-probability, non-representative, and convenience sampling. Since there are procedural and personal limitations, which I will elaborate in the methodology chapter, the subjects of this study are limited to participants and organizers of the FNM, who self-identify as women with different characteristics. One of the limitations was the COVID-19 pandemic, which shaped the interview mode: I did interviews via online platforms, Zoom and Microsoft Teams, and it resulted in both constraints and opportunities.

1.5.   A Brief Statement of Assumptions

Women mainly read the code of the street and night in accordance with their gender identity and the culture in which they live. Since they are aware of the risk of sexual assault and stigmatization, their spatial experiences are mainly interwoven with avoidance behaviors. The thesis aims to explore the relationship between women's participation in the FNM and their spatial experiences in Beyoğlu, arguing that this process has provided women with new opportunities to compensate for their difficulties in practicing the street and night in their everyday lives. I argue that feminist activism is an umbrella strategy that allows women to reclaim the night and the street when and where they are expected to transgress their assigned borders. In the study, I assume that women gain spatial control and spatial confidence through the FNM by attending and organizing the march in Beyoğlu, where they face fear in their everyday lives. I claim that the FNM in Beyoğlu paves the way for women to create a safe space through feminist activism. Furthermore, Beyoğlu appears to be not only a stage but also a *thirdspace*-characterized—fluid—space and a social actor that provides women with possibilities within the coexistence of constraints.

Because I am one of the participants of the FNM, I began with my own marching experiences and the narratives of my surroundings before I built my thesis statement and made a set of assumptions. I also did a pilot study that includes eight participants' perceptions, attitudes, and actual behaviors about the FNM in Beyoğlu. Although I had a chance to verify most of the assumptions derived from my participant observation

and others' narratives, I encountered some findings that I did not expect. Here, there are key statements of assumptions that I made before conducting the fieldwork:

There are different forms of reality in the matter of women's perceptions, attitudes, and actual behaviors in the context of urban public spaces in Beyoğlu. The boundaries of women's urban mobility can be identified by similar factors (actors, places, etc.) in different ways and levels, which shape their emotional and practical reactions to the city. For example, a transgender woman with a strong community affiliation may find peace in Mis Street at night, while solitary walking is a nightmare for another transgender woman at night or in the daytime in Tophane, Beyoğlu. Since women come from different cultural, economic, and social backgrounds and have intersecting multiple identities, their experiences, either spatial or social, can be similar or different but cannot be the same. Thus, each woman's participation in this study will offer an authentic and subjective representation of particular realities and knowledge.

As the participant researcher, I play a key role in establishing the sample, extrapolating the themes, etc. From forming the framework of the thesis to the interpretation of the data, I shape all data gathering, analysis, and writing processes in accordance with my values, multiple identities, and worldview. Yet, I still believe in generating scientific knowledge while standing against complete objectivity and value neutrality. I believe in the power of qualitative research methods in the matter of obtaining an in-depth understanding of what participants and I experience.

1.6. A Brief Statement of Key Findings

As it was studied in the literature, the city offers women a chance for liberation when compared to periphery residences (Kern, 2019; Wekerle, 1985; Wilson, 1992). However, in the urban context, women's mobility is limited because of fear of being subjected to violence (Hollander, 2001; Pain, 2001; Stanko, 1995; Valentine, 1989). It was framed that gender role beliefs, which function together with fear of violence, undermine women's right to the city in different aspects (Beebejaun, 2017; Fenster, 2005; Misgav & Fenster, 2016; Solnit, 2002) and shape their experiences in the city depending on their differences (Garber, 2000). It eventually results in the representation of women as passive and fearful users of the city. However, some scholars have pointed out the potential of feminist activism in taking back what was

taken from women in the urban context (Baytok, 2014; Casey, Goudie, & Reeve, 2008; Coe & Sandberg, 2019; Sandberg & Coe, 2020; Hvala, 2012; Koskela, 1997). Soja (1996a) insisted that the city, as a space in between fluid power relations, is not situated but fluid: *thirdspace.* Then, Kocabıçak (2003) used his conceptualization of the metropolis as *thirdspace* in relation to the opportunities available to Saturday Mothers in their activism practices and political identity formation in İstiklal Street.

In line with the assumptions deriving from the relevant literature, I had a chance to answer my research questions and sub-questions in this study. Eventually, I encountered several key findings:

Beyoğlu offers some participants anonymity that makes them relieved in their daily lives. However, anonymity is not available to everyone, and everybody does not desire it. Not every woman is afraid of violence. Among the ones who have this emotion, there are different factors and reasons for their fear. Women's motivations for participation in the FNM differ depending on their multiple identities. The FNM deconstructs the representation of women as passive users of the city while providing them with the collective visibility in the symbolic place—Beyoğlu—. It demands women's right to the city. It enables women not only to feel safe at the march but also to have a sense of authority and ownership, to some extent. Women experience the power, in both spatial and social terms, because they feel capable. However, it represents a place where women experience inter and intra-group contestations. As Beyoğlu is a *thirdspace* of diverse political standings in the city, participants with different feminist approaches encounter at the FNM. So, there are not only two camps of the government and participants, but there are sub-groups between the participants. Participating in the FNM in Beyoğlu shatters the duality of fearful women and assertive placemakers, but it creates a space for diverse socio-spatial experiences.

1.7.   Thesis Structure

This study is composed of seven chapters. In the second chapter, I frame the boundaries of women's urban mobility by considering the discussion in the relevant literature. This chapter has three focal points: It begins with the interrelation between gender and space to offer an in-depth understanding of women's spatial experiences and urban struggle in public spaces. Then, it frames feminist activism in the context of

women's negotiation strategies. Finally, I focus on the conceptualization of *thirdspace* because it illuminates how space has been evaluated as a social actor shaping the limits of women's spatial experiences in the city.

The study's third chapter constitutes the research design, methodological limitations, and ethical considerations. In this chapter, I elaborate on data gathering, data analysis, sampling methods, and the reasons for employing qualitative research to answer the research questions.

Beginning from the fourth chapter and in the following two chapters, I discuss the findings. Since the study is established upon three main parts, the chapters follow about safe and unsafe spaces in Beyoğlu, women's spatial control at the FNM, and Beyoğlu as a social actor—*thirdspace*—. In the concluding chapter, I try to draw a general review of this study's background and scope. It represents a summary of the study while its main aim is to show how the FNM in Beyoğlu indicates an opportunity for women's physical and symbolic placemaking in the city. Furthermore, this chapter frames research limitations, besides recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

> Any settlement is an inscription in space of the social relations in the society that built it. ... Our cities are patriarchy written in stone, brick, glass, and concrete (Jane Darke, 1996, as cited in Kern, 2019, p. 13).

Dichotomies shape "a woman's place" in the city and the boundaries of women's urban mobility (Kanes, Shomaker & Charlise, 2019; Massey, 2001 [1994]; Wekerle, 1985; Wilson, 1992): Relevant literature indicates that the gender binary between men and women, the urban versus rural duality, and the division between public and private spaces result in diverse representations: public man versus domestic woman and vulnerable woman versus dangerous man. According to these binaries that emerge from gender role beliefs, women are assumed to be fearful and passive users of public spaces while they cannot have full authority in private spaces. Regarding the mystification of home as a safe space for women and the representation of public spaces with—presumably male—perpetrators of sexual violence, women's perceptions of safety lead them to employ avoidance strategies in urban public spaces. Fear dictates women to stay at home or bear the risk of being exposed to sexual violence "out there" (Kern, 2019). Their spatial activities, both in private and public spaces, take form not only by their gender identity but also their intersecting multiple identities such as class and ethnicity. From their attire to behavior, women's urban mobility is considered, in the relevant literature, as a matter of limitations. Timewise and spatial limitations over women's mobility are conceptualized through their negotiation strategies in the city in two forms: passive and proactive strategies.

On the other hand, the city is represented with potential opportunities that offer women a chance to make room for themselves on their own terms in the urban context. Besides the gendered representation of cities and citizenship, some scholars define the city in a way that opens up space for women. Although it is not inherent in every city,

metropolises are framed as liberating urban structures for women. Moreover, feminist activism has also been considered as *a tactical choice* (Coe & Sandberg, 2019) and entitled as *bold walk* (Koskela, 1997) in which women walk through their fear and create a safe space for themselves in the city: Some scholars indicate that feminist activism enables its participants to appropriate what has been taken from them: the right to participate in everyday activities and urban public spaces. This chapter explores women's choices and strategies available to them in the city. In line with this, I frame feminist activism in women's negotiation strategies with their limited mobility in the city while founding the theoretical framework of this study: Feminist activism is regarded as a proactive strategy that claims women's right to access and be in the street at night without fear, which paves the way for the participants' collective visibility and spatial control. Regarding urban theories that see the potential of contested yet fluid spaces for socially disadvantaged groups, Beyoğlu, which I discuss in a way that opens up space for these to be experienced, is included in this study with its *thirdspace* dimension. The *thirdspace* term has been studied by many social scientists in the frame of social movements. Beebejaun (2017), Hamdan-Saliba and Fenster (2012), and Misgav and Fenster (2016) take feminist activism with its potential under the title of *thirdspace,* while Soja (1996a) and Lefebvre (2015 [2014]) conceptualize *thirdspace* as a social actor and space through fluidity of powers. Yet, I offer a two-fold explanation of *thirdspace* in the same structure: This study represents Beyoğlu with the coexistence of constraints and opportunities, and I aim to explore the potential of the FNM therein, which results in the consolidation of *thirdspace* by means of feminist activism.

2.1. "A Woman's Place" in the City

When I began to search for studies that handle the mutual relationship between gender and space, I found that feminist geographers and architects were the prominent scholars who tried to understand the gendered organization of the city (e.g., Bondi, Massey, McDowell, and Rose). Among these scholars, Massey (2001 [1994]) illustrates the multilayered structure of geography, which is interwoven with gender. As she argues,

> … space and place, spaces and places, and our senses of them (and such related things as our degrees of mobility) are gendered through and through. Moreover they are

gendered in a myriad different ways, which vary between cultures and over time. And this gendering of space and place both reflects *and has effects back on* the ways in which gender is constructed and understood in the societies in which we live (p. 186).

In her conceptualization of gendered space, power relations are not fixed but in constant change. McDowell (1999, p. 12), on the other hand, identifies their aim as feminist geographers "is to investigate, make visible and challenge the relationships between gender divisions and spatial divisions, to uncover their mutual constitution and problematize their apparent naturalness." Feminist geographers regarded both gender and space as social constitutions that together create gendered spaces and different spatial experiences of men and women in the city.

> The adage "a woman's place is in the home" exemplifies this gendering of private space and implies that public space is therefore that of men. … The discriminatory gender-based separation of public spaces reinforces stereotypes and contributes to the sense that women aren't entitled to use public space in the same way as men (Kanes, Shomaker & Carlise, 2019, p. 16).

Regarding Kanes, Shomaker and Carlise's (2019) statement, scholars mainly make sense of "a woman's place" in the city through the gender binary and the division of public and private spaces. According to the cultural expectations that function together with gender role beliefs, women are regarded as homemakers who are limited with the walls of indoor places while men are assigned to public spaces due their perceived breadwinner position in the family. Gender role beliefs confine women in their houses because of the representation of their assumed vulnerability. On the other hand, men's expected bravery and boldness makes it possible for them to appropriate public spaces that are assumed to be dangerous, uncanny, and unsafe for women.

Although cultural confinement of women in their houses, Wilson (1992) depicts the city with its liberating potential for women because it offers choices that are not offered in rural settings. According to her approach, even feminist research represents women as the victims of urbanization while promoting the image of the city through masculinity. She contradicts with this tendency and suggests taking a closer look at the opportunities in the city: anonymity, spontaneity, and freedom. Similarly, Wekerle (1985) considers that "a woman's place is in the city," and Kern (2019, p. 12) restates that "The city is the place where women had choices open up for them that were unheard of in small towns and rural communities." In the conjunction of their rationales, rural settings not only exclude women from the production process but set

29

the limits off and confine them to the home, whereas the city with social activities paves the way for women's mobility. However, Kern (2019) adds different features of the city in order to represent choices available to women: "Less tangible, but no less important, are the psychic qualities of the city: anonymity, energy, spontaneity, unpredictability, and yes, even danger" (Kern, 2019, p. 12). McDowell (1999, p. 148-149) states that urban public spaces are paradoxical because women experience fear, anxiety, harassment, attack, etc. in streets and open spaces where women also escape from male dominance. In a similar vein, Visakha (2021) interprets women's perceptions of danger and experiences of violence together with the choices available to them in the city. As far as she considers, "… the conditions that render women vulnerable to different forms of exclusions and violence in the city, are exacerbated by gender-insensitive urban infrastructure that is neither designed for women's bodies nor is responsive to their needs" (p. 14). As indicated by Kern (2019), neither cities nor suburbs feel like a woman's place.

Alkan (2005), in a study limited to Ankara, finds that almost half of women's spatial experiences in the city are limited to their homes and neighborhood. In this study, it is seen that nearly half of the women, who use urban public spaces in their everyday lives, regard the street as a place to fulfill their household responsibilities. On the other hand, a significant proportion of women use public spaces to visit their relatives' houses and families. As a result of this study, Alkan (2005) says that women's limited mobility in urban public spaces is significantly related to caregiving and other responsibilities attributed to women. Tuncer (2014) likewise states that women's practice of going out from home is not independent of the effects of households. Like Alkan, Tuncer's study shows that the relationship between women and urban public spaces is shaped by the cultural boundaries of women within the home and the household. As all these studies indicate, cities do not provide women with complete advantages. It brings experiences interwoven with myths and representations emerged from gender role beliefs and cultural codes.

The statement "Women's place is at home," as an assumption we encounter in many cultures, reinforces women's commitment to the home while presenting the existence of women in the city as uncanny and dangerous. In *Women Who Marry Houses: Panic and Protest in Agoraphobia,* Seidenberg and DeCrow (1983) discuss the social

dimensions (cultural codes, gender role beliefs etc.) of agoraphobia. Ussher (1992) likewise states in *Women's Madness: Misogyny or Mental Illness?* that women's limited mobility in the city is attributed to women's nature without considering that it is a structural problem of the gendered urban spaces. Although it goes beyond the limits of this study, agoraphobia is an experience that is seen more in women than in men, which mostly confines women's fear in the city to the limits of psychology and locates it in a "disease" context, regardless of its social dimensions.

2.1.1. Gendered Citizenship and Women's Right to the City

As the scholars of the subject (e.g., Pateman, 1988; Secor, 2004; Walby, 1994, etc.) have noted, equality claims on citizenship constitute a liberal theory which aims at promoting inclusive citizenship yet overlooks the differences that eliminate particular people from having equal share in the city. Although citizens have different identities, the so-called universal definition of citizen describes a person with responsibilities and rights without emphasizing these identities. On the other hand, the signifier—citizen— signifies a stereotypical person. A citizen carries privileged identities depending on the context: being male, mature, urbanite, Sunni, middle-class, Turkish, etc., in Turkey. Besides gender, all characteristics like class, ethnicity, religion, etc., draw a line between "citizens" and "strangers" (Secor, 2004) who are supposed to experience public spaces in different ways and levels. Walby (1994) questions how citizenship is gendered and how citizenship is essential for gender. Although she does not frame women's participation in the city under the title of "women's right to the city," she reads citizenship, which is imbued with gendered presuppositions, as the major obstacle that limits women's spatial experiences in urban public spaces. On the other hand, Wilson (1992, p. 8) insists that although women are not perceived as full citizens, they overcome this situation "in the interstices of the city, negotiating the contradictions of the city in their own particular way."

Through *the right to the city* term, Lefebvre (2000 [1996]) and Harvey (2012) insist that everyone has the right to use, participate, and transform the city. In their conceptualizations, the city is run through capitalist production. As a result, those who do not have the capital lose their right to use and decide on the city. Accordingly, their right to the city term demands greater control over space reproduction for those who

lost these rights. Lefebvre (2015 [2014]) thinks that space is socially constructed and reproduced by its users while it in turn reproduces all social relations as an actor. In this spatial organization and mutual relationship, the right to the city in Lefebvre's conceptualization, means more than an individual demand for access to urban services: It is a collective right, to the production and reproduction of the city, shared by urban users who are supposed to have the power to change the city. While Harvey and Lefebvre call for collective action, their conceptualizations of space and right to the city explain spatial inequalities via economy without emphasizing patriarchal power relations. Lefebvre prioritizes the working class with the potential to end the urban problem. According to Lefebvre (2000 [1996], p. 158), "only the working class can become the agent of this realization." On the other hand, he states, "the pressure of the working class has been and remains necessary (but not sufficient)" for the recognition and realization of rights in general (p. 157). Considering his conceptualization, Fenster (2005, p. 221) argues that Lefebvre not only eliminates patriarchy but also "creates a rather neutral public domain which is sterilized from any power relations and by that has no relevance to the realities of many women in cities". As Zengin (2019 [2014], p. 361) presents a similar opinion, limiting the right to the city issue to anti-capitalist approach does not democratize but undermines the relationship that people, who have negative experiences in the city because of their gender identities, sexual orientations, and ethnicity, establish with and within the city.

When citizenship and cities are conceptualized as shared and universal, those who are out of the privileged positions experience public spaces with limitations on their rights. In Harvey and Lefebvre's understanding, the right to the city excludes the idea that rights are already gendered. As Marxism has been criticized for being gender-blind for years, the right to the city term, which looks at the city only through the lenses of class, ignores gender. Harvey (2012) identifies the right to the city as a necessity for all actors, despite the capital holders' appropriation. He explains the absence of capital as an obstacle to the right to the city. However, Soja (2010) problematizes the political organization of space by looking at three core forces that lead to *spatial injustice*: class, race, and gender. However, gender cannot go beyond being the third category that comes after class and race in *Seeking Spatial Justice.* In a few sentences, Soja repeats that the built environment is where patriarchy sprouts and sustains; therefore, it prevents actors from experiencing the city in a just way. Soja's conceptualization of

space as a realm of inequalities can be applied to many areas, including gender and women's studies. However, he touches upon gender without details. So, with Soja's subtle effort, the prominent urban scholars, who dealt with the excluded actors of cities and their right to the city, ignore that the city is already a gendered space. Eventually, existing social and spatial power relations and citizenship rights appear gendered but missing in the relevant literature.

2.2. Women's Use of Urban Public Spaces with Limitations

The idea that women belong to the home and men to the street has made it difficult for women to appropriate urban public spaces. As a result, women's presence and spatial experiences in the city require to be negotiated. The length of their shorts, the tone of their laughter, and when and with whom they are in the street are monitored and controlled by society. Streets are perceived as uncanny spaces that welcome potentially dangerous men who are prone to perpetrate violence, particularly sexual violence towards women, according to social norms, cultural values, and gender role beliefs. On the contrary, the home, which is regarded as a women's habitat, has been mainly studied in academia in the frame of domestic violence that includes physical, sexual, psychological, and other types of violence towards women. Kern (2019) summarizes this situation as follows:

> We do sort of believe that "our rape" is already out there, an inevitability waiting in the shadows. In contrast, domestic violence, sexual assault by acquaintances, incest, child abuse, and other "private," yet much more prevalent, crimes receive far less attention. From a feminist perspective, this difference in attention serves to direct women's fear outwards, away from the home and family, reinforcing patriarchal institutions like the nuclear family and women's reliance on heterosexual partnership for the appearance of security. In a vicious cycle, this stigmatizes violence experienced within the "safe" space of the home and drives it further out of sight (p. 147).

As Kern (2019) argues, women's fear of public spaces consolidates the power of the family, confines women within the boundaries of the home, and inevitably prolongs the vulnerable image of women in the city. The meanings attributed to public spaces and the demonized representation of city streets, especially after it gets dark, cause women's presence in the street at night to be stigmatized as deviant, loose, dangerous, and in danger; and their behaviors to be tagged immoral and correlated with the sex industry (Solnit, 2002). The cost of transgressing their assigned borders in the city not

only results in stigmatization but makes them encounter the risk of violence and violence itself.

2.2.1. Threat of Sexual Violence "Out There"

The threat of violence "out there" encourages women to identify with the home and forces them to appropriate indoors rather than outdoors in the city. The literature on the reciprocal relationship between spatial inequalities and gendered presuppositions deals with fear as a gendered emotion. The seemingly gender-neutral and universalistic perception of these ideas reinforces women's confinement to private spaces while portraying public spaces with the risk of sexual violence. In the scope of this study, it is seen that the relevant literature frames the night and the street as a demonized time period and a dangerous place for women. Since city streets are socially constructed with the idea of violence and fear (Koskela, 1997, 1999; Listerborn, 2016; Lordoğlu, 2020 [2018]; Pain, 2001; Tandoğan & Şimşek İlhan, 2016; Valentine, 1989), women's nighttime presence in the city streets has been represented as a double transgression of their assigned borders. As Ahıska (1992) remarks, violence is not only a devastating act. It as well identifies, produces, and draws the line of the city. It creates a consensus through negation (p. 128). Ahıska's approach has its origins in Foucault's depiction of sovereign power and disciplinary power. In this binary consideration, the former indicates a power built on violence, while the latter is a subtle version that aims at creating docile bodies with the threat of violence:

> In itself the exercise of power is not violence; nor is it a consent which, implicitly, is renewable. It is a total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions; it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action (Foucault, 1982, p. 789).

Public spaces that are supposedly open to anyone are secluded spaces for the sake of a determined group: Women's marginalization in the relevant space and time ends up with the privatization of streets and night for men's appropriation. Accordingly, this privatization serves a perception that obscures women's right to the street and right to the night. Solnit (2002, p. 243) calls "women's right to roam the city" as a need, and she clarifies how women's nighttime walks have been sexualized. She makes a connection between the words "prostitutes," "streetwalkers," "women of the street,"

and "public women" while discussing the historical background of how night and streets were associated with "the sex industry" (p. 237).

In parallel with Foucault and Ahıska's rationale, fear constitutes women's socio-spatial experiences in the city. It limits and keeps women in their limited space while consolidating men's privileged positions and choices in the urban context. As Kern (2019, 147) considers, fear keeps women in an actual paradox and makes them dependent on men's protection, which comprises a basis for the "heteropatriarchal capitalist system in which women are tied to… home and [keep being] responsible for domestic labour within the institution of the nuclear family" while regarding taking up space in urban public spaces as being prone to be subjected to sexual violence. As a result, fear promotes men's and women's status quo in the city.

2.2.2. Mystification of Home as a Safe Space

The sociopolitical organization of public spaces hinders and marginalizes women's nighttime presence in the street through their sexuality and the fear of social stigma. As Ryan (1990) and Solnit (2002) name, the common perceptions in and about public spaces confine women in two categories: *endangered* versus *dangerous* women and *diurnal* versus *nocturnal species.* While Ryan focuses on the late 1800s, it still lights the way for the perception of women's nighttime walk in the street and the biases on their "asking for it" positions. Çavuşoğlu (2014, as cited in Acuner, 2016, p. 5) likewise states, public spaces serve heterosexual male sexuality with the categorization of women under the *virgin, mother,* and *prostitute* triad. Besides the dichotomy between dangerous men and endangered women, the representation of uncanny and wicked women, who stroll around the streets at supposedly mean times, reinforces the idea of women's confinement to the home—pseudo safe space for women—. However, some scholars studied this issue which Valentine (1992, as cited in Hollander, 2001, p. 84) describes as "the mismatch between the geography of violence and the geography of fear." As it is framed in the relevant literature, women's experiences in the city, including their fear of public spaces, are reproduced through a set of representations and myths.

Valentine (1989) indicates *the fear paradox,* and Pain (2001) calls *the spatial paradox* that deems home safe, although women mainly have been exposed to their male

intimate partners' violence in their own houses. Moreover, Condon, Lieber and Maillochon (2007, p. 118), through a set of in-depth interviews and a survey conducted in France, discovered women take more precautions in unfamiliar public spaces at night; however, violence mainly occurs in the daytime and familiar spaces. Hollander (2001) clarifies this paradox with the idea that people are taught *perceived vulnerability* of women and *perceived dangerousness* of men through mundane conversations, media coverage, and personal experiences. Sandberg (2020), in a similar vein, considers how journalistic reporting produces gendered and racialized fear of violence in the city. Çiçekoğlu (2018 [2007]) likewise takes films into consideration when exploring how media have an effect on women's fear in the city. As they argue, this process results in socio-spatial control over women's mobility in public spaces while encouraging men to minimize the fear of violence and avoid employing safety strategies.

These practices that are linked to the gender belief system appear in the relevant literature in the form of the creation of a "responsible woman." Stanko (1996) states that women are advised by police and media to think about their place in the city and take responsibility to ensure their own safety: "For instance, when a young mother was brutally killed in a London park, police suggested women avoid parks until the killer was arrested" (Stanko, 1996, p. 15). According to Valentine (1989, p. 385) and Wilson and Little (2008, p. 176-177), gender role beliefs drive women victim-blaming when the responsibility is not satisfied. Çakır (2017 [2009]) adds another dimension to the discussion by analyzing the Ottoman edicts [fermanlar] that regulate women and men's presence in the city. According to her detailed analysis, people were invited to obey the dress code, permitted days, hours, and places to go out: In the case of a violation of the rules about women's mobility in public spaces, not only women but also shopkeepers who had provided service as against the rules, and spouses and fathers, who were regarded as responsible for the woman's honor, were threatened with physical harm, exile, and even death penalty due to unfulfilled responsibility. As indicated, it limits women's mobility in the city more than ever because it intensifies the pressure on women's shoulders and set other actors responsible for their behaviors.

Fear is a restrictive emotion that has the potential to keep women in domestic spaces. However, it is not to say that women experience both public and private spaces without

violence and on an equal basis. Although studies dealing with the home as an unsafe place have increased in number, the street's portrayal as a space with the danger of sexual violence survives in minds. As a result, the situation forces women to be live on their nerves, feel forced to negotiate triggers in the city, and employ coping strategies that are mainly questioned as they restrict women's freedom of movement in the city and hinders their nighttime presence in the street. Valentine (1989) discerns that women's avoidance and restricted use of supposedly dangerous time and space allows men to secure their already privileged positions in public spaces. Koskela (1999) likewise states that those women with fear knowingly or unknowingly consolidate the image of the street as a masculine terrain. As Valentine (1989, p. 389) names, *the cycle of fear* perpetuates itself and serves the purpose of patriarchy: Women's fear forces them to avoid appropriating streets at night and ask for men's protection. Therefore, women's nighttime presence in the street, in the urban context, seems marginal, whereas men appear to be the so-called "masters" of the street, particularly at night. Eventually, neither uncanny night and streets nor fearful women are natural. Rader (2008) shows how newly married and divorced women's fear management strategies function as a tool prolonging women's fear and men's position in the city. As she considers, newly married women take their spouses along with them into fearful situation as a precautionary measure and transfer their fear and the responsibility of being fearful to their spouses. On the other hand, she explores that divorced women sometimes set their ex-partners and other men responsible for their own safety and sometimes embrace gender crossing and act more masculine in fearful contexts. In both cases, she states that women's strategies have the potential to reinforce the gendered structure of space and socio-spatial boundaries of women's mobility in the city. Rader (2008) borrows *patriarchal bargain*—the term coined by Kandiyoti (1988)—and makes use of it in the context of women's negotiations with fear in the city: According to Rader (2008, p. 48), women give up "their power over their ability to manage fear to men, in hopes of gaining safety."

2.3. Women's Negotiations with Timewise and Spatial Limitations in the City: Avoidance Strategies versus Assertive Strategies

Koskela (1999, p. 115) terms *the social night* to explain that night is socially constructed and imbued with "dark" thoughts that invite people to perceive women's

presence in public spaces as "out of place." Following the well-lit route, keeping away from dark alleys, avoiding eye contact, pretending to walk with a purpose or in disguise have been used by women as strategies that have paved the way for their nocturnal urban experiences. Although they could be evaluated as self-controlling and self-policing strategies, the relevant literature acknowledges their importance in women's negotiations within the forbidden space and time, where and when they are supposed to transgress their confined borders. Women circumvent the demonized appearance attributed to the nighttime-street through the use of strategies. Despite the extensive body of self-limiting strategies in the relevant literature, women also employ individual and collective strategies that give them a change to become active actors in public spaces that tacitly or explicitly exclude them. Scholars (Baytok, 2014; Casey, Goudie, & Reeve, 2008; Coe & Sandberg, 2019; Sandberg & Coe, 2020; Hvala, 2012; Koskela, 1997;) studied that women employ strategies that enable them to appropriate streets with agency. As they all argue, women transform those spaces for themselves and other women; thus, these strategies ensure their active presence in public spaces.

Studies dealing with women's use of public spaces occupy an important place in different disciplines in both national and international literature. However, they are generally related to work and dwelling. Moreover, strategies that women employ to open up a path in public space have mainly been studied in the context of leisure and everyday life. On the other hand, women's nighttime presence in the street at night is among the significant issues that Turkish academia has not acknowledged yet. Eventually, the thesis aims to fill the gap in the literature and contribute to the related discussions as it acknowledges women's appropriation of the street at night with agency by organizing and participating in the FNM in Beyoğlu. Koskela's (1997) conceptualization of *bold walk*[23] and Coe & Sandberg (2019) consideration of the TBTN march in Sweden as a *tactical choice* motivated me to build this study on the FNM as an assertive strategy that women employ to negotiate the limited boundaries of their urban mobility by taking up space and appropriating the most symbolic place in the city. Eventually, as the relevant literature indicates (e.g., Hamdan-Saliba & Fenster, 2012; Koskela, 1997; Sandberg & Coe, 2019, etc.), feminist activism has been

---

[23] Hille Koskela (1997) coined the term "bold walk" to refer to women's agency in public spaces by embracing courage rather than strategies that cease their mobility.

addressed as a tool for sustaining spatial confidence and a safe space for women not only "in the interstices of the city" (Wilson, 1992) but also the most symbolic, fluid, and contested public space of Turkey: in Beyoğlu due to its *thirdspace* dimension. Despite the fear of violence, women, who are supposed to transgress their assigned borders in the street at night, employ assertive strategies to enable themselves in this presumably dangerous place and time period. Accordingly, this study aims to explore whether women resist the perception that deems them "out of place" in public spaces, through those strategies.

Women's spatial reasoning is generally perceived through a stereotypical image of a woman without analytic intelligence and the ability to read the directions through a city or on a map. On the other hand, women mainly read the codes of the street and time imbued with patriarchal power relations. As Cahill (2000) argues, *street literacy* is one of the most important factors that affect teenagers' urban survival. Koskela (1997, p. 310) likewise gives particular importance to *spatial expertise* as an ability to detect dangerous moments and situations and act as is required. Regarding Cahill and Koskela's conceptualizations, I assert that women learn to read the codes of the street from the very beginning of their lives. Although this ability may generate avoidance behaviors, it can open the way for employing assertive strategies such as forming solidarity and alliance with reliable people, involving in feminist activism, etc. Cultural expectations and gender role beliefs somehow force women to find a way out while bothering their urban mobility.

de Certeau (1988), in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, uses the terms *strategy* and *tactic*. In his study, power relations are not fluid: Power holders employ strategies to establish, maintain and reinforce the existing spatial order and social relations. On the other hand, "dominated" ones use tactics to resist the imposed socio-spatial order through practices of everyday life. He states, "whatever it wins, it does not keep" (de Certeau, 1988, p. xix), while drawing a strict line between capacities of tactics as "victories and art of the weak" and strategies as "strong"s practices: "strategies are able to produce, tabulate, and impose" whereas "tactics can only use, manipulate, and divert" spaces (p. 30). According to de Certeau, tactics remain limited and incapable of setting the way in a power struggle.

Unlike Soja's multiplicity in *thirdspace*, de Certeau's conceptualization of space indicates that subjects with will and power have a place where they maintain their power through strategies; however, tactics do not have a proper locus. Accordingly, de Certeau (1988, p. 37) quotes von Bülow as he says a tactic is a maneuver "within the enemy's field of vision." As a result, he insists on that "weak" subjects employ some tactics within spatial and social order established and maintained by the "strong." de Certeau handles the issue of walking in a city as a tactic: Walkers "write without being able to read" the urban text (p. 93) by choosing and creating some ways while ignoring others. That's why he considers walking as both an affirmative and a transgressive action. What de Certeau repeats and reinforces, knowingly or unknowingly, is that weak, passive, and unconscious individuals use tactics in the city which is supposed to be the authority's property. Even though walking manipulates the spatial organization and urban planning, he does not emphasize walkers produce and reproduce the city with tactics. So, I find de Certeau's approach limited and limiting.

On the other hand, Uysal (2017), in *Sokakta Siyaset: Türkiye'de Protesto Eylemleri, Protestocular ve Polis*, emphasizes that different actors produce street politics with awareness about their unequal power. Since the protesters differ on their social and political profiles, Uysal (2017) states that they change the repertoire of contention[24] and employ different strategies and contra strategies. While doing a detailed illustration of all actors, she uses Bourdieu's habitus framework to understand police culture. Uysal discovers strategies and contra strategies take form according to the contradicting profiles and habitus. Unlike de Certeau, Uysal does not illustrate an invincible authority that surrounds and defeats the "other." She indicates that social and political continuities, transformations, and fragilities form places, protests, discourses, and actors of the street. Since Uysal aimed to analyze various groups, her study does not focus on women, although they are represented. In Uysal's study, women, as almost half of the protesters, employ strategies to negotiate the limits of public spaces and devise contra strategies to overcome repressive forces, despite *sokağın bedeli ve riskleri* [the cost and the risks of the street]."

---

[24] The term, Uysal (2017, p. 24) borrows from Tilly, means a set of approved strategies that collective actors employ to make their claims available in a given historical context.

de Certeau and Uysal's studies contribute to my thesis with their contradiction between "strategies versus tactics" and the less tensioned occurrence of "strategies and contra strategies." Although none of them focuses on gender, de Certeau does not even consider gender as a parameter that affects the form of these strategies or tactics. His emphasis on the division between strong and weak actors illustrates stability, which contradicts the *thirdspace* dimension that I adopt for my thesis. Uysal dealt with political protests, but de Certeau studied everyday life. Her study covers political protests and actors from the 1990s to 2000s in Turkey. Therefore, my thesis agrees with Uysal's consideration since she is aware of the fluidity among actors, spaces, and strategies. My thesis benefits from these studies as they constitute an important part of the relevant literature dealing with strategies employed in political protests and in the everyday life. Regarding the gap in the literature, my thesis focuses on gender while highlighting women's spatial strategies as I aim to understand whether women actively use, produce, and reproduce Beyoğlu at night through feminist activism.

As Uysal (2017, p. 214) argues, the *sociological distance* between police and protesters magnifies police brutality. Her study dealing with protests, protesters, and police's profile in between 2002 and 2016 in Turkey explored that police and protesters were opposite poles. Police officers generally grew up in patriarchal families and received an education that made them believe in that protesters are the obstacles for the state's continuity. In contrast, protesters, generally young, professional workers, or students with political and social awareness, saw the police as a homogenous group and "the pawns of the government." Therefore, the tension between the two poles led to harsh contestations via various strategies and contra strategies. The study also reintroduces that law enforcement units like riot police, special and support teams, and undercover police officers are not the only actors that aim to suppress and control protests and protestors: The study also indicates ostensibly responsible citizens: family members, neighbors, and inhabitants.

Lordoğlu (2020 [2018]) studied single women's preferences of dwelling settings and their choices in the city. She shows that not only single women employ strategies to negotiate the gendered organization of space but their surroundings, especially parents, try to create a rapport with neighbors, householders, and real estate agents to perform the image of a decent and reputable family in order to provide comfort and security

for their daughter in the neighborhood. The study also expands on single women's strategies that they use to negotiate the urban struggle. I briefly sort them as "performing the expected" and "avoiding the unwanted:" role-playing, presenting strong family ties, keeping away from a certain type of outfits and behaviors, etc. Similarly, Singleton and Green's (2006) research shows that young women choose to walk in groups because they feel in need of taking lift and disguise to eliminate gossip, ostracism, parental disapproval, and loss of reputation in their neighborhood.

On the contrary, Casey, Goudie, and Reeve (2008) show that other actors ease women's negotiations in public spaces. In their article issuing homeless women's spatial strategies in public spaces, they found that gatekeepers like security staff, park and toilet attendants, librarians, etc. create a symbiotic relationship: Homeless women are accepted in "tolerated" hours and welcomed in their places to prevent more unwanted actors than themselves, like graffiti artists. On the other hand, women generally perform some strategies which necessitate disguise, mobility, and vigilance. Pretending like a rightful user of the service sometimes equals pretending masculine in their estimations. Eventually, the relevant literature indicates that strategies that are supposed to open the gates of urban public spaces for women are challenging as they may promote patriarchal power relations and sustain gendered presuppositions of women's appropriation of the street.

2.4. The Potentials of Urban Public Spaces for Women

Institutions and organizations that offer the opportunity to combat violence in a systematic way are mostly located in city centers. Women, who are subjected to violence, "often need to leave their place of residence to avoid violence, lose their traces against the perpetrator or the potential perpetrator, and to keep their shelter address secret" (Bayram, 2013, p. 15). In line with this, cities offer anonymity when compared to suburbs or rural settings. Although Wilson (1992) makes sense of anonymity as a liberating advantage available to women in the city, which keeps them aside from male gaze, cities need to be thought with anonymity that somehow free some women from their abusive partners, oppressive parents, neighbors' gaze, etc. Cities, particularly metropolises, provide women with the opportunity to hide, and as Wekerle (1985) and Kern (2019) state, from having more job opportunities to

accessing entertainment venues, cities offer their residents multilayered social activities and opportunities. Compared to small settlements such as villages, neighborhoods, etc., where we are likely to encounter people we know, city centers offer a heterogeneous spatial experience and crowded places in which we can relieve from surveillance. It can provide socially disadvantaged groups to lose their traces and hide. For example, as I learnt not from the literature but from my social surroundings, women who have changed their names by moving away from the place where they were subjected to violence are likely to prefer to live in metropolises and city centers rather than small areas where they can be found as if they were put up by their perpetrators.

On the contrary, public spaces, especially the streets and squares, are political venues, where women collectively be visible and protest violence which mainly occurs in domestic spaces. Women have a chance to form solidarity and alliance in these sites or come together with their allies. Eventually, they create a moment in which they threaten the (potential) perpetrators while instilling hope in women who are exposed to violence or those who are likely to be subjected to any form of violence. Nonetheless, women are still subjected to violence or live with the threat of violence in urban public spaces, where their existence is regarded as the transgression of their assigned borders.

Cities both necessitate and enable the use of strategies for women: Urban public spaces constrain or ignore women's right to the city through patriarchal power relations while offering fluidity, anonymity, and networks that women can take advantage of. As far as cities have various actors and hierarchical power relations, public spaces where these actors attribute different meanings are already contested and in need of negotiation. Anonymity has a place in the literature, which indicates a chance for women's emancipation in urban public spaces. Wilson's (1992) *Sphinx in the City* is the prominent book that became a reference book for many scholars who have been studying women's place in the city. Besides Wilson's perception of women's participation in the city, many scholars (e.g., Baudelaire, Benjamin, Simmel) emphasized that modern cities offer anonymity for—supposedly male—people with a desire to stroll around the streets. Since there is a dense population in city centers, people do not have detailed information about their social interactions. Their own

identities in turn become anonymized for others. So, cities free people from others' recognition and conceal their unique identities. However, Koskela (2000) criticizes anonymity through the city surveillance cameras and closed-circuit televisions (CCTVs) as security began to mean hidden and male-dominated control over women who do not have access to technological and political authority. In a similar vein, the proposal of CCTVs in İstanbul traces back to the military regime in Turkey (Batuman, 2015, p. 893). So, as stated by McDowell (1999, p. 156), cities provide women with the coexistence of opportunities and constrains, where "The very anonymity of the urban crowd may protect women, while at the same time that edge of danger is a lure to explore the city landscape."

Moreover, Garber (2000) challenges the perception that anonymity is an efficient ground for women and LGBTI+ individuals who seek visibility, access, and recognition rather than anonymity. Garber (2000) discloses the incompatible relationship between two states that indicate marginalized people can avail themselves of anonymity in cities and those people's visibility in the same context. As she argues, actors of a city can gain identity through visibility. That's why she challenges feminist and queer assumptions that deem anonymity as the first step of being emancipated in the city. In this text, marginalized individuals and groups can claim their political presence not anonymously but through visibility. She bounds anonymity with isolation and powerlessness. Since people with observable differences do not experience anonymity completely, Garber (2000, p. 31-32, p. 34) insists anonymity is not butch, drag, black, etc.-inclusive. Kern (2019) argues how pregnant women cannot be invisible in the city because of their changing body. Sometimes, intersectionality of different states makes it harder for women to be invisible in the city: Güçlü (2004, as cited in Yardımcı & Bezmez, 2014, p. 317) likewise states "Whom people look in İstiklal Street? Either an alien or a cripple in a short skirt."[25] Ass these scholars indicate, some bodies are the subjects of gaze despite from a demanded visibility.

So, the idea that deems anonymity, as the nature of the city and an advantage for socially disadvantaged groups, fails. However, remaining anonymous can be a tactical choice that participants embrace to avoid regulations and pressure. Invisibility can

---

[25] Herkes kime mi bakar İstiklal Caddesi'nde? Ya bir uzaylıya ya da kısa etekli bir topala.

bring relief from surveillance that bothers individuals. Moreover, it does not necessarily mean visibility of a marginalized group fosters their acceptance and full participation within the society. Eventually, anonymity appears to be a complicated issue in terms of women's choices in the city.

Koskela (2005) defines urban space through three dimensions: urban space as "elastic," "tamed," and "suppressed." She indicates that the city gives room for women's strategies and their active use. Although space and people's perceptions of space are socially constructed by their families, media coverage, surveillance cameras, etc., Koskela thinks space and patriarchal power relations can be challenged by interpretations of the space, women's boldness, confidence, reasoning, and with technological equipment. As she believes, these insisting strategies and repeated spatial practices in the city enable women to "produce space that is more available for (themselves and) other women" (Koskela, 1997, p. 316). Coe and Sandberg (2019), Wooden (2000), and Sandberg and Coe (2020) show that feminist activism is a tactical choice, through their studies on the TBTN march. Baytok (2014) and Hvala (2012) insist on the same idea by, respectively, analyzing the Gezi Park protests and street protests in Ljubljana. As all these scholars argue, feminist activism paves the way for women to take up space in the city, where they may transform the space and their own political identities.

As city surveillance cameras are used for security reasons, they serve to control unwanted actions and actors. That's why they make space available for some actors in spite of the elimination of others. Koskela (2000) considers technology with an emphasis on surveillance cameras as objectifying, disciplining, and categorizing tools. She states that men, as invisible controllers, are behind the cameras whereas women are under surveillance. Since the article was written almost a quarter-century ago, it might not predict that women would benefit from technology not only by proving sexual harassment but also by enabling themselves to enter public spaces as the owners of personal gadgets. Also, women can benefit from technology by using it to become visible and form a network in the case of social movements (Şener, 2021).

The literature covering women's right to the city insists that women's and men's spatial experiences are different. Moreover, women are not a homogeneous category.

Their multiple identities set their choices and preferences in the urban context. Some women experience double or multiple exclusions because of their multiple identities. From demographical backgrounds to social competencies, various identities may create various strategies among women. Vaiou and Kalandides (2009) call the situation as "the multiple determinations of otherness in public space." According to their consideration, in the city, "there are relations of power, hierarchical representations, first or second-class outsiders" (p. 14).

2.5. Trialectics of Spatiality and Women's Placemaking in the City

As Lefebvre (2015 [2014]) and Soja (1996a) indicate, space has a reciprocal relationship with power relations in the relevant literature on fluidity. As both scholars agree, there are different aspects and actors of space. They believe space is an arena made of power relations, and it shapes the power relations. With its physical, representative, and experienced forms, space creates opportunities for repressed actors of social movements while favoring the repressors. Similarly, Beyoğlu, with the main, side, and the backstreets; short cuts, police barricades, and symbolic meanings that it represents is a place where the FNM participants and the authority clash by means of different actors. Despite the lack of a qualified gender lens, Soja's conceptualization of *thirdspace* offers a more theoretical framework that I can build my thesis on in the matter of analyzing Beyoğlu. His spatial theory indicates that Beyoğlu can be regarded as a contested space that paves the way for the use of strategies and contra strategies. Since Soja's conceptualization bears the traces of Lefebvre's spatial triad on perceived, conceived, and lived space, *thirdspace* functions as a space full of opportunities that shatter the authority's total control and the hegemony of *firstspace* and *secondspace*.

Lefebvre (2015 [2014]) ensures the spatial triad loses efficacy if three modes of space are treated solely. Soja (1996a) likewise, in the conceptualization of *thirdspace*, states that space is both real and imagined, and *thirdspace* intertwines and encompasses *firstspace* and *secondspace*. That's why *thirdspace*, as a fluid entity, ends the domination of fixed and authoritative aspects of space, and it sets the ground for the struggle between the authority and the "other." It is an evolving space where marginalized actors and the centralized power meet. Thus, their struggle reproduces

the space and shape their own spatial experiences. At this point, I think that *thirdspace* offers women a contested and fluid ground where they can transform the space for their own sake. While fluidity, just like anonymity, is both an emancipating and repressing force, it gives room for women to make their own ways in between power relations.

Misgav and Fenster (2016) discuss how social movements create a temporary and permanent ground for women. They claim that activism creates a *thirdspace*. Eventually, scholars mentioned above deal with social movements and the transformative power of activism in different aspects. They make it possible to assert that *thirdspace* is a political venue that welcomes protesters and enables them to create a space of their own to make their voice heard in the city to some extent. From the TBTN to the Gezi Park protests, the relevant literature regards social movements as a tool for women to reclaim their right to the city in different ways and levels. They also regard urban public spaces as political venues with an opportunity to challenge women's perceived vulnerability besides the risk of violence out there. As Koskela (1997) and Coe and Sandberg (2019) did, this study centers around the FNM as an assertive strategy that women employ to take up space in Beyoğlu and protest other facets of gender inequalities other than their spatial and timewise borders in the city. So, the study is built on the literature that ensures there is a strong correlation between feminist activism, women's right to the city, and the multidimensional structure of space where women make room for themselves and other socially disadvantaged groups in the city.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study aims to explore whether women enable themselves in the street at night through feminist activism. The relevant literature tackles fear of violence as a spatial and timewise reflection of patriarchy, which is supposed to result in women's avoidance behaviors in urban public spaces. On the contrary, I focus on the FNM, as an assertive strategy in which women gain spatial control and spatial confidence by forming feminist solidarity and alliance while easing their fear of violence in Beyoğlu. The research subjects consist of—cisgender and transgender—women among organizing committee members and participants. However, the FNM participants in İstanbul are not limited to women despite the call that addressed only women and transgender individuals for years: As stated, the FNM was open to women and transgender individuals' participation ("Kadınlar Gece Yürüyüşü İçin 14. Kez Sokaklarda Olacak", 2016). However, as I have witnessed several times, men, non-binary, queer+ individuals have been participating in the march, despite the discussions on feminist subjectivity. The study has a feminist standpoint, not because a woman conducts it with women and for women, but because it aims to analyze the patriarchal organization of space and challenge the dominant conception of "a woman's place" in the city and women's roles in urban public spaces. Focusing only on women's experiences cannot make the study feminist. It is even possible to restrict the category of women by recruiting only cisgender heterosexual women because of sampling bias. Considering this double-edged situation, I assert that the more critical pillar of a feminist methodology is the approach on which I aim to find out patriarchal power relations and challenge them not only for women but also for other socially disadvantaged individuals. Thus, this study attempts to discover the patriarchal reorganization of Beyoğlu, while trying to challenge this portrayal through women's spatial experiences as part of feminist activism in Turkey. In order to get an in-depth

understanding of this issue, I formed two research questions that unfold into three sub-questions:

Research Questions:

RQ1: How do women's characteristics and participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu form their spatial experiences in this fluid and symbolic place?

RQ2: How do their intersecting identities and the multidimensional structure of space shape these women's claims to Beyoğlu, as part of feminist activism in Turkey?

Sub-questions:

SQ1: How do these participants experience Beyoğlu in their everyday life?

SQ2: How do women's perceptions of safety, attitudes, and actual behaviors take form during and after their participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu?

SQ3: What are the social characteristics and spatial dimensions of Beyoğlu?

As I built the study within the framework of these questions, in this chapter, I will map a route with multiple stops in which I clarify the reasons for creating this type of research design and employing particular research strategies to answer them: Since I chose to do qualitative research, this chapter offers a basis for employing semi-structured in-depth interviews and participant observation as data-gathering methods. It also frames TA as a form of data analysis technique. Getting into detail, I expand this chapter on methodological limitations and particular stages of the research procedure while introducing my methodological choices.

3.1. Research Design

When I was planning to write a master's thesis, I decided to study the FNM that has been organized in İstanbul, through women's lived experiences and my own share at the march. Since it began to be organized in 2003, it continues to keep its place in discussions about Beyoğlu, especially İstiklal Street. This situation enabled me to establish a mutual relationship between women's spatial experiences and political disputes over this symbolic place. As I wanted to study the İstanbul context but currently live in Ankara, this decision provoked some limitations and required me to design an appropriate path for a qualified study. So, from gathering data to its analysis,

I planned all steps in accordance with the limitations: Time, scope, and cost were the primary constraints that the COVID-19 pandemic intensified. Together, they formed the sample selection procedure, the sample's representativeness, and the reliability of the data. From a different perspective, advances in communication technologies allowed me to conduct online interviews rather than doing face-to-face interviews, which provided both advantages and disadvantages. I had a chance to ease these limitations by using Microsoft Teams and Zoom—video conferencing platforms.

Studying women's participation in the FNM necessitates a constant consideration of knowledge production through the lenses of a feminist standpoint with an emphasis on women's heterogeneous characteristics. The literature indicates that fear of violence results in spatial and timewise control over women's mobility in the city. It is supposed to cause women to employ fear management strategies that mainly restrict their behaviors and lead them to avoid using specific places at a particular time. This study aims to explore how the FNM, as an assertive strategy, shapes women's spatial experiences in Beyoğlu, including their perceptions of safety, attitudes, and behaviors. Since the characteristics of the participants determine the reliability of findings, I endeavored to establish a representative sample with a focus on women's heterogeneity concerning their age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, community affiliation, involvement in feminist activism in the context of Beyoğlu, etc. I aimed at producing knowledge from women's lived experiences, with an emphasis on their diverse backgrounds and social and spatial positions in the city such as being a participant, a member of the organizing committee; a sex worker working in Bayram Street or an academic living in Beykoz, rather than regarding women as a homogenous category.

I aim to understand how women with different characteristics experience Beyoğlu at the FNM versus in their everyday lives. As the relevant literature indicates, women avoid using public spaces in their everyday lives, particularly at night, because they are afraid of being subjected to fear of crime therein. In line with this, I aim to understand how women's perceptions of fear shape their urban mobility in Beyoğlu. But in fact, in this study, I aim to explore the role of their heterogeneity and multidimensional structure of Beyoğlu in forming women's spatial experiences both in their everyday lives and at the FNM. Since I assert that there is a mutual relationship

between space and gender, this study is an endeavor to understand the interconnectedness between women's spatial experiences in Beyoğlu, the social characteristics and spatial dimensions of space, and women's multiple identities. Women's spatial experiences are supposed to fit in gender role beliefs; hence, those who do not fulfill the expectations face sexual harassment, sexual violence or at least the risk of stigmatization and disapproval. As a result, some women employ avoidance strategies whereas others do not embrace being a passive user of the city, and they reclaim it through strategies like feminist activism. Accordingly, in this study, I adopt a feminist methodology in which I built my thesis on revealing gender inequalities that crystallize in women's spatial experiences and their placemaking efforts in the city as agents of the FNM.

Researchers mainly employ qualitative research methods to obtain details about participants' lived experiences in social sciences. However, the current tendency is evolving to use mixed methods, which is an effort to enhance the study's trustworthiness while eliminating the risk of missing out on revealing the link between participants' socio-demographic backgrounds and their experiences. Depending on the scope of my study, I conducted qualitative research by using two data-gathering methods: participant observation and semi-structured in-depth interviews. Doing structured or unstructured interviews would lead participants not to express their ideas and experiences in a straightforward and comfortable way or to get off the point. Therefore, I built my thesis through semi-structured in-depth interviews with open-ended questions. I determined the basis and awaited more relevant and particular questions—probes—depending on our interaction. I sometimes preferred to stay silent. Sometimes I opted for echoing the participants without providing an affirmation but with a strong desire to delve deeper into what participants chose to narrate. So, I sought to establish a dialogue between me, as the participant researcher, and the research participants rather than an interrogation between an interviewer and respondents or a researcher and researched individuals. Eventually, I claim the possibility of embracing a feminist standpoint. As the participant researcher, I hold an in-between position in this study. Accordingly, I find it essential to conduct this research by taking a close look into the researcher's positionality, which becomes clear thanks to consideration of *situated knowledges*, *self-reflexivity*, and *conscious partiality*.

3.1.1. Research Philosophy: "A" Feminist Standpoint Theory

In the scope of this study, I aim to produce knowledge that I derive from the experiences of the FNM participants from a feminist standpoint of my own: In this feminist standpoint theory, I merge Harding's *strong objectivity*, Haraway's *situated knowledges* and Mies's *conscious partiality*. Since there is no woman but women, no feminism but feminisms, and there is no the standpoint but standpoints, I define my version of the feminist standpoint as a study aiming at contributing women and LGBTI+ individuals, including myself, whose existence in the street at night is marginalized. Reinharz and Davidman (1992, p. 4) insist that there are women's ways of knowing instead of a woman's way of knowing. From a similar perspective, this study has a feminist standpoint not because it was conducted by a woman, for women's emancipation and about women, but because its main aim is to challenge the gendered organization of the street and night by studying the limits of women's efforts on enabling themselves in the symbolic place through feminist activism.

The study explores the limits of women's agency over a symbolic place rather than putting women under the title of obedient and dominated individuals when it comes to appropriation of Beyoğlu. Although it illustrates unequal power relations through the Governor's Office's ban on İstiklal Street and other spatial interventions in Beyoğlu, it seeks to understand how feminist activism gives room for women's spatial confidence and placemaking experiences via feminist solidarity and alliance. It tries to find out if women exercise spatial control by organizing and practicing the FNM while experiencing the same place with—possibly but not certainly—fear of crime in their everyday lives. In order to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings and answer my research questions thoroughly, I planned to structure the study with and on women's experiences. At this point, I faced one of the core issues of conducting a feminist research: Since women have multiple identities, I considered their experiences in the study through the concepts of heterogeneity and intersectionality: I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with 22 women—aged between 21 and 61—who identify as cisgender, transgender, gender-fluid (yet transgender); heterosexual, bisexual, lesbian, and asexual. Their profession, level of income and attachment to Beyoğlu also differ, which shapes their spatial experiences at the FNM and in their everyday lives therein.

I aim to explore diversity among participants in addition to their socio-demographical backgrounds, with a representation of disputes over feminist subjectivity, the decision-making process in the organizing committee, etc., to shatter the duality that essentially positions women under men as a homogenous category. Haraway (1988) states that "The standpoints of the subjugated are not "innocent" positions" (p. 584). Identifying women's, including the participants and me as the participant researcher, *situated knowledges* in this study has the potential to illustrate intra-group power relations while eliminating the risk of creating a universal woman's knowledge and the illusion of an objective researcher. While giving the central place to women as the sole participants of this study, I acknowledge the significance of their *situated knowledges.* Subjects of the study are not women with homogenous characteristics but women participating in the FNM who have similar yet heterogeneous characteristics. Harding (1987, p. 9) identifies the best feminist analysis as a study in which the researcher " [is] placed in the same critical plane as the overt subject matter" while considering the self in the matter of "class, race, culture and gender assumptions, beliefs and behaviors." As the participant researcher, I acknowledge that I build this study with my personal background and lived experiences even if I devoted myself to managing my biases in order to eliminate ethical issues.

3.1.1.1. Self-reflexivity

To clarify my attachment to this study, I grew up in an off-centered municipality of İzmir, Bergama. I was born to parents—working-class, primary school graduate, identified as Turkish and religious Sunni—who were maintaining a patriarchal relationship in which my sister and I were taught "a woman's place" in the city: Although my father took us for watching football matches at a *kahvehane*, where he still is a habitué, when we were little girls, he began to refuse to take us there when puberty "kicked us in." After we hit adolescence, my sister, who was called *kız gibi* [girlie], and I, who was named *erkek fatma* [tomboy] by my father then, were pushed into the mother's side—domestic spaces with any woman but familiar men—. Although my sister had adopted almost all manners as she was five years older than me, I was having trouble understanding the situation. I was exposed to my mother's rolling eyes when I walked by a *kahvehane* or a mosque when men gathered for Friday prayer. I was visiting the cemetery in my regular clothes as a child, and then I was

offered to wear a veil and some long-sleeve outfits in order to get in. Even though I was using these places before, I began to be expected to avoid these places or at least play by rules—choosing appropriate gaze, tone of voice, attire, and pace—when I appeared as a young woman. As one of the research participants, Güz (a 25-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as feminist), states the obvious: "You know, this thing happened as I got older. ... When my boobs showed up, *el alem* [people] came out,"[26] which resulted in surveillance over my spatial experiences.

As my parents got older, their claims and effects diminished but shifted. However, their advice clicked the issue on my mind: I still feel the strain when I walk by a place where three *kahvehane*s meet a mosque in Bergama despite the anger that triggers me to walk with confidence in a male-dominated and secluded space. Although places were taken away, I keep trying to loosen my shrunken map. This study is one of those endeavors in which I try to understand women's spatial and timewise borders first and then explore their efforts to make themselves enable where their presence is controlled, limited, and surveilled because of their gender.

With regard to my academic background, I studied Media and Communication in my bachelor's studies. I majored in Newsmaking. Because I was into slow journalism and feature stories rather than breaking news, I wrote news reports about people and places where collective memory and migration studies meet urban sociology: I did interviews with lower-class single male elders, hotelkeepers, refugees, migrants, women cleaners, etc. who were living or working at bachelor's rooms wherein once minorities and seasonal workers lived in İzmir. I also wrote about the gender politics of transportation since women-only pink buses were on the agenda at the time. After graduation, I kept studying spatial issues: A fellow partner and I made two short documentaries, about a Rum house in Bergama, İzmir; and a house in Sur, Diyarbakır, that illuminate the history of the population exchange through a Greek family's grandson's inherited memory and attachment to his ancestors' house and forced migration through a woman's attachment to her house. While doing these academic and artistic works, I recognized that the space issue, which I was looking at through the lenses of collective memory only, was related to gender entirely. Then, I felt an urge to form a basis for

---

[26] Hani yaşım ilerledikçe bu şey oldu yani… memelerim çıkınca el alem de birlikte çıktı benim memelerimle.

54

my experiences, which resulted in my attachment to academia in the Program of Gender and Women's Studies at Middle East Technical University (METU).

Ahmed (2017) puts together a killjoy survival kit that she sees as a feminist toolbox, including a pen and a keyboard, other killjoys, books, etc. From a similar perspective, my survival kit includes a pen and a keyboard, other feminists I stand with, a whistle that reminds me of the FNM, iconic photographs of the crowd walking in İstiklal Street, and so forth. In short, my feminist survival kit consists of academia and feminist activism in the form of street demonstrations that gather thousands of women and LGBTI+ individuals with feminist demands. In addition, Mies (1979) insists that the knowledge production process in women's studies should result in a contribution to women's emancipation: According to Mies's (1979) rationale, it would be a betrayal,

> … if academic women, who were never involved in any struggle or were never concerned about women's oppression and exploitation, should try to reduce Women's Studies to a purely academic concern, restricted to the ivory tower of Research Institutes and Universities (p. 7).

As Mies (1979, p. 8) suggests, I took this study "into the streets" and laid it into social movements context, in which I identify myself as a participant of the FNM, so as to "struggle against patriarchy as a system." Within the context of this explanation, my study aims to reestablish the tie between academia and feminist activism. It requires me as both the researcher and a participant of the FNM to question my position in between insider and outsider statuses, objectivity and subjectivity debate, and presumed tension between my academic identity and interests in activism, which Merton (1972, p. 26) clarifies it as "double loyalty."

As I attribute greater importance to activism and link it to self-devotion, I do not identify myself as an activist but as a feminist researcher, which I did not hide during the fieldwork. Regarding the academia and activism binary, before conducting interviews, I expected participants to judge me for sitting on an ivory tower because I—a member of academia—was told it in a small group conversation in the feminist circle, Ankara. I am not an academic, yet I was introduced to the well-known statement that judges academics, even from gender studies, for not tackling issues from the field but hollow theories. Consequently, I had the idea that I needed to employ some strategies to eliminate the risk. Accordingly, I noticed and put into words that I held a

fluid position in between a researcher and a participant, a part of academia and feminist activism, an insider and an outsider, etc., as Dinçer (2019) suggests by emphasizing the importance of the researcher's positionality and fluidity of these two positions.

As one of the subjects in the research, the researcher echoes in all phases and takes an active role in the study. I do not have a fixed position, as the participant researcher: My ideas and standpoint are embedded in the relations I established in the field, the assumptions, and the findings. Unlike the Cartesian duality between objectivity and subjectivity, I embraced myself as the participant researcher who carries burdensome baggage full of biases, ideas, and characteristics. Also, I am aware of fluid power relations that preclude strict hierarchical divisions between me as the researcher and the participants. The theory enables me to question the participants and my position with regard to power relations, as we all have different standpoints and diversified backgrounds. Thus, in this study, I seek to gaze into my role and attitudes with ethical concerns: I take my position, as the participant researcher, into consideration under the title of *self-reflexivity* term.

The study invites me to think about the knowledge production process consisting of the field study, data analysis and critical writing on findings and discussion. Regarding the scholars' efforts to understand researchers as the subjects of their own studies, I have been thinking about my role as the researcher and a participant of the FNM. Because Beyoğlu, especially İstiklal Street, and the march occupy an essential place in my memory and political identity formation, I included my share in this study as the participant researcher who has attended and continued to participate in the FNM while writing a master's thesis about it. My position brings some difficulties to consider, and yet, it teaches me about doing research from a feminist standpoint while improving my attachment to feminist activism and affiliation with the feminist activist circle in İstanbul.

3.1.1.1.1. In-between Position of the Participant Researcher at the FNM

Studying an issue that I am a part of puts me in a precarious position, which frees me from being accused of sitting on an ivory tower while laying ethical responsibilities onto my shoulders, and yet it provides me with Wolf's (1996, as cited in Orhon, 2014, p. 57) "double vision." Merton (1972) emphasizes that "individuals have not a single

status but a status set" (p. 22); then, he clarifies that different conditions activate different statuses while causing them to dominate each other (p. 25). In this study, I experienced that the fluidity between these statuses paved the way for gaining acceptance, trust, and cooperation in the field while leading me to question my positionality since I sometimes felt I was more of a researcher than a participant and more of a participant than a researcher. Although I imagined merging these together, I found myself tackling my role shift and controlling my behaviors: I avoided taking responsibility at the march. I took field notes and stepped back consciously during the time participants were discussing men's participation.

I think there are no strict boundaries that split the position of a researcher as a complete insider and a complete outsider. According to Hill Collins (1986), through an analogy, both black workers at white employers' houses and black researchers in sociology keep the outsider position while keeping limited insiderness. Since these subjects' experiences differ from the experiences of white employers and white-dominated academia, Hill Collins argues that they cannot embrace being a complete insider: She terms "the outsider within position" of black women researchers in the sociology discipline. In that sense, I critically refer to Hill Collins' article: Within the scope of my study, I keep "an insider within" position as a researcher who hesitates to call herself an activist, currently lives outside of İstanbul, and yet identifies as a feminist who has attended the FNM in different contexts, respectively, İzmir, İstanbul, and Ankara. Ergun and Erdemir (2010), through their own fieldwork experiences, refer to Azerbaijani and Turkey as "neither unfamiliar nor fully familiar" settings because they have similar cultural backgrounds but different identities with their informants. Similarly, İstanbul appeared as a setting wherein I, as the participant researcher, kept "a betwixt-and-between position, [which] usually ends up with a fluid status that does not lead to either inclusion or exclusion" (Ergun & Erdemir, 2010, p. 34).

Ergun and Erdemir (2010) argue that researchers negotiate their insiderness and outsiderness constantly, through participants' perceptions and interpretations. As specified by their article, a researcher's status is agreed upon ethic and emic approaches. On the one hand, I am not yet an academic or an activist. However, I saw my reflection—as "a typical academic who devoted herself to saving women and/or transgender individuals while objectifying their experiences"—in the eyes of some

activists, especially those identified as transgender women who rejected taking part in this study. On the other hand, the Internet not only functions as a medium for recruiting participants but also enables participants to search for researchers with whom they can potentially talk to, which provided me with keeping a default insider position for some of the participants. According to some research participants' acknowledgment, a semi-academic article, which I wrote for *beyond.istanbul*, about the FNM in Beyoğlu, and some public posts on Facebook about organizing the FNM in Ankara created room wherein I held an insider position with multiple identities as a researcher, feminist, and activist. My insider status was even strengthened when I fulfilled the code of language like understanding and using *lubunca*[27] words and feminist terminology for those who were worried at the beginning.

As many scholars (e.g., Bektaş-Ata, 2020; Berger, 2015; Dinçer, 2019; Dwyer & Buckle, 2009; Hellawell, 2006; Hill Collins, 1986; Merton, 1972; Orhon, 2014, etc.) expand on the doctrines/statuses/positions of an insider and an outsider researcher, there are some advantages and disadvantages of both statuses. However, I argue that researchers who hold an in-between position can make use of this unsteady place. I have been affiliating with feminist activism and İstanbul with a limited familiarity. The fieldwork, including doing interviews and participant observation, provided me with a spectrum wherein I could gain acceptance, build trust, observe the groups' actual selves, and be able to see participants' intra-group contestations.

3.1.1.2. Knowledge Production through Situated Knowledges

Feminist standpoint scholars insist that conservative science methods and methodologies are gender-biased. As a result, they suggest giving room for women as the subjects of the study. Brooks (2007) and Harding (1991, 1995, 2004) emphasize the importance of women's lives as "the point of departure", and others (e.g., DeVault, 1990; Hesse-Biber, 2007; Reinharz & Davidman, 1992; Salman Yıkmış, 2015, etc.) indicate feminist interviewing strategies from women's standpoint. These scholars point out that feminist knowledge is rooted in women's consciousness and experiences

---

[27] The secret queer slang/language that has been used by the LGBTI+ community in Turkey in order to keep themselves safe. As Magid (2017, para. 5) mentions, "… Lubunca was primarily used among LGBTQ sex workers, particularly transgender women [because] … When they were walking in the streets they needed to protect themselves from abusive crimes and police" by communicating through a secret language.

that enable them to observe and express a "more reliable" image of social reality. Harding (1993, p. 71; 1995, p. 334) likewise states that the pure objectivism insistence leads science to "weak objectivity" as it is assumed to be value-free, but it becomes androcentric in essence. Harding's model of feminist standpoint epistemology, named as *strong objectivity*, appears as a maximized version of objectivity through the consideration of positions, values, and interests of the researcher.

On the other hand, the literature on the possibility of a feminist methodology indicates that methodologies or methods are not intrinsically feminist (Harding, 1987, 1995; Ramazanoğlu & Holland, 2002; Sirman, 2020). As the scholars argue, while giving the central place to women in a study cannot make it feminist, it is possible to produce and promote patriarchal power relations as a researcher with relations established in the field. Besides the relationship between the researcher and the research participants in interviews, the situation is about all phases of the thesis, from choosing the research question to the discussion. As Haraway (1988) states, "feminist objectivity" corresponds to *situated knowledges* as researchers' multiple identities are the lens through which they make sense of the world and form their research: In this study, I position myself as the participant researcher who identifies as a feminist.

Besides the importance of researchers' positioning, feminist standpoint epistemologies mainly relate doing feminist research with the issue of "starting from marginalized lives" to maximize objectivity. This study is established upon careful subjectivity, in accordance with my epistemological approach, which necessitates thinking about constituted and embodied positions rather than pure objectivity. I do not assume the participants of the study are oppressed; instead, I analyze their positions in between fluctuations. As all these scholars argue, subjects have different and multiple identities that establish heterogeneous and unique experiences. I aim to explore how participants' heterogeneity leads to different spatial experiences. Also, I try to find out if the intersectionality of their multiple identities leads them to employ different reasonings for their attachment to Beyoğlu and the FNM.

3.1.2. Methodological Choice: Qualitative Research

In research, everything begins with a research question. Then, every step serves to address and answer it through the researcher's methodological choices: The selection

of the research methods—data-collection methods and methods of data analysis—depends on the research's aims and the researcher's approaches. Methodological choices might take form within research limitations, yet a researcher needs to employ particular strategies so as to generate data and ensure the study's trustworthiness. Here, in this study, I aim to explore women's spatial experiences, including their practical and emotional reactions, in the matter of their participation in feminist activism. The study promises to find out how participants of the FNM experience Beyoğlu before and during the march: In this way, from the departure of women's lived experiences, I hope to understand whether their involvement in the FNM provides them with spatial confidence and alleviates their everyday fear of violence.

As I seek to understand women's lived experiences in detail, the quantitative research method, on its own, does not have the capacity to answer my research questions. I could employ a mixed-methods research approach. However, limitations allowed me to conduct mono-method research—qualitative research—that is built on two data-collection methods: interviews and participant observation. In the end, I aimed at getting an in-depth understanding of the situation while identifying codes and the recurring patterns. Thus, I found TA appropriate as a method of data analysis. Any change in method selection procedure causes changes in data. That's why, in this chapter, I try to expand upon every title for the representation of not replicable but applicable research.

3.1.2.1. Research Strategy

I am going to expand on the research methods in the upcoming part. However, I will give a brief overview in this section: First, doing semi-structured in-depth interviews provided an advantage that was beneficial for elaborating the data I gathered. In addition to having detailed information about the participants' lived experiences, doing in-depth interviews allowed me to comprehend their perceptions and emotions that form those experiences. In the end, the participants' experiences with their approaches and emotions unfolded into categories that I built my study on. Regarding preparation for the questions, I embraced doing semi-structured interviews. So, I had determined most of the questions in advance. However, as there are different ways to ask the same question to different participants, I added, removed and reformed some questions when participants had difficulty understanding.

I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews and participant observation to answer the research questions. As I have attended several meetings and marches both in Ankara and İstanbul, the procedure of doing participant observation sometimes resembled ethnographic research in some respects: Although the dynamics of cities differ, I participated in the organizational meetings in Ankara, in 2020 and 2021; and I attended the march in İstanbul, in 2021 and 2022. I claim that my observation provides a semi ethnographic aspect because I had a chance to observe the relationships between different actors. Thus, the observation of the field provided me with an in-depth understanding of the decision-making process, plans, and improvisations about the FNM. I also had a chance to match the recurring themes and codes that emerged from the semi-structured in-depth interviews with my field observation.

3.1.2.1.1. Semi-structured In-depth Interviews

According to Creswell (2007), the most used method of data collection in qualitative research is interviewing. In this study, I aim to explore whether the FNM provides women with spatial confidence in comparison with fear of violence that triggers them to avoid some places at a particular time in their everyday lives. I seek to understand how women create and consolidate the image of the symbolic place in Beyoğlu by participating in this march and attaching it to placemaking. In order to clarify the dimensions of this issue, I needed to find out the patterns of women's lived experiences. That's why I employed the interview method.

I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with 22 participants who identify as cisgender and transgender women with diverse sexual orientations—heterosexual, bisexual, lesbian and asexual—, aged between 21 and 61. 20- and 65+ people were subjected to shift curfews during the severe effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in Turkey, hence the FNM was supposed to exclude these women's representation in the street, in 2021. Although my field observation contradicted this assumption, the age range of the participants of this study matches the ideal. On the one hand, I found it necessary to study whether this limitation hindered women's participation or resulted in new spatial experiences. On the other hand, I gave importance to the accumulation of feminist memory. That's why I accepted that the age limit could change. However, snowball sampling and quota sampling led me to conduct interviews with both

participants and organizing committee members of the march, who are between the ages 21 and 61. I conducted one-to-one interviews. To fulfill the representativeness, I included independent (from the membership of an organization) [bağımsız] and organized [örgütlü] women in addition to women who identify themselves with different socio-economic statuses, occupations, etc.

Interviews require the participants to express their ideas in their own words (Reinharz & Davidman, 1992, p. 19). However, as the one who determines and designates the questions and analyzes the narratives, the researcher is responsible for eliminating leading questions. Open-ended questions can eliminate the risk of leading participants to choose or think in between structured choices that cannot reflect the participants' preferences and experiences but the researchers' perspectives (DeVault, 1990, p. 100). In this study, I asked the participants to answer at least 39 questions that were structured before the interview under the title of four main sections:

1- Demographic Information
2- Affiliation with Beyoğlu, İstanbul (especially İstiklal Street)
3- Affiliation with Feminism(s) and Feminist Activism (the FNM)
4- Negotiating the Space: Spatial Dimensions of Beyoğlu

Interviews' competence was framed by the clarity of the questions' design, the issue's relevance, and the participants' level of interest in the topic. In the semi-structured model, questions and topics to be addressed take shape as the interview unfolds. All participants have different identities and experiences. That's why I asked follow-up questions to comprehend their affiliation with feminist activism, the FNM, and Beyoğlu. Although I followed a set of questions that I had prepared, the conversation-characterized interview necessitated me to ask more questions.

Even though face-to-face interviews have long been considered as the core strategy of qualitative research, the pandemic has revealed that researchers need to explore alternative data-collection methods in order to reach participants and conduct their research at a distance. Although producing knowledge in and of the field is a crucial advantage of fieldwork, the pandemic has made it extremely challenging. Howlett (2022, p. 398) states that "the virus has, in many ways, pushed us back into the armchair—both in a physical and metaphorical sense—and required us to utilize new methods to conduct research from our own homes."

If I were living in İstanbul, I would have preferred to conduct face-to-face interviews. However, the pandemic came and stayed so long that I had no chance to plan to interact with the participants face-to-face, which forced me to find an alternative way. I had to consider the risk of infection before missing out on observing women's jest and mimics behind the mask while doing a face-to-face interview. That's why I did semi-structured in-depth interviews via videoconferencing. I conducted interviews—except one—between October 2021 and February 2022. Although the COVID-19 restrictions were being applied, travel bans and curfews were canceled at a time. Thus, I could travel from Ankara to İstanbul to conduct fieldwork in place. Since I noticed the opportunities and strengths of conducting interviews via online platforms due to limitations like time and cost, I decided to conduct interviews via Microsoft Teams and Zoom despite some crucial disadvantages. These video communications apps were available but have become more familiar and common digital platforms along with the rise of the pandemic. Unlike face-to-face interactions that are synchronous both in time and space, video interviews provided me with a time and cost-effective fieldwork while bringing the participants and me into asynchronous yet cyberspace.

I conducted online interviews because the study's preliminary limitation was the pandemic, which provided me with some opportunities along with difficulties. Except for one participant who had limited competence in technology, 21 participants were interviewed via videoconferencing. Zoom required users to have a premium account for having 40+ minutes-long meetings and recording opportunities then, thus I had to invite the participants to create an account on Microsoft Teams which had the same features for free. When Zoom began to offer unlimited time and local recording opportunities for the basic plan owners, I had a chance to conduct interviews via Zoom, after doing interviews with nine participants, which is a platform that the participants knew and trusted more. Two participants were living outside of İstanbul—in İzmir and Bodrum—. Some participants were working up until the morning. Also, I have been volunteering as a research assistant in the Gender and Women's Studies Program at METU, which required me to stay in Ankara during the fieldwork. That's why video conferencing became an opportunity for me to schedule meetings in a limited time. On the contrary, doing online interviews generates some difficulties: It necessitates both the researcher and participants to have technical competence, digital literacy, and

technological tools (Archibald, Ambagtsheer, Casey & Lawless, 2019; Howlett, 2022).

Regarding the place they connected to Zoom or Microsoft Teams, videoconferencing has the power to reveal participants' spatial experiences in their houses, workplaces, etc. with different actors from their partners to family members. So, it riches the study, in contrast with face-to-face interviews, while ambiguating the reliability of data. It was hard to inform the participants about isolating themselves during the interview. Because most of them participated in our online interview from their house, our interviews were easily cut from time to time by a family member or a partner who asked to be taken care of or for everyday problems. Therefore, the procedure created a risk of distorted stories and ideas, and yet, it provided me with a grasp of participants' affiliations with different actors and spatial experiences in diverse contexts. Similarly, my spatial surroundings, including my office and dormitory room with details from my favorite mug to drawings on the wall, became visible to the participants, thanks to videoconferencing. If the participants and I conducted a face-to-face interview, there could not be a chance to observe both settings at a time. However, Microsoft Teams and Zoom allowed me to conduct more conversation-like interactions, wherein we saw each other in casual clothes and around daily chores. This mutuality formed intimacy while weakening the hierarchical structure that I did not aim to establish at all. Nevertheless, I was aware that although self-reflection is vital for reducing power differentials between participants and the researcher, getting too intimate might give the impression of a false illusion (Stacey, 1991, as cited in Hesse-Biber, 2007, p. 128).

Interviews lasted between 65 minutes and 3 hours. They took longer depending on the participants' affiliation with the FNM in Beyoğlu. While doing interviews via videoconferencing, I recorded the whole interview with the participant's approval. However, some participants, especially a woman with political affiliations and women ($n=3$) identified as transgender, requested not to be recorded visually but let me record their voice. Some of these women trusted me that I do not use visual recordings even if I recorded it, even though one of them did not even open the camera. As a researcher—once a journalist candidate—who conducted both synchronous (face-to-face interview and phone interview) and asynchronous (e-mail interview) methods before, I used recording applications and tools like a sound recorder, camcorder,

telephone, and computer. When I contrast my previous experiences with doing an interview via videoconferencing and recording it without using a third-party tool or an app, I noticed that participants felt more comfortable and became straightforward on these digital platforms. As Neuman (2007 [2004]) states the obvious:

> Recorders and videotapes provide a close approximation to what occurred and a permanent record that others can review. They serve as "jotted notes" to help a researcher recall events and observe what is easy to miss. Nevertheless, these items can create disruption and an increased awareness of surveillance (p. 292).

Since both Zoom and Microsoft Teams informed them about being recorded by me as the host, they knew their speech was being recorded. However, they got familiar with the situation after a while as there was no tool like a visible sound recorder that was constantly stimulating them. In my opinion, the default recording feature is one of the reasons that made participants comfortable but not the best: As I recognized, trust was the most critical dynamic in producing authentic knowledge and generating rapport, which we built through the feminist network and by showing and seeing our natural habitats in the ordinary course of the video interview. In the end, I also asked them to choose a pseudonym for themselves. Eventually, I recorded the interviews by coding them with the names they selected for participant anonymity and confidentiality.

I also did follow-up interviews that I learned to conduct during my bachelor's studies. I had discussions with different people on the inadequacy of media students and members' ethical considerations in different contexts. Thus, I would like to clarify what a follow-up interview means for me as the researcher in this study. Even if the researcher aims at controlling the whole process during the interview, it is sometimes cut down because of technical issues or the participant's request, which causes misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and results in inaccurate data. As DeVault (1990, p. 104) states, "What produces the analysis is the recognition that something is unsaid, and the attempt to articulate the missing parts of the account." I think employing this type of strategy, in which I transcribed the interview and detected the missing parts, offered a chance to verify data. In this study, I did follow-up interviews not to ask the same questions for the second time but to clarify, verify, and detail the parts that participants already talked about.

In the end, doing follow-up interviews enabled the participants and me to develop trust. I expected the participants to have difficulty in expressing themselves and telling their stories through a screen and to somebody they do not know in person, hence I was afraid of having unreliable and invalid data. However, both snowball sampling and follow-up interviews provided me with the opposite. This procedure, as I planned, offered me detailed and credible data while delaying the expected date of finishing the fieldwork.

3.1.2.1.2. Participant Observation

Participant observation enables researchers to compare the represented selves of the participants that can be derived from interview transcriptions with their actual actions in the field (Ramazanoğlu & Holland, 2002). If it is done before data gathering, it gives researchers an opportunity to build and review their research/interview questions and recruit key informants (Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest & Namey, 2005, p. 16). In this study, I preferred to conduct participant observation to have a holistic exploration of women's spatial experiences in the related context: In addition to getting an in-depth understanding of some participants' marching experiences via interviewing, I had a chance to test their answers by observing not particularly their emotions but the population's feelings in the field through observation. This method revealed the complex nature of the FNM, including the diversity of the population and their social interactions not only with participants and non-participants but also with symbolic places.

I had a chance to observe both İstanbul and Ankara contexts from 2019 to 2022 through my participation in marches and meetings. I did participant observation in the FNM in İstanbul two years in a row—2021 and 2022—, which provided me with two critical opportunities: As Mack et al. (2011) suggest, I accessed some of these participants purposively in 2022 as my observation in 2021 had enabled me to detect the key participants. I became visible in the field during participant observation in 2021. This visibility provided me with acceptance in the recruitment process, and it consolidated my insider position in the eyes of the possible research subjects. Secondly, I reviewed the interview questions that I designed for women's marching and everyday life experiences in İstiklal Street. After attending the march, I expanded the contextual scope to Beyoğlu because it became difficult to know if participants

could make it to reach İstiklal Street due to the Governor's Office's ban and police interventions. Yet the participants continued to narrate their experiences by linking their thoughts and feelings with this symbolic place—İstiklal Street—.

I embarked on doing overt participant observation during the meetings. However, I could not manage this type of observation during the march. Since there were thousands of participants at the FNM, I could not inform all people whom I was observing. That's why I embraced both overt and covert participant observation for the study. It allowed me to comprehend non-verbal signs, jests and mimics: I observed the magnitude of police interventions and precautions in İstiklal Street. During this part of the field process, I had a chance to see the participants, non-participants, their social interactions, and some particular places. I conducted active participation because I am conducting research that I am a part of, which evoked ethical considerations about my level of involvement and self-reflexivity.

According to Siegel's (2018) definition of the complete participant, my position turned from active participation to complete participation—full membership—when I encountered the participants with whom I had interviewed, in the field: In 2021, I attended the FNM in Sıraselviler Street. At that time, I was just forming the sample. That's why the study participants were unaware that I was doing observation. However, when I participated in the march in 2022, I had interviewed with 22 women and was introduced to many participants and the members of the organizing committee. When I met with these women at the march, they did not seem anxious because of being observed but showed affection. In line with this situation, doing participant observation brought some difficulties along with the benefits: Since data was described and interpreted by me, who has prejudices and personal approaches, it became biased and subjective in the first place. I believe that there is no knowledge out of the producer. As Sword (1999, as cited in Berger, 2015, p. 11) restates, "no research is free of the biases, assumptions, and personality of the researcher," I admit that I affect the knowledge production process with my share at the march as well as on my desk. Yet, I believe that I produced authentic knowledge by exploring my in-between position as the participant researcher.

I did focused and selective observation: During the observation, I focused on the inductive and deductive themes and sub-themes I had derived from the interviews and literature while waiting for an opportunity to determine new themes in the field. I used analog and digital means to create and save what I observed: The field notes consist of my hand-written notes, sketches, maps, and digital media, including sound and video records with photographs and screenshots from WhatsApp groups and Google Maps. Since marching is a volatile activity, it was hard for me to write down all of my observations. As a result, I strategically recorded my voice when I needed to take notes about participants, their social interactions, spatial use and my personal thoughts and feelings. In the end, I wrote it all down in my field notebook in full sentences by anonymizing people and clarifying places for a confidential but detailed illustration of the march and descriptive narrative that I composed thanks to using multiple recording tools.

3.1.3. Time Dimension

Since I have been studying the same issue for almost three years, I had an opportunity to attend the march in both Ankara in 2020 and İstanbul in 2021 and 2022. I also participated in organizing committee's meetings in Ankara in 2020 and 2021 and an evaluation meeting in İstanbul in 2021. As a result, the research transgresses the borders of a cross-sectional study. However, it does not precisely fit in a longitudinal study like a panel or a cohort study. Since I collected data at different times, the study provides me with a comparison of spatial interventions of police, the effects of the pandemic, and participants' experiences in different years. However, as I collected data from different samples, I could not compare the same participants repeatedly over a period of time. This study can be considered longitudinal partially as my observation does not enable me to detect changes at an individual level, but at a group level: The FNM hosts thousands of participants. Even though I saw the same committee members two years in a row, it was impossible to see the same participants. Thus, I could observe the group of all participants and organizers with other actors like police, shopkeepers, and media members rather than observing the same individuals.

Turkey confirmed the first case of COVID-19 on March 11 in 2020. However, the FNM happens on March 8. Since other countries had begun to announce their cases earlier, participants attended the march in 2020 with little anxiety but without

precautions. I was in Ankara at the time. However, I could not observe a change in the magnitude of participants' number or a difference in their behaviors because it was the first FNM that I participated in Ankara, except for the FNMs I attended on the METU Campus during my master's studies. On the other hand, I witnessed some critical changes in the İstanbul context when I attended the march two years in a row, and besides, I could observe some differences through participants' statements in the interviews and media coverage over the years. Despite the pandemic's severe effects that even led to curfews in 2021, neither the participants of this study nor the members of the feminist circle in İstanbul hesitated about participating in the march in 2022. Nevertheless, participants—who were walking through İstiklal Street before the ban in 2019—were as much as they could walk between Sıraselviler Street entrance and Taksim Training and Research Hospital in 2021, which illustrates that the ban on İstiklal Street not only caused a change in the march's route but also led the number of participants to decrease over the years. As participants of this study emphasize, aging causes people to stuck in their houses in their everyday lives as well as it prevents them from taking the risk of being exposed to physical violence, or it causes them to hesitate over walking for miles because of the ban just to reach the marching crowd:

> People tend to stay in their houses after a certain age. Also, they might become too lazy to do something or can have health problems as they age. (break) I don't know. When looking back, people my age kept their hands off the street… and women's movement… (Gönül, 60 years old, a transgender heterosexual woman).[28]

> … I used to be more active on these issues, but I have calmed down a lot these days… but I can actually call myself a feminist. I calmed down because the pandemic actually… I have a disease, I mean, I had cancer. … I also experienced a cell fraction. So, I had to protect myself. You know, "just in case"... Because… if I get Corona during the pandemic, maybe I may have a problem. That's why I stopped for a little while. Also, we had a group. I mean, there were female friends and we were with them all together. Well, some of them settled in another place. Some of them are old (she laughs), some of them have children now. That's why we no longer are go-getting (Çiçek, 46 years old, a cisgender heterosexual woman).[29]

---

[28] Bi yaştan sonra insan daha böyle eve çekiliyo. Bi de böyle yaş ilerledikçe insanda üşengeçlik mi oluyo ya da sağlık sorunu yaşayabiliyosun… ne biliyim? Bi bakıyosun benim yaş kuşağım hep çekildi [sokaktan]. Kadın hareketinde de…

[29] … eskiden bu konularda daha aktiftim aslında ama baya sakinleştim şu anlarda… ama yani ben kendime feminist diyebilirim aslında. Sakinleştim çünkü pandemi süreci aslında… Yani bende bi hastalık var, kanser vardı bende. … Bi de fraksiyon yaşadım arkasından. O yüzden korumak zorundaydım kendimi. Hani "Nolur, nolmaz?" Çünkü pandemi sürecinde Korona'ya

Moreover, in 2022, on the 20th anniversary of the FNM, İstiklal Street was banned, and Sıraselviler Street was closed. Consequently, both participants of the FNM and transients who were passing through this place had to stroll all around the place and find an alternative way. Regarding the participants' statements and my personal knowledge of the place deriving from the participant observation, the ban and this closure, together with the effects of the pandemic, resulted in a decrease in participation, especially in middle-aged or elderly participants'—disabled bodies and those who were coping with a health problem—attendance.

3.1.4. Participant Recruitment Criteria

Research subjects are comprised of participants who self-identify as cisgender and transgender women with different sexual orientations. I also tried to create a sample that represents intersectionality and different feminisms as much as possible. Because of limitations and preferences, I aimed to do semi-structured in-depth interviews only with women without casting women as the only subjects of the march. Besides, I admit that I did not and cannot include all women attending the march. I planned to conduct inclusive research. However, the target population is an isolated group that is heterogeneous and yet with similar networks. As a result of snowball sampling, I did not have the possibility to interview with women who identify as radical feminists excluding transgender women. I also did not interview with women who are police officers, shopkeepers, media members, etc., even though they are a part of the march on different levels and with diverse motives because this study focuses on the participants and organizers of the march. On the other hand, as part of participant observation, I included their attitudes and behaviors directed at the participants and me as the participant researcher. While struggling to include women with different and diverse characteristics, I had an exclusive criterion. As I clarified earlier, the study does not cover some women while including others. This preference was a conscious choice that derived from the limitations and the scope of this study.

---

yakalanırsam belki bi sorun yaşayabilirim. O yüzden birazcık durdum yani ben. Bi de bizim… bi grubumuz vardı. Yani kadın arkadaşlar vardı ve onlarlaydık hep beraber. E kimisi bi yere yerleşti. E kimisi yaşlandı (gülüyor), kiminin çoluk çocuğu var şimdi. O yüzden pek bi [girişken] olamıyoruz artık.

Depending on my experiences in doing interviews about political issues, I needed to gain the participants' trust first. That's why I relied upon my network with people from some associations and surroundings in İstanbul. I embraced purposive sampling and snowball sampling with quota sampling to find relevant participants and organizers who attended the march and—not necessarily—the meetings. I included women without fitting them into certain stereotypes like being cisgender or heterosexual. On the contrary, I tried to create a sample structured into heterogeneity and intersectionality. I approached heterogeneous characteristics of women and their distinct experiences within the boundaries of this research.

3.1.4.1. Sampling Design

As a researcher who preferred to conduct qualitative research methods in her study, I still acknowledge conducting Mixed Method Research (MMR) as a proper way to produce credible findings. However, there are ways to enhance the trustworthiness of the data that researchers gather while conducting qualitative research. For me, the most critical step is the recruitment of participants. Using different sampling types to create a representative sample would reach the research into a qualified study as the sample is tested in a pilot study.

Women as an umbrella gender identity include different individuals with other identities. Their spatial experiences emerge from their positions. In this study, I tried to access women with different sociodemographic characteristics. So, I invited participants through purposive sampling, snowball sampling, and quota sampling. I had a chance to conduct my pilot interviews with eight women while writing the article, *Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü: Mekânın Sınırları ve Yasaklı Gece* [The Feminist Night March: The Limits of Space and the Banned Night], for beyond.İstanbul in 2020. The issue was about the relationship between gender and space, and I studied women's participation in the FNM in İstanbul. While doing narrower-scoped interviews for this article, I selected the participants from my network and among their surroundings. In the end, I faced ethical and procedural difficulties: Some of the participants got off the topic, and others supposed that I had already known their roles at the march. So, I decided not to use field results for this article, although I generated new questions and edited the ones I had already designed for my research. I thought I should not have included the participants I have known for this very reason. Finally, in this study, I

conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with 22 women who do not know me in person, but I know a few of them through feminist circles, media coverage, and by seeing them at the marches. Because I center the study around women's spatial experiences in Beyoğlu, I made a research design in which units of analysis include the FNM participants who identify as women and some symbolic places, like İstiklal Street, in Beyoğlu. So, it adds sampling process a spatial dimension, which can be recognized in the findings chapters.

Qualitative researchers, as Hesse-Biber (2007, p. 119) points out, generally pay attention to employing purposive or judgmental samples. In parallel with her remark, in this study, I embraced purposive sampling, snowball sampling, and quota sampling, which resulted in non-probability, non-representative, and convenience sampling, because I aimed to include women with diverse sociodemographic characteristics and social affiliations. As a result, the findings could be biased because the participants were chosen among prominent feminist activists, their surroundings, and social media users whose accounts were public. For all sampling methods, there is a risk of creating unreliable results. However, I already embraced the idea of careful subjectivity, and I admit to my impact as the researcher who gives form to the findings together with the participants. Hill Collins (2000 [1990]) likewise emphasizes that,

> … with each group using the epistemological approaches growing from its unique standpoint, become the most "objective" truths. Each group speaks from its own standpoint and shares its own partial, situated knowledge. But because each group perceives its own truth as partial, its knowledge is unfinished (p. 270).

Similarly, Mies's (1979, p. 6) conceptualization of *conscious partiality* shows that researchers keep a position where they can offer partial identification for participants of the study instead of a place wherein they produce "spectator-knowledge." Women have different and multiple identities; accordingly, in this study, I admit to offering a partial representation of their experiences at the march in Beyoğlu: The thesis does not represent women within authorities like politicians, police, shopkeepers, etc. Within the limitations of this study, it is not possible and sensible to enhance the scope and conduct interviews with other women with different affiliations with the FNM, rather than the ones who organize and participate in it. Eventually, I admit that my research represents and generates partial knowledge.

3.1.4.1.1. Purposive Sampling

As indicated in the informed consent form, the research depends on participants' willingness and availability. As a result, I embraced convenience sampling, which takes form within three types: purposive, snowball and quota sampling methods. Purposive sampling, also known as selective sampling and judgmental sampling, is the first method I used during the recruitment of the participants. Since I wanted to access a particular subset of women, all participants were selected because they fit a particular profile. Because I conceptualize the category of women as a spectrum including differences in gender identity (transgender, cisgender, gender-fluid+), sexual orientation (heterosexual, bisexual, lesbian, asexual+), age, occupation, level of income, level of education, class, etc., I aimed at accessing—as possible as it was—women with different characteristics and from different sociodemographic backgrounds.

I focused on recruiting women who identify both as a participant or an organizer, a feminist or not a feminist, and İstanbulite or not an İstanbulite; who live on the Asian or the European side of İstanbul; etc. Committee-member women, transgender women and women who identify with different standpoints in feminisms were crucial to access because of the representation issue. As a result, I purposefully contacted 13 women in order to have them in this study. However, as about their availability and willingness, it resulted in nine key participants out of 13 joining the research:

1- Cemile (a 31-year-old cisgender lesbian woman who identifies as feminist, committee member, never-married single, translator, lives in Hisarüstü-Sarıyer/İstanbul),

2- Leyla (a 32-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as a Muslim feminist, participant of the FNM, divorced single, research director, lives in Üsküdar/İstanbul),

3- Gönül (a 60-year-old transgender heterosexual woman who hesitates to call herself feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, retired, occupied with sex work in Ülker Street in 90's Beyoğlu/İstanbul, lives therein),

4- and Ayşe (a 61-year-old cisgender asexual woman who identifies as feminist, former committee member, divorced single, retired NGO worker, lives in Acıbadem-Kadıköy/İstanbul)

were the participants that I learned about their participation in the FNM through media coverage and by seeing them at the march. Ayşe and Gönül are available on Facebook, and I have Leyla and Cemile's e-mail contacts, so I directly accessed them through these channels.

On the other hand, I searched for #feministgeceyürüyüşü [#feministnightmarch], #8M2019, #8M2020, and #8M2021 on Instagram to find appropriate participants for this study by considering whether they fit the boundaries of this research and quota sampling. In this way, I accessed the following participants:

5- Veronika (a 21-year-old transgender bisexual woman who identifies as an intersectional feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, sex worker in Bayram Street, lives in Beyoğlu/İstanbul),

6- Anahit (a 21-year-old transgender heterosexual woman who identifies as a transfeminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, cohabits with a transgender (man) partner, sex worker in Bornova Street, lives in Alsancak/İzmir),

7- Lisa (a 30-year-old gender-fluid and yet transgender lesbian woman who identifies as a queer vegan feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, poet and performer, lives in Maltepe/İstanbul),

8- Bengi Su (a 41-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who prefers not to call herself feminist, participant of the FNM, married to a cisgender man, unemployed IT staff, lives in Samatya-Fatih/İstanbul),

9- and Damla (a 45-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as feminist, participant of the FNM, married to a cisgender man, content creator and author, lives in Bodrum)

3.1.4.1.2. Snowball Sampling

Sometimes, researchers have difficulty accessing to relevant participants. So, they employ snowball sampling in order to build a sample. Here, in this study, I used this method in two forms: I, first, depended on a small number of participants to access potential research subjects, especially transgender women to build trust. Thousands of participants attend the FNM. However, I aimed to do semi-structured in-depth interviews with women within some boundaries that I mentioned before. Consequently, after I interviewed the participants that I recruited by purposive sampling, I asked them to refer me to some subjects who might be willing to attend

this research. However, I did not mean to create a sample through linear snowball sampling that requires one referral per participant.

I asked preselected participants to suggest some other participants, but some failed to provide a referral. Others referred multiple subjects. So, the situation forced me to embrace quota sampling to form a relevant sample. Therefore, this method turned into exponential discriminative snowball sampling: I screened potential research subjects according to the primary criteria like identifying the self as a woman and participating in the FNM in İstanbul at least once, together with my intended criteria on the sample's heterogeneity. The process resulted in a time-consuming selection protocol, and yet, it improved the reliability of research outcomes.

By employing this type of sampling strategy, six participants attended the study:

10- Gece (a 21-year-old transgender heterosexual woman who avoids identifying herself as feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, cook, lives in Beşiktaş/İstanbul),

11- Eylül (a 23-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as close to transfeminism, participant of the FNM, never-married single, freelancer, lives in Sarıyer/İstanbul),

12- Güz (a 25-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, unemployed graduate, lives in Ataşehir/İstanbul),

13- Sena (a 27-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who does not call herself feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, research assistant, lives in Kağıthane/İstanbul),

14- Elif (a 40-year-old transgender heterosexual woman who identifies as feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, unemployed bar manager, lives in Şişli/İstanbul),

15- Oya (a 51-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who avoids calling herself feminist, participant of the FNM, married to a cisgender man, academic, lives in Beykoz/İstanbul)

Then, I contacted some collectives (Pembe Hayat LGBTT Dayanışma Derneği [Pink Life], Sosyal Politika Cinsiyet Kimliği ve Cinsel Yönelim Çalışmaları Derneği–SPoD [Social Policy, Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation Studies Association], Cinsel Şiddetle Mücadele Derneği–CŞMD [Association for Struggle Against Sexual Violence], şugarmekanlar [sugarplaces], the FNM e-mail group, Kadın Komiteleri

[Women's Committee], Cumartesi Anneleri [Saturday Mothers], and Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu [We Will Stop Femicides Platform]) to ask them whether they want to refer potential subjects. However, Pembe Hayat LGBTT Dayanışma Derneği, şugarmekanlar, and Cumartesi Anneleri did not contact me back. Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu emphasized that they do not want to involve in a study about the FNM. On the contrary, SpoD, CŞDM, Kadın Komiteleri and the organizing committee's e-mail group forwarded my invitation to relevant subjects. In the end, some women contacted me as they wanted to take part in this study. By this method, I included seven participants:

16- Meryem (a 24-year-old cisgender bisexual woman who identifies as a Muslim feminist, committee member, never-married single, project assistant, lives in Tarabya-Sarıyer/İstanbul),

17- Deniz (a 26-year-old cisgender bisexual woman who identifies as close to transfeminism, participant of the FNM, never-married single, social service specialist, lives in Feneryolu-Kadıköy/İstanbul),

18- Zeynep (a 26-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as a radical and Marxist feminist, participant of the FNM, never-married single, unemployed student, lives in Sarıgazi-Sancaktepe/İstanbul),

19- Tülin (a 31-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies with socialist feminism, committee member, never-married single, computer technician, lives in Eyüp/İstanbul),

20- Nazlı (a 32-year-old cisgender bisexual woman who identifies as feminist, participant of the FNM, married to a cisgender man, IT consultant, lives in Hisarüstü-Sarıyer /İstanbul),

21- Güllü (a 35-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as feminist, committee member, married to a cisgender man, audit manager, lives in Moda-Kadıköy/İstanbul),

22- Çiçek (a 46-year-old cisgender heterosexual woman who identifies as feminist, participant of the FNM, divorced single, paid family worker, lives in Burgazada/İstanbul)

3.1.4.1.3. Quota Sampling

Quota sampling is a non-probability sampling method in which researchers build a sample that consists of a representative population. After the first phase of participant observation and pilot study, I created quotas so that the research results could be

trustworthy. However, there was no statistical data on the population of the FNM participants. Consequently, the final subset of the study was decided according to my knowledge of the population. Considering my observation, I applied quotas for the recruitment of participants based on their age, sexual orientation, level of education, etc. while gauging the trend among the participants, which resulted in a combination of quota sampling and participants' willingness to participate in this research: uncontrolled quota sampling. Since the FNM participants' experiences differ by their characteristics, I aimed to represent their heterogeneity. Finally, the criteria were divided into subsections as each predetermined category includes at least one participant in order to better reflect the diversity of the population:

- Age: women between the ages of 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-64
- Gender identity: cisgender, transgender, gender-fluid+ women
- Sexual orientation: asexual, lesbian, bisexual, heterosexual+ women
- Level of education: women who hold primary school, high school, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree, etc.
- Level of income: women without an income and women who earn between the wage/salary ranges of 0-2825,89 Turkish Lira (TL), 2.825,90[30]-3.000 TL, 3.001-6.000 TL, 6.001-8.000 TL, 8.001-10.000 TL, 10.001 TL and more.
- Class - income group (according to the participant's self-recognition): lower-class, lower-middle-class, middle-class, upper-middle-class and upper-class women
- Feminist statement: women who identify as feminist or avoid identifying themselves as feminist
- Mode of feminist activism: women who identify with an organization/collective and women who identify as individual activists
- Marital status: never-married single, divorced single, and married women
- Residency: women who live on the Asian or the European side of İstanbul

3.1.4.2. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants

In this study, I embrace a feminist standpoint. There are feminisms and feminists, and so do feminist standpoints. I call my standpoint feminist not only because it deals with women's participation in the FNM but because it offers an analysis of a spectrum of feminisms and women who are with different characteristics. Although participants' gender identities and sexual orientations are important determinants, they are not the sole parameters. As a matter of representativeness, I aimed to include cisgender and transgender women from different cultural, economic, and social backgrounds.

---

[30] By the end of fieldwork, the minimum wage corresponded to 2.825,90 TL.

In the interviews, I asked questions about women's encounters with actors, especially police and their response to those agents. Thus, the study might lead to legal problems. As a result, I paid no regard to the participants' comprehensive identities, especially their names. I included the pseudonyms that the participants chose for themselves. However, I find it necessary to include their gender identities and affiliations with the march and İstanbul, as I believe they are the parameters that diversify their experiences predominantly. Depending on my personal experiences and intra-group conversations, participants' relationship with İstanbul, İstiklal Street, feminist activism, and the FNM affect their practical and emotional reactions: fear, spatial avoidance, spatial confidence, etc. Consequently, while doing the TA, I included quotations within the framework of participants' different characteristics and backgrounds.

Table 3.1 The participants' sociodemographic profile

Pseud.	Age	Self-identified gender	Sexual orientation	Occupation	Income range ₺	Level of education (degree)
Veronika	21	Transgender woman	Bisexual	Sex Worker	10.001 ≥	High-school graduate
Anahit	21	Transgender woman	Heterosexual	Sex Worker	10.001 ≥	Primary school graduate
Gece	21	Transgender woman	Heterosexual	Cook	≈ 2.826	High-school graduate
Eylül	23	Woman	Heterosexual	Freelancer	≈ 2.826	Bachelor
Meryem	24	Woman	Bisexual	Project Assistant	≈ 2.826	High-school graduate
Güz	25	Woman	Heterosexual	UE Graduate	None	Bachelor
Deniz	26	Woman	Bisexual	Social Service Specialist	6.001-8.000	Bachelor
Zeynep	26	Woman	Heterosexual	UE Student	None	High-school graduate
Sena	27	Woman	Heterosexual	Research Assistant	6.001-8.000	Master's degree
Lisa	30	Transgender woman	Lesbian	Poet & Performer	None	Primary school graduate
Tülin	31	Woman	Heterosexual	Computer Techn.	< 2.826	Bachelor
Cemile	31	Woman	Lesbian	Translator	3.001-6.000	Bachelor
Nazlı	32	Woman	Bisexual	IT Consultant	10.001 ≥	Bachelor
Leyla	32	Cisgender woman	Heterosexual	Research Director	10.001 ≥	Master's degree
Güllü	35	Woman	Heterosexual	Audit Manager	10.001 ≥	Bachelor
Elif	40	Transgender woman	Heterosexual	UE Bar Manager	< 2.826	High-school graduate
Bengi Su	41	Woman	Heterosexual	UE IT Staff	6.001-8.000	Master's degree
Damla	45	Woman	Heterosexual	Content Creator & Author	3.001-6.000	Master's degree
Çiçek	46	Woman	Heterosexual	Paid Family Worker	≈ 2.826	Primary school graduate
Oya	51	Woman	Heterosexual	Academic	10.001 ≥	Ph.D.
Gönül	60	Transgender woman	Heterosexual	Retired Sex Worker	< 2.826	Primary school graduate
Ayşe	61	Woman	Asexual	Retired NGO Staff	3.001-6.000	Bachelor

3.1.5. Ethical Considerations

In order to conduct the fieldwork that involves data collection with people, first, I applied to the METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee. After receiving the approval, I began to do semi-structured in-depth interviews with the participants, but I began to study with a new supervisor. Consequently, the approval and the informed consent form, which are in the appendix section, include my former supervisor's name instead of my current supervisor. In the informed consent form, I aimed to inform research participants about the purpose of the study, procedure, and confidentiality before they agreed to participate in this research. Because I conducted research through videoconferencing with almost all participants, I received their approval while recording their voices so that I could obtain their consent vocally.

Thanks to technology, it was possible to conduct my study via videoconference. I still feel uncomfortable about doing interviews in this way while finding face-to-face interviews essential for studies that are especially about social movements. However, interviewing via Microsoft Teams and Zoom became a necessity rather than a possibility due to the pandemic's unstable situation. The study covers police and participants' encounters; so, it could cause social or penal sanctions because of participants' direct expressions. Also, it includes the participants' gender identity and sexual orientation, which some participants prefer to hide, especially from their parents. Although their comprehensive identities are protected, and I gave this information in the informed consent form, they could have embraced self-censorship because they did not know me in person or avoided telling their stories to whom they see on a screen. In any case, I believe that doing follow-up interviews paves the way for qualified research. In addition to this, at the end of the fieldwork, I asked them to choose a pseudonym for themselves, which consolidated confidentiality while comforting me since I did not want to assign names, especially for transgender women who might go through a traumatic situation about their assigned names before. For the confidentiality of the data I gathered, I anonymized it with the pseudonyms that the participants chose by themselves. I listed the transcripts with the pseudonyms while keeping which pseudonyms correspond to the participants' names as a hard copy and in encrypted documents.

3.1.6. Data Analysis

Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014 [1994]) suggest that examining the data set depends on three steps in qualitative research: data condensation,[31] data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. As Miles and Huberman's interactive model of analysis indicates, these are recurring activities that a researcher applies throughout the data gathering and analysis procedures (Baltacı, 2017; Punch, 1998). Coding and taking notes, that takes the researcher into generating themes and categories, prepare the researcher for the analysis. In this study, fieldwork results are comprised of the interview descriptions, field notes, and my observation notes, which correspond to 55-hour-long sound and visual recordings and over 500-page-long written material. Therefore, data condensation and data display are the vital strategies I implied by the six-phase model of Braun and Clarke (2006, as cited in Kiger and Varpio, 2020, p. 846)–namely: familiarizing with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report–.

3.1.6.1. Transcription

DeVault (1990, p. 110) emphasizes that "writing is not a transparent medium which researchers simply convey "truths" discovered in the field, but itself constructs and controls meaning and interpretation." In this study, the writing process begins with transcription, which prompts me as the researcher to rethink ethical considerations and the trustworthiness of the study. In transcribing, I began with preparing a descriptive structure in which I indicated the name of the participant, date, duration, context, setting and the predetermined questions. As part of a confidential study, I changed participants' names with their pseudonyms after finishing the procedure.

I did not use any transcription program. Manual transcribing caused exhaustion, which led me to delay follow-up interviews and the finishing date of fieldwork. However, as Kiger and Varpio (2020, p. 850) state, "For audio data that need to be transcribed, the process of transcription can be time-consuming but also serves as an excellent way to become familiar with the data." As Ryan and Bernard (2003, p. 88-89) insist, "for those who tape their interviews, the process of identifying themes probably begins

---

[31] They warn researchers about the risk of data reduction.

with the act of transcribing the tapes." I included my annotations and descriptions of the surroundings together with interpretations as tinted in the transcripts. Correspondingly, the procedure came in many opportunities, from familiarizing with the data to making their pre-evaluation as part of the TA.

During transcribing process, I employed the model of verbatim—word for wor—dtranscription, including the participant's dialect, emotional expressions (e.g., "she laughs" or "she gets angry; silences as "long silence" or "break"; unfinished sentences with aposiopesis with an ellipsis, and verbal tics: *şey* [well], *yani* [I mean], *ııı…* or *eee…* [um], ya! [ah, uh], etc.) Since participants' style of pronunciation and tone of voice pave the way for making deductions about their differences, I typed them as identical as possible. Using these—what Bogdan and Taylor (1975, as cited in DeVault, 1990, p. 106) call *dialogue accessories*—resulted in not a flawless reproduction but a rigorous transcription.

In order to gather data, I conducted interviews with 22 women who speak the same language that I speak—Turkish—. However, to represent Turkish data in this study, I needed to translate it into English, which evoked the issue of "getting lost in translation". For researchers who conduct research in languages (the same with the participants) other than English, translation becomes a challenging (van Nes, Abma, Jonsson & Deeg, 2010), and yet promising (Pereira, Scharff & Marhia, 2009) step. I translated related parts of transcriptions to reflect the participants' experiences and ideas in quotes. As a result, I began to get anxious about losing the essence of interviews. Because the interviews include idioms, slang, and authentic references in Turkish, I admit I might lose them in English. However, I did my best to translate what the participants said in the source language. Moreover, I got support when I faced difficulty translating some *lubunca* words and other slang words from my peers with a master's degree in gender and women's studies. As Emmel (1998, as cited in Regmi, Naidoo & Pilkington, 2010) argues, including a second researcher in this process is the only strategy to ensure the accuracy of the translated section and equivalence. On the one hand, translating the transcriptions might erase authentic details and nuances. On the other hand, as Pereira et al. (2009) ensure, translation is open to interpretation, and it leads researchers to find and produce knowledge because language difference provides researchers with a critical position wherein they can review their data set with

a distance. Thus, translation turns "into a productive and informative process that can help to reveal assumptions or beliefs" (Martinius, 2021, para. 6), which may contribute to the construction of thematic schema and its analysis.

3.1.6.2. Coding

Punch (1998) sees coding as a prerequisite that paves the way for identifying patterns. Codes emerge with the familiarization of the data set from the re-reading procedure, and they build a basis for the draft and final versions of the themes. Thus, generating the initial codes is the key step of the six-phase model of analysis (Baltacı, 2017). Since searching, reviewing, and naming the themes depend on rigorous coding, they constitute one of the essential activities on the way of a trustworthy TA (Braun & Clarke, 2019; Braun, Clarke & Weate, 2016). These scholars and Miles et al. (2014) state that there are two subphases for generating initial codes: first cycle and second cycle coding for creating codes named as basic, low-inference or descriptive; advanced, complex, inferential or pattern codes. So, the first coding cycle composes the preparation of analysis, but advanced coding constitutes the analysis.

In this study, I implement data condensation about women's spatial experiences through affirmative and negative codes that either ease their spatial experiences or challenge them: e.g. feminist solidarity, sense of belonging, visibility, anonymity, etc.; gendered fear of violence, spatial avoidance, spatial confidence, force/control, etc. TA "is a method for describing data, but it also involves interpretation in the processes of selecting codes and constructing themes" (Kiger & Varpio, 2020, p. 847). In accordance with this statement, I admit that coding as part of TA is a reflexive activity in which the researcher follows whether an inductive (data-driven) or deductive (theory-driven) strategy. Because I reviewed the relevant literature before the fieldwork, I created some of the descriptive codes before doing interviews and familiarizing with the interview transcriptions. However, together with the re-reading process, I created, reviewed, or deleted codes, which enabled me to get into analysis.

3.1.6.3. Thematic Analysis (TA)

As all scholars agree in the relevant literature, re-reading is the first and the most important part of qualitative analysis. In the scope of TA, it builds the bridges between

data set, themes, and finally, the patterns. Bogdan and Biklen (1982, as cited in Ryan & Bernard, 2003, p.89) suggest that researchers need to read the text at least twice. It takes the researcher into the theme-identification, reviewing and naming by looking for repetitions, similarities, and differences.

For theme generation, Ryan and Bernard (2003) suggest manually cutting, sorting, and painting techniques and digital features like word counting via computer programs. After a dense re-reading process, I reviewed themes that I generated *a priori* from the relevant literature on women's gendered fear of violence and their feminist activism experiences. Although I like being an "analog person in a digital world," I used the navigation feature of the Microsoft Word in order to search for recurring patterns through words like "-kork" (the word stem for "korku" [fear], "korkarım" [I am afraid], "korkmam" [I am not afraid], etc.), "taciz" [harassment], "gece" [night], etc. I used both manual (hardcopy transcriptions) and digital opportunities to generate themes and subthemes.

As I understood from Braun and Clarke's framework and Ryan and Bernard's (2003) suggested strategies, this study includes both inductive and deductive, semantic (obvious expressions) and latent (implicit ideas) elements. So, I believe that I produced authentic knowledge because the TA method opened the way for an in-depth understanding of women's spatial experiences in a condensed version. On the one hand, it provides the researcher with the essence of fieldwork results within shorter yet detailed documentation. On the other hand, its flexibility and reflexivity deriving from the researcher's biases in generating codes and themes evoke ethical considerations. Thus, TA, as an analysis method, has both advantages and disadvantages.

In this analysis model, I generated two main themes: fear of violence as a spatial and timewise control over women's mobility in Beyoğlu and women's spatial control in Beyoğlu that they gained through their participation in the FNM. Then, I consolidated these themes by adding sub-themes about women's attachment to feminist activism and the FNM together with the features of Beyoğlu as a symbolic place full of actors that either ease or challenge women's placemaking efforts.

3.1.6.4. Analysis of Participant Observation

Because I represent the analysis of participant observation within the finding and discussion chapters in detail, this section offers a brief review of the analysis. Regarding participants who identify as a woman, man, non-binary, queer+, either feminist or not, I preferred to analyze women's experiences rather than give a bias to the subject of the march. I aimed to analyze women's experiences because of limitations and conscious reasons, but I do not cast women participants as the sole subjects of the march. I analyze women's involvement in the FNM as I wonder about their experiences with academic aspirations to contribute to the relevant literature and with personal interests to learn women's tenacious "steps." The analysis endeavors to generate patterns from the participants' experiences that I derive from the interviews. However, participant observation promises to give a more detailed representation of different actors' attendance and non-participants' behaviors at the march. Although I had a chance to observe two meetings and a march in Ankara, I built this study on women's experiences at the FNM in İstanbul. Consequently, I acknowledge the importance of my observation in Ankara as it paved the way for an advanced observation in İstanbul, yet I cannot make a comparison because the characteristics and dynamics of these cities and their users are different.

In this study, I have been keeping an in-between position that offers me both advantages with disadvantages: Since I did participant observation in a familiar field with a familiar population, I was aware of the codes and components of feminist activism, including particular slogans, flags addressing to particular gender identities and sexual orientations, placards referring to political discourses, etc. For example, in 2021, I followed a small group of participants carrying a transgender flag to access Sıraselviler Street because I had already known their involvement. Some of them were LGBTI+ individuals whom I knew from feminist circles. In a similar vein, in 2022, I had anxiety because of police intervention and barricades that divided participants into small groups and prevented them from uniting. However, I calmed down as I heard a familiar voice—calling all participants to gather in Cihangir Street—of a woman who is one of my research participants and a member of the organizing committee.

On the one hand, I explored that the FNM makes room for women in the city: Women gain group visibility, control, and spatial confidence by organizing and participating in the march. As the participants of this study mainly argue, they build trust and hope at the march in Beyoğlu, where they experience fear and anger in their everyday lives. However, they keep experiencing fear and anger at the march in different levels and because of different actors. The FNM consolidates women's attachment to Beyoğlu since they attribute meaning to this symbolic place through their marching experiences that they weaved with feminist solidarity and alliance. On the other hand, in parallel with the study subjects' expressions, intra-group contestations crystalize, especially in discussions about the men's participation: I witnessed several discussions among the participants about the feminist subject during and after the march.

3.2. Methodological Limitations

Because I formed the sample through purposive, snowball, and quota sampling types, it resulted in non-probability, non-representative, and convenience sampling. On the other hand, as the researcher, I admit that the study offers partial patterns rather than holistic representations. Overall, the study is a master's thesis that took shape within limitations like scope, access, time, cost, and finally, the pandemic. Within a determined period, I tried to plan a tentative calendar that formed according to the participants' schedules and my workload with other possible constraints. As a result of these limitations and conscious reasons, I preferred to do semi-structured in-depth interviews with participants and organizing committee members. Because the research was not supported financially, I had to afford all possible costs like traveling and accommodation expenses, technical equipment, digital-platform membership, etc. I did almost all interviews via Zoom and Microsoft Teams, which provided me with time and cost-effective field research. However, in order to attend the FNMs in 2021 and 2022, I used several vehicles (taxi, Metro, and bus), in which I had a chance to observe women's use of public spaces in a different dimension: public transportation, for further studies.

In addition to general constraints, I experienced unique limitations that derive from doing interviews with especially activists and transgender women. I had planning difficulties because participants, who identify as activists, delayed or canceled our

meetings as they organized demonstrations or attended several protests. This issue also caused these participants to misremember their experiences at the FNMs: They could replace their participation memories in other marches like the Pride Parade and the march on November 25 with the FNM practices. That's why I sometimes obtained distorted memories and incorrect dates or names that I verified thanks to doing follow-up interviews later. Interviewing via Microsoft Teams and Zoom made it easy to compensate for delays as they do not require synchronicity in space while paving the way for excuses and postponing the interview date.

I interviewed with six transgender women, whose majority were occupied with jobs that needed them to work up until midnight or the early hours of the morning. Because two of them were sex workers and two of them were engaged in nightclubs for their occupation, it was hard for me to arrange meetings in the daytime. Their workload and work hours were flexible. So, I had to keep up with their schedule. Even if I forced my schedule and delayed the tentative deadline of the fieldwork, three candidate participants, who were working as sex workers or performing artists, left the study as there was not an appropriate time for them to attend after several delays. I did interviews with these four women only at night, after they got off their workplaces. As a result, I did these interviews at different hours, from midnight to 04.00 AM, which one of the participants, Veronika (a 21-year-old, transgender bisexual woman who identifies with intersectional feminism), calls *trans[gender] hours.* As a researcher who is more of a night person than a morning person, I was only too glad to adopt the situation. However, I was living in a dormitory room built of paper-thin walls. Hence, I preferred to stay at my office for a comfortable and confidential interview.

3.3. Concluding Remarks

This study comprises of my rationale on methodological choices, including a particular research design, research philosophy, research strategies, and the effects of methodological limitations. This chapter clarifies that I aimed to answer the research questions with specific data-gathering and data analysis methods: It specifies the details of choosing qualitative research with semi-structured in-depth interviews, participant observation, and TA. As I meant to answer the research questions through qualitative research, I admit that this study gives a partial representation of the truth,

as social scientists mainly agree on representing a pattern rather than claiming to submit a complete representation. Thus, the thesis explores women's spatial experiences before and during the FNM in Beyoğlu via recruited participants' narratives and my participant observation that encapsulates my descriptions and interpretations of reality according to my thoughts and feelings.

The conduct of research resulted in a study that has the characteristics of an ethnographic study, including my participation in marches and meetings several times, and in different cities: İstanbul and Ankara. As a result, it transgresses the boundaries of a cross-sectional study, yet it does not represent a longitudinal one like a panel or a cohort study. Although this procedure brought about multilayered findings, it led to a time-consuming process. I compensated it for using a time-effective interviewing model via videoconferencing with participants whom I selected through purposive, snowball, and quota sampling. Dwyer and Buckle (2009, p. 61) state that "because our perspective is shaped by our position as a researcher (which includes having read much literature on the research topic), we cannot fully occupy one or the other of these (insider and outsider) positions."

In this study, I identify as a feminist researcher who keeps an in-between position as the participant researcher. Because I employ "a" feminist standpoint theory, this chapter enunciates that I ponder the issue of researchers' multiple identities that make them insiders, outsiders, or outsiders within through *self-reflexivity* and *situated knowledges*. Consequently, I promise to generate a trustworthy pattern by employing multiple strategies, samplings, and approaches.

3.4. Trustworthiness

Interpretation, together with other factors like data's measurability, draws a line between qualitative research and quantitative research. Qualitative research, which is built from a feminist standpoint in this study, does not result in measurable statistics and complete accuracy; therefore, it does not seek *reliability, validity, generalizability,* and *objectivity.* The same data set can be interpreted differently by different researchers. The same researcher might generate different analyses from the same data set in particular contexts, or, as longitudinal studies have proven, the same researcher together with the same participants might create different data over a period of time.

Therefore, the basic elements of trustworthiness in quantitative research appear in distinct forms and through different criteria in qualitative research. Lincoln and Guba's approach to trustworthiness became a point of departure for many qualitative research scholars: Their model provides a four-headed structure consisting of *credibility, transferability, dependability,* and *confirmability,* in the issue of trustworthiness in qualitative research. As Stahl and King (2020) and Shenton (2004) argue, Lincoln and Guba's four criteria correspond to four fundamental criteria of trustworthiness in quantitative research as follows:

- reliability—dependability
- validity—credibility
- generalizability—transferability
- objectivity—confirmability

On the contrary, I do not find it necessary to seek an equivalence. Qualitative research functions through different dynamics and dimensions, which provides researchers, participants, and readers with co-creation and interactive procedure. Knowledge production depends on sample selection protocol, sample size, participants and researchers' backgrounds and biases in qualitative research. Consequently, I admit to exploring partial knowledge deriving from a particular subset of women, which I still endeavor to ensure the data's authenticity in pursuit of a trustworthy study. As a result, I ensure trustworthiness by emphasizing interpretation, self-reflexivity, and partiality while employing strategies to meet a credible and applicable study's needs. Lincoln and Guba (1985, as cited in Shenton, 2004, p. 65) suggest that researchers should use *methodological triangulation* in order to compensate for limitations that risk credibility. In this study, I employed *data triangulation*: I applied participant observation in addition to doing interviews. Also, I did follow-up interviews wherein I clarified the misunderstandings, which resulted in verified data and allowed me to get into a dependable study. On the other hand, I provide a detailed description of all procedures in the methodology chapter. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985, as cited in Nowell, Norris, White & Moules, 2017, p. 3), *thick description* enables researchers to question the research's transferability—applicability—. As a researcher who experienced a limited level of ethnographic study in different cities and different years, I consider every data I produced during the fieldwork unique. Eventually, this study

cannot be replicated because it offers patterns through the experiences of a particular subset of women.

Finally, I, as the participant researcher, am effective and responsible for all phases, from the selection of the research questions to the analysis. As I mentioned in this chapter repeatedly through the representation of *situated knowledges, self-reflexivity,* and *conscious partiality*, this study takes form in my biases, characteristics, and background as well as the participants' experiences.

CHAPTER 4

BEYOĞLU IN BETWEEN UNSAFE AND SAFE SPACES FOR WOMEN

In this study, I aim to understand the role of women's participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu in shaping their spatial experiences therein. In order to explore how their involvement in the FNM shapes the participants' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors, I need to consider their everyday life experiences in Beyoğlu first. Therefore, in this chapter, I will answer one of the current questions: How do these participants experience Beyoğlu in their everyday lives?

As a result of the TA, I framed findings under four core emotions forming the participants' spatial experiences in Beyoğlu: fear, anger, trust, and hope. In this part of the study, I will answer the question through the fear of crime that has been covered as the primary emotion constituting the boundaries of women's mobility in urban public spaces in the relevant literature. Accordingly, I will analyze the participants' perceptions of safety about particular places, people, and certain hours in their daily lives in Beyoğlu, their emotional reactions they develop as a result of these perceptions, and finally the actual behaviors they display in this symbolic place depending on their perceptions and attitudes.

Regarding the fieldwork, I came across a network of findings that significantly overlapped with the literature. The participants' characteristics differentiate their safety perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors in and about Beyoğlu. Their narratives indicate variations of fear of being exposed to crime: violence and mugging. Among these variations, the common pattern is the fear of being subjected to violence, which leads participants to avoid using particular places at certain hours—urban public spaces at night—or employ strategies to negotiate triggers. Regarding the findings of this study, it is possible to claim that since fear of violence causes women to avoid

appropriating the city or limits their urban mobility, it deprives their right to the city in some respects. The fear of being exposed to verbal, sexual and physical violence plays an important role in determining the safe and unsafe spaces of the city for women. In parallel with the literature explaining the presence of women in public spaces with gendered fear of violence and especially the risk of being exposed to sexual harassment or rape, men seem the prominent actors that trigger participants' fear. In this study, participants describe fear-triggering actors as all-men "users" and "owners" of Beyoğlu. They perceive men with the potential to harm women here in their everyday lives and call them "drunks," "clients of sex workers," "cops," "fascists," "Arab tourists," etc. In the TA, men appear under three groups: "men in the street," "law enforcement officials," and "foreigners." While this study confirms the dichotomy of "vulnerable women" and "potentially dangerous men" that appears in the literature, it is possible to say that fear is a gendered emotion based on the gender binary between men and women, which determines the boundaries of women's urban mobility. However, the fear that I have covered in this study has multiple dimensions related to participants' class and ethnicity besides their gender identity. Participants' perceptions of violence in public spaces, their emotional reactions to the risk of violence, their strategies for using the city and the choices available to them in the city are shaped as a product of their intersecting identities. For example, their residence (side, district, neighborhood, street), the place they prefer to enjoy (clubs, bars, cafes, etc.), means of (public) transportation they can afford or have to use, and hours when they prefer to be in the street are determined by these intersecting identities including their gender, class, social identity (ethnicity, political engagement, group affiliation, etc.).

4.1. Locating Fear in Participants' Everyday Life Experiences in Beyoğlu

The way women use the city is not taken into account during the design, planning, and reorganization process of urban public spaces (Alkan, 2005; Falú, 2014; Hayden, 1981). Regarding research participants' (N=22) expressions, planning decisions cause women to step back from using particular places at certain hours in the city. Participants state that they feel fearful in Beyoğlu, especially after it gets dark: They have difficulty finding safe spaces, affordable means of transportation, and well-lit streets for walking. They believe that women's participation in urban life is not well-

addressed, so they regard the current situation as a deprivation of women's right to access and use public spaces in the city. On the other hand, feminist urban planning praises physical and social infrastructure's effects on women's urban mobility and safety (Kern, 2019; Visakha, 2021). As feminist urban planners consider walking as part of women's mobility in the city, they attach great importance to safety audits in contrast to gender-blind approaches in urban design. Nevertheless, the general assumptions about women's safety in the city (e.g., street lighting, crowded places, large-scale public transport network, etc.) are not enough to make all research participants feel safe.

> When I look from here, I see the lights [of İstiklal Street]. …this is an androcentric place… because that's what it was planned for. … If [urban] planning is not feminist, only men can stroll there comfortably. … For example, when a city… will be planned for women, [they say] that "Let's improve street lighting, so that women can walk around…". No! I am in Taksim right now. There is razzle-dazzle all around, and it is bright... but the most crowded street in Turkey is the least safe street for me (Veronika).[32]

> … [Beyoğlu] is a very crowded place. Seriously, the population has changed… it's scary sometimes. Most of the businesses have already been taken over. … There are no familiar shopkeepers here at the moment. Maybe in the side streets, there are people who are dissident like us, who are on the same wavelength… but in the [main] street, there are people with a different mindset. …for example there are businesses that cooperate with the police (Çiçek).[33]

As all participants state, women's access to urban public spaces at night is limited because they do not have the privileges that (many) men have in the city. Both cultural expectations and gender role beliefs regard women's walking in the street at night as a "wicked behavior" and confine them to their houses, which creates a vicious circle in which men take up space and own the street. As Anahit says, "… a woman cannot go out at night comfortably. … of course, it happens because we do not have the

---

[32] Burdan bakınca ışıklarını görüyorum [İstiklal Caddesi'nin]. …burası tamamen erkeklerin egemen olduğu bir yer… çünkü zaten bunun için planlanmış. … [Kentsel] planlama feminist değilse; orda sadece erkekler rahatça gezebilir. … Mesela kadınlar için bir şehir… planlanacağında "Şurdaki ışıklandırmayı artıralım, kadınlar gezebilsin…" [derler]. Hayır! Ben şu an Taksim'deyim. Her yer cümbüş[lü], ışıl ışıl …ama Türkiye'nin en kalabalık caddesi benim için en güvensiz cadde.

[33] …çok kalabalık bir yer [Beyoğlu]. Ciddi anlamda popülasyon değişti… bu ürkütüyo bazen. İşletmelerin çoğu zaten ele geçirildi. … [Tanıdık, bildik] esnaf yok şu anda. Belki ara sokaklarda, bizim gibi muhalif olan, o kafada olan insanlar var… ama cadde üzerinde daha farklı kafa yapısında insanlar var. …emniyetle iş birliği yapan mekânlar var mesela.

privileges that men have or… because she does not have a say in the city… because this society is comprised of men, the street is masculine…"[34]

> ... I want to emphasize how masculine a lot of things actually are. [There are] potential dangers [in Beyoğlu] that women are uncomfortable, and can be uncomfortable, with. So, the safe space issue isn't just about taking up space on a street or walking in the street, it's [about] the lack of some egalitarian elements. Like many businesses I mentioned [that they locate in Beyoğlu] are entirely male-owned, mostly men work here, [and all] bosses are men... (Elif).[35]

The fact that a place is illuminated does not put an end to the participants' fear of violence in the public spaces of the city. However, some participants (*n*=3) think that illuminated streets can reduce women's fear of being exposed to violence and mugging. In addition, deserted places seem dangerous to many participants, while they find peace in a familiar environment surrounded by familiar people.

> Moda is safer than many places in İstanbul. [When I was living there], I went to bars, meyhanes, etc., that took 10-15 minutes to go from my house. …it was not a problem for me to be there at night because I did not go to Moda from Maltepe… Otherwise it would be challenging. Because I was moving in a very small area, which is safer than other places, at night… it had better street lighting, and there were many people in the street… I had an above average sense of safety (Damla).[36]

> I was coming home from Etiler. There was no light in the street for almost 300-meter long. It was the main street… I called the Municipality of Beşiktaş, and I said "I feel uneasy. I'm not comfortable on the way home", but they did not fix it. … when you

---

[34] …bir kadın gece rahat bi şekilde sokağa çıkamıyo. …tabii [bu] erkeklerde olan ayrıcalıklara sahip olamamamızdan ya da… kentte söz sahibi olamamasından [kaynaklanıyor]… çünkü zaten bu toplumun tamamı erkek, sokak erkek, cadde erkek…

[35] … bi sürü şeyin aslında ne kadar erkek olduğunu vurgulamak istiyorum. [Beyoğlu'nda] kadınların rahatsız olduğu, olabileceği potansiyel tehlikeler [var]. Yani güvenli alan hikâyesi, sadece bir sokakta olmak ya da yürümek değil, bitakım eşitlikçi unsurların az olmasıyla [ilgili]. [Beyoğlu'ndaki] bahsettiğim bi sürü işletmenin tamamen erkeklere ait olması, çoğunlukla buralarda erkeklerin çalışması, patronların erkek olması gibi...

[36] Moda, İstanbul'un biçok yerine göre daha güvenli bi yer. [Orada yaşarken] dışarı çıktığım zaman da evimden 10-15 dakika mesafedeki barlara, meyhanelere falan gidiyodum. …geceleri benim için çok sorun diğildi çünkü ben Maltepe'den gitmiyodum Moda'ya… Başka türlüsü benim için zorlayıcı olurdu fakat ben geceleri çok küçük bi alanda hareket ettiğim için ve o küçük alan da genele kıyasla daha güvenli bi alan olduğu için; işte aydınlatılmış, zaten bi sürü insan var sokakta… ortalamanın üzerinde bir güvenlik hissim vardı benim.

encounter such things … you subconsciously pay attention [in case] someone is behind you, and you walk apprehensively (Nazlı).[37]

…if the place is vibrant at night, I don't [fear] about spending time there that much. For example… Spending time in the evenings in Üsküdar is more challenging because there is no life after 9:00 PM here. …I don't get nervous that much about being out at night, where life goes on (Leyla).[38]

…there is a difference between walking in İstiklal [Street] at night and wandering around the side streets in Tarlabaşı. There are various triggers in İstiklal, but the crowdedness and the fact that the city life continues there can provide confidence a little more… but there is a crack in the sense of belonging in the side streets. I mean, after 9:00 PM., it feels like the place doesn't belong to me... the owners of the place have come and I have to go now... (Eylül).[39]

Fear, as an emotion drawing the limits of women's mobility in the city, causes participants to avoid using particular places or to use them in a limited manner under certain conditions (Hollander, 2001; Koskela, 199, 2005; Pain, 1991; Valentine, 1989). This study partially connects participants' statements to the relevant literature. We see that some participants are afraid or hesitant to be alone at night due to the fear of being exposed to sexual violence because of their gender identity, especially when it intersects with disadvantageous situations: aging, having an illness, care responsibility, etc. Participants' fear sometimes prevents them from going out at night. So, it is possible to say that fear is a spatial and timewise reflection of patriarchy in the city, which restricts women's urban experiences. However, this study's subjects are women who engage in feminist activism in the street. For that reason, despite their hesitations, it is expected that the participants show a different perception and experience pattern among women in Turkey. Relevant literature indicates that women

---

[37] Geçen mesela Etiler'den eve geliyorum. Rahat 300 metrelik bi yolda ışık yoktu. Ana cadde… Beşiktaş Belediyesi'ni aradım, "Huzursuz hissediyorum. Eve giderken rahat diğilim" dedim ama hâlâ yapılmadı. … böyle şeyleri gördükçe… otomatikmen dikkat ediyosun arkandan biri çok mu yaklaşıyo [diye], huzursuz yürüyosun.

[38] …gecelerin canlı olduğu yerlerde vakit geçirmekle ilgili çok fazla [korkum] yok. Mesela… Üsküdar'da akşamları vakit geçirmek daha zorlayıcı çünkü 21.00'den sonra hayat kalmıyo burda. …hayatın devam ettiği yerlerde o kadar gerilmiyorum gece dışarda olmak konusunda.

[39] …gece İstiklal'de yürümekle Tarlabaşı tarafındaki ara sokaklarda dolanmak arasında fark oluyo. İstiklal'de çeşitli güvensizlikler oluyo ama kalabalıklığı ve şehir hayatının orda devam ediyo oluşu güveni biraz daha sağlayabiliyo… ama ara sokaklarda bi çeşit aidiyet bağının kopuşu söz konusu. Yani akşam 21.00'den sonra orası bana ait değilmiş gibi… mekânın sahipleri gelmiş de benim artık gitmem gerekiyomuş gibi hissediyorum açıkçası…

feel forced to control their behaviors and appearance in the city to cope with the risk of being exposed to violence. So, it calls these types of strategies self-policing (Pain, 1994). In this study, not all women identify as feminist activists, but they agree their involvement in this march makes them a part of feminist activism in Turkey. Although I do not believe there is a homogeneous "a woman category", these participants who take part in feminist activism have a special place among women profiles in Turkey. Some participants employ strategies, such as choosing plain or long-sleeve outfits and controlling the space they take up in the street, to prevent violence, which can be named self-policing. However, the subjects of this study do not give up on the street. Since they attend a march, which transgresses the cultural codes about a woman's place in the city, it is possible to say that their coping strategies are generally assertive.

After the fear of being exposed to verbal (catcalling, insult, hate speech, etc.) and sexual (gaze, harassment, rape, etc.) violence, participants have a fear of being exposed to mugging and physical violence in transforming Beyoğlu. According to participants' depictions, Beyoğlu transforms in terms of its physical appearance and symbolic meanings. The gap between this image and their own political stances makes these women feel the fear of theft and burglary because of changing demographic profile in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu. Whereas injury, custody, and death appear as the possible forms of physical violence in Beyoğlu applied by the government by means of law enforcement officials during protests and other resistances therein.

When participants are not in the majority, they feel like they are wandering in a *yabancı kalabalık* [strange crowd]. In that case, they avoid using the "main street" (İstiklal Street) in Beyoğlu, but they find peace in side streets (Mis Street, Tel Street, Bayram Street, etc.). These preferences indicate a multilayered situation. Being together with people of similar concerns or profiles paves the way for participants to have ownership and feel confident. Since they identify "the strange crowd" as a group of potential perpetrators of violence and men of opposing political stances, the crowd connotes insecurity for these women. Panelli, Kraack, and Little (2005) argue that women's fear and sense of agency is related to particular places and sites—*spatial familiarity*: "These may be personal homes or they may be familiar areas where frequency of association makes them *feel like home* [emphasis added]" (p.501).

In my everyday life, I don't feel like I belong there when I walk [in the crowd] in İstiklal [Street], but... when all women are [together], it feels like we gathered in a living room in a house. ... [At the Feminist Night March], it feels like the place is ours for that night (Deniz).[40]

İstiklal Street is too crowded for me … *an unfamiliar crowd* in which I do not feel at *home*… [but] side streets in Tarlabaşı, …[they are the places] that are regarded as dangerous and are tried to be transformed through this discourse... It transforms into a places where everyone opens their doors to you when the police attack… form solidarity… wherever you turn, you feel safe [there]. … [That's why] I don't feel a need to leave Taksim after a certain hour… but I'm already in a group, hanging out in *familiar places*... I get out of there and take a taxi right away... —you don't have any other public transport to go Hisarüstü at that hour other than the taxi—. I go down from Mis Street to Tarlabaşı, and take a taxi, and go home (Cemile).[41]

Side streets are much more than a street for us... like a home... Even at the most unsafe hour, we feel safe when we take a turn into one of those side streets while passing through İstiklal [Street]. Rather, we [feel] that we protect that space and are being protected therein. I mean, we have fun there, we fall in love there, we get drunk there, we make love there, we make new friends there. Of course, Mis Street is the safest of all… or Bayram Street… where transgender sex workers work. … straight men come to this place, and they haggle [about the price of sex]. Despite the presence and bullying of those men, I feel safe on that street because the subject that creates that place is actually the transgender women working there… they have the authority there (Lisa).[42]

---

[40] Normalde İstiklal'de, [o kalabalığın arasında] gezerken oraya ait hissetmiyorum ama… bütün kadınlar [bir arada] olunca böyle bi evin salonunda toplaşmışız gibi hissettiriyo. ... [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nde], o gecelik orası bizimmiş gibi geliyo.

[41] İstiklal Caddesi benim açımdan fazla kalabalık …bana tanıdık gelmeyen, içinde kendimi evimde hissetmediğim bi kalabalık… [ama] Tarlabaşı'nın ara sokakları, …tehlikeli olarak lanse edilen ve bu söylem üzerinden dönüştürülmeye de çalışılan [yerler]... Polis saldırısı olduğunda hani herkesin sana kapısını açtığı… dayanışma gösterdiği… kendini hangi sokağa dönsen güvende hissettiğin bi yere dönüşüyo. … [Bu yüzden] ben belli bi saatten sonra Taksim'den ayrılma ihtiyacı hissetmiyorum… ama zaten bi grup içersinde, bildiğim mekânlarda takılıyo oluyorum... ordan çıkıp hemen bi taksiye binip... -o saatte zaten başka toplu taşıman olmadığı için hani Hisarüstü'ne gelmek açısından-. Mis Sokak'tan Tarlabaşı'na inip taksiye binip eve gidiyorum.

[42] Ara sokaklar bizim için bir sokaktan çok daha fazlası... ev gibi... En güvensiz saatte bile İstiklal'in içinden geçerken o ara sokaklardan birine saptığımızda kendimizi güvende hissediyoruz. Daha çok orda o alanı koruduğumuzu ve korunduğumuzu [hissediyoruz]. Yani orda eğleniyoruz, orda aşık oluyoruz, orda sarhoş oluyoruz, orda sevişiyoruz, orda yeni arkadaşlar ediniyoruz. Mis Sokak tabii başlıca güvenli… Hani Bayram Sokak… trans seks işçilerinin çalıştığı bir sokak. Oraya …heteroseksüel erkekler gelir, pazarlık yapar. O erkeklerin o sokaktaki varlığına ve kabadayılıklarına rağmen o sokakta kendimi güvende hissederim çünkü o sokağı var eden özne orda çalışan trans kadınlardır… orda onların borusu öter.

Mis Street, Bayram Street, or Tarlabaşı are not exceptional places in the matter of women's perceptions of safety and solidarity in Beyoğlu. Almost 30 years ago, in 1996, when Selek conducted research about transgender individuals' displacement in Ülker Street, she found that transgender women took strength from each other, and potential perpetrators regarded their solidarity as a show of force that prevented them from using violence. However, after the displacement, the most safeguarded place transformed into a place where these women felt forced to employ security measures more than ever (Selek, 2014 [2011], p. 127). Regarding Selek's identical finding, I assert that women's perception of safety in Beyoğlu is mainly correlated with the density of their population, solidarity, and alliance.

Cultural codes of the street and beliefs about "proper" womanhood, which are unique to Turkey or not, trigger the participants' fear of crime in public spaces in various ways. Sexist notions shape the way participants use urban public spaces and participate in nightlife, so their visibility. For example, benevolent sexism statements put pressure on the shoulders of "victims" (mainly women) rather than perpetrators of violence (mainly men) and suggest women take care of themselves just in case something bad happens. In line with this, Eylül states "[Let's suppose that] a woman was murdered and her body was found in the trash, the comments will only be [about that woman]: "What was she doing there at that [late] hour? Why did she wear it? She should not have been there as a woman"[43] These expectations put women in a vulnerable position and ask them to keep an eye open in the street, wherein they can be exposed to male violence. These statements do not prevent the participants from being in the street at night, but it causes them to feel fear: "anxiety," "unrest," and "tension," especially when they are alone outside at night. The level and reason for their fear take shape according to the participants' sociodemographic characteristics.

> The perception [that we have] in Turkey did not exist in Germany. I noticed that we were exposed to [verbal] harassment a few times, after moving to Turkey, when we went out with girls alone [without men]. When I could not wear the clothes that I wore in Germany here, I began to run out of patience. … When I said "Grandpa, we're gonna Taksim with the girls today," he said that "Get the taxi license plate and write it to me." In Germany, you don't even think about it. You go everywhere by tram there; you don't even have to take a taxi. Why do you take a taxi here? …whenever I

---

[43] Bi kadın öldürüldü ve bedeni çöpte bulundu [diyelim], yapılan yorumlar sadece [o kadınla ilgili olur]: "O [geç] saatte orda ne işi varmış? Niye onu giymiş? [O da] Kız başına orda olmasaymış."

take a taxi or a minibus, it remind [me of] Özgecan Aslan[44]. Once I was the only woman in the minibus, I was coming from Taksim to Beşiktaş… It was in the evening. Then, you get paranoid and say, "Please let a woman in, let a woman in..." (Nazlı).[45]

…women always drink less [alcohol]. While men can drink and have fun until the morning, women do not have such freedom and class [privilege]. They have to consider [every possibility] more. If she has family ties... will she have to explain herself to others when she gets home at the end of the night? If something bad happens when she gets drunk, does somebody say "Oh, a drunk woman!"? How can she prove herself? We have so many worries (Elif).[46]

I mean, they're always talking about women's attire... There are men who stalk, masturbate after, harass, or murder women who wear hijab. It's not just those male citizens out there that prevent women to go out at night. This is partly about the state and the system. This state is not a secular one, it is a conservative state. I mean, it is political Islam, you know. It's also about the culture. "What is she doing there at night?" [they say]. It has a cultural background, you know. Well, the "Women stay at home" thing... So they suppose, "If she can go out at night, she is a loose-woman" (Night, 21 years old, a transgender heterosexual woman, cook, lives in Beşiktaş/İstanbul).[47]

---

[44] Özgecan Aslan, a 19-year-old woman, was murdered while resisting attempted rape on a minibus in 2015, on the way home, in Mersin, Turkey. The minibus driver, Suphi Altındöken, committed the murder. Then, his father, Necmettin Altındöken and his friend, Fatih Gökçe, helped him in covering up the murder. Aslan's murder caused nationwide protests, reminded us about women's urban struggle and triggered women's fear of public spaces.

[45] Almanya'da, o algı yoktu burdaki gibi. Türkiye'ye taşındıktan sonra, birkaç kere kızlarla yalnız [erkekler olmadan] çıktığımızda [sözlü] tacize uğradığımızın farkına vardım. Almanya'da giydiklerimi burda giyemeyince öyle tak etmeye başladı yavaştan. … "Dede bugün kızlarla [Taksim'e] gidicez" [dediğimde] "Taksi plakasını al, bana yolla" falan diyodu. Almanya'da aklına bile gelmez. Orda tramvayla gidip geliyosun her yere, taksiye bile binmek zorunda değilsin. E burda neden taksiye biniyosun? …ki hep taksiye bindiğimde de minibüse bindiğimde de [aklıma] Özgecan Aslan geliyor. Bi keresinde yalnızdım minibüste kadın olarak ki Taksim'den Beşiktaş'a geliyorum... Akşamüstüydü. E noluyo? Kafanda oynamaya başlıyor. Diyosun ki "Nolur kadın girsin içeri, nolur kadın girsin içeri..."

[46] …kadınlar her zaman daha az [içki] içerler. Erkekler sabaha kadar içip delicesine çoşup eğlenebilirken kadınların böyle bir özgürlük ve sınıfsallıkları yok. Daha hesap kitap yapmak zorundalar. E şimdi ailevi bağları varsa... gecenin sonunda eve gittiğinde birilerine bi şeyleri izah etmek zorunda mı? Bi durum olsa, sarhoşken bi şey yaşasa "Aa sarhoş kadın!" mı diyicekler ona; neyi, nasıl ispat edicek? O kadar çok kaygı var ki içimizde.

[47] Yani hep bu kadınların giyim kuşamından bahsediyolar ya… Abi kapalı bi kadının arkasından da mastürbasyon yapan ve tesettürlü kadınları da taciz eden, öldüren, katleden erkekler var. Bu kadınların geceleri dışarı çıkamamasının şeyi sadece dışardaki o erkek vatandaşlar da değil. Bu biraz da devlet, biraz da sistemle alakalı. Bu devlet laik bi devlet değil, bu devlet muhafazakâr bi devlet. Yani siyasal İslam bildiğin. Bu biraz da kültürle alakalı. "Gece kadının dışarda ne işi var?" kültürü vardır ya hani. Hani "Kadın evinde oturur" şeyi… Yani şey gibi görülüyor: "Bu kadın geceleri dışarıya çıkabiliyosa rahat bi kadındır."

The previous research on women's spatial experiences in the city explores that women's perceptions of safety in the city result in spatial and timewise control over their mobility. This study confirms the relevant literature and finds that fear causes women to employ negotiation strategies, from avoidance practices to forming alliances and solidarity to ensure their own safety. For example, in the experiences of Sena and Damla, we see that some districts and neighborhoods have a different place in women's fear, which causes the participants to live in certain parts of the city. As studied by some scholars (e.g., Başdaş, 2010; Biricik, 2010; Selek, 2014 [2011]; Zengin, 2019 [2014]), it is especially evident in transgender women's housing, working, and entertainment experiences in Beyoğlu: I found that transgender research participants seek access to safe spaces more than others. So, they choose to live in places where they can form solidarity with their allies as part of their urban survival.

The responsibilities towards dependents (children, parents, partners, and pets) prevent research participants from appropriating urban public spaces. The effects of caregiving responsibilities on women's urban mobility patterns seem much more complex than having to be at certain places at certain times to fulfill their children's needs. These responsibilities emerging from patriarchal relationships imbued in cultural family structures cause women to feel fear while going alone out, wherein they are presumably open to being subjected to violence. In short, some participants (*n*=5) fear that something bad can happen to them in the street, which may prevent them from seeing their loved ones and fulfilling their caregiving responsibilities. Tivers (1988, p. 86) likewise makes a connection between childcare responsibility, women's fear, and guilt in the relevant literature. She states that women, because of imposed sanctions and the cultural ideology that assign this responsibility to only women, mothers have a constant fear of causing their children to suffer because of *maternal deprivation*.

On the contrary, participants who live alone (*n*=6: Veronika, Güz, Deniz, Leyla, Gönül, and Ayşe) or live with a friend(s) (*n*=5: Gece, Meryem, Anahit, Tülin, Cemile) rather than a family member do not name a similar type of fear. For example, Sena says she did not hesitate to be out at night while living alone in Beşiktaş. However, after she began to live in Kağıthane with her parents, her preferences about going out and coming back home changed: She says she began to use taxis more for her daily travel needs at night as she finds this means of transportation safer. Living with the

family assigns her a responsibility to inform her parents when she is late or stays out. Because she has to face possible risks in the neighborhood and encounter her parents at home, she prefers to stay with a friend instead of coming back home after midnight and giving an account of her delay to the parents.

On the other hand, participants say caregiving responsibility blocks women's mobility in urban public spaces, especially at night: "Mothering" to children (*n*=5: Ayşe, Oya, Çiçek, Damla, and Leyla), cats (*n*=6: Veronika, Güz, Sena, Bengi Su, Leyla, and Gönül), or dogs (*n*=4: Gece, Deniz, Nazlı, and Elif) and giving care to elders (*n*=1: Gönül) makes these participants shoulder another responsibility before they step out of the house. Although women have some opportunities that help them to compensate, they may face other constraints that emerge from their intersecting multiple identities. For example, Damla, whose children are not yet adults, says she has the chance to pass caregiving responsibility to her parents living upstairs or her spouse; however, she complains that it is still her responsibility to organize the process. Also, Gönül mentions that they can afford to hire a live-in nursemaid for her mother's care on weekdays. Women who are advantageous in terms of their socioeconomic status can compensate for the domestic responsibilities imposed on them by the society: hiring maids for household chores that imprison them at home or shifting the care-giving responsibility to a paid nanny or nursemaid are services that relatively wealthy women can purchase. Thus, women who are economically advantageous can challenge their confinement to home by purchasing services. However, these advantages do not transform them into subjects who freely roam in the city. For example, Gönül can pass her mother's care to a paid nursemaid in weekdays. However, her mother deems Gönül responsible for her care at weekends because Gönül's sister has her family to run, but Gönül is single. Eventually, she feels forced to take care of her mother at home despite her desire to go out.

Damla and Çiçek describe caregiving responsibility as an invisible shackle preventing mothers from using public spaces at any time and taking risks in feminist activism. Similarly, Oya and Ayşe say that they became more comfortable outside at night after their children grew up. Also, Çiçek says that she has not experienced such limitations since her ex-spouse got child custody after the divorce. Leyla is a participant with joint custody. She does not share caregiving when his 6-year-old son is with her. She states

that they can go to many places together, but there is a time limitation since her son needs to sleep. Pregnancy, giving birth and taking care of children's sicknesses also cause women to be unable to use the street and night (Kern, 2019). For example, Leyla says that she could not attend the FNM in the year she gave birth, and Damla could not participate in the march because she had to care for her sons' sickness. Women's gendered responsibilities can make them stuck in their houses. Also, like their sociodemographic characteristics and identities, these responsibilities cause participants to fear violence "out there," which sometimes keeps them away from public spaces.

> There is probably no woman without their shackles[48], but if she is younger, if her shackles are more flexible, and if she has a bit of more inner courage… [it effects women's access to the street and their participation in activism.] For example, that night [on March 8] I have to get out [of the march] and go back home because there are children at home waiting for me (Damla).[49]

4.1.1. Fear Variations among the Participants

Participants' intersecting identities, including but not limited to their gender, class, and ethnicity, create variations in their fear of crime in their everyday lives at night in Beyoğlu. From the type of violence to the imagined profile of the perpetrator, participants have different perceptions and experiences. For example, Veronika, a transgender woman, states she experiences harassment more when compared to other women in İstiklal Street because her gender display does not match the ideal representation of a woman in Turkey. Since she is taller than almost everyone in the street, she thinks that she cannot blend in and become a part of the crowd. Her appearance does not provide her invisibility in the street, in contrast to Wilson's (1992) depiction of the liberating city. On the contrary, she is the one who is being watched. Participants' spatial experiences, fear variations, and safety strategies in Beyoğlu are

---

[48] She means the responsibilities including running a family, taking care of children, etc.

[49] Hiç prangasız bi kadın yoktur herhalde ama daha genç ve prangalarının daha esnek olmasının ve biraz da belki içten gelen bi cesaretinin olmasının [kadınların sokakta ve aktivizmde olmasında] etkisi var. Mesela [8 Mart'ta] o gece [o yürüyüşten] çıkıp eve dönmek zorundayım çünkü evde çocuklar var beni bekleyen (Damla).

bounded by their characteristics, including their physical features and group affiliations.

Table 4.1 Fear variations among the participants in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu

FEAR OF VIOLENCE	Verbal Violence	Catcalling Mocking Swear Insult Hate speech
	Sexual Violence	Gazing Harassment Assault
	Physical Violence	Stalking Physical attack Hate crime Forced disappearance Murder
FEAR OF MUGGING		Theft Robbery

Participants' fear of crime in Beyoğlu mainly comes from two triggers: fear of violence (verbal, sexual, and physical violence) and mugging (theft and robbery). They define fear of theft and robbery as "having stolen their property" and do not address it through experience but within the scope of the risks of public spaces in Beyoğlu. One-third of the participants recall their fear of mugging; however, none of them indicates it is gendered. They consider it as a part of the risks that may apply to anyone using Beyoğlu. According to their perception, theft and robbery became everyday risks because of the transforming population of Beyoğlu. The fear of violence, on the contrary, appears to be a gendered emotion. I have listed the most repeated triggers under three groups: verbal, sexual and physical violence. Catcalling, stalking, gazing, sexual harassment, and physical attack are the most repeated and experienced triggers. In most cases, these forms of violence overlap in participants' perceptions and experiences in Beyoğlu, while some fears belong to a particular group of participants. For example, while cisgender women mostly express the fear of verbal and sexual violence, the fear perceptions and experiences of transgender women are mostly about sexual and physical violence. In addition to this, cisgender women's experiences and expectations of verbal violence are limited to catcalling. In contrast, transgender women are afraid of being subjected to hate speech and crime based on their

transgender identity. Besides gender, having a disease, caregiving responsibility, aging, etc., exacerbate the participants' fear of crime.

> …I don't want to go [out] at night. …I am a transgender woman… Well, I think, if I walk from Taksim Square to Tünel, I would probably be harassed more than a hundred times. [Before] I've experienced both physical and verbal harassment. My fear is directly related to my experience (Veronika).[50]

> I don't think I experienced anything that I can regard as bad in İstiklal [Street]. … well, I witnessed it happened, and I heard it. You know, these are enough for people to be afraid. … The [fear] perception [about this place] was formed through the experiences of my close circle or of their environment. For example, in that respect, Kadıköy always seems safer to me (Eylül).[51]

> I remember İstiklal [Street] with the bomb attacks and as a place where women were harassed (she laughs) on the new year's eve as it was portrayed in the media. … With these thoughts in my mind, I try to walk [there] without touching anyone, with my arms like this (she pulls them up). If I am going to Taksim, I definitely consider what I wear. I don't want to expose my body parts (Zeynep).[52]

As Valentine (1989, p. 386) argues, "Women develop individual mental maps of places where they fear assault as a product of their past experience of space and secondary information." In a similar vein, in this study, whether transgender or cisgender, participants were at least subjected to men's verbal harassment and offensive gaze in the streets of Beyoğlu. Regarding transgender participants, their fear perceptions are related to their own experiences. In contrast, cisgender participants' fear perceptions are largely shaped by other women's experiences and media coverage, particularly news. As women who have lived or worked in Beyoğlu for years, the

---

[50] …gece [sokağa] çıkmak istemiyorum. …trans bi kadınım… Hani düşünüyorum, Taksim Meydanı'ndan Tünel'e kadar yürüsem muhtemelen yüzden fazla taciz edilmiş olurum. [Daha önce] fiziksel de sözlü de yaşadım. Korkum direkt deneyimimle ilgili.

[51] İstiklal'de kötü diyebileceğim bi şey yaşamadım sanırım. … hani yaşandığına şahit oldum, duydum. Hani bunlar da yetiyo aslında insanın korku edinmesine. … Yakın çevremin ya da onların çevresinin aktardıkları deneyimler üzerinden bi algı oluştu. Mesela o açıdan Kadıköy hep daha güvenli gelir bana.

[52] İstiklal hem bomba saldırılarıyla… bi de o yılbaşlarında, medyada gösterildiği hâliyle kadınların taciz edildiği (gülüyor) bi yer olarak aklımda. … Bunları düşünerek [orada] kimseye dokunmadan, kollarımı şöyle yaparak (kollarını kendine çekiyor) yürümeye çalışırım. Taksim'e gideceksem mutlaka ne giyceğime dikkat ederim. Bi yerimin açılmasını, görünmesini istemem.

transgender participants (N=6) were subjected to physical, sexual, psychological, and social violence here to the degree that cisgender participants have never been exposed in their lifetime. Gece, for example, states she got stabbed twice in Beyoğlu when she was alone and with her friend. Another participant, Gönül, says she is one of the transgender sex workers who were forced to displace from Ülker Street in the '90s by Beyoğlu Police Department's Chief Police Officer Süleyman Ulusoy aka *Hortum Süleyman*. She says she was exposed to excessive physical violence with other transgender women by a group of men called *tahtacılar* in the streets of Beyoğlu. Her experiences vary from being exposed to sexual harassment of men on new year's eve to a police raid in Beyoğlu. Eventually, participants' fear of crime in Beyoğlu takes form with their past experiences, preconceived notions (cultural codes: values, expectations, etc.), and present circumstances (gender identity, residency, the time they live in, etc.).

> I'm not walking around in fear... because nothing too bad has happened to me so far. If there was such a thing... I'd be careful... maybe I won't go out at all. … I'm careful though… I'm cautious because of ever-increasing violence. You know, when violence against women and femicides become a current issue, I become cautious even in front of the door of my house, or I feel uneasy (Nazlı).[53]

> Nothing bad happened to me but… the streets are not safe [in Beyoğlu] at all. None of the city centers are safe for women anymore. For example, I don't want to stay there after a certain hour. I think I can't go back to home safely after the midnight. One day, I saw the woman, who was killed with that Samurai sword, on the news. …the news was described in such detail… how he sneaked up on her from behind… After seeing that news, I inevitably felt frightened. …the next day, while I was out at night, I kept looking behind me as I walked through the way (Tülin).[54]

The research participants describe Beyoğlu as an unsafe space for women because of the experiences of their own and other women that they mainly encounter in media

---

[53] Korku içinde gezmiyorum… çünkü şu ana kadar başıma çok kötü bi şey gelmedi. Belki öyle bi şey gelse… dikkat ederim... belki de [dışarı] hiç gitmem. … Yine de dikkatliyim… artan şiddet olaylarından dolayı temkinliyim. Hani gündeme ne kadar çok kadın cinayeti, şiddet olayları, bilmem ney falan geldikçe ben burda kapının önünde bile dikkat ediyorum veya huzursuz hissediyorum.

[54] Benim başıma bi şey gelmedi ama… sokaklar hiç güvenli değil [Beyoğlu'nda]. Kent merkezlerinin hiçbiri güvenli değil artık kadınlar açısından. Belirli bi saatten sonra kalmak istemiyorum mesela. 00.00'dan sonra eve güvenli gidemiycemi düşünüyorum. Bi gün haberlerde o samuray kılıcıyla öldürülen kadını gördüm. …haber o kadar detaylı anlatılmış ki… kadının arkasından nasıl yaklaştığı…Onu gördükten sonra ister istemez korku duydum. …sonraki gün gece dışardayken yolda arkama falan bakarak yürüdüm.

portrayals. Deniz recaps the fact that other women's lived experiences become a reference point for women's fear in the city, and states "They say, "They killed the woman in the middle of the street with a Samurai sword." I am now… well, now anybody has become afraid of going out."[55] Başak Cengiz is a woman killed with a samurai sword, by a man who is said to be mentally ill while walking in the street in Ataşehir, İstanbul, in the evening. I did not address this issue in the questions. We held the interviews months after this incident, but 3 out of 22 participants mentioned this issue while mentioning their fear of physical violence in the street. New Year's Eve is another iconic image that participants associate with fear of sexual violence. It mainly indicates Western tourist women who were subjected to sexual harassment in Taksim. These two images create or reinforce fear among participants (n=5). Gönül's fear is directly related to her own experience, while Zeynep and Damla's fear of being exposed to violence is formed due to the representations they see in media. Leyla and Cemile say that media representations function as generators inculcating women with fear of being exposed to sexual harassment and murder in urban public spaces. On the other hand, Deniz and Leyla did not mention their personal experiences associated with the fear of being in the street at night in Beyoğlu. Since they do not have a sense of belonging here, they do not use the place in their everyday lives. They may not face sexual or physical violence because they do not prefer to be alone there, which exactly supports the relevant literature on women's avoidance strategies in the city.

> Because I was [usually] going [to Beyoğlu] with my boyfriend, who is my husband now, I avoided worries. Well, I did not go alone there, but we sometimes went with girls because… we were less afraid then. Today… that is now a place to which I don't feel that much attached… For example… there is a video showing that Arab male tourists are everywhere in İstiklal [Street] on New Year's Eve. … I think it was very scary. I wouldn't want to get into that crowd. People regarded [that fear] as [being opposed to] the migrants, but first and foremost, it was very disturbing because there were not any women, no females [in the street] (Damla).[56]

---

[55] Mesela diyolar ki "Sokağın ortasında kadını Samuray kılıcıyla öldürmüşler." Ben artık… yani [artık] sokağa çıkmaya korkuyor insan."

[56] [Beyoğlu'na genelde] sevgilimle -artık kocam yani- gittiğim için bitakım endişelerin önünü kesmiş oluyodum. Hani tek başıma gitmezdim de kız kıza gittiğimiz olurdu çünkü… daha az korkuyoduk o zamanlar. Bugün… yani o kadar koptuğum bi yer ki orası… Mesela yılbaşında… Arap erkek turistlerin İstiklal'de yoğun olduklarını gösteren bir video. … çok ürkütücüydü bence. Öyle bi şeyin içine girmek istemem. İnsanlar [bu korkuyu] göçmen olmalarına verdi ama ondan önce bence orda hiçbir kadın olmaması, dişi olmaması çok rahatsız ediciydi.

...going out at night... either [means being subjected to harassment or theft]. I was harassed once on New Year's Eve. İstiklal [Street] was a very [enjoyable] thing for women on New Year's Eve. Over the last 20 years, it has been deteriorated. We attended the celebrations in [Taksim] Square once or twice. We were harassed once. I mean, we were also a group, but when the [place] is crowded, he probably didn't realize that we were a group... (Gönül).[57]

The fear of being exposed to violence limits these women's mobility in Beyoğlu. Therefore, their fear perpetuates itself and turns into psychological violence. As a result, I argue in this study that fear has physical, social, economic, and psychological dimensions that shape/restrict participants' spatial experiences in Beyoğlu. And yet none of the participants feel identical emotions and have the same experiences. England and Simon (2010, p. 203) emphasize that people's social and spatial positions determine their fear and perceptions of safety in the city, and they add that "Urban space can been seen as a space of fear for many and those fears are not restricted to any one age, class, gender or race, although those social markers can play a role in geographies of fear."

4.1.2. Frightening Actors (Them) versus Reliable People (Us)

Participants find common ground in the matter of the potential perpetrator's profile. Men in the street are regarded as perpetrators of verbal, sexual, and physical violence in the eyes of many participants. Besides these men's street violence in everyday life, participants depict law enforcement officials' systematic physical violence as "state violence" towards them. Finally, they indicate a particular group of foreigners as perpetrators of verbal and sexual violence, composed of refugee and tourist men from the Middle East. Participants state that sometimes the perpetrators' profiles overlap. For example, when talking about systematic violence, some participants say that male residents of Tophane, whom they call "fascist," "religionist," etc., cooperate with the police and be a part of their state violence in order to endanger participants.

---

[57] ...gece çıkmak... ya tacize ya da işte hırsızlı[ğa maruz kalmak demek]. Yılbaşında bi kere taciz yaşadım. İstiklal yılbaşında kadınlar için çok şey [keyifli] bi şeydi. Son 20 yıldırdan fazla işte, bi bozulma yaşandı. [Taksim] Meydanda kutlamalarda falan böyle... Bi kere mi ne, iki kere mi ne çıktıydık yılbaşında. Bi keresinde tacize uğradık. Bi de gruptuk yani ama adam heralde [ortam] kalabalık olunca grup olduğunu fark etmiyo...

Table 4.2 Fear triggering actors (potential perpetrators)

Men in the street	Drunks drug users homeless clients of sex workers fascists/conservatives/religionists/İslamists/bigots(residents)
Law enforcement officials	police watchmen
Foreigners	Syrian and Afghan refugees Middle Eastern Arab (rich, hair-implanted) tourists
*exception	(cisgender women) anti-trans feminists – (TERFs)

Participants identify particular places in Beyoğlu with the risk of being exposed to sexual harassment and rape. So, they feel in danger. In addition to sexual violence, they are also afraid of encountering theft and state violence here. The fear perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of the participants in Beyoğlu mainly come from men who are the potential perpetrators of violence in the eyes of the participants. They suppose these men are with opposite political stances.

> Because I am a woman, I cannot feel comfortable [in Beyoğlu]. It was always said that you could feel a little bit safer when you are walking [on the main street] in İstiklal and Taksim, but back streets would be dangerous. When my father went to work there, [they said] "Oh, be careful when you take the girls with you. The back streets are like swamps." This may be the fact that sex workers and brothels are there, but I don't think they are the real problem. I am afraid there as a woman because of the men who spend the night there and harass women who pass through the street. You know, it seems like they can hunt someone down and do something there at any moment. … I think it is unique to Taksim. … I went to [Beyoğlu] at around 1:00 AM in the other week. There was no way! I couldn't even walk without being catcalled. I'm talking specifically about İstiklal [Street] and its side streets. That's so frightening. I pass through the side street in order to reach İstiklal [Street]… words… I am verbally harassed by men. …the [men's] profile does not change when I reach to the main street (Meryem).[58]

---

[58] Kadın olmamdan kaynaklı [Beyoğlu'nda] rahat edemiyorum. Eskiden beri İstiklal'le, Taksim'le ilgili hep [ana caddede] biraz daha güvenle yürüyebileceğin ama arka sokakların tehlikeli olacağı söylenirdi. Babam oraya çalışmaya gittiğinde mesela "Aman yanında kızları götürürken dikkat et. Oranın arka sokakları bataklıktır" falan [derlerdi]. Bu… seks işçilerinin ve genelevlerin orada olması sebebiyle olabilir ama bence asıl problem onlar değil. Benim kadın olarak orda bulunurken korkmamın sebebi geceyi orda geçiren erkeklerin geçen kadınlara tacizde bulunması. Yani her an orda birini avına düşürüp bir şey yapabilirlermiş gibi [geliyor.] … Kadıköy'de hiç böyle bir şey yaşamıyorum. …bu durumun Taksim'e özel olduğunu düşünüyorum. … Geçen haftalarda gece 01.00 gibi [Beyoğlu'na] gitmiştim. Mümkünatı yok, laf atılmadan yürüyemiyorum. Özellikle yani İstiklal ve ara sokaklarından bahsediyorum. Bu çok ürkütüyo yani. İstiklal'e çıkmak için ara sokaktan geçiyorum… laflar…

All participants describe Tophane and Kasımpaşa with "conservative," "religionist," "Islamist," "bigot," or "fascist" actors. Some of them identify Tarlabaşı and Çukurcuma with extortionate club owners and the parking lot mafia. According to their perception, these actors make these places unsafe for women. Even Mis Street, which especially transgender participants find safe because of the presence of "people like them" in their daily lives, can turn into a temporary unsafe space when a cisgender "anti-trans" and "anti-immigrant "TERF" enters. This case proves that space is not an empty stage or a container of social activities but a social actor with people and power conflicts.

> When you go down from Tarlabaşı… and cross the street, you reach Tophane, where religionists, fascists live… I was warning people in a few protests, by saying "Buddies don't go there" because Arab and Kurdish Islamists wait there [for us]. Mainly those from Siirt, Bitlis, and Batman live there; their Islamist and nationalist ones. …wait [for us] with sticks. Every year, they do [collaboration] with the police (Gönül).[59]

In the end, participants' perceptions of safety in Beyoğlu, which shapes their mobility and other spatial experiences therein, are formed through the "Us" and "Them" dichotomy. The state of being a member of "Us" and "Them" is about sharing common ground in the matter of their social boundaries, including their gender identities, sexual orientations, political stances, and community affiliations. In the relevant literature, Tan (2007) frames this situation, within urban public spaces, in people's sense of belonging and citizenship context. As she considers,

> Identifying oneself with a city and questioning the sense of belonging through a city is becoming less relevant today. Belonging to a community–one marked by shared lifestyles, property ownership and a sense of belonging–has become more important. This is the new, conflicted definition of citizenship in the contemporary global city (p. 485).

The participants sometimes describe the actors they find uncanny and fear-triggering as "users" and sometimes as "owners" of Beyoğlu. According to the participants'

---

erkekler tarafından sözlü tacize uğruyorum. …[gerçi] caddeye çıktığımda da [erkeklerin] profil değişmiyo.

[59] Tarlabaşı'ndan… inip karşıya geçtin mi… o şey… dinci, faşistlerin olduğu… Tophane [var bir de]. …ben öğütlüyodum bikaç eylemde "Arkadaşlar oraya gitmeyin" diye çünkü orda hazır bekliyo o Arap ve Kürt İslamcıları. Orda ağırlıkla Siirtliler, Bitlisliler, Batmanlılar oturuyo; onların da İslamcı ve milliyetçi tipleri. …sopalarla bekliyolar. Her sene kasten orda polisle birlikte [iş birliği yapıyorlar]

expressions, drunks, drug users, and homeless men appear as visible subjects of Beyoğlu, yet they take ownership only between certain hours. On the other hand, Middle Eastern Arab tourists are identified as actors who cause Beyoğlu to change both in a physical and symbolic sense. They are associated with the changes in the service sector and the entertainment industry in Beyoğlu. Some participants see them and refugees from Syria and Afghanistan as potential perpetrators of gazing, stalking, and sexual harassment. Moreover, sex workers' clients are perceived as dangerous and yet tolerated. Although the participants are uncomfortable with their presence due to the risk of verbal and sexual violence, they tolerate them because they do not see them as "the owners". For all participants, Bayram Sokak belongs to transgender sex workers rather than their clients. Participants feel safe here because they think they can find support from sex workers when something bad happens.

Participants mainly list dangerous men under three groups: residents of Tophane and Kasımpaşa; the parking lot mafia, and club workers, including owners, managers, door attendants, and bouncers who extort money from sex-worker transgender women in Tarlabaşı and Çukurcuma. Besides, they indicate the AK Party government, as an initial actor generating fear among women, seized Beyoğlu from the participants. The more the gap between people of different lifestyles, including their sociopolitical considerations, gets wider, the more they seem dangerous to each other.

> Even when I was 18-19, I would not prefer to be alone [in Beyoğlu] after the midnight. You know [İstiklal Street] gets weird after 1:00 AM. That's why I wouldn't have preferred it back then (2000s), I guess I wouldn't prefer it now either. I used to find it a bit risky in the past because people got drunk [at night], there were fights in the street... There were some bars and other places that serve alcohol. … As you walk, someone pushes the other towards you. That's why it seemed uncanny to me. Because of alcohol consumption men sometimes could act like this in that street (Oya).[60]

> … At night, after a certain hour… İstiklal Street turns into a really male-dominated place. Especially, the main street! I believe that at least half of these men are

---

[60] 18-19 yaşlarındayken bile saat 00.00'dan sonra [Beyoğlu'nda] tek başıma kalmayı tercih etmezdim. Biliyosun [İstiklal Caddesi] saat 01.00'den sonra biraz daha farklılaşıyo. O nedenle o zaman da (2000'ler) çok tercih etmezdim, herhalde şimdi de çok tercih etmem. Ben geçmişte de biraz riskli buluyodum orayı çünkü insanlar [gece] içkili oluyolardı, sokakta kavga çıkıyodu... Orda bitakım barlar, içkili mekânlar oluyodu. … Sen yürürken birisi diğerini senin üzerine doğru itiyo falan. Ondan dolayı tekinsiz geliyodu bana. İçki ve alkolle bağlantılı olarak erkeklerin bu tip hareketleri olabiliyodu caddede.

undercover cops… they are not that different than any harassment perpetrator man, so you feel the same uneasiness (she laughs) (Cemile).[61]

In Tophane ... Islamists… oh it was very terrible. They used some words [to provoke us]… some of them said "pansy," "fagot," we will kill you" and more. One of them even said "We threw [you] off buildings in Iraq, we will throw [you] off buildings here." I suppose he is a member of ISIS (she laughs)… because ISIS members threw LGBTI+ individuals off buildings in Iraq (Anahit).[62]

In order to cope with male violence or the fear of violence, participants employ some negotiation strategies. These strategies can be considered passive and assertive. Some participants feel forced to control their own appearance and behaviors. While they mean to have a safe space, they sometimes prefer to fit into the cultural codes. In addition to the passive yet placemaking strategies such as avoiding wearing short dresses or going back home before it gets dark, they prefer to carry a weapon or substitute in order to respond to perpetrators. Moreover, all participants find peace when surrounded by familiar and trusted people. So, sometimes they ask for these people's accompaniment.

Well, we all do the same thing. We all take our key in our hands. We carry pepper spray or something else. We protect ourselves with a dog. …we're not even allowed to carry them (she laughs). …I have an electroshock device. Why is that? …with a friend, who is a transgender woman and a sex worker, of mine and I were going out during the pandemic. She was wearing a knuckleduster. … We just wanted to stroll around and come back. But no! It even creates problem (Veronika).[63]

I was listening to music in the Metro. It got dark. It was evening [hours] but it wasn't 10:00 PM! I took off my earphones [while walking out of the Metro] of course! Because if somebody approaches from behind, how will I hear [him]? I mean, I felt comfortable [in the street at night] because I spent my years in a very small and very

[61] … gecenin belli bi saatinden sonra… gerçekten çok erkek dominasyonlu bi yere dönüşür İstiklal Caddesi. Yani özellikle ana caddenin üstü! ki bu erkeklerin de en az yarısı bence sivil polis… böyle herhangi bi tacizci erkekten o kadar farkları yok ki hani resmen sivil polis erkeklerin varlığından da aynı ölçüde huzursuz oluyosun (gülüyor).

[62] Tophane'de... İslamcılar… ay çok korkunçtu. Böyle [bizi kışkırtmak için] laf attılar falan… kimi işte "Top, ibne… Öldürücez sizi" falan gibi şeyler söylüyolar. Yani bi tanesi hatta şey demişti: "Irak'ta damdan attık, burda da damdan atçaz." Kendisi herhalde IŞİD üyesi (gülüyor)… çünkü Irak'ta LGBTİ+'ları damdan atan IŞİD yani.

[63] Hepimiz aynı şeyi yapıyoruz yani. Hepimiz anahtarımızı elimize alıyoruz. Biber gazı, bi şey taşıyoruz. Köpekle koruyoruz kendimizi. …kaldı ki bunları taşımamız bile (gülüyor) yasak. …elektroşok cihazım var. Niye var yani! …bi arkadaşımla -trans bi kadın o da ve seks işçisi- dışarı çıkıyoduk pandemide, eline muşta takıyodu. … Bi sokak dolaşıp gelicez yani. Ama yook! Onda bile sorun var.

safe area, but as soon as I stepped out of that comfort zone, I also had the reflexes of many women. I mean, getting a taxi, or a public transportation vehicle alone at night… there are different strategies for these… like texting [people I trust]… (Damla).[64]

If I go out at night, I take the dog with me… because no one can [harass me] easily when I am with my dog. ...my dog's size, breed, etc.... it is a dog that will instill trust in friends and fear in foes (she laughs). That's why I use [it] sometimes for security purposes (Deniz).[65]

[If I'm alone] I consider my outfit. I walk fast. I isolate myself; I wear my earphones. I walk in the middle [of the street], not from the side. This is how I developed certain security strategies. I take care of myself. My eyes are wide open. I don't think these are things that I individually do because I am transgender. Even if you are a cisgender person, harassment is quite common [in Beyoğlu] now. I try to exist there by paying attention [to everything]. But it works in [the main street] İstiklal… when I enter the side streets, I begin to feel safe. I put aside my vigilance (Lisa).[66]

I ran businesses like bars and cafes in Beyoğlu for years. … when I think [of my experiences], of course, most women want to leave earlier, before the men leave the place. Mostly women hang out in groups. Well, this is definitely about their perception of safety. They avoid staying up too late or drinking too much alcohol (Elif).[67]

Some women hold their keys in their hands like a weapon, some go out with dogs. Especially transgender sex workers take a big dog with themselves when they go to such secluded places… or go out at night. They always talk on a mobile phone, with a single earphone on. When was working as a sex worker [in İstanbul], I would be

---

[64] Müzik dinliyodum Metro'da. Hava kararmıştı. Akşam [saatleriydi] ama 22.00 değildi! [Metro'dan çıktığımda yürürken] kulaklıklarımı çıkardım tabii ki! çünkü arkamdan biri, bi ses gelse nasıl duyucam? Yani benim yaşamım çok küçük ve çok güvenli bi alanda geçtiği için rahat hissediyodum ama o konfor alanının dışına çıktığım anda biçok hemcinsimin refleksini ben de taşıyodum. Yani taksiye binmek olsun, herhangi bi toplu ulaşım aracına gece tek başıma binmek olsun… onların hepsinde farklı stratejiler var… hani bindiğimde [güvendiğim insanlara] mesaj atmak gibi…

[65] Gece dışarı çıkacaksam köpekle çıkıyorum… çünkü köpeğim varken kimse o kadar kolay [taciz] yapamaz yani. …köpeğimin cüssesi, ırkı, vesaire de… biraz hani dosta güven, düşmana korku salacak (gülüyor) bi köpek. O yüzden [onu] güvenlik amaçlı onu kullandığım oluyo.

[66] [Yalnızsam] kıyafetime dikkat ediyorum. Ordan hızlı geçiyorum, hızlı yürüyorum. Kendimi soyutluyorum, kulaklığımı takıyorum. Daha kenardan değil, daha ortadan yürüyorum. Belli güvenlik yöntemleri geliştirdim böyle. Kendimi gözetiyorum. Gözüm etrafta açık hani. Bunların hani trans olarak özel olarak benim yaptığım şeyler olduğunu düşünmüyorum. Hani cis biri de olsan taciz [Beyoğlu'nda] çok yaygın artık. Dikkat ederek var olmaya çalışıyorum orda. Ama bu İstiklal'de böyle… ara sokaklara girdiğimde kendimi güvende hissetmeye başlıyorum. Alert olma hâlimi bi kenara bırakıyorum felan.

[67] Yıllarca Beyoğlu'nda [bar ve kafe gibi] mekânların işletmeciliği yaptım. … gelen bütün kadınlara baktığım zaman tabii ki yani çoğu erkeklerden önce, daha erken gitmek istiyorlar. Çoğunlukla kadınlar grup hâlinde takılıyorlar. Eee bunun direkt güvenlik [algısıyla] alakası var. Çok geç saatlere kalmamaya ya da çok içmemeye özen gösteriyorlar.

incredibly careful when I went out. My phone was usually accessible, and I would talk to someone on the phone. … When I was getting in a car … I would walk around and keep the license plate in my mind. We feel forced to use … such tactics. I share live location with my friends. … I carried pepper spray and pocketknife. I faced fine for carrying pepper spray because of the police, but I don't give up because I have to ensure my own security. I know that the government, the state, the authority does not provide it. When I was attacked, I know that I was not offered treatment as an equal citizenship, and the perpetrator won't be punished. We provide our own security to survive. … We feel anxiety when going out at night or the necessity to exist in the city as a group. As women, we can go out at night as a commune. The Feminist Night March is exactly one of those endeavors (Anahit).[68]

Security measures are natural defense mechanisms. Especially Anahit's statement has the power to illustrate women's choices and preferences in the city.

Table 4.3 Participants' safety strategies in their everyday lives

Avoidance practices	avoiding using potentially unsafe spaces avoiding going out in potentially risky hours wearing headphones: avoiding communication avoiding physical contact with men
Self-controlling attitudes	watching for their own outfit: elimination of wearing "short," tight, or transparent clothes or choosing sportwear to ease their mobility
Recurring behaviors	taking off headphones: becoming extra alert informing others about the taxi number (plate) sharing live location via social media
Carrying weapons/tools for self-defense	electroshock weapon, pepper spray, pocketknife holding keys between their fingers getting prepared to use items as impromptu weapon
Having accompaniment	women (feminists, friends, *gacılar*, *lubunyalar*, girls, etc.) men (partners, brothers, spouses, friends, etc.) dogs smartphones

We see that participants' precaution and prevention strategies sometimes end up with their elimination of particular places and hours. However, they also use some strategies

---

[68] Kimi kadınlar anahtarlarını silah gibi elinde tutuyo, kimileri sokağa köpeklerle çıkıyo. Özellikle trans seks işçileri böyle daha tenha yerlere… gece sokağa çıkarken büyük bir köpek alıyolar ellerine. Ya da işte daima cep telefonuyla konuşurlar, tek kulaklık takılı şekilde. [İstanbul'da] seks işçiliği yaptığım dönemde sokağa çıktığımda çok dikkatli davranırdım. Telefonum genelde sürekli açık olurdu ve biriyle konuşurdum. …bi araca binerken …arkasından dolaşıp plakasını [alırdım]. Böyle taktiklere… mecbur kalıyoruz. Arkadaşlarıma canlı konum atıyorum. … Biber gazı ve çakı taşıyodum. Polis bi sürü ceza yazdı bana bu yüzden ama vazgeçmiyorum çünkü kendi güvenliğimi sağlamak zorundayım. Hükümetin, devletin, iktidarın bu güvenliği sağlamıycanı biliyorum. Saldırıya uğradığımda eşit yurttaşlıkta tedavi görmiycemi, o saldırının failinin cezalandırılmıycanı biliyorum. Hayatta kalabilmek için kendi güvenliğimizi kendimiz sağlıyoruz. …gece sokağa çıkarken kaygı ya da kentte komün hâlde var olma zorunluluğu [hissediyoruz]. Kadınlar olarak gece sokağa komün hâlinde çıkabiliyoruz. Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü de tam olarak böyle [bi çaba].

to transform unsafe spaces into safe spaces for themselves in an assertive way. Wearing headphones (speaking to someone or not) means isolating oneself from the environment and avoiding being disturbed by the potential perpetrator. On the other hand, removing the earphones makes it possible to maintain awareness of their surroundings and the possible dangers in the environment. Another repetitive strategy that has become a ritual is to write down the license plate. Despite their fear, women are forced to use public transportation in the city for reasons such as lack of income and parking problems. Moreover, women feel obliged to use taxis and minibuses, depending on their income level, due to the lack of services for affordable and more accessible vehicles such as the Metro, city bus, and Metrobus. This study shows that participants note the license plates of the vehicles they get in alone at night against possible dangers. Some participants choose their clothes as "appropriate" when entering a place they find unsafe for women, and they keep up with the cultural codes.

Although the proportion of those who carry weapons or substitutes among the 22 participants seems low, half of the transgender participants do it. Among these women, Veronika is the only one who does almost all of the above. As a transgender woman who has spent almost her entire life in Beyoğlu after moving to İstanbul, the fact that she applies these has the potential to provide us with partial knowledge about the urban struggle of trans-experienced women in unsafe public spaces. It is also an important trend for women to ask for companions when going out or going back to home. Even if they do not ask for it, they feel safer with a trusted person's accompaniment rather than being alone. Sometimes this happens with the accompaniment of men (brother, partner, friend, etc.) and sometimes women (sister, friend, etc.). Some participants feel safe having their dogs with them when they go out at night. Some participants say they have their smartphones prepared to inform others of their location when they enter an unsafe space for themselves, while others say that they get encouragement from the person they talk to on the phone. In other words, the participants use the dog and the smartphone to prevent possible dangers and intimidate perpetrators. As I said before, participants of this study occupy a special place among the women in Turkey. All participants associate their motivation to attend the FNM or their experience at this march with a sense of trust rather than fear. They use the strategies of being together and getting strength from one another at this march. In other words, they are not

114

passive; they all accompany each other to take over Beyoğlu, feel better in the street at night, and not feel alone but strong.

4.1.3. Fear of Certain Places

The sides and neighborhoods in which participants (N=22) choose or have to live differ. 4 of the cisgender participants (N=16) lived in Kadıköy at some point in their lives. 12 of them lived in the districts and neighborhoods of some municipalities other than Kadıköy and Beyoğlu because of the necessity of living in the family home, economic insufficiency, and political ties. From the narratives of cisgender women, we can deduce exactly where they currently live. However, we cannot fully understand the number of participants who have lived in Beyoğlu for a while. On the contrary, all transgender participants (N=6), except for one, base their ties with Beyoğlu on the fact that they have both worked, had fun, made politics, and lived there, and they definitely mention this issue in the interviews. Elif, a transgender woman who has worked in Beyoğlu for many years, is the only participant who is not among these women but feels a deeper sense of belonging toward Beyoğlu than where she lives right now (Şişli). All transgender participants explain their relationship with Beyoğlu through the desire to live in a safe space where they are accepted with their gender identity. Anahit says she moved to İzmir to deal with some of the problems emerging from being a Kurdish transgender woman without sufficient income. She was in İstanbul, she occupied with sex work in Beyoğlu, around Tarlabaşı and lived in Kurtuluş, Şişli. After her neighbors blamed her for hosting clients at home and being a member of "terrorist" groups, she began to argue with the house owner. Since she could not afford to live in a better apartment, she preferred to move to İzmir and live around Bornova Street (Alsancak, Konak), where especially transgender sex workers live and work together, to ensure her own safety and establish solidarity. Gönül says that she did not leave Ülker Street because it is a symbolic place for the history of transgender sex workers' resistance in Beyoğlu. Unlike transgender participants, cisgender participants generally live in other parts of the city (Kadıköy, Sarıyer, Üsküdar, Eyüp, Beykoz, etc.). When they compare Kadıköy with Beyoğlu, they find Kadıköy safe and Beyoğlu unsafe for women.

> ..when you are a transgender person, the places you live are structured. …when a cisgender woman or a cisgender man looks for an apartment… they want to meet

certain criteria, but we don't have that privilege. For example, I wish that "I have a real estate agent who can find me an apartment and a homeowner who will accept me with my [transgender] identity." This is my only criterion. … İzmir is a little more relaxed, especially Bornova Street. Since transgender people have been living there for years... I went there because of security reasons (Anahit).[69]

I always wanted to live around Beyoğlu, in Cihangir, because… years ago, when I was sitting in a café, a very sweet boy, who was assigned male, passed by me and winked at me. It [felt] like I would always be safe in that neighborhood, and it made me think that "There is no harassers, no bad boys here". … [It is important to live here] in order to reach gatherings quickly, because the Queer community is usually in Beyoğlu. … It really feels like a shell. Imagine a snail. It has a shell, a very wet one. [Beyoğlu], becomes a shell to me, in that shell I always keep my body wet [and alive] (Lisa).[70]

I was the only one who stayed in that famous street: Ülker. … Since I'm live here for years and years, no one has a problem with me that much.. I didn't leave there. [I live] in my own house… But I had a lot of friends who had their own houses, yet they all sold their homes and fled. There is no one left in this street other than me [among those who have lived during Ülker Street incidents]. I have been there for 30 years. I also lived two streets ahead for 4 years, in Başkurt Street[71] (Gönül).[72]

---

[69] …trans olunca yaşıycan yerler belli. …cis bir kadın veya cis bi erkek ev aramaya gittiğinde… belli kriterleri oluyo ama biz ona sahip değiliz. Mesela "Bana ev verebilecek bir emlakçı ve beni bu kimliğimle kabul edecek bir ev sahibim olsun." Tek kriterim bu. … İzmir biraz daha rahat, özellikle Bornova Sokak. Zaten yıllardır transların yaşadığı bi semt olduğu için... Güvenlik meselesi yüzünden oraya gittim.

[70] Beyoğlu civarlarında hep Cihangir'de oturmak istedim çünkü… yıllar önce orda bir kafede otururken çok tatlı, dışardan erkek atanan bir çocuk önümden geçmiş ve bana göz kırpmıştı. Bu bana o mahallede hep güvende olucağımı [hissettirmiş] ve "Burda tacizciler yok, kötü çocuklar yok" tadı vermişti. …sosyalliklere de hızlı bir şekilde erişmek adına [burada yaşamak önemli] çünkü queer topluluk genelde Beyoğlu'nda. … Gerçekten bana orası bir kabuk gibi geliyo. Bir salyangoz hayal et. Onun bir kabuğu olsun ve o kabuğun içi çok ıslak olsun. Hani ben [Beyoğlu'nda] kabuğuma doğru gidiyorum ve onun içinde sonsuzcasına bedenimi orda ıslak tutuyorum (Lisa).

[71] Formerly known as Sormagir Sokak. It is one of the streets in Beyoğlu, where transgender women lived, worked and formed a solidarity when they were exiled from other places, such as Abanoz Street, Pürtelaş Street, and Ülker Street.

[72] O meşhuuur Ülker Sokak'ta tek ben kaldım. …çok eski olduğum için benle kimsenin pek sorunu yok. Terk etmedim orayı. Kendi evim[de yaşıyorum]… ama kendi evi olan bi sürü arkadaşım vardı, hepsi satıp kaçıp gittiler. Şu an sokakta benden başka [Ülker Sokak olaylarının yaşandığı zamanlardan] kimse kalmadı. 30 senedir ordayım. 4 sene de iki sokak ilerde oturmuştum, Başkurt Sokak'ta.

Selek (2014 [2011]) states that transvestites and transsexuals[73] moved from one street to another but did not leave Beyoğlu despite "deadly" operations that aimed to displace them throughout the history. After giving a historical background about sex work and transgender individuals' symbolic places in Cihangir, Galata, and Sıraselviler, wherein Abanoz Street, Ziba Street, Pürtelaş Street, and Ülker Street locate, Selek (2014 [2011]) makes a connection between *alt kültürden olmak* [subculture membership] and transgender women's perceptions of safety and ownership in Beyoğlu: "… they feel safer in the most "illicit" district of the city. … Transvestites and transsexuals trust the dynamics of Beyoğlu, so they regard Beyoğlu as the safest space for themselves" (p. 117).[74]

In regard to the statements of my research participants, Selek's argument remains valid, and it can be adapted to the experiences of both transgender and cisgender participants. In this study, I found that participants refuse to abandon Beyoğlu, wherein they feel attached because of their individual memories and the history of feminist activism in Turkey, although they mainly find it unsafe for women. They insist on taking up space and appropriating here. However, their perceptions of safe and unsafe spaces in Beyoğlu take shape according to their intersecting identities and provide them with different emotional reactions and spatial experiences.

---

[73] Although some people keep identifying themselves as transvestite or transexual, these are now outdated words to identify crossdresser and transgender individuals.

[74] … kentin en "gayri meşru" semtinde kendilerini daha güvenli hissediyorlar. … Travesti ve transseksüeller ise bu dinamiklere güvenerek, hala Beyoğlu'nu kendileri için en korunaklı mekân sayıyorlar.

Table 4.4 Participants' perception of safe and unsafe spaces in Beyoğlu (streets, neighborhoods, pubs, bars, cafes, etc.)

REASONS FOR SAFETY	PARTICULAR PLACES	REASONS FOR INSECURITY
- memory of feminist activism - memory of LGBTI+ activism - allies (e.g., LGBTI+ community: *gacılar* and *lubunyalar,* etc.) - trans-inclusive clubs (e.g., Bigudi Club, Kırmızı Bar, Bova Jazz Club, etc.)	**MİS STREET**	- the risk of facing custody, pepper gas, etc. - nearby venues for potential perpetrators (e.g., shisha cafes, etc.) - undercover police officers
- memory of feminist activism (e.g., feminist gatherings in Feminist Mekan, etc.) - feminist allies (e.g., the Socialist Feminist Collective (SFK), Amargi, etc. -either closed or open) -inhabitant-allies (e.g., some shopkeepers, managers, etc.)	**TEL STREET**	-nearby police stations
- allies (e.g., transgender sex workers, etc.)	**BAYRAM STREET**	- dangerous men: potential perpetrators who are comprised of clients of sex workers
- trans-inclusive clubs (e.g., Şahika, etc.)	**NEVİZADE STREET**	NA
- women friendly and familiar venues (e.g., Muaf Beyoğlu, Front Door, etc.)	**KURABİYE STREET**	NA
- women friendly and leftists, feminist, Kurdish people-inclusive venues (e.g., Şiirci, etc.)	**SÜSLÜ SAKSI STREET**	NA
- LGBTI+-inclusive clubs (e.g., Uçan Ev, etc.)	**BÜYÜKPARMAKKAPI STREET**	NA
-allies (e.g., *gacılar, lubunyalar*, etc.)	**SADRİ ALIŞIK STREET**	- dangerous men: extortion gang composed of bouncers in Sahra Club

Table 4.4 (con't)

		- gentrification
- allies (*comrades* who are comprised of Kurdish laborers, leftists, familiar people, etc.)	**TARLABAŞI**	- dangerous men: police, watchmen, mafia groups – parking lot operators, extortion gang composed of bouncers in Bahriyeli Pub, etc.
- memory of social movements (e.g., the FNM, Pride Parade, Gezi Park protests, etc.)	**İSTİKLAL STREET**	- the risk and the experiences of verbal, sexual, and physical violence -dangerous men: men in the street, foreigners, and law enforcement officials
- memories of May Day protests (solidarity)	**TAKSİM SQUARE**	- 1 May 1977 (murders of protesters)
- memory of Gezi Park protests (e.g., setting up a tent for feminists, challenging sexist and homophobic swear words, etc.) - memory of LGBTI+ community gatherings -sex work memories (e.g., *çarka çıkmak* [stroll]	**GEZİ PARK**	- memory of Gezi Park protests (e.g., police brutality, murders of protesters, etc.)
- memory of feminist marches, including the FNM -memory of Saturday Mothers' sit-in protests - women friendly venues (e.g., Ziba Pub, Passage Hazzopulo, etc.) - sites of memory (e.g., Passage Hazzopulo)	**GALATA**	- memory of police brutality
- memory of feminist marches including the FNM - allies (e.g., Kırmızı Kedi Kitabevi, etc.)	**TÜNEL**	- memory of police brutality

Table 4.4 (con't)

		- trans-exclusionary gay clubs (e.g., Tek-Yön, etc.)
NA	**CİHANGİR**	- memory of transgender women's murders and displacement (e.g., from Başkurt Street,)
- allies (e.g., transgender women)	**ÇUKURCUMA**	- mafia groups (so-called parking lot operators)
NA	**TOPHANE**	- dangerous men: residents who are comprised of fascists, conservatives, religionists, Kurdish and Arab Islamists, bigots, etc. (potential perpetrators of physical and verbal violence, who are at the disposal of police and the AKP)
NA	**KASIMPAŞA**	- dangerous men: residents who are comprised of fascists, conservatives, religionists, Kurdish and Arab Islamists, bigots, etc. (potential perpetrators of physical and verbal violence, who are at the disposal of police and the AKP)

Surroundings of Tarlabaşı… a very safe space [because] there are familiar businesses and venues. It was valid for all parts of Mis Street before. Now we're stuck in half of it, to the bottom corner. The upper side of the street welcomes undercover cops, hookah cafes, weird nightclubs… There is an invisible border in the middle of Mis Street. The upper part is for the masculine world (she laughs), but the bottom part is ours. … You will see familiar faces when you turn into the street from the corner of Ziba [Pub]. There was a distinction between the upper half of the İstiklal [Street] and its lower half. It was like an invisible border separating it beginning from Galatarasay Square: There would be more women in the upper part of İstiklal [Street] at night, while their density in the street would decrease when approaching the bottom side. Now I think male domination became common in general in İstiklal [Street] when compared to previous years (Cemile).[75]

---

[75] Tarlabaşı [civarı]… çok güvenli bi alan [çünkü] tanıdığımız işletme ve mekânların olduğu bi yer. Mis Sokak'ın eskiden tamamı için bunu söyleyebilirdik. Şimdi Mis Sokak'ın yarısına, alt köşesine sıkıştık. Üst tarafı sivil polisler, nargile kafeler, tuhaf gece kulüpleri… Görünmeyen bi sınır var Mis Sokak'ın ortasında. Yukarsı erkek dünyanın (gülüyor), aşağısı bizim gibi. … Ziba'nın köşesini döndüğünüz andan itibaren tanıdığınız insanları görürsünüz.

Kadıköy, Beşiktaş, Şişli, and Sarıyer were perceived as safe spaces to which some participants feel attached. In contrast, all participants draw attention to Beyoğlu's in-between position with both safe and unsafe spaces. They see Beyoğlu as a place consisting of symbolic places in Turkey, such as Istiklal Street, Taksim Square and Gezi Park, that seem unsafe to some participants while others feel safe there. Yet, except for two (Leyla and Deniz), participants feel attached to these places as they are important for the history of feminist and LGBTI+ activism in Turkey. Mis Street and Tel Street are prominent safe spaces for participants. Mis Street has hosted several feminist protests and marches, including the FNM. Likewise, there have been safe spaces, including Sosyalist Feminist Kolektif (SFK) [Socialist Feminist Collective], Amargi, Lambda, and currently Feminist Mekan in Tel Street. Participants associate these two streets with safety because they see them as a junction point where like-minded women and LGBTI+ individuals exist. Bayram Street and Tarlabaşı are contested places for these participants because of the coexistence of triggers and reliable actors. Bayram Street, where sex workers constitute the majority, offers a place for solidarity for most participants. However, some participants point out that they feel fearful because they encounter the clients of sex workers whom they identify as potential perpetrators of sexual violence. Similarly, being in Tarlabaşı polarizes participants into two groups: those who feel safe and claim ownership here and those who see the risk of encountering fearsome actors. Tarlabaşı, where leftist residents form the majority, is gentrified and controlled place by law enforcement officials. Therefore, some participants feel anxious about being harmed by the police, while others feel welcomed because there are residents with similar political stances here. There are also implicitly unsafe spaces for women in the eyes of participants because of the presence of fear-triggering actors, whom I listed in table 4.2. Regarding participants' safety perceptions and experiences of violence, Tophane comes first in the list of unsafe spaces for women.

> In Bayram Street, usually sex workers' houses take place. Even though people think this place is unsafe, it is safer mostly for people like us because if something bad happens, there will always be someone there to rave about. You'd find help. ... It feels uncanny to encounter men, who come there as sex workers' clients,… but still, it is

---

Eskiden İstiklal'in üst yarısı ve alt yarısı arasında bi ayrım vardı. Galatarasay Meydanı'ndan görünmeyen bi sınırla ayrılır gibiydi: İstiklal'in üst tarafında daha fazla kadın olurdu geceleri, alt tarafa doğru gittikçe sokaktaki kadın sayısı azalırdı. Şimdi bence daha genele yayılan bi erkek dominasyonu var yani eskisine oranla İstiklal'de.

much safer to face those men [in Bayram Street] than encountering them in another place. [Bayram Street] is safe for those women because they have each other there, however, it is an uncanny place because it is close to the police station. That street is such a street… It goes down to Çukurcuma. Çukurcuma, is a gentrified place… a place in-between. There is also the parking lot mafia. … So, while you feel safe there because of the presence of transgender women, you feel uncomfortable due to the parking lot mafia (Cemile).[76]

This study indicates that factors shaping participants' spatial use and safety perceptions in Beyoğlu are not limited to their gender. Participants feel welcomed in some neighborhoods, streets, clubs, cafes, etc., because of their ethnic, feminist, or transgender identity and political stance. On the contrary, these identities and their sociodemographic characteristics sometimes cut the tie between participants and public spaces in Beyoğlu. For example, Gece states that she feels comfortable with her transgender identity in many clubs while she does not feel welcomed as a transgender yet Kurdish woman in others. So, the bond that participants form or strengthen with some places depends on fractions and solidarity among the groups.

[In Beyoğlu] Uçan Ev… is especially a political place. Actually, it's [for] heterosexual [individuals], but fortunately our fags have taken over it (she laughs). Apart from that, Şahika is transgender people's place. … There is a place called Bigudi in Mis Street, it was a place for lesbians, but now it is a place to where Kurdish LGBTI+ individuals go and feel more comfortable therein. Well, LGBTI+ is not only about gay people or transgender people, but there is a class issue and ethnic classification. In other words, the hierarchal relationship exists not only in gender roles, but also in ethnic identity and financial state. [For example] they don't play a Kurdish song in TekYön, and they don't dance *halay*, but we can dance halay or make political speeches in Bigudi and where I work, Uçan Ev (Gece).[77]

---

[76] Bayram Sokak'ta seks işçilerinin evleri var genelde. İnsanların daha güvensiz [olduğunu] düşünmelerine rağmen daha güvenlidir çoğunlukla bizim gibi insanlar için çünkü başına bi şey geldiğinde orda cazgırlık çıkarcak birileri illaki bulunur. Yardımsız kalmazsın. ... Oraya müşteri olarak gelen erkekler yüzünden tekinsiz hissedersin …ama gene de aynı erkekle başka bi ortamda karşılaşmaktansa [orada] karşılaşmak çok daha güven verici. [Bayram Sokak] o kadınlar açısından bi yandan hem birbirleri olduğu için güvenli, bi yandan da çok tekinsiz mekânlar, yani polis karakolunun hemen aşağısında. O sokak öyle bi sokak ki… Çukurcuma'ya iniyo. Çukurcuma mutenalaşan… ara bi yer. Orda tabii bi de otopark mafyası var. … Yani aynı sokakta transların varlığından ötürü güvende hissederken otoparkçılarından rahatsız hissediyosun.

[77] [Beyoğlu'nda] Uçan Ev… özellikle politik olan bi yer. Aslında orası heteroseksüel[ler için] bi mekân fakat sağ olsunlar bizim ibneler ele geçirmiş orayı (gülüyor). Onun dışında, Şahika transların yeri. … Mis Sokak'ta Bigudi diye bi mekân var, lezbiyenlerin mekânıydı ama… artık özellikle Kürt LGBTİ+'ların gittiği ve daha rahat ettiği bir mekân. Yani LGBTİ+'ların arasında sadece gaylik ya da translık meselesi yok, sınıfsal ve etnik bir sınıflandırma da var. Yani alt-üst ilişkisi sadece cinsiyet rollerinde değil, etnik kimlik rollerinde ve ekonomik güçte

In other words, Beyoğlu offers safe spaces for some and unsafe spaces for others concerning the participants' intersecting identities. Some participants say that they feel safe between *dost mekânlar* [friendly places] and familiar people in Beyoğlu, where they feel a sense of belonging and form solidarity and alliance. Beyoğlu is meaningful for those who attach there through their individual and collective memories, which generates sense of belonging. When their understanding of space overlaps with their sense of community, it eliminates women's fear (Panelli, Kraack & Little, 2004). At this point, the FNM in Beyoğlu becomes a means for its participants to appropriate the place without fear but with confidence. On the contrary, when men, whom they see as dangerous, provide the majority, participants feel alone, and it prevents them from using particular places in Beyoğlu, especially after it gets dark.

4.1.4. Fear-triggering Hours

Every one of the participants, without exception, thinks that Beyoğlu is uncanny and dangerous for women at night. Nevertheless, Güz, Cemile and Elif say that they do not feel compelled to leave Beyoğlu when it gets dark. They say that their "courage" originates in people they trust. The more they think they are surrounded with "like minded" people, the more they feel the courage. Among 22 participants, only two women prefer to be in the streets of Beyoğlu, especially at night: Güz and Anahit. Except for them, all participants are afraid of being in Beyoğlu at night for various reasons. In any case, being in a familiar environment and surrounded by reliable people alleviates these women's fear and provides them with confidence because their fear is not about darkness itself, but potential perpetrators who take over the place when the allies are gone.

> … At night, after 2:00 AM, women leave İstiklal [Street], and mostly men, drunken gather in İstiklal Street. Then it is not possible to walk alone, and it is not safe. At night, after 1:30-2:00 AM, the street changes. That's why I wouldn't prefer [to go there at those hours] (Ayşe).[78]

---

de var. TekYön'de bir Kürtçe şarkı çalmazlar, halay yapmazlar mesela ama Bigudi'de ve benim çalıştığım Uçan Ev'de halay çekebiliyoruz veya politik konuşmalar yapabiliyoruz.

[78] … gece 02.00'den sonra kadınlar İstiklal'den çekilmiş oluyo ve daha çok böyle ee erkekler, sarhoşlar İstiklal Caddesi'ni doldurmuş oluyo. O zaman tek başına yürümek tekin olamıyo, güvenlikli olmuyo, o yüzden. Gece hani 01.30-02.00'den sonra o caddenin çehresi değişiyo. O yüzden [o saatlerde oraya gitmeyi] tercih etmem.

I think there was a time [to leave] İstiklal [Street], and it was 2:00 AM. After that time, it's like a magic wand… It was the time when women gradually disappear and the men's population increases. It's like someone silently gave an order (she laughs). …it used to be around 2:00 AM, when the balance change. It's happens much earlier now... We get out of meeting [and leave Tel Street] in the evening, around 10:00 PM, it seems like there are no women on İstiklal Street at all. So, I don't feel like an outsider in Taksim… but I feel like that in İstiklal Street! I regard Istiklal Street as an obstacle to overcome in order to go wherever I go. …but from the moment I turn into Mis Street, or Bekar Street, or what else… Süslüsaksı Street, Tel Street, etc… from the moment I enter those streets… If I close my eyes, I can even find the paving stone under which dirty water comes out. For me, it is an area that I know very well… in every way… So, that mudhole looks familiar to me (she laughs), so it makes me feel good (Cemile).[79]

…I prefer to stay [in Beyoğlu] until 10:00 PM at the very latest, then it is not safe. … the social structure suddenly evolves. …it turns into a place where heteronormative people come and hang out, ...it welcomes abusive men as a crowd. That's why I don't go there at night (Lisa).[80]

While Beyoğlu does not offer complete safety during the day, the participants' statements prove that women begin to feel an intense fear after it gets dark. Participants identify especially 9:00 PM, 10:00 PM, midnight, 1:00 AM and 2:00 AM as unsafe and fear-triggering hours for women, which prevents them from being in places they deem dangerous. In this matter, their gender identity causes disagreements among the participants. Most of the participants hesitate to be in Beyoğlu at similar times. All transgender women, except one (Lisa), have worked in nightclubs or occupied with sex work in Beyoğlu at some point in their lives. Despite their fear, transgender participants feel forced to be in Beyoğlu as they earn money at night. Gönül says that as a former sex worker, she is no longer as afraid as the others and her younger self in Beyoğlu because she began to experience fewer acts of violence. However, as she gets

---

[79] Yani eskiden bi saati vardı bence İstiklal'in, 02.00'ydi o saat. O saatten sonra sanki sihirli bi değnek… Kadınların böyle yavaşça ortadan kaybolup erkek yoğunluğunun arttığı zaman. Sanki biri sessizce bi emir vermiş gibi (gülüyor) böyle. …o dengenin değiştiği saat 02.00 civarıydı. Şimdi çok daha erken... Biz akşam toplantıdan çıkıyoruz saat 22.00'de, İstiklal Caddesi'nde kadın yok gibi yani. Yani ben yabancı hissetmiyorum Taksime… İstiklal Caddesi'ne hissediyorum! İstiklal Caddesi'ni istediğim yere gidebilmek için aşılması gereken bi engel olarak görüyorum. …ama Mis Sokak'a döndüğüm andan itibaren ya da işte Bekâr Sokak'a ya da ne biliyim… Süslüsaksı Sokak'a, Tel Sokak'a falan… O sokaklara girdiğim andan itibaren… gözümü kapasam bastığımda altından pis su çıkan taşı bile bilirim. Hani çok tanıdığım bi alan benim için… her açıdan… Yani o pislik bana tanıdık geliyor (gülüyor), o yüzden bana iyi hissettiriyo.

[80] …maksimum 22.00'ye kadar [Beyoğlu'nda] olmayı tercih ederim, sonra güvenli değil. …sosyal yapı bir anda değişiyo. …heteronormatif insanların geldiği, takıldığı bi yere dönüşüyo, ...tacizci erkeklerin doluştuğu bir şey oluyo. O yüzden [oraya] gece gitmiyorum.

older, she avoids using the street at night. She says she is afraid of getting an irreparable injury because she lost her muscle. Veronika, on the other hand, works in a brothel in Bayram Street. She says she can go to her home in five minutes when she leaves the workplace. However, she crosses İstiklal Street and goes out of the way because the risk of sexual harassment is more tolerable for her than being stalked by the police. For Anahit, who sees *lubunyas* at cafes in Mis Street and transgender sex workers in Tarlabaşı and İstiklal Street at night, being around these places in Beyoğlu at night gives her more confidence than ever. When participants see the opportunity of meeting with people with whom they stand, Beyoğlu turns into a risky but safeguarded place.

> Some people mainly prefer to use [İstiklal Street] during the daytime, they feel safer at that time, but I feel the opposite: I survive like a bat because I am a transgender woman… At night, that street turns into a place where women, whom people call whores, Gypsies, and "others" in [and of] the society [literally] exist. I find it safer to be in Taksim at night because transgender people are there, because all of them are my friends… For example, [sex-worker] transgender people wouldn't be at cafés at night, they work [in the street], but *lubunyas* sit in the café. …when I go out at night, if I am not working, I sit at certain cafés on Mis Street, or if I faced an incident… I go to *gacıs*, who are transgender women, … When I go out on that street during the daytime, I may not be able to get organized against any hate crime, but at night we can do it. …sex-worker women can exercise their right to exist in the city at night. Because she is a sex worker, she feels forced to use that right because she has to go out at night, she has to work. But… there is a risk of sexual assault. ... we cannot use the right to night because of these concerns: "Will we be subjected to sexual assault, extortion, hate crime or violence?" These concerns are actually valid just for us, for women. A man has no concerns [in this regard] (Anahit).[81]

Most participants do not prefer to be in particular neighborhoods, streets, side streets, and places of entertainment, especially between the hours of 9:00 PM and 2:00 AM.

---

[81] Bazı insanlar [İstiklal Caddesi'ni] gündüz kullanmayı daha fazla tercih eder, kendilerini o saatlerde daha güvende hissederler ama ben tam tersi: Trans bi kadın olduğum için kendimi bi yarasa gibi var ediyorum …o cadde işte [gece] insanların orospu dediği kadınların, Çingenelerin… toplumun diğer kesiminden insanların var olduğu bi şeye dönüşüyo. …özellikle Taksim'de translar olduğu için ben gece orda var olmayı daha güvenli buluyorum… çünkü hepsi arkadaşlarım... Mesela gece [seks işçisi] translar kafede olmaz, [sokakta] çalışırlar ama lubunyalar kafede olur. …gece çıktığımda, çalışmıyosam eğer Mis Sokak'ta belli kafelere otururum ya da bi olay yaşadıysam… gacıların —yani trans kadınların— yanına giderim. … Gündüz o caddeye çıktığımda yaşıycam nefret saldırısına karşı örgütlü bi hâl alamayabilirim ama gece onu yapabiliyoruz. …seks işçisi kadınlar gece kentte var olma hakkını kullanabiliyolar. Seks işçisi olduğu için o hakkı mecburen kullanıyo çünkü gece sokağa çıkması gerekiyo, çalışması gerekiyo. Ama orda… cinsel saldırı riski var. ...gece hakkını kullanamamamızın nedeni işte bu kaygılar yani: "Cinsel saldırıya, gaspa, nefret saldırısına ya da şiddete maruz kalacak mıyız?" Bu kaygılar aslında sadece bizde var. Bir erkeğin [bu konuda] hiçbir kaygısı yok.

However, some participants do not hesitate to use these places then. Considering the experiences of transgender women in sex work or the entertainment industry in Beyoğlu, these women feel forced to go out, especially at night. Still, they take the risk of encountering potential dangers despite their fear.

> It's so true that walking in İstiklal Street at night gives women freedom. Still, when walk there at night, especially after the midnight... Let's suppose I came out of a place; I just got out of a meeting or had a drink with friends and I'm going home back... Those who sing in the street... others who walk, in a group composed of women and men... it makes me feel free to walk in İstiklal Street at night. ...I think walking at night is better for me in the matter of feeling the street (Ayşe).[82]

Ayşe finds Beyoğlu dangerous, especially at night, for women. However, she mentions that being in İstiklal Street at night gives her a sense of freedom. Just as Anahit finds peace at night thanks to her trusted social surroundings, Ayşe says that she feels free as a woman at night here. Her approach, which is an exception in this study, has a place in the literature. The decrease in physical strength with aging increases city dwellers' fear. However, as women get older, it is possible their fear of being exposed to physical and sexual violence in the street decreases, which does not completely apply to Gönül because of her transgender identity. As Pain (1995) says,

> the elderly women... are less likely to worry about street violence than younger women. ... Women aged between 18-30 are over one third more likely to avoid going out alone because of fear of violence than women over 60, and more likely to feel unsafe with strangers (p. 594).

I think we can read this experience, which has a meaningful basis in the literature, in two ways: the first is the loss of sexuality with aging (in the eyes of society); the second is the cultural codes of "respect" towards elderly people in the community we live together. This study's sample size is not large enough to prove this. However, I believe it is not a coincidence that three women over 50 among all participants say that they gained recognition, prestige, and status as they got older. Hence, they became less fearful in public spaces at night than the participants between the ages of 21-46. In Turkey and even all over the world, we witness those older women are exposed to

---

[82] İstiklal Caddesi'nde gece yürümenin... kadına özgürlük hissi verdiği çok doğru. Yani ben hâlâ orda gece yürüdüğümde, hele gece 00.00'dan sonra yürüdüğümde böyle... Bi yerden çıktım diyelim; bi toplantıdan çıktım ya da işte arkadaşlarla içtik ve eve gidiyorum... Böyle bi tarafta şarkı söyliyenler... işte yürüyen insanlar kadınlı erkekli... bana özgürlük hissi verir yani İstiklal Caddesi'nde böyle gece yürümek. ...gece yürümenin sokağı hissetme anlamında bana daha iyi geldiğini düşünüyorum.

violence up to death in the street. However, as indicated worldwide, younger people (especially women) are at the highest risk of street violence (Almanza Avendaño, Romero-Mendoza & Gómez San Luis, 2022).

Walking in the street at night "as a woman" is addressed by all participants as a vulnerable position with the risk of sexual harassment. Participants' fear of sexual violence is not limited to Beyoğlu. However, they talk about how the axis, which includes Taksim Square and Istiklal Street, becomes more unsafe for women, especially at night. The risk of violence, ranging from catcalling to murder, coerces these women to stay away from the place they fear or to employ some strategies (saving money for calling a taxi, asking for friends to accompany them, etc.) in line with their income level.

> I don't go there at night, no! That's Taksim! I think I don't go out [at night] in general, I don't know. Actually, I used to go out at night in Germany… its day didn't matter, on weekdays or weekends. I used to come back home at night safely, but here … there is no that culture of going out alone [at night]. Why is it so? (she laughs) (Nazlı).[83]

> I would not prefer [to go to İstiklal Street] late at night. I don't prefer to go there when it's secluded, on weekdays. …because it's uncanny. I guess we don't prefer to walk anywhere late at night... I mean it is about feeling unsafe and being in fear of our life, and because of harassment… You can be robbed, you can be catcalled, something bad can happen to you (Güllü).[84]

> Anything can happen in every street, every venue of [Beyoğlu] at any time. If it doesn't happen, we'll be grateful and go home like that. "Wow!" we say, "Nothing happened. It is a surprise!" …I think that all women …prepare themselves psychologically when they go to Beyoğlu. …if she wants to have fun, but has a time limit… If it is after 10:00 PM, she thinks: "What will I take to go back?" …if the place is far from [public] transportation, it may be necessary to return by taxi (Elif).[85]

---

[83] Gecee gitmem [orya], ı ııı. Taksim yani! [Geceleri] genel olarak bi yere çıkmam diye düşünüyorum, bilmiyorum ki. Almanya'da eskiden gidiyodum aslında… hafta içi, hafta sonu hiç fark etmiyodu. Geceleri de rahat rahat dönüyodum ama burda …[gece] yalnız bi yere gitme kültürü de yok. İşte, neden acabaaa? (gülüyor).

[84] Gece geç saatte [İstiklal'e gitmeyi tercih] etmem. Hafta içi tenhayken etmem. …tekinsiz olduğu için. Hiçbir yerde yürümeyi tercih etmeyiz galiba gece geç saatte... Güvende hissetmemek yani. Can güvenliğimiz ya da işte taciz… soyulabilirsin, laf yiyebilirsin, başına bir şey gelebilir.

[85] [Beyoğlu'nun] her an her sokağında, her işletmesinde bir durum yaşanabilir. Yaşanmıyorsa şükrederiz ve öyle gideriz evimize. "Vay beeee!" deriz "Hiçbi şey yaşanmadı. Hayret!" …bütün kadınların …Beyoğlu'na giderken psikolojik olarak ön hazırlık yaptığını

In addition to their gender, socioeconomic statuses shape women's choices in the city. For example, affordable entertainment venues are all male-dense places in Beyoğlu, making them dangerous and full of the threat of sexual violence in the eyes of the participants. In addition to the actors of these places, gender role beliefs and cultural expectations prevent women from having fun alone in places they deem dangerous. Elif, who ran places of entertainment in Beyoğlu for years, explains this situation through women's economic insufficiency. Similarly, Ayşe and Cemile, members of the organizing committee, associate the party held after the FNM with women's right to exist in the city at night. They believe that the after-party provides women an affordable safe space where they can have fun without being concerned about triggers.

> I have worked in entertainment venues [in Beyoğlu] for years and had a chance to observe a lot. … Women feel forced to drink less [alcohol] because they earn less than men do. They have to go home earlier because they face safety problems more than men do... Should a woman take a taxi or a get on bus at night? When should she go to Beyoğlu? When should she leave here? Can she dance, sit in a bar, have a drink, have fun alone? There are quite grueling ways for women… to participate in the entertainment world and exist at night. …gaze, catcalling, taxi drivers… on the bus, on the Metrobus, in the Metro… any harassment incident… Well, when we leave a place after a certain hour… After 10:00 PM, it becomes weird. There is a time for families, quote, unquote, "mothers, wives, and women" to be at home, and it's like a gender prime time (she laughs). When you transgress that [limit], even the taxi driver chooses different words to speak to you (Elif).[86]

> It is a class-based issue for women to be in the street at night because affordable places are mostly male-dominated. You know, there are birahanes. When you consider cheaper places like them, they are uncanny for women. When you look for safer places for women, they're more expensive, or they address the middle-class. That's why it is a class-based issue for women to have fun in the city at night. You know, drinking alcohol and having fun is regarded as something that we don't deserve, as a luxury. It's [perceived as] a luxury and immorality. Here, we are supposed to consider

---

düşünüyorum. …eğer eğlenmek istiyosa, bir zaman sınırını aşıyorsa… 22.00'den sonraysa akşam! bi düşünür yani: "Neyle dönücem?" …gitçeği yer [toplu] ulaşıma uzaksa eğer taksiyle dönmesi gerekebilir.

[86] Yıllardır [Beyoğlu'nda] gece hayatında çalıştım, çok fazla gözlem yapma şansım oldu. … Kadınlar çoğunlukla daha az [alkol] içmek zorunda hissediyolar çünkü erkeklere nazaran daha az kazanıyolar. Evlerine daha erken gitmek zorundalar çünkü erkeklere nazaran daha çok güvenlik problemleri yaşıyolar... Bi kadın gece taksiyle mi gitse, otobüsle mi gitse? Beyoğlu'na kaçta gitse, ordan kaçta çıksa, dans edebilir mi, bi barda oturabilir mi, içki içebilir mi, yalnız başına eğlenebilir mi? Kadın[ların]… eğlence dünyasına ve geceye iştirakında epey meşakkatli yollar söz konusu. …birinin bakışı, laf atması, taksicinin… otobüste, Metrobüs'te, Metro'da… herhangi bi taciz… Yani zaten belli bi saatten sonra çıktığımızda... 22.00'den sonra gariplik başlıyor. Ailelerin —tırnak içersinde—, annelerin, eşlerin, kadınların evde olma saati dediğimiz bi saat var ve böyle toplumsal cinsiyette prime time gibi bi zaman o (gülüyor). Onun dışına çıktığınız zaman taksicilerin diyoloğu bile değişebiliyo.

women's access from home to the factory at night under the title of their [right to the city]… but we cannot talk about drinking [alcohol] and living it up (she laughs) (Cemile).[87]

4.2. "Our Safe Space" and "Lost Ground"

Beyoğlu means a tightrope walking between safe and unsafe spaces for women. Fear of violence causes participants to map safe and unsafe spaces here. Due to their disadvantages, some participants step back from using the places they find unsafe. They form alliances in safe spaces or turn unsafe spaces into safe spaces for themselves by forming alliances therein. Participants associate the places they find unsafe in Beyoğlu with the men, whom they regard as the potential perpetrators of violence and users and "owners" of Beyoğlu. According to the participants, the AK Party government's policy in Beyoğlu in the last 20 years has been transforming the men's profile here. The changing physical appearance of the place and its symbolic meanings make it a place for religious and nationalist men who embrace political Islam and support police forces. Therefore, participants no longer feel safe in this symbolic place where they have been doing activism and using in their everyday lives. As Selek (2014 [2011, p. 175]) named, transgender women's commemoration of their life in Ülker Street created the myth of the "old days" ["eski günler" miti], in which they praised their solidarity and community power. In a similar vein, in this study, research participants regard some symbolic places of Beyoğlu as "stolen." They think they previously had the ownership in Gezi Park, Taksim Square, and İstiklal Street, but they identify the current situation as a territorial loss.

> Let me say that the image of Taksim has deteriorated... the people in the street have also changed a lot. …Middle Eastern tourists came. You know, in the old days… the place was full of tourists from Europe or the US. It was quite different then. Unfortunately, right now, it is not like that. I miss that time too much. That's why I still feel attached to İstiklal [Street] because when I came here as a tourist before, I could feel free while walking in the street. ...I was happy. … to experience that

---

[87] Kadınların gece sokakta olması sınıfsal bi şey çünkü ucuz mekânlar erkek yoğunluklu mekânlar. Hani böyle birahaneler vardır. Daha ucuz mekânlara baktığında kadınlar açısından tekinsizdirler. Kadınlar için daha güvenli içkili mekânlara baktığın zaman daha pahalılar ya da daha orta sınıfa hitap eden şeyler. O yüzden kadınların [kentte] gece eğlenmesinin sınıflı bi tarafı var. Hani içkili eğlence sanki böyle (sessizlik) hakkımız olmayan bi şeymiş gibi ya hayatta. Yani lüks. İnanılmaz bi lüks zaten, aynı zamanda da ahlaksızlık [algısı]. İşte geç saatte fabrikadan eve dönerken sokakta tacize uğramama çerçevesinde [kadınların kent hakkını] konuşabiliriz ama içip sıçma çerçevesinde konuşamayız, (gülüyor) haşa yani!

atmosphere of Turkey. The crowd, the joy… it was beautiful. Unfortunately, we don't have it at the moment (Nazlı).[88]

We already faced house raids because of prostitution. ... Ülker Street was the last place remained [where transgender sex-worker women lived at that time]… They destroyed Cihangir in the 90s. Ülker Street was just isolated. Hortum [Süleyman] came in 1996… then left at the end of 1997. … We had 30 apartments, and we were about 100 people... Only my house and five or six people remained, and they fled (Gönül).[89]

Beyoğlu was actually a liberated region. Beyoğlu was actually ours. We laid claims to that place because it was a place for all marginalized communities. … It is important to be in Beyoğlu because of this. I think the insistence [on walking here for the Feminist Night March] is related to its memory (Anahit).[90]

The most common pattern is the mutual relationship between the participants' place attachment to Beyoğlu and their political identity in the formation of their perceptions of safety. Beyoğlu hosts fearsome actors that I have grouped above, as well as the research participants' allies. Their perceptions of safety are largely related to the presence of familiar places and people from similar sociodemographic backgrounds. Political identities and social relations of the participants play a key role in shaping their safety perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. For example, Cemile finds Tarlabaşı safe due to the presence of leftist fellows. Leyla, who defines herself as a Muslim feminist and says that she could not establish a sense of belonging in Beyoğlu with this identity for years, finds Tarlabaşı dangerous because she cannot establish closeness with its residents. People's perceptions of safe and unsafe spaces base on their positioning. As England and Simon (2010) argue, fear is not a restricted emotion

---

[88] Taksim'in genel olarak imajı mı bozuldu diyeyiiim... insan şeyi (profili) de çok değişti. …Orta Doğu'dan turistler geldi. Hani eskiden… her yer Avrupai yabancı, işte Amerika, bilmem ne… onlarla doluydu. Çok farklı bi ortam vardı. Şu an maalesef [öyle] değil. O zamanııı aşşırı özlüyorum. O yüzden böyle İstiklal'e de bi bağlılığım hâlâ var çünkü eskiden buraya turist olarak geldiğimde, orda yürürken kendimi özgür hissediyodum. ...mutluydum.

… Türkiye'nin havasını hissetmek. O kalabalık, neşe… çok güzeldi. Şu an maalesef yok o.
[89] Zaten fuhuş için sürekli basılıyoduk. ... [Seks işçisi trans kadınların yaşadığı yer olarak] bi Ülker Sokak kalmıştı… Cihangir'i 90'larda darmadağın etmişlerdi. Ülker Sokak daha böyle sotede kalıyodu. Hortum [Süleyman] 96'da geldi… 97'nin sonunda gitti. … 30 tane daire vardı bizim elimizde, 100'e yakın insan... benim ev ve beş-altı kişi kaldıydık, onlar da kaçtılar.

[90] Beyoğlu aslında kurtarılmış bi bölgeydi. Beyoğlu bizimdi yani aslında. Toplumun tüm ötekileştirilmiş kesimlerinin var olduğu bi yer olduğu için sahiplendiğimiz bi yerdeydi. … Beyoğlu'nda olma hâli bu noktada önemli. Bu [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nü burada yapma] ısrarı bence burdan geliyo.

to any sociodemographic characteristics or an identity, however they shape people's perceptions and experiences in the urban context.

Contrary to Anahit, who says that she can only exist at night due to limited choices available for transgender sex workers in the city, participants find night uncanny. After all, some particular places, hours, and actors are perceived safe for some participants and dangerous for others. The fact that the same place seems safe for some participants while insecure for others points to the participants' multiple intersecting identities. Identifying with a feminist and Kurdish identity, being a member of the LGBTI+ community or being a cisgender woman, etc., cause variations among women's experiences and perceptions in and about Beyoğlu. Also, financial sufficiency enables women's urban mobility as it provides them with a chance to access *safer* means of transportation. Participants generally describe Beyoğlu as a place where constraints and opportunities coexist, which provides room for women and their activism, but also danger. There are people (feminists, women, LGBTI+, etc.), spaces (Mis Street, Tel Street, etc.), places of entertainment (Muaf, Şiirci, etc.) together with perpetrators (fascists, religious men, etc.), unsafe spaces (Tophane, Çukurcuma, etc.) and exclusionary spaces (trans-exclusive gay clubs, etc.) in Beyoğlu. As Pain (1991) states,

> The location of women's perceptions of risk, of the actual risks they are exposed to, and of their behavioural responses, are of key importance in understanding how sexual violence affects women. A mistaken assumption common to a more traditional geographical approach is that the physical areas women fear are more important than the symbolic connotations of space; as fear is a psychological phenomenon whether it is justified or not, it is the meanings to which it is attached which are crucial. For individual women the spatial separation of feelings of fear and safety may well be experienced as particular localities, or conversely there may be no clear physical boundaries to what is 'safe' and 'unsafe'. It is of greater significance, though, to study on a broader scale how these spaces are constructed, what they represent, and how cumulatively they might affect women's lives (p. 417).

Women's differences in gender, class, age, marital status, etc., result in myriad forms of inclusion and exclusion in the city. A feminist standpoint can allow us to comprehend how these differences affect some women more than others and shape their spatial access to and mobility in the city. All in all, the research participants experience the fear that women generally experience in the city. They employ some strategies to deal with violence that keep them aside from using public spaces. Women get a chance to confront this emotion, reclaim safe public spaces at night for themselves, and come together with their allies at the FNM. Thus, the FNM is an

assertive strategy among all negotiation strategies. At the same time, Beyoğlu, which has been socio-politically lost for almost all activists, turns into a safe space where women gain spatial control and spatial confidence, *albeit* temporarily and on a limited level, through feminist solidarity and alliance. In the end, participants transform the symbolic place in some respects, as they collectively become visible and feel safe thanks to the *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu that allows women to make physical and symbolic room for themselves in the city.

CHAPTER 5

WOMEN'S EMOTIONS AND BEYOĞLU: TEMPORARY SPACE APPROPRIATION AT THE FEMINIST NIGHT MARCH

> In my everyday life, I don't feel like I belong there when I walk [in the crowd] in İstiklal [Street], but... when all women are [together], it feels like we gathered in a living room in a house. ... [At the Feminist Night March], it feels like the place is ours for that night (Deniz).[91]

This chapter is composed of key findings of the current study. In this part of the thesis, I am going to indicate the effects of the participants' intersecting identities on their motivation to attend the FNM. However, I am here to discuss the complete findings addressing to the effects of the FNM on women's spatial experiences in Beyoğlu by asking "How do women's characteristics and participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu form their spatial experiences in this fluid and symbolic place?" and "How do women's perceptions of safety, attitudes, and actual behaviors take form during and after their participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu?"

In the previous chapter, I discussed that the participants' everyday life (spatial) experiences in Beyoğlu take shape by fear of being exposed to verbal, sexual, and physical violence and mugging of especially three groups of men (men in the street, law enforcement officials, and foreigners) in relation to their gender, age, class, ethnicity, and other sociodemographic characteristics. Having listed the recurring themes, I found that the FNM brings the participants about a chance to appropriate and take over the symbolic place, make room for themselves on their own terms (placemaking), and finally gain spatial confidence in the place where they feel forced to negotiate the fear of crime in their everyday lives. So, this chapter indicates an

---

[91] Normalde İstiklal'de, [o kalabalığın arasında] gezerken oraya ait hissetmiyorum ama… bütün kadınlar [bir arada] olunca böyle bi evin salonunda toplaşmışız gibi hissettiriyo. ... [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nde], o gecelik orası bizimmiş gibi geliyo.

emotional shift from fear of sexual violence to trust and hope since these women attend feminist activism, wherein they form feminist solidarity and alliance. On the other hand, the march shifts the participants' fear of physical and verbal violence into similar yet different forms of fear and anger deriving from the risk of having exposed to male violence and state violence in Beyoğlu. According to the participants' narratives, they ease their fear of men in the street and foreigners because they feel able and confident due to the presence of other women and LGBTI+ individuals. However, they keep being afraid of a group of all-male actors (e.g., residents of unsafe spaces) despite the presence of their allies.. Moreover, transgender participants state that they prefer to be together with their community in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu so as to avoid male violence and TERF violence. However, the FNM makes them encounter women of different feminisms and political stances. Although they can eliminate the risk of being assigned male in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu by staying in their assumed safe spaces and being surrounded by their own community, they meet fear-triggering actors other than dangerous men (police, residents of unsafe spaces, media members, and shopkeepers) at the march: trans-exclusionary feminists who argue with them about having body hair as a marker of their masculinity and *kissy* cisgender women who show extra attention and love [*pandalamak*][92] to transgender women (N=6) while reproducing a subtle form of transphobia. Similarly, Muslim feminist participants (N=2) complain about some "orientalist" women and the media's disproportionate affection at the march, which they have never asked.

Concerning the participants' marching experiences, I found that the march allows almost all participants to have authority and collective visibility since they take over the symbolic place, *albeit* to a limited level and temporarily. It also provides these women with a safe yet risky space. The march appears with the potentials to ease the participants' everyday life fear. Still, it generates other types of fear, mainly about inter (dangerous men including police [Them] versus participants [Us]) and intra-group (participants [Us] versus participants [us]) contestations. So, it has the potential to

---

[92] I have encountered that *pandalamak* is also being used in a good way, interchangeably with hugging. However, in this study, transgender experienced women use this *lubunca* word to indicate "natrans" [cisgender] women's hidden transphobic behaviors and expressions towards transgender women like comparing them with cisgender women and praising their *womanlike* appearance *despite* their trans identity.

transform the participants' fear and anger into trust and hope, yet it causes them to experience a new form of fear and anger due to in-group divergences.

5.1. Fear and Anger at the FNM

5.1.1. Fear and Anger towards "Them"

In their everyday lives, participants are afraid of the men whom I listed in table 4.2 in Beyoğlu. The FNM transforms their fear of sexual violence to some extent. The fear of being subjected to men's sexual harassment is the most recurring trigger that women have in their everyday lives. However, during the march, this fear gives way to the fear of physical violence applied by the police. Still, some participants are afraid of being sexually harassed by men attending the march or by men passing through Beyoğlu at that moment. Also, after the Governor's Office's ban, the police began to block the main street—İstiklal Street—which caused women to be stuck in the dangerous side streets and encounter residents of neighborhoods like Tophane. It consolidated their daily fear experiences.

> …it began something in Taksim: [Middle Eastern] male tourists come and watch [the women in the Feminist Night March] to see what they are doing [here]. And [they] get dizzy when they see the fancy women [at the march], and of course, because they are Muslim tourists… (Güllü).[93]

> …I didn't really kick anyone out of the field by beating, but I looked them in the eye and said, "What are you doing here?" Now, men do not dare to do so, but 4-5 years ago, they were saying "You are talking about feminism. We advocate for women's rights, too, but you don't let us [in]." Of course, I won't! Who are you to come there to protect me? How do I know you're not going to harass any woman here? This is our safe space and it should stay in that way. You have no place here (Eylül).[94]

> For example, the police began to block both the front way [that leads to Taksim] and the two sides of the road [in Tünel]: Şişhane and Tophane. …but they have to open the ways at some point. … They did the same thing in the protests we did for the

---

[93] …şey başladı artık Taksim'de: [Orta Doğulu] erkek turistler geliyo, [bunlar burada] napıyorlar diye [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nde olan kadınları] izliyor. [Yürüyüşte] bir de süslü süslü kadınları görünce [bunların] kafaları uçuyor, tabii bir de Müslüman turist oldukları için…

[94] …kimseyi döverek alandan atmadım gerçekten ama kötü kötü bakmalar, "Senin ne işin var burada" demeler oldu. Şimdi erkekler buna çok cesaret edemiyorlar ama bir 4-5 sene önce "Feminizmden bahsediyorsunuz. Biz de kadın haklarını savunuyoruz ama [katılmamıza] izin vermiyorsunuz" diyorlardı. Vermeyeceğim tabii! Sen kimsin de oraya beni korumaya geliyorsun? Senin orada herhangi bir kadını taciz etmeyeceğini ben nereden bileceğim? Burası bizim güvenli alanımız ve böyle kalması gerekiyor. Senin burada bir yerin yok

İstanbul Convention… they closed the Karaköy side. … We had to leave the place through Tophane. It was safe as we were there as a group, but still a couple of incidents happened. This side [Karaköy] is safe, this side [Tophane] is not. The police [especially] closed the other side and let us go down from here [Tophane] (Sena).[95]

[Since we did not insist on the barricade] someone shouted at me "You are coward"… I actually have relatively little fear of police brutality. ...but I might be afraid of. I would regard this person, who indicates fear as an insult to the "coward," as antifeminist. Well, it is incredible to make a woman feel bad and humiliate her because she is afraid of violence. She can be afraid. I can be afraid, too. There is nothing shameful or wrong about that. Besides, why can't we be afraid of police brutality (she laughs)? (Cemile)[96]

Subjects that make participants feel safe are not limited to women and LGBTI+ individuals at the march. It feels safe to come together with familiar all-male shopkeepers, media members and leftists for some participants (*n*=3: Bengi Su, Çiçek, Nazlı), despite their gender, but it is an exception. On the contrary, others (*n*=17) feel uncomfortable about being surrounded with—particularly cisgender heterosexual—men whom they regard as potential perpetrators of sexual harassment. Among these participants, only Lisa and Elif think that the FNM should be open to anyone who identify with feminism(s). As transgender women who once experienced exclusion in the field, they find it important to be careful about reproducing spatial exclusion. In addition, for some participants, not all women and LGBTI+ individuals constitute trust: There are women representatives of the political parties (the AK Party, the Democracy and Progress Party (DEVA), the Nationalist Movement Party (MHP), the İYİ Party, the Republican People's Party (CHP), and the Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP)), and gay individuals or transgender men, who give participants annoyance as they see their existence as part political promotion and consider them as out of the rightful participants. Beyond these actors, participants indicate a group of men who

---

[95] Polis mesela… hem [Taksim'e giden] ön yolu, hem [Tünel'deki] yolun iki kolunu kapatıyor artık: Şişhane ve Tophane tarafını kapatıyo. …ama bi noktada açmak zorunda. … İstanbul Sözleşmesi eyleminde de yaptı galiba o pisliği… gidip bi de Karaköy tarafını kapattı. … Tophane tarafından inmek zorunda kaldık. Topluca indiğimiz için güvenli oldu ama yine de orda bi iki olay oldu. Şurası [Karaköy] güvenli, bu tarafı [Tophane] değil. Polis bizi [özellikle] burdan [Tophane'den] indirdi, diğer tarafı kapattı.

[96] [Barikatta diretmediğimiz için] "Korkaksın" diye bağırmıştı biri… Ben aslında polis şiddetinden nispeten az korkuyorum. …ki korkabilirim de. [Buradaki] korkuyu korkağa bi hakaret olarak söyleyen insanı antifeminist addederim ben. Yani bi kadının şiddetten korkmasından ötürü ona kötü hissettirmek ve aşağılamaya kalkışmak bence olabilicek şey değil. Korkabilir. Ben de korkabilirim. Bunda ayıp ya da yanlış bi şey yok. Yani neden polis şiddetinden korkmayalım ayrıca (gülüyor)?

try to make their anti-government voice be heard at the FNM, since the FNM became the last protest that endures its claim on Beyoğlu after the Governor's Office's ban. Also, other participants' male companions, including their partners, friends, and family members, in the field cause some participants (*n=3*: Ayşe, Cemile, Oya) to feel fear and anger, especially disappointment which creates tension between them and their women allies.

> Many women come there with their [male] partners. … they hold hands and come there together as a heterosexual couple (she laughs). …There are cisgender men participants like these men. … Women say, "He is not such a patriarchal man" blah blah blah. Those moments become very desperate because you often have to argue with the woman, not the man, and when you say "Leave here" to the man, the woman leaves, too (Cemile).[97]

> We once had an argument [with feminists] because of it. C... and H…. are my [cisgender male] friends. They came [to walk] with us, too. It was in 2016. … All those serious, namely feminist women (she laughs) chased them away. "Leave here, we don't want you here" [they said]. … I was very inexperienced then. "What should I do? How should I send [my friends] away? How can I stop [feminists] to do so?" (she laughs) I was in-between because of the people I love. Women, after all, are of te same gender. ... you can't offend them, you can't offend them either. It was a terrible situation. They got me twice in row (Çiçek).[98]

Participants employ some strategies to respond to fear-triggering actors' potential violence at the march, as well as in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu: In contrast to their everyday life experiences, only one of the participants, Güz, carries weapons to respond to police brutality at the march. Since they feel safe during the march because of being surrounded by their allies, it is obvious that they do not need to employ strategies to ensure their safety for the risk of being subjected to sexual violence as much as they do in their everyday life. On the other hand, a few participants (*n=4*: Gece, Oya, Sena, Anahit) find bringing extra clothes for the risk of getting arrested

---

[97] [Erkek] sevgilisiyle gelen kadınlar [çok oluyor]. …el eleler yani hetero bi çift olarak [geliyor] (gülüyor). …cis erkek katılımları var böyle. … Kadınlar diyo ki "O öyle patriyarkal bi adam değildir" falaaan filan. Çok çaresiz oluyo o anlar çünkü erkeklerle değil, kadınlarla kavga etme durumunda kalıyosunuz çoğunlukla ve kadın da gidiyo adama "Git" dediğinizde.

[98] Bi keresinde bu yüzden [feministlerle] kavga ettik. C... ve H…. diye (cis erkek) arkadaşlarım var. Onlar da [yürüyüşe] geldiler bizimle. 2016'ydı. … Bütün o ciddi, yani feminist olan kadınlar (gülüyor) bunları kovaladılar. "Gidin burdaaan, sizi istemiyoruuuz" [dediler]. … O zamanlar çok acemiydim. "Napsam acaba? [Arkadaşlarımı] nasıl yollasam? [Feministleri] nasıl durdursam? (gülüyor)" Böyle bi arada kaldım çünkü sevdiğim insanlar. E kadınlar da sonuçta hemcinsim benim. …onları da kıramıyosun onları da kıramıyosun. Çok kötü bi durumdu. İki arada bi derede kaldım ben ciddi anlamda.

important, while others (*n*=2: Gece, Lisa) believe it may prevent the risk of harassment on public transportation or being gazed at by their neighbors and family members on the way to home.

> I usually take extra clothes for [the Feminist Night March] with me. … I wear sparkling dresses and attend the march [but] you can be detained there. [Let's suppose] you go to the court, you wait there for a couple of days. In those few days, you become shabby, slightly masculine. … Well, that dress doesn't deserve that face. So I definitely [carry] casual clothes. You can't stand there in that gorgeous dress. Our S… she experienced such a situation once. S… is extremely reckless, she likes to wear racy dress, but she was living with her family then. She cadged a dress off me… for the march. It was a mesh jumpsuit. Anyone can see her undies. She took another dress [to the march] with her because she had to change her dress [on her way home] (Gece).[99]

Although fear is a common and multidimensional emotion in participants' both everyday life and marching experiences in Beyoğlu, their anger is more related to in-group contestations. They feel anger toward the state that becomes visible by means of police forces in the field. However, since participants feel able to endure police brutality together, their anger and fear toward police becomes tolerable. Among dangerous actors in the field, the AK Party government is the most repeatedly expressed actor that triggers participants' anger rather than fear. Participants emphasize that it *stole* what belongs to the participants, then they lost this political ground—Beyoğlu—, which indicates the importance of taking up space in this symbolic place and taking over it during the FNM.

5.1.2. Fear and Anger among Participants (Us versus us)

Two recurring issues among the FNM participants cause in-group contestations: the route and the feminist subject. Participants' fear and anger toward each other emerge from in-group divergences. For example, the route is the most repeated dispute among the organizing committee members and their discontents in the field. Since 2019, when the Governor's Office's ban on İstiklal Street came into effect, the FNM participants

---

[99] Genelde [yürüyüşe] ekstra kıyafet götürürüm. …şıkır şıkır giyinip gidiyorum [ama] ertesi günü… gözaltına alınıyosun. [Diyelim ki] mahkemeye çıkıcan, bikaç gün orda bekliyosun. O bikaç gün içinde paspal oluyosun, hafif laçolaşıyosun (maskülenleşme). … E o elbiseye de o yüz olmaz. O yüzden mutlaka spor şeyler [götürürüm]. Orda o jilet gibi elbiseyle duramazsın yani. Bizim S… de bir kere böyle bi durum yaşadı. S… aşırı rahat bi kadındır, açık giyinmeyi çok sever ama işte o zamanlar ailesiyle beraber yaşıyodu. Eyleme gittiğimizde benden bi tane elbise almıştı… Boydan boyaaa tulum ama file. Sütyeni ve slip külodu görünüyo… [Yürüyüşe] yanında elbise götürmüştü çünkü eve giderken [üzerini] değiştirmesi gerekiyodu.

began to face violence when they tried to access İstiklal Street and walk toward Taksim Square. As a result, they had to gather in Sıraselviler Street in 2019 and 2020 and Cihangir Street in 2022. In both situations, they were forced to leave Beyoğlu by sloping down Karaköy. Some participants (*n*=9) interpret the situation as a collaboration with the government and regard it as a compromise. 4 out of 22 participants remain undecided about the situation. On the other hand, others (*n*=9), especially the organizing committee members, consider the risk of being pushy, which may cause a decrease in women's participation in the FNM. They say that insisting on İstiklal Street makes the participants vulnerable to extreme physical violence in the presence of police forces. As they see themselves as responsible for ensuring the crowd's safety, they mean to take advantage of using other streets in Beyoğlu despite the political importance of İstiklal Street. As Sena—not a committee member—says "[There is] a tension… because of the risk of confronting women with the police while trying to get them to İstiklal [Street]. [The debate about the march's route] is shaped around the safe space discussion."[100]

> [Since the İstiklal ban], the organizing committee members tend to direct [participants] towards Karaköy. It is because of the agreement they made with the police. "Read the press release in Sıraselviler. Then convince them to go back. Nobody should try to reach [Taksim]." This is how the deal was made. The police do not intervene because they know that the committee will direct us back to Karaköy. Whenever we say, "We will go to Taksim, İstiklal [Street]," we face police brutality. ... The committee's decision about going back to Karaköy is a setback. It means the renunciation of Taksim, the space that has already been won (Eylül).[101]

> We were there on the first march blocked by the police. Where were you (the committee)! when we were resisting, and we get beat? Were you in Taksim? Have you been in Sıraselviler for 18 years? … Instead of walking to Sıraselviler, and Karaköy, applauding and turning back, I prefer to walk in the corridor of my house.

---

[100] Kadınları İstiklal [Caddesi'ne] çıkarmaya çalışırken polisle çok fazla karşı karşıya getirmenin yarattığı bi gerginlik [var]. [Rota tartışması] güvenli alan tartışması üzerinden şekilleniyor.

[101] [İstiklal yasağından beri] komitenin Karaköy'e yürütme yönelimi var. Bu yönelim aslında polisle yaptığı anlaşmadan geliyor. "Basın açıklamasını Sıraselviler'de oku. Sonra kitleyi geri gönder. Kimse, [Taksim'e] gitmeye çalışmasın." Bu şekilde bir anlaşma yapılıyor. Polis Karaköy'e geri yürünüleceğini bildiği için müdahale etmiyor. Ne zaman ki "Biz Taksim'e, İstiklal'e çıkacağız" dediğimizde polis saldırısıyla karşılaşıyoruz. ... Eylem komitesinin Karaköy'ü seçmesi bir gerilemedir. Taksim'den, kazanılmış alandan bir vazgeçiştir.

The same thing! You have not been [in Karaköy] for 18 years. You did not get the achievements there (Güz).[102]

Many women, from 7 to 70, attend [this march]. When we insist on İstiklal [Street], we actually ruin that safe space. This I what happened in 2019. I was with my friends who had their children with them, and they had a lot of trouble because [the police] pushed us as a result of that insistence. … Therefore, it makes much more sense to walk to Sıraselviler or Karaköy as an alternative route. … That's why I resent the women who don't consider the decision of [walking to Karaköy] (Meryem).[103]

As the organizer of the march, you experience the following pressure: [There are two tendencies]. One of them (she laughs) is the revolutionary vein. "Let's push the barricade, let's reach there, if we can't do it, let's get detained" [they say.] They say, "This [place] is ours." They get upset when others do not insist on that place. Another vein is about those who come there because they can still feel safe there. They do not feel comfortable being a part of the fight that makes the protesters vulnerable to police brutality. … in 2019 we laid on the barricade and the police repelled us. For some participants, it was a great, heroic story, for others it felt very insecure and unhappy. We set ourselves a responsibility: "This march must continue" we say. There is a crowd composed of 10,000 women and LGBTI+ individuals. We must do our best to keep this crow together (Cemile).[104]

…the committee is working to create a space where women and LGBTI+ individuals feel safe. That's why the committee sets itself responsible. If you ignore that responsibility and say "I do what I want," you make a mistake. ... In 2021, on November 25, [the feminist group we disagreed with about the barricade] stayed there

---

[102] [Polisin] engellediği ilk… yürüyüşte biz oradaydık. Orada direniyorken, dayak yiyorken sen neredeydin [platform]? Taksim'de miydin mesela? 18 yıldır orada mıydın, Sıraselviler'de miydin? … Ben Sıraselviler'e, Karaköy'e yürüyüp alkışlayıp döneceğime evimin koridorunda yürürüm. Aynı şey! 18 yıldır [Karaköy'de] değilsiniz. Şu an içinde bulunduğunuz birçok kazanımı da orada elde etmediniz.

[103] 7'den 70'e birçok kadın gelebiliyor [bu yürüyüşe]. İstiklal konusunda ısrarcı davranınca o güvenli ortamı aslında kırmış oluyoruz biraz. 2019'da bu yaşandı. Yanımda çocuklu arkadaşlarım vardı ve baya zorluk çektiler çünkü [polis] sıkıştırdı bizi o ısrarın sonucunda. … O yüzden alternatif olarak Sıraselviler'de ya da Karaköy'e yürümek çok daha mantıklı. … Onun için [Karaköy'e yürüme] kararını dinlemeyen kadınlara biraz sitem ediyorum.

[104] Yürüyüşün organizasyonunu yapan insan olarak şöyle bi baskı yaşıyosun: [İki eğilim var]. Bunlardan biri (gülüyor) devrimci damar. "Barikatı zorlayalım, meydana çıkalım, çıkamıyosak gözaltına alınalım. Burası bizim" diyen ve bu yapılmadığında yürüyüşten mutsuz olanlar var. Bi diğer damar da aslında kendini hâlâ orada güvende hissedebildiği için oraya gelen ve eylemcileri polis şiddetine açık kılan hareketlere kendini uzak hissedenler. … 2019'da barikata yüklendik ve polis püskürttü. Kimisi için müthiş bi kahramanlık hikâyesiydi bu, kimisi kendini çok güvensiz ve mutsuz hissetti. Bütün bu şeyler içersinde biz bi sorumluluk biçtik kendimize: "Bu yürüyüşün devam etmesi lazım." Burda 10.000'lerce kadın ve LGBTİ+'nın oluşturduğu kalabalık var. Bu kalabalığın dağıtılmaması için elimizden geleni yapmamız gerek.

on their own and could do nothing. … Well, it means that it was the crowd that strengthened them (Ayşe).[105]

[Those who want to push the barricade] are adventurous. So, you come and lay into the barricade first. Who can come the next year? Think about HDP. Hundreds of people would gather even for the smallest incidents. I can't even see them now. Now they cannot come together… Fear … How can you gather people after you cause them to get beat up. Beating is not the only risk, you would also be arrested (Gönül).[106]

İstiklal Street, Sıraselviler Street and Karaköy are not given the same importance within the scope of the political meanings attributed to Beyoğlu. İstiklal Street is described as *AKP'nin kırmızı çizgisi* [the redline of the AKP], so the participants interpret the bans on social movements that took place in Beyoğlu before as the purification of space for the sake of the revitalization projects of the AK Party Government. According to the participants, Karaköy and Sıraselviler Street serve as places of excile. Meryem describes this exile situation as follows: "[Karaköy] is one of the places where the government directs women in every dispute about the route. This is where the main disagreement sprouts. [Some say that] are we listen to their order?"[107] However, participants want to gather in and transform İstiklal Street, not Sıraselviler Street or Kadıköy, because they experience violence in their everyday lives here in Beyoğlu.

Beyoğlu, especially İstiklal Street, as a politically sacralized place, witnesses conflicts between the police and the protestors. Depending on the participants' experiences, the street appears to be both the locus and the focus of the tension between these actors. It is a site of struggle, with its physical and symbolic dimensions, where these actors employ strategies and contra strategies to prove their power and make their claims

---

[105] …kadınların ve LGBTİ+'ların kendilerini güvende hissedeceği bi alan yaratmak için çalışıyo o komisyon. Komisyon kendini o yüzden sorumlu hissediyo. Sen o sorumluluğu yok sayarak "İstediğimi yaparım" [dersen] yanlış yaparsın. ... Geçen 25 Kasım'da, [barikat konusunda ters düştüğümüz feminist grup] alanda kendi kendilerine kaldı ve bi şey yapamadı. … Demek ki onları güçlendiren şey o kalabalıkmış.

[106] [Barikatı zorlayanlar] maceraperest. O zaman buyur, önden dal bakalım. Kim gelicek seneye? E düşün bak HDP'yi. Ufacık şeye bile kaç yüz kişi geliyolardı. Hiç göremiyorum bile artık ben onları. Şimdi getiremiyolar. Korku … İnsanları kafasını gözünü yardırdıktan sonra bi daha nasıl getirirsin? Bi de dayak yemekle kalmıyor… tutuklanıyosun.

[107] İktidarın kadınları her tartışmada yönelttiği yerlerden biri Karaköy. Temel tartışma da burdan çıkıyo. "Dediklerini mi yapacağız?" denildiğini duyuyorum.

visible. The authority assumes the form of law enforcement officials in the march's route. It also mediates its power and pressure through politicians' discourses, city surveillance cameras, limitations over public transportation, etc. From physical to social strategies, the spectrum aims to intimidate protesters. Projects and discourses crystalize in *firstspace* and *secondspace*, whereas the diversity of power relations indicates the existence of *thirdspace*. Although İstiklal Street is controlled, limited, and banned, women participating in the FNM experience Beyoğlu with its almost all backstreets and side streets that they do not prefer to appropriate in their everyday lives.

Besides the route, participants have different opinions about the subjects that can participate in the march. Although many of them (*n=17*) are uncomfortable with men's participation, some (*n=3*), at least once, attended the march with their male partners, friends, or family members. Some participants (*n=5*) say that men can be the subjects of feminist thought and demand women's rights together. A group of participants, composed mostly of transgender women, agreed with the others that the participation of cisgender men is controversial; however, they argue that especially transgeder and gay men can attend this march as rightful participants because they experience disadvantages of their gender identities and sexual orientations. Men's participation is a controversial matter because some participants think they can trigger women's fear of being subjected to sexual harassment, while others think that men need to give up appropriating all public spaces at least for that night—March 8—in Beyoğlu, so as to women be in safe.

> Men really need to leave an area without men! This goes for gay, transgender, cisgender, and heterosexual men as well. We need man-free airspace. That night (the FNM) [is] for that. That's the essence of [this march] … [Some men say] "I don't need to be there. I need to leave that space to women." Some gay men prefer to stay away [there], and (she smiles) I think it's a very honorable behavior (Veronika).[108]

> [I attend this march] to say, "The street is mine. The night belongs to me, and this [place] is mine." If [men] don't let my voice be heard there, that will be the worst thing they can do. … You (men) can support me by staying out and listening to us (women and LGBTI+ individuals). [I think that men's insistence on participating in the march]

---

[108] Erkeklerin gerçekten bir alanı erkeksiz bırakması gerekiyor artık! Bu gay, trans, cis, hetero erkekler için de geçerli. Erkeksiz hava sahasına ihtiyacımız var. O gece bunun için [var]. Olayı bu zaten [bu yürüyüşün] … [Bazı erkekler] "Orda bulunmama gerek yok. O alanı da kadınlara bırakmam gerekiyo" diyo. [Oraya] gelmeyen gay erkekler var ve (tebessüm ediyor) bu çok onurlu bi davranış bence.

is a great example of Jacobinism. Men think that "I defend women's rights on their behalf." So I think that [the march] should be closed to men's participation and voice (Güllü).[109]

Women are main subjects of this march. I mean transgender women and non-transgender (cisgender) women… But if you mean the supporters… I think heterosexual men and gays can also come to support… (long silence) but I don't trust them. Even in that place… harassment, teasing… they can perpetrate. No! Men should not participate… I gave up. Masculinity does no vanish (Gece).[110]

Aaah this issue… "Men should not come. Let men die" or something… I know from my own experience at home, my spouse is a very feminist person. He always stands behind me. … He also attended these marches several times. ... I think men can attend the march, if they want. … A man can be as feminist as I am (Nazlı).[111]

Wooden (2000), Coe and Sandberg (2019), and Sandberg and Coe (2020) show that feminist activism is a tactical choice through the consideration of the TBTN march. Baytok (2014) and Hvala (2012) insist on the same idea by analyzing the Gezi Park protests and street protests in Ljubljana, respectively. As they consider, street protests are a routinized performance where women and transgender individuals challenge patriarchal gender beliefs for themselves and others as agents—participants and organizers—. In this sense, I agree with these scholars as they find that the marches denote women and transgender individuals' spatial resistance. The FNM, in a similar sense, is organized and participated by women, transgender and non-binary+ individuals while cisgender men's participation is mainly perceived as taboo. As I attended several meetings, the march has been organized with feminist efforts and tense decision-making processes. Women gain agency as they determine where to

---

[109] [Ben bu yürüyüşe] "Sokak benim, gece benim, burası benim" demeye gidiyorum. [Erkekler orada] benim sesimin duyulmasına izin vermiyorlarsa o onların yapacağı en büyük kötülük zaten. … Senin olacağın destek kenarda durup [bizi: kadınları ve LGBTI+ bireyleri] dinlemek yani. [Yürüyüşe katılma ısrarlarının] "Onun hakkını, onun adına ben savunuyorum" gibi dev bir jakobenlik olduğu[nu düşünüyorum.] O yüzden [yürüyüşün] kesinlikle erkek katılımına ve erkek sesine kapalı olması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.

[110] Oranın asıl özneleri kadınlar. Yani trans kadınlar ve natrans (cisgender) kadınlar… Ama destekçi olarak dersen… bence heteroseksüel erkekler ve gayler de desteğe gelebilir… (uzun sessizlik) ama işte güvenmiyorum. Orda bile… tacizdi, laf atmaydı… yaparlar yani. Yok… erkekler eklenmesinler ya… vazgeçtim. O erillik geçmiyor.

[111] Yaaaa bu tartışma… "Erkekler gelmesin. Erkekler ölsün" falan filan… Ben evden biliyorum, eşim çok feminist bi insan. Her zaman da arkamda durur. … O da bikaç kez katıldı …bu genel yürüyüşlere. E erkekler istiyolarsa gelebilirler bence. … Erkek de benim kadar feminist olabilir.

walk, which slogans to chant, whom to include, how to sneak unpermitted objects through the control points, etc. in these meetings. In addition to the planning phase, women practice the nighttime walk collectively at the march. Therefore, in my thesis, the FNM as part of feminist activism appears to be an umbrella strategy that paves the way for women's active use of Beyoğlu besides other strategies women employ to access and stay in the street: It eventually works as an ambivalent strategy that women employ to confront gendered spatial reproduction and their representation as fearful and passive users of the city.

Trans-exclusionary feminists do not recognize transgender women as women. In this study, there are no trans-exclusionary women. First of all, this is a limitation that emerges from my standpoint. I could have interviewed with these women, who are not in my network, purposively for the sake of this study, but I did not. Since this study concerns gender self-identification, I did not want to contradict myself. Except for these, the participants could have expressed a similar opinion, but it did not happen. The findings of this study do not indicate a disagreement about transgender women's participation in the FNM. However, as transgender women state, and the organizing committee members admit, transgender women's previous experiences of participating in the march are traumatic. Transgender women, whose participation in the FNM was not welcomed a few years ago, say that the march reminds them of their traumatic experiences about their involvement in feminist activism. On the other hand, the organizing committee members say that they decided to call cisgender and transgender women to the march in order to avoid gender reassignment after it became hard to control the ever-increasing population.

> TERFs describe feminism in which cisgender women are naturally the subjects because they think that only women with cunts are sacred, or only the women with cunts are women. But on the contrary, we argue that transgender women, transgender men and LGBTI+ individuals are the subjects of feminism and the Feminist Night March (Anahit).[112]

> While I was in [body/gender] confirmation process… I was not accepted into the field because I was transgender… "Why?" I said, "I'm a woman too. "This is a controversial issue for us at the moment" they said. So, this is one of the traumatic

---

[112] TERF'ler sadece amı olan kadınların kutsallığı olduğunu ya da amı olanların kadın olduklarını düşündükleri için doğalında cis kadınların öznesi olduğu bir feminizm anlatıyo. Ama biz tam tersi, trans kadınların da trans erkeklerin de LGBTİ+'ların da feminizmin ve bu gece yürüyüşünün öznesi olduğunu savunuyoruz.

stories for me. … Transgender women's or other individuals' (of LGBTI+ community) experiences about participating in this march are very traumatic (Elif).[113]

Some transgender participants keep being excluded by cisgender women in the field, and their gender identity is questioned. They regard some cisgender women's behaviors as ass-kissing and uncandid. Such experiences trigger their fear of being assigned male at the march. In order to prevent this, some of them (*n*=3) choose to display a more feminine appearance at the march that they do not embrace in their everyday lives.

> Before my [Hormone Replacement Therapy (HRT)] process, I wouldn't cut my beard when it didn't grow too long. … I didn't have any problems about it [in my everyday life], but I always wanted to dress up [in order not to be assigned a man] especially for women's movements. When I go there, women say, "You are so beautiful. You are beautiful even more than I am!" You know, she means that "I am the original woman, but you are more beautiful than me as a man." I go crazy then! (Anahit).[114]

> I preferred to dress very feminine for the Feminist Night March on purpose because… [my body] was masculine then. At that time, I had not yet started the [HRT] process. In order to prevent others' gaze and humiliation, I even wore exaggerated make-up. I even wore a wig (Gece).[115]

In addition to transgender participants' traumatic experiences, Muslim feminist participants experienced similar stress in participating in the march. They likewise state those days are over, although they still encounter other participants and the media's excessive attention, which makes them feel frustrated.

> There were more orientalist types [at the march before]: "Oh, how beautiful, you are here TOO. (she smiles) Oh, it's so cute. It's so nice of you to be here, TOO!" [they

---

[113] [Beden/cinsiyet] Uyum sürecindeyken… alana alınmamıştım trans olmam sebebiyle… "Neden?" demiştim, "Ben de bi kadınım." "Şu an bizim için tartışmalı bi konu bu" demişlerdi. O yüzden benim için travmatik öykülerden biridir bu. … Trans kadınların ya da [LGBTİ+ içindeki] öteki bireylerin yürüyüşe katılma deneyimleri çok travmalıdır.

[114] [Hormone Replacement Therapy (HRT)] sürecimin öncesinde sakalım çok uzamadığında kesmezdim. … [Gündelik yaşamımda] sıkıntı yaşamıyordum ama kadın eylemlerine özellikle [erkek atanmamak için] süslenip gitmek istiyodum. Gittiğimde kadınlar… "Ay çok güzelsin. Benden bile! güzelsin" [falan diyor.] Hani "Ben orjinal kadınım ama sen erkek hâlinle benden bile güzelsin" diyo aslında. Çıldırıyorum!.

[115] Feminist Gece Yürüyüşlerine… özellikle çok kadınsı giyinmeyi tercih ederdim çünkü o zamanlar… erkeksiyim diye. O zaman daha [HRT] süreç[ine] başlamamıştım. O bakışmaları, aşağılamaları biraz daha azaltmak için daha bi abartı makyaj yaparak… peruk taktığım bile olmuştu yani.

said]… Compliments, applause, asking to be photographed together, so on. Well, it has changed a lot [because] it has been teased a lot [with this attitude] (Leyla).[116]

I would like veiled women to attend [the march] more. There is a prejudice on feminists. They are regarded as women who wear miniskirt or loose women… I become very happy when I see veiled women at the march. Also… I think we should strengthen or encourage that community a little more (Bengi Su).[117]

All in all, the FNM alleviates the participants' everyday life fear triggers like the risk of being exposed to sexual harassment in Beyoğlu because women think they form the majority here. However, it prolongs their fear of being subjected to physical violence of the state by means of police and other actors who have the same political stance as the government: shopkeepers, media members; fascist, religionist, Islamist, and bigot residents. On the other hand, the march triggers participants' fear and anger because of in-group contestations.

The supposedly passive users of the city, who are women in the scope of the relevant literature, reclaim their right to the city and give room for their spatial practices by employing feminist activism as an umbrella strategy: FNM participants create a temporary safe space of their own, which they constitute through their presence and interactions with others in Beyoğlu. On the other hand, they face contestations because they cross the boundaries of "a woman's place" in the city. The situation shows public space is not only a physical entity that is already determined, but it is a lived space with spatial practices and social interactions. Eventually, this study acknowledges that crossing the ascribed boundaries and taking up space in the center of the city does not vanish the patriarchal power relations while proving that the gendered organization of space is not fixed and impermeable but transformable thanks to assertive strategies like feminist activism.

---

[116] [Önceden yürüyüşte] daha oryantalist tipler oluyodu: "Aaah ne kadar güzel, siz de burdasınız. (gülümsüyor) Ya çok tatlıı. Burda olmanız çok güzel bi şey sizin DE!" falan [diyorlardı]… Tebrik etmeler, alkışlar, beraber fotoğraf çekilmek istemeler. Eee artık o baya azaldı [çünkü] baya dalga geçildi bu [tavırla].

[117] Başörtülü kadınların [yürüyüşe] daha çok katılmasını isterim. Genelde feminist eşittir mini etekli, "yollu kadın"… önyargı[sı] var ya. Kapalı kadınların da geldiğini gördüğümde çok mutlu oluyorum. Bi de… bence o kesimi biraz daha güçlendirmeliyiz veya cesaretlendirmeliyiz.

5.2. Trust and Hope at the FNM

Participants assert that marching in Beyoğlu, "the most symbolic place in Turkey", together with other women and LGBTI+ individuals, gives them a sense of ownership that they have never experienced. They argue they provide the majority during the march in Beyoğlu, so they do not worry about the risk of being exposed to sexual violence here. They keep repeating that men in the street cannot gaze, harass, or hurt women at the march because the place, *albeit* temporarily, belongs to the participants. As they indicate solidarity and alliance as the prominent conditions for their safety in Beyoğlu in their everyday lives, "being surrounded by reliable people" allows them to create safe space for women and LGBTI+ individuals at the march. At the FNM, Beyoğlu becomes a place where women find common ground despite their differences, which allows them to experience safety and spatial confidence.

> We have differences… but our problems are so similar and emerge from the same things. … Therefore, there are too many people that can attend this march, from people whose intersecting identities cause them to experience inequality to members of vulnerable communities… people who are libertarian, want to form solidarity, have the awareness… Regardless their gender identity, these people can attend the march because there are many groups who experience a similar type oppression that women experience (Elif).[118]

Not all participants have the urge to occupy İstiklal Street, yet all of them indicate the importance of having walked there. Regarding İstiklal Street and other symbolic places like Taksim Square and Mis Street, participants identify Beyoğlu as the most important place in the history of feminist activism in Turkey. Women exist with the risk and fear of being exposed to verbal, sexual, and physical violence in their everyday lives therein. However, in this study, I found that they experience spatial control as organizers and participants at the FNM. That's why I argue that marching in Beyoğlu provides the participants with agency that derives from taking over the symbolic place and placemaking for themselves through feminist solidarity and alliance: They take strength from each other at the march while resisting against the police and other potentially dangerous men, whom they feel forced to tolerate when they are alone at night in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu. As almost all participants repeated, the FNM

---

[118] Farklılıklarımız var… ama sorunlarımız o kadar benzer ve aynı yerlerden geliyo ki. … O yüzden [bu yürüyüşe] kesişeni de bileşeni de gelebilir; özgürlükçü, dayanışmacı, çeşitli farkındalıklara sahip olan… o kadar çok "gelebilir insan" var ki. Cinsiyet tanımaksızın bu arada çünkü bu sistemde kadınların ezilmesine benzer ezilen bi sürü grup var.

opens room for them in the city at night. Participants exist in Beyoğlu "as they are/want," without worrying about their outfit, tone of their voice, time of their walk, etc. during the march because they trust women and LGBTI+ individuals whom they see as their allies:

> I won't be able to go there on March 9 as I appeared on March 8 because March 8 [creates] a moment when I can be free. … I walk there on March 7 with fear and anxiety… On March 8… I walk there with confidence. My anxiety vanishes! March 8 is the day I experience the least fear for if "Can a man harass me [in Beyoğlu]". …all women are [at the march], there. How can I feel safe more? (Veronica).[119]

> I attend this march in clothes that I do not normally wear, do not prefer to wear, or hesitate to wear. … We have a deep-seated fear [about dancing in public], but on March 8 … we will be the ones dancing around those who play tambourines or erbane. I dance there in a miniskirt or whatever I want to wear… I live it up. This is not something I normally do, but we don't be afraid of if "we will be harassed, someone will say something or look at us in a bad way" (Eylül).[120]

Since the participants think they are surrounded by their allies at the march, the fear of being exposed to sexual violence is no longer a problem. Regarding their repeated expressions, the FNM creates a moment in which participants are beyond the risk of "ordinary men's sexual harassment". It offers the participants a safe space where some of them discover their *personas* and *capabilities*, while others can bring their *full selves* into existence without having to hide themselves or filter their behaviors. English (2004, p. 100) refers to Bhabha's cultural third space[121] as a site of fluidity, where one's identity is constructed, reconstructed, or deconstructed: "Third space is where

---

[119] 9 Mart'ta oraya 8 Mart'taki görünüşümle gidemiycem ama 8 Mart'ta gidiyorum çünkü… özgür olabildiğim bi an [yaratıyor.] … 7 Mart'ta orda korkarak, kaygılı bi şekilde yürürken… 8 Mart'ta… özgüvenli bi şekilde yürüyorum. Kaygım sıfıra iniyo! "Bir erkek beni [Beyoğlu'nda] taciz eder mi" korkusunu en az yaşadığım gün 8 Mart. …tüm kadınlar [yürüyüşte], orada. Daha ne kadar güvende hissedebilirim ki?

[120] …yürüyüşe normalde giymediğim, belki tercih etmediğim belki de giymekten çekindiğim kıyafetlerle gidiyorum. … [Kamusal alanlarda dans etmekle ilgili] içimize sinmiş bi korku var ama 8 Mart'ta… tef ya da erbane çalanların etrafında dans eden bizler oluruz. Orda mini etekle ya da ne giymek istiyosam onunla kendimi kaybetmişçesine dans [ederim]. Bu benim normalde yapabileceğim bir şey değil ama "Taciz edilir miyiz, biri bi şey der mi, kötü bakar mı" korkumuz yok.

[121] Cultural third space, which Homi Bhabha deals with from a postcolonial perspective, is not included in this study as it is a theory mainly about the hybridity of identities. Scholars who talk about *thirdspace* basically use this term to indicate ambiguity, fluidity, and potentiality to show that power relations are neither total nor fixed.

we negotiate identity and become neither this nor that but our own. Third is used to denote the place where negotiation takes place, where identity is constructed and re-constructed…"

Besides *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu, from the departure of English's standpoint, I believe that the FNM, with its social and historical aspects, itself is a *thirdspace* where participants negotiate space and their own identities, then become more comfortable with themselves. It is a movement that opens the way for so-called abnormal identities, bodies, and performances. As Meryem says, marching at the FNM allows her to kiss her same-gender partner, although she does not have the confidence to perform it in her everyday life in Beyoğlu. As is understood from the participants' experiences at the FNM, this march forms *a spatial moment* in which participants transform the space as well as their selves. In the end, they behave in the way they want: dance, walk, or kiss their same-gender partner without concern but with *confidence*.

> Feminist Night March changed me a lot. …[that's] where I reveal my personas. It is a place where I can dance in the middle of İstiklal [Street], sing songs… If a man says something, I oppose him there. Normally, I'm not a very brave person [but] this march… turns into a place where I feel much stronger (Leyla).[122]

> You have only one day in a whole year to walk there, where you walk with a constant anxiety in your daily life, with your friends, with bells on. There is such a mode of walking called "Meryem's March 8 marching mode." Even I am astonished for my behavior. Only one day in 365 days… I love to walk around and dance in the streets of [Beyoğlu]. … For example, being able to kiss my [same-gender] partner in İstiklal [Street], Sıraselviler [Street]… Except for this march, it is not possible for me to do such thing there (Meryem).[123]

Participants' conceptualization of sexual harassment is still correlated with men's existence. However, men become *invisible* or *ignored* because participants discern that

---

[122] Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü beni çok değiştirdi. …[orası] personalarımı ortaya çıkardığım bi yer. Orası İstiklal'in ortasında dans edebildiğim, şarkılar söylediğim… bi erkek laf atıyosa ona karşı çıktığım [bir yer]. Normalde çok cesur bi insan değilim [ama] gece yürüyüşü … kendimi çok daha güçlü hissettiğim bi yere dönüşüyo.

[123] Sürekli tedirgin hâlde yürüdüğün caddede senede sadece bir gün! arkadaşlarınla güle oynaya yürüyorsun. … "Meryem'in 8 Mart yürüyüş modu" diye bir şey var. Yani ben bile şok oluyorum. 365 günde sadece 1 gün… [Beyoğlu] sokaklarında hoplaya zıplaya gezmeye, dans etmeye bayılıyorum. … Mesela [same-gender] partnerimle İstiklal'de, Sıraselviler'de öpüşebilmem… 8 Mart gece yürüyüşü dışında orda öyle bir şey yapma ihtimalim yok benim.

they are more crowded. Eventually, participants' confidence emerges from their feminist solidarity and alliance formed by themselves in the field.

> I encounter men [at the walk], but I didn't come across a man who says something to the participants. I'd probably get angry though, but frankly speaking (in a condescending way), I don't get triggered… We are 45,000 people. Here, (emphasis) we are 45,000 people! What if you (men) look at me? [But] it's something to face that man'a gaze it that crowd… and encounter him after [the crowd] has dispersed… (Deniz).[124]

> For example, right now (midnight), thousands of women are walking in İstiklal Street, but they are not organized. That's why, thousands of women are subjected to harassment there. [In the Feminist Night March], [no one] except the police… or the ordinary men who use İstiklal Street, can harass us… because that place belongs to us. It's ours in those hours! (Veronica).[125]

Beyoğlu, in the conjunction of İstiklal Street and Taksim Square, where different actors testify each other's power and employ different strategies, is contested. İstiklal Street frames FNM participants' experiences in real and imagined ways. Eventually, it matters as it is integral to constructing and maintaining women's identities and the visibility of their claims. Participants stake a claim on collective visibility at the FNM. Although they come from different cultural, economic, and social backgrounds, they gather and reclaim their rights together. As Mies (1979, p. 20-21) claims, women belong to the same social category, and "This general feeling of 'being on the same side… [helps] to overcome the usual barrier between people from different classes and cultures." In this study, participants likewise say that the FNM offers them a chance to encounter their allies and find common ground despite their differences. Vaiou and Kalandides (2009) assert that "Others" may find common ground when they share exclusion in the city. Women, likewise, in their everyday lives and at the march, share exclusion in Beyoğlu at different levels. When they share otherness at the march, they perhaps become less strange to each other. In that way, they become visible to each

---

[124] [Yürüyüşte] erkeklere denk geliyorum ama ordakilere laf atan bi erkeğe denk gelmedim. Sinirlenirim herhalde öyle olsa ama çok da açıkçası (küçümseyen bi ifadeyle) "triggerlanmam" (tetiklenmem) … 45.000 kişiyiz hani. Burada zaten (üzerine basa basa söylüyor) 45.000! kişiyiz. Sen baksan n'olur? [Ama] o kalabalığın içinde görmek başka bi şey bunu … [kalabalık] dağıldıktan sonra… görmek başka.

[125] Mesela şu anda (gece yarısı) da binlerce kadın yürüyo İstiklal Caddesi'nde ama örgütlü değil. O yüzden mesela binlerce kadın tacize maruz bırakılıyor orda. [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nde], polis dışında [kimse]… ya da İstiklal Caddesi'ni kullanan standart erkekler bizi taciz edemiyo… çünkü orası bizim zaten. Orası o saatlerde bizim!

other before they become visible to the government. So, the FNM has the potential to consolidate the group identity and the bond between participants while making visible in-group contestations.

> Women are really different from each other… but it is the fact that we all find a common ground because we are women and we experience the same type of oppression. [Walking at this march] provides another form of interaction there: coming together in the street, fighting together… For example, the protest is over, but we don't disperse. We talk, we hug, we kiss each other… [Feminist Night March] causes different women to find a common ground and be in juxtaposition for only one reason with power (Tülin).[126]

> At the march …there were transgender people who exposed their tits. I'm not saying it has to be, but I really like to see it (she laughs). I mean, I think that those who are excluded as "unacceptable" should especially participate in this march. … It is very important that [the acceptable and the unacceptable subjects] come together because normally… they don't come together. Veiled women and transgender women there… I think it's beautiful (Güllü).[127]

> All women shout [at the march] together for one purpose. This is very nice. In everyday life… sometimes women can be hostile to each other, but you can see solidarity in that space. For example, when it is heard that "the police are coming," they secretly try to help [one another] (Bengi Su).[128]

> The [Feminist Night March] is something that builds confidence in us because I know that here, at this hour… there is an individual who will speak for me. … Normally I have to hide myself, but in that day I do not. In the public space, I feel strong when I'm on the bus, or walking in the street. … It is not possible for any shopkeeper to

---

[126] Kadınlar gerçekten birbirinden çok farklı… ama bizi orda ortaklaştıran kadın olmamız, aynı ezilmeyi yaşamamız. [Yürüyüş] orda başka bi etkileşim sağlıyo, sokakta yan yana gelmek, birlikte mücadele etmek… Mesela eylem bitiyo ama dağılmıyoruz. Konuşuyoruz, sarılıyoruz, öpüşüyoruz… [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü] çok farklı kadının tek bi sebeple ortaklaşıp gerçekten güçlü bi şekilde yan yana gelmesi[ne neden oluyor].

[127] …memelerini açan translar vardı. Ben bu illa olmalı demiyorum ama görmek çok hoşuma gidiyor (gülüyor). Yani "makbul olmayanlar" diye dışlananların özellikle katılması gerektiğini düşünüyorum. … [Makbul olanlarla olmayanların] bir araya gelmesi çok önemli çünkü normalde… bir araya gelmiyorlar. Başörtülü, trans kadının orada olması… bence çok güzel.

[128] Bütün kadınlar [bu yürüyüşte] hep birlikte, tek bir amaç için haykırıyorlar. Bu çok güzel. Normal yaşantıda… bazen kadınlar birbirine düşmanlık yapabiliyo ama o ortamda birliği görebiliyosunuz. Mesela "Polis geliyo" denince gizli gizli [birbirlerine] yardım etmeye çalışıyolar.

harass me [in Beyoğlu that day]. There are tens of women or [LGBTI+] individuals who will shout with me when I shout (Güz).[129]

[At the march] in 2019, a woman came up to me and asked, "What are you doing here?" "What are you doing here?" she said. I was shocked. I said, "Who are you? How can you dare you to ask it? You shouldn't be here." "Anyone asking me that is not a feminist" I said. She moved away from me so quickly. I quickly ran over to her and looked at in the eye again. "This place belongs to me!" I said. "I am the subject here. You can't come and do this to me" I said. "You'll get used to it" I said. "This is male violence" I said. Then a few people came, they drove her away. She was just that shocked. I think she regretted then (Lisa).[130]

As they all argue, marching in this symbolic place gives participants a sense of power. According to the participants, it is important to march in Beyoğlu because it intimidates the government and all perpetrators of violence. All participants find it important to march there for the history of feminist activism, while some (*n*=8, Muslim feminists and transgender participants) seek to be collectively visible with their uncelebrated identities therein. As all participants repeated, Beyoğlu gives them a chance to encounter supporters and perpetrators, which provides women with a chance to make room for themselves in the city while taking part in this power struggle. Participants mostly associate the symbolic value of Beyoğlu with İstiklal Street. Particular attention is paid to being visible and heard in this place. As Elif argues, "İstiklal Street is a place that all authorities and their opponents cast their eye on. It is quite important for women to walk in that much contested place, even if the march was prevented."[131] Eylül likewise states that "Being in İstiklal [Street], in Taksim

---

[129] [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü] bize güven inşa eden bir şey çünkü biliyorum burada, bu saatte… sesime ses olacak bir birey var. … Normalde kendimi saklamak zorunda kalıyorum ama o gün saklamıyorum. Kamusal alanda; otobüsteyken, sokakta yürüyorken güçlü hissediyorum. … O [gün Beyoğlu'nda] herhangi bir esnafın beni taciz etmesi mümkün değil. Bağırdığım zaman benimle birlikte bağıracak onlarca kadın ya da birey var orada.

[130] 2019 [yürüyüşünde] bi kadın yanıma geldi ve bana "Senin burda ne işin var?" dedi. "Sen burada ne yapıyosun?" dedi. Şok oldum. "Sen kimsin, ne hakla bunu soruyosun, senin burda olmaman gerekiyo" dedim. "Bana bunu soran biri feminist değil" dedim. Bu benden böyle hızlı adımlarla uzaklaştı. Hızlıca yanına koştum ve onunla tekrar göz teması kurdum. "Burası bana ait!" dedim. "Ben buranın öznesiyim. Gelip bana bunu yapamazsın" dedim. "Buna alışıcaksın" dedim. "Bu bi erkek şiddeti" dedim. Sonra birkaç kişi geldi, onu uzaklaştırdılar. O da böyle şok oldu zaten. Pişman da oldu bence.

[131] İstiklal Caddesi… bütün iktidar ve muhalifler tarafından göz konulan bi yer. … Bu kadar çekişmeli bir sahada kadınların bir gece vakti yürümesi her ne kadar engellenmiş olsa da… bence muazzam önemli.

actually means a show of strength. It means insisting on the city. …it has a symbolic meaning."[132]

> …We will leave [Beyoğlu] neither to the state nor the men. There is such an insistence [about Beyoğlu]. …the feminist struggle reaches there despite the police barricade and blockade. Rather than insisting on [material] Beyoğlu, we stake a claim to our history and struggle (Tülin).[133]

> … [İstiklal Street] was not handed to anyone on a silver platter, on the contrary, it is a place that was taken with struggle… Feminist Night March takes place in İstiklal [Street]! Even though that could not happen in recent years, it is what it is… Its' historical background and experiences imbued in that place have a special meaning (Sena).[134]

> When other social protests are considered too, Beyoğlu has a different meaning for the protest tradition in Turkey. The fact that women here [at the Feminist Night March] could do what political parties and other organizations could not do… the fact that they were able to exist there provided with substantial self-confidence (Oya).[135]

The Governor's Office's ban on İstiklal Street prevents participants from appropriating the street as the route. It creates an in-group divergence because some participants (*n*=13) think they need to occupy it for the sake of feminist activism's previous achievements and future determination. However, some participants (*n*=9) think gathering thousands of women and LGBTI+ individuals together and ensuring their safety is more important than insisting on İstiklal Street and providing a legitimate basis for police brutality towards themselves. On the other hand, the ban creates a common idea: Participants state that the government closes roads leading to İstiklal Street. It limits the public transport vehicles and closes stations. So, participants have

---

[132] İstiklal'de, Taksim'de olmak aslında bir bakıma güç gösterisi. Kenti bırakmamak demek. …sembolik bir anlamı var.

[133] …Ne devlete ne de erkeklere bırakmıycaz orayı. [Beyoğlu'yla ilgili] böyle bi ısrar var. …feminist mücadele, polis barikatına ve ablukasına rağmen oraya geliyo. Biz [yer olarak] Beyoğlu'nda ısrar etmekten çok tarihimize ve mücadelemize sahip çıkıyoruz.

[134] …[İstiklal Caddesi] kimseye altın tepside sunulmadı, aksine mücadeleyle alınmış bi yer… Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü İstiklal'de olur! Son yıllarda böyle olmasa da bu böyledir… Tarihsel birikiminin, oraya sinmiş deneyimlerin önemli bi anlamı var.

[135] Beyoğlu'nun gelenek açısından Türkiye'de, diğer toplumsal eylemlilikler de düşünüldüğünde başka bi anlamı vardır. Burda kadınların [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nde] siyasal partilerin, başka örgütlerin yapamadığını yapabilmiş olması… orada var olabilmiş olması ciddi bir özgüven getirdi bize bence.

to find alternative ways in order to reach the place. As they all agree, this ban motivates them to communicate with other participants and strengthens their group bonds. Also, since it causes them to discover new paths and give meaning to them, the ban gives them a sense of ownership in Beyoğlu. As long as they become familiar with the place, women also gain *spatial expertise* (Koskela, 1997, p. 310): "an ability to interpret the signs of danger," which enables them to "identify situations that should be avoided or that one should be careful in." They learn to identify potential dangers and negotiate them in Beyoğlu as "experts in urban semiotics."

> …the policy that the government adopted against us actually strengthens our struggle. For us, Sıraselviler Street is now much more than Sıraselviler Street. For us, the street leading down to Karaköy now has more political meanings. … there is now such a space in our history. We gained a new [political] venue, and we know that the government could not take [İstiklal Street] that it thought it took over from us. That place is still ours. Galatasaray Square is ours. İstiklal Street is ours. … Fortunately, we change that route, and become able to transform different areas with different political meanings. … The government disperse us around. … I have to walk all over İstanbul. When I walk all over İstanbul, it makes me visible in every single place there (she laughs) (Lisa).[136]

> Everybody tries to enter a street there. [Police blockage] forces you find an [open gate] yourself. After that, someone informs others, and say "We entered from this point." There are many back streets of Taksim … that you do not know. …if you ask, I cannot name it …but if I go there, I will get through the place. I can find it now! (Sena).[137]

> …the state cancels the ferry to Kabataş in order to prevent this march. You have to get there in various ways. I mean [the ban] actually allows us to have more control over

---

[136] …iktidarın bize karşı güttüğü politika aslında bizim mücadelemizi güçlendiriyo. Bizim için artık Sıraselviler Caddesi Sıralselviler Caddesi'nden çok daha fazlası. Bizim için artık Karaköy'e inen cadde, artık… çok daha fazla politik anlamlara sahip. …geçmişimizde artık böyle bir alan da var. Yeni bi alan kazandık ve …iktidarın kapattığını sandığı İstiklal Caddesi'ni bizden almadığını biliyoruz. O alan hâlâ bizim. Galatasaray Meydanı da bizim, İstiklal de bizim. … İyi ki o rota değişikliğini yapıyoruz ve farklı alanları farklı politik anlamlarla dönüştürebiliyoruz. … O kadar bizi iktidar dağıtıyo ki etrafa. … Ben İstanbul'un her yerinde yürümek zorunda kalıyorum. İstanbul'un her yerinde yürüdüğümde bu da beni orda her bir yerinde görünür kılıyo (gülüyor).

[137] Orda herkes bi sokak[a girmeyi] deniyo. [Polis ablukası] seni [açık yolu] kendin bulmaya zorluyo. Ondan sonra birileri "Burdan girdik biz" diye haber veriyo. Oralar da hani bilmediğin bi sürü arka sokağı Taksim'in. …sorsan tanımlayamam …ama gitsem altından, üstünden girerek bi yere varırım. Artık bulurum!

the city, because when we try to reach [Beyoğlu] and walk there at the Feminist Night March, we need to walk all over the city (Eylül).[138]

Uysal (2017, p. 274-275) states that there are some sensitive places where authorities do not tolerate protests aiming to challenge their power; so, they intensify harsh strategies. In the scope of my thesis, İstiklal Street is one of those places with deep representations for both authorities and protesters. Protesters' repertoires are formed with the effects of police oppression and control besides their personal and collective backgrounds (Uysal, 2017, p. 288). One of the protesters, with whom she did an interview, states, "Government pressure was heavy. That's why I learned 50 paths to reach my home" (p. 254). Eventually, Uysal says that protesters employ strategies and contra strategies to make the place available for themselves. In this study, participants' experiences show that the sacralization of İstiklal Street made it possible for the participants to gain spatial competence in Beyoğlu.

5.3. The FNM's Role in Shaping Participants' Spatial Experiences

Participants negotiate the gendered organization of public space and challenge it through feminist activism, in the form of the FNM in Beyoğlu. They state that the FNM gives them a safe space where they are exposed to violence or live with the threat of violence in their everyday lives. Since they have a say about Beyoğlu during the march, they think they get authority and spatial control in a sense. Yet, it is not permanent. When the march ends, the route begins to welcome the men in the street and other fear-triggering actors, while women and LGBTI+ individuals—reliable people—lose ground, trust, and hope. Thus, participants' fear of sexual, verbal, and physical violence by three groups of men strikes back again. As the participants feel trust and hope in Beyoğlu during the march, they await a year to feel the power to walk here with confidence. Overall, the FNM temporarily widens women's mind maps of safety therein.

Besides women's different experiences in the FNM, there are similar and different tendencies that motivate women to attend the march. For example, Bengi Su says she

---

[138] …bu yürüyüşü engellemek için devlet Kabataş'a vapuru kaldırıyor. Oraya… başka başka yollardan ulaşman gerekiyo. Yani [yasak] aslında şehre daha hâkim olmamızı sağlıyor çünkü biz yürüyüş için [Beyoğlu'na] ulaşıp orda yürümeye çalışırken de bir yürüyüş yapmış oluyoruz.

attends the march because she wants to feel the joy of walking and dancing together with other women and LGBTI+ individuals in Beyoğlu, which is politically lost. However, Zeynep says she wants to walk for women killed by men or arrested by the government and will never have a chance to walk in Beyoğlu in the future. Leyla states that being at the FNM with Muslim feminists from her organization offers them collective and public visibility. At the same time, all transgender participants have the same sense of being visible with their transgender identity in a place where they can achieve acceptance. The most repeated motivation to attend the FNM is the desire to feel safe and powerful, and act as they want together with their allies, that becomes possible thanks to feminist activism.

> Beyoğlu is a safer place for me, in day and at night, on March 8. I do what I want. I move slowly. I'm like a snail there. … I leave a wet, sparkling light behind me. You know, I live that street up, freely, without fear, without anxiety. [The march] gives me complete confidence there. In that space, you don't remember what fear is. In fact, you think, "I'll hang around here until 4:00 AM while holding a bottle of wine" because some of us [the participants of the Feminist Night March] would be around until late at night. You know, it doesn't end at 00:00 that night (Lisa).[139]

> In Karaköy… there is a platform before you reach Tophane-i Amire. There was a group of 8-10 men on that platform. They were watching the crowd that was going down to Karaköy during the Feminist Night March. …but there were thousands of women! Then… those men and women began to shout each other and bicker. One of those men threw a cigarette on women, just to cause trouble… but… women climbed onto the platform… and… laid into them! [The men] were shocked what had happened to them and just fled! They are also a very dangerous group... because they are the shopkeepers who laid into the protesters with scimitar swords at Gezi [Protests]... These men are them. But… there were thousands of women, thousands of people. Well, you have to know your place! … They just ran away, so I felt so good. It was one of the greatest satisfactions of my life. ... I still feel high when I remember it. The enthusiasm of that gathering and solidarity cannot be found anywhere else (Damla).[140]

---

[139] 8 Mart günü, gündüzü ve gecesi Beyoğlu benim için daha güvenli bi yer. İstediğim gibi hareket ederim. Yavaş hareket ederim. Salyangoz gibiyimdir orda. …arkamda ıslak, ışıltılı bir de ışık bırakırım. Hani o sokağı, caddeyi yaşarım özgürce, korkmadan, tedirgin olmadan. [Yürüyüş] bana orayı tam anlamıyla güvenleştirir. Orda korku gelmiyor aklına. Hatta … "Ben gece 04.00'e kadar elimde şarap şişesiyle burda takılırım" diye düşünüyosun çünkü gece geç saatlere kadar etrafta bizden birileri oluyo. Hani 00.00'da bitmiyor o gece.

[140] Karaköy'de… Tophane-i Amire'ye gelmeden bi set var. Setin üstünde 8-10 kişilik bi adam grubu… bakıyorlar, Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nde Karaköy'e inen kalabalığı izliyorlar. …ama biiinlerce kadın var! Sonra… orda, o adamlarla kadınların arasında bağrışmalar, atışmalar oldu. Adamlardan bi tanesi kadınların üstüne sigara atmış, sırf sorun çıksın diye… kadınlar setin üzerine tırmandılar… ve bunlara bir! giriştiler. [Erkekler] neye uğradığını şaşırdılar ve kaçtılar! Bunlar bi yandan da çok tehlikeli bi grup… çünkü işte Gezi'de palayla… dalan esnaf… Bunlar onlar. Fakat… binlerce kadın var, binlerce insan. Hani biraz haddini bilmen

In this study, I argue that the FNM, as one of the *tactical choice*s, with reference to Coe and Sandberg, 2019, per se has the potential to transform Beyoğlu through participants' spatial practices, including their feminist solidarity and alliance established in the field. Women actively and strategically use Beyoğlu (İstiklal Street, Sıraselviler Street, and Cihangir Street) at the march for their own needs, claims, and purposes. They do not accept the cultural codes that inculcate women with the mystification of home as a safe space while representing public spaces with verbal, sexual, and physical violence for women. Women are not fearful users of the city altogether. They collectively oppose cultural codes of the street and the representation of proper womanhood that depreciate women's right to appropriate public spaces and consolidate women's perceptions of fear, especially at night, in the street. On the contrary, they transgress the borders in order to make room for themselves in the city. Participants ease their fear of sexual violence, while keeping experiencing the fear of physical violence. Overall, women gain confidence in the symbolic place that they transform from unsafe space to temporary safe space through their involvement in feminist activism.

Table 5.1 Fear and trust-triggering conditions at the FNM for participants (a spectrum)

	Women take over the symbolic place at night.
SAFETY	They feel free from the fear of sexual violence.
	Women provide the majority of population in Beyoğlu.
	Men are excluded, visible, or ignored in the field.
	Participants come together with their allies: feminist solidarity and alliance.
	in-group divergences
	media members and shopkeepers
UNSAFETY	The risk of encountering physical violence of dangerous residents
	Fear of being subjected to state violence/police brutality

---

lazım! … Bunlar kaçtılar ya, o kadar iyi hissettim ki. Hayatımda yaşadığım en yüksek tatmin duygularından bi tanesiydi. ... Hâlen hatırladıkça acayip yükseliyorum. O birlikteliğin, dayanışmanın yaşattığı coşku gerçekten başka hiçbi yerde yok.

The possibility of being exposed to verbal, sexual and physical violence by men causes the participants to feel unsafe in many parts of Beyoğlu in their everyday lives. On the other hand, participants in the FNM trust most of the people they accompany and describe them as their alliances. As a result, it causes participants to feel safe in Beyoğlu during the march and for the next few hours until their allies lose ground. Participating in the FNM not only transforms Beyoğlu from an unsafe space into a safe space but shatters the representation of women as fearful subjects in the city and brings their confidence into view. Men who trigger women's fears and are seen as potential perpetrators of violence become invisible, ignored, or challenged as long as women form feminist solidarity and alliance. Of course, not all participants feel fearful in their everyday lives as they do not all feel confident at this march. The level and reasons for women's trust in Beyoğlu differ in their intersecting identities. Besides the existence of fear and trust-triggering people therein, Beyoğlu is an important social actor in this study. Although the most repeated theme indicating participants' trust at the FNM is about feminist solidarity and alliance, Beyoğlu is more than a stage: It is the social actor that paves the way for women's meetings and placemaking for and at the FNM. In other words, in this study, space is one of those actors consolidating the transformative power of feminist activism. For that reason, I indicate the coexistence of constraints and opportunities, which is the essence of the *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu. I believe that it is the first condition that makes way for women to create a safe space for themselves in the street at night through feminist activism. In a symbolic and contested place, where power relations are not fixed but in a constant change, women find a way to transform Beyoğlu into a temporary safe space and themselves from fearful individuals into confident agents.

> I notice that we transform anger in all our protests. Our anger against the authority used to be something like this: We shouted, we raised our fists, we were angry, we frowned. Now we use cheer as an instrument of anger. …I say it for all forms of feminist activism. For example, we know that the Feminist Night March will be eventful, but… we go there to look for a lover or a sex partner. We go there to flirt… we put on make-up… we dress up. We resist the authority in a very joyful but also very angry way. Then we go to the afterparty. … We interact with others in other places as well. … So you don't even remember to be afraid therein (Lisa).[141]

---

[141] Tüm eylemlerimizde öfkeyi dönüştürdüğümüzü fark ediyorum. İktidara karşı öfkemiz önceden şöyle bir şeydi: Bağırırdık, çağırırdık, yumruğumuzu kaldırırdık, sinirliydik, kaşlarımızı çatardık. Şimdi bir öfke aracı olarak neşeleniyoruz artık. …bütün işte feminist eylemliliklerin tümü için söylüyorum. Mesela Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nün olaylı geçiceğini biliyoruz ama… oraya aslında kendimize sevgili veya koli aramaya; flörtleşmeye de

Overall, as expressed by the research subjects, the FNM transforms the fear and anger they experience in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu into trust and hope. Since Beyoğlu has been transformed by different governments in years, but women with other political groups keep doing activism there, participants expect to walk in İstiklal Street and take over this symbolic place again. Their hope derives from solidarity and alliance they established due to feminist activism. Also, those who relate the Governor's Office's ban to the conservative political stance of the AK Party government anticipate that "the AKP will lose the election, but feminist women, other women, and LGBTI+ individuals will keep being taking up space on March 8 in the streets of Beyoğlu."[142]

Although the march triggers participants' fear of being subjected to state violence, in-group contestations, and some men's (residents, media members, shopkeepers, etc.) physical violence during the march, women take strength from each other and find a way to appropriate Beyoğlu with confidence rather than fear. They argue that the FNM not only transforms unsafe spaces into safe spaces but opens a way for women's physical and symbolic placemaking as it makes them take over spatial control to a limited degree and be collectively visible in Beyoğlu at night, where and when they feel excluded or live with the threat of violence in their everyday lives.

At the FNM, women reproduce Beyoğlu. They challenge its secluded structure that welcomes dangerous men who are supposed to be comprised of all-male perpetrators of violence, police, rich Arab tourists, etc., *albeit* temporarily. Although gender remains a neglected aspect in the matter of shaping cities (Alkan, 2012), I assert that women's participation in feminist activism in the street has opened room for their own and others', those socially disadvantaged groups with unaccepted identities, space appropriation. Based on the participants' experiences, women alleviate their fear of being exposed to sexual harassment and assault despite their appearance, anxiety of being subjected to verbal and physical violence by conservative residents: They feel

gidiyoruz… makyaj yapıyoruz… süsleniyoruz. Çok neşeli ama aynı zamanda çok öfkeli bir şekilde iktidara direniyoruz. Sonrasında partiye gidiyoruz mesela. … Sosyalleşiyoruz da başka başka alanlarda. … Yani orda korkmak gelmiyo bile aklına.

[142] Hani şundan emin ol ki zaten gidicek AKP (gülüyor) bence… ama her 8 Mart'ta feminist kadınlar ve çağırdıkları kadınlar ve LGBTİ+ o alanda olmaya devam edicek (Ayşe).

free to act in the way they want. For example, as Güllü states, having a beer on the pavements of Beyoğlu at night becomes possible when women are surrounded with their allies at the FNM. Since they take up space here collectively, they stake a claim on the city and its ownership. As Dewerpe (2006, as cited in Uysal, 2017, p. 39) states "Protests transform cities, and cities give an identity to protests. Therefore, there is an interaction between the city and the demonstrations. Making an appearance in a city is forming a body with the city."

CHAPTER 6

BEYOĞLU AS A SOCIAL ACTOR: *THIRDSPACE*

Since participants take over Beyoğlu as "the most symbolic place", which also bears traces of the history of feminist activism in Turkey, the FNM provides them both collective visibility and spatial confidence. As they appropriate, *albeit* partially and temporarily, and march in this place, I assert that the FNM in Beyoğlu has the power to transform women's fear and anger into trust and hope. Women live, work, have fun, or engage in activism in the streets of Beyoğlu in their everyday lives, which makes them encounter men who trigger their fear of being subjected to verbal, sexual, and physical violence. On the contrary, they encounter their allies, composed of women and LGBTI+ individuals, which causes them to feel free from the risk of being exposed to men's gaze, sexual harassment, and assault. At the march, women also consolidate the importance of this place for their individual memories and the history of feminist activism in Turkey, and they make room for themselves altogether. In this study, I claim that Beyoğlu is more than a stage or an empty container of social activities. On the contrary, it is a social actor that enables socially disadvantaged groups to claim their rights in the street. In order to better understand this relationality, in this chapter, I will first discuss the social characteristics and spatial dimensions of Beyoğlu. In detail, this chapter works through the *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu, that offers women a chance for placemaking in the city. Eventually I am going to answer the relevant research question: How do their intersecting identities and the multidimensional structure of space shape these women's claims to Beyoğlu, as part of feminist activism in Turkey?

Regarding the recurring themes, this chapter indicates that the FNM paves the way for women's physical and symbolic placemaking in Beyoğlu. Since women find a way to appropriate the streets of Beyoğlu, whether they deem safe or unsafe in their everyday

lives, at the march, the FNM makes it possible for women to get their right to access and use these public spaces after it gets dark, temporarily and to a limited degree. Participants of the FNM aim to gather in Beyoğlu. However, the government tries to prevent them from gathering for the march, as it has been trying to challenge other political protests that take place therein. So, regarding the results of this study, participants, on March 8, strategically get into groups in the daytime before İstiklal Street is completely closed. They do not leave the place as soon as the march ends: Many of them attend the after-party, which paves the way for women to access affordable places of entertainment and eases their fear of verbal, sexual, and physical violence as they keep sticking together with their allies. They appropriate this place before, during, and after the march. Eventually, this study confirms my assumptions derived from the relevant literature on feminist activism and *thirdspace*: Since the place consists of constraints and opportunities together, marching in Beyoğlu enables women's placemaking in the most symbolic urban public space of Turkey. I argue that the *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu displaces the authoritarian power to a limited degree and enables "others" to emerge and stake a claim on the city.

6.1. Potentials of Beyoğlu for Socially Disadvantaged Groups

Lefebvre (2015 [2014]) and Soja (1996a) enounce that constraints intertwine with opportunities within the city. Cities, formed of diverse material features and symbolic meanings attributed by different actors and their coexistence, are social products. In the context of this study, I consider urban public spaces as fluid focal points of cities that provide the discontents with an opportunity to make a change and experience power. Regarding social movements in city centers, Soja's depiction of *thirdspace* indicates a chance for socially disadvantaged groups to encounter and cope with power holders.

Since Beyoğlu is a physical entity full of ideological representations, it is room for disagreement. It is still the place of the FNM in İstanbul, despite the Governor's Office's ban on İstiklal Street. That's why, in this study, I read Beyoğlu as a contested space through Soja's *trialectics of spatiality*, which is rooted in Lefebvre's *spatial triad*. Both Lefebvre and Soja depict three dimensions of space that pave the way for the coexistence of domination and resistance. Lefebvre's conceptualization of the three "moments," which are *perceived, conceived,* and *lived space,* constitute a reference

point for Soja's conceptualization of *firstspace, secondspace,* and *thirdspace.* In my argument, Beyoğlu is a place that includes three dimensions of space, enabling women to appropriate the place through feminist activism, although it is one of the places generating fear of crime: the risk of being exposed to several types of violence and mugging. In both understandings, these moments are not situated but fluid. Beyoğlu, which is being shaped by power holders and their opponents, develops a similar process. Its material and conceived reorganization ends up with conflicts between the AK Party government and its discontents, as well as in-group contestations among the participants of the FNM. Bartu (1999) puts her thoughts about these contestations into words through urban renewal in Beyoğlu in the 1980s as it follows:

> …it demonstrates how history, the past and its relics, and different readings of the past become a symbolic capital that can be used in contemporary political struggles. As with every revitalization attempt, this one also entailed a certain reading and interpretation of the past. Questions such as what Beyoglu looked like in the past, which Beyoglu to revitalize for whom, and what Beyoglu represents and to whom became critical political issues. Different actors and groups had different narratives about the past and the present; stories about the physical landscape served as commentaries on the social, political, and cultural landscape (p. 34-35).

Although Lefebvre and Soja's dimensions can substitute each other's places, the scholars' perspectives on social movements build different characteristics for their conceptualizations. Lefebvre added a spatial dimension to Marxist theory while reading space with Marxism. However, Soja's *thirdspace* dimension fits in my thesis, as it considers gender in a sense and may illustrate the relationship between gender, space, and feminist activism. Even though Lefebvre's model is theoretically more competent and original, Soja's attitude toward *thirding-as-othering* is politically more appropriate for my study. *Thirdspace*, by its name, shatters the binary representations and duality. Soja (1996a) uncovers the coexistence of spatial constraints and opportunities, as he discusses *real-and-imagined* cities in detail. *Thirdspace* means more than the coexistence of *firstspace* and *secondspace*. It indicates *endless possibilities* within the city (Soja, 1996a, p. 81). For this very reason, Soja's threefold spatial understanding matters for my thesis. Soja, who did not expand on *firstspace* and *secondspace*, discusses *thirdspace* through different theories, from Foucault's *heterotopia* to hooks's *choosing marginality,* in detail. His spatial depiction of Los Angeles and Amsterdam enables me to comprehend Lefevre's theoretical plan. On the other hand, Lefebvre's spatial triad, which remains an abstract model, flows in

between social and economic relationships deriving from capitalism. Studying Beyoğlu via the spatial triad without giving particular importance to the place's capitalist reproduction means emptying out the meaning of the triad. That's why I chose *thirdspace* as the theoretical framework, although I believe Soja's model resembles a compilation of Lefebvre's theoretical base.

They show the production of space and the actors' relations in a circulating schema. The observable parts of a city, streets, squares, etc., influence people's experiences, and these experiences influence the real and imagined reproduction of the city back. So, the subjects' right to the city is directly related to contestations. I chose *thirdspace* as it is built on the theory that insists on the multiplicity of power in a city. Even if there are hierarchical relationships, *thirdspace* indicates none of the actors is passive in the production of space. As Wilson (1992) thinks of the possibility of liberation for women, Soja (1996a) considers that the fluid and centerless structure of the postmodern city feeds opportunities. I think Beyoğlu's reproduction may lead us to better understand the women's spatial experiences: It may guide us to comprehend whether women resist the deemed perceptions about their spatial activities and take an active role in the city.

6.1.1. Beyoğlu as *Firstspace*

Firstspace as the material world embodies the effects of *secondspace* and *thirdspace*. It mirrors imagined thoughts and plans while bearing traces of everyday life and circulating actors within the city. Thus, as a part of the spatial wheel, it leads to a multifaceted spatial interpretation. In this sense, Beyoğlu takes place in the center of İstanbul. As a part of the European side, it necessitates using several means of transport for those trying to access there from other districts. It includes İstiklal Street that is a 1400-meter-long pedestrian street with a touristic tram between three squares: Taksim Square, Galatasaray Square, and Tünel Square. The street connects nine neighborhoods. The police control point is available in Taksim Square, and city surveillance cameras surveil all strategic points throughout the street. In-between these neighborhoods with people from different sociodemographic backgrounds and places of entertainment, Beyoğlu has different public spaces where different actors encounter. Since the previous route of the FNM, İstiklal street, is crowded and closed to traffic, it

hinders disabled people's movements while limiting the mobility of police vehicles. Due to physical constraints, people with different abilities experience the street with inclusion and exclusion.

The street, which was illuminated and pitched in the 19th century, is now equipped with streetlights and neon signs hanged on a growing number of franchised businesses. Today, potted trees with seats enable people's appropriation in the street where dozens of trees were cut as they embowered shops' windows in 2005. By selling, closing, or forcedly relocating many places like Emek Cinema, İnci Patisserie, Rumeli Arcade, in which the participants of this study feel attached and safe, the street's appearance and identity twisted after the 2000s (Ural, 2016). Besides apparent interventions in aforesaid businesses, some other places like Rebul Pharmacy and Kelebek Corset that witnessed centuries and political incidents had to move because of the burden of increasing rents. The entertainment tax, the difficulty of getting a liquor license, the smoking ban in closed public spaces, and finally, the occupancy ban that forbids businesses to put their tables and chairs in the street terminated many local and small businesses that could not bear the economic burden with the effects of neoliberal governmental policies. Eventually, hotels, shopping malls, kebab shops, big-name brands, and franchised chains were replaced with centuries-old businesses that take place in Turkey's collective memory and trace back to minorities of İstanbul (Günal & Çelikkan, 2019). Since individuals and groups experiencing İstiklal Street are justified or marginalized through power relations, the street's physical state makes sense with an elaboration on the political aims and discourses behind its construction.

As participants say, Beyoğlu has some advantages and disadvantages that make it possible and impossible to gather for the FNM and negotiate police pressure. Regarding the most repeated narratives, Beyoğlu has unsafe neighborhoods that make participants encounter the residents' physical violence when police build barricades to prevent them from accessing İstiklal Street during the march.

> Beyoğlu is located upon the very verge of Kasımpaşa and Tophane, [which creates a disadvantage at protests]. [At the Feminist Night March, in 2020], they hung Palestinian flags on a street in Tophane. The [residents] were waiting in front of their houses [to beat us]. Because we were afraid, we couldn't enter the street... Police

closed İstiklal [Street], but we had to go to Şişhane... it was a very scary incident (Anahit).[143]

Last year, when we walked to Karaköy at the Feminist Night March, there were men drinking alcohol on a corner. There is an awful place there where Karaköy and Tophane meet. It is more of a place for fascists. While those men were drinking alcohol there, they cursed us by using hideous swearwords. They did not get physical with us, but they swore a lot (Tülin).[144]

On March 8, 2020, they blockade all roads leading to İstiklal [Street]… They closed all of the entrances beginning from Nevizade and Tarlabaşı. The streets are narrow, it was impossible to pass through İstiklal [Street]. … After all, it's a street, and it is a determined place where the entrance and the exit are apparent. It's easy to close that place... (she laughs), it's also easy to trap [participants] during police brutality (Deniz).[145]

Because of the predefined structure of the streets, those especially who are not familiar with Beyoğlu have difficulty in accessing the marching route and escaping from the police. They all agree that it is easy for police to surround İstiklal Street and prevent participants' entrance. Since this symbolic place hosts dangerous actors and unsafe spaces, and is on the way to police stations, participants find it hard to take spatial control here. As Panelli, Kraack, and Little (2005) claim, *spatial familiarity* is the prominent component of sense of agency.

The streets [of Beyoğlu] are too chaotic. It becomes too difficult when you try to run away or leave the place. You know, there are no parallel streets and no proper urbanization there. So… for me… it is most likely to get lost there. … It's a very difficult neighborhood for those who don't know the place, or for newcomers. The shopkeepers made it difficult as well. For example, we get expose teargas, a shopkeeper pulls shutters down and trap us… we get stuck under the shutter. "Don't

[143] Beyoğlu'nun Kasımpaşa ve Tophane'nin dibinde bi yer olması [eylemde dezavantaj yaratıyor]. [2020'deki yürüyüşte], Tophane'de bi sokağa Filistin bayrakları asmışlar. [Mahalleli] kapılara çıkmış [bizi dövmek için] bekliyo. Korkudan giremedik… İstiklal'i kapatmış polis, mecburen Şişhane'ye çıktık… çok korkunç bi şey.

[144] En son Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nde geçen sene Karaköy'e yürüdüğümüzde orda içen adamlar vardı köşede. Karaköy'le Tophane'nin birleştiği kötü bi yer var orda. Daha çok işte faşistlerin yaşadığı bi yer. Orada adamlar içerken bize baya iğrenç küfürler ettiler. Fiziksel müdahalede bulunmadılar ama küfürler ettiler.

[145] 2020, 8 Mart'ında İstiklal'e girişleri öyle bir kapadılar ki… bütün yolları… Nevizade'den, Tarlabaşı'ndan bütün girişleri kapadılar. Sokaklar dar, geçmek mümkün olmadı İstiklal'e. … Orası bi cadde sonuçta ve hani girişi, çıkışı belli. Kapatması kolay bi yer… (gülüyor) ve polis şiddeti sırasında da kıstırmak da kolay bi yer açıkçası.

come, don't come" he says, and he pushes us, kicks, or something. It's not nice, that's not nice at all! (she laughs) (Meryem).[146]

[In Beyoğlu] streets are fixed. It is easy [for police] to manage the side streets in İstiklal [Street] because they are not connected to each other that much. For example, there is a more labyrinthine structure in Kadıköy, and the side streets are not as organized as in İstiklal [Street]. So [there is always a way out] when you face police attack at a protest therein. Police know what strategy to employ in İstiklal [Street]… it is not a difficult place for the police to develop strategies (Güz).[147]

It is already crowded, then, you enter the [field]. Before, others were marching there during the Feminist Night March. It was difficult for them too (she laughs). [Beyoğlu] was advantageous in terms of transportation, now they interrupt it. For example, because of this march, the Metro stations [in Taksim and Şişhane, that lead to İstiklal Street] are closed on May 8. You have to get off a few stops early or you need to access there through another place and just walk. … You can reach Taksim from everywhere you think of, but they prevented it (Bengi Su).[148]

İstiklal [Street] is a narrow place compared to the density of the crowd. We couldn't escape when the police fired teargas to us. It has a position that prevents escape in an intervention. [Also] Police constantly do criminal record check in that place. Encountering police [there] is very frightening. Sarıgazi is a revolutionary neighborhood. There are too many police there too, and they know me. I don't feel nervous there, but the police in Taksim… undercover, uniformed, special action… it makes me nervous. The police blockade is a routine for that place (Zeynep).[149]

---

[146] [Beyoğlu'nun] sokakları çok çok karmakarışık. Kaçmaya çalışırken veya giderken çok çok zorluyo. Hani paralel, düzgün bir kentleşme olmadığı için orda, benim kaybolma ihtimalimin yüksek olduğu sokaklar. … Bilmeyen, yeni gelen birisi için çok çok zor bir semt. Esnafı zorluyo beni bi de. Mesela gaz yiyoruz, adam üzerimize kepenk kapatıyo, sıkışıyoruz kepengin altında. "Gelmeyin, gelmeyin" diye ittiriyor, tekmeliyo falan. O hoş değil, yani hiç hoş değil! (gülüyor).

[147] [Beyoğlu'nda] sokaklar belirli... İstiklal'in ara sokakları yönetilmeye çok müsait çünkü birbirine o kadar çok bağlanmıyor. Kadıköy'de mesela daha labirent bir yapı var ve İstiklal'deki kadar düzenli değil ara sokaklar. O yüzden eylem anında müdahale ile karşılaşıldığı zaman [bir çıkış yolu bulunuyor]. İstiklal'de artık polis hangi stratejiyi kullanacağını biliyo… [orası] polisin strateji geliştirmesi çok zor olan bir alan değil.

[148] Zaten kalabalık, üstüne sen de giriyosun [alana]. Önceden, [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü sürerken] başkaları da yürüyüş yapıyodu orda. Onlar için de zor oluyodu (gülüyor). [Beyoğlu] ulaşım yönünden iyiydi, artık ulaşımı da kapattılar. Mesela yürüyüş olunca işte Metro[nun İstiklal Caddesi'ne çıkan Taksim ve Şişhane durakları] durduruluyo. Bikaç durak erken inmek ya da başka yerden gitmek, yürümek zorunda kalıyosun. … Her yerden gelebilirsin Taksim'e ama onu da kapattılar.

[149] İstiklal kitlenin kalabalığına göre dar bi alan. [Polis biber] gazı sıktığı zaman kaçamazdık. …müdahalede kaçışı engelleyen bi pozisyonu var. [Bir de] polis orda sürekli GBT sorgusu yapar. [Orada] polis görmek insanı çok ürkütüyo. Sarıgazi devrimci bi mahalle. Orda da polis yoğundur ve beni de tanırlar. Orada gerilmiyorum ama Taksim'de silme polis… sivil, üniformalı, özel harekât… beni geriyo. Polis ablukası orası için rutin.

On the other hand, some participants who have been living or working in Beyoğlu for years state that it is easier for them to understand which street to use for escape or where they can hide out during police intervention. So, being familiar with the place has the power to make participants afraid or confident in the presence of disadvantages in Beyoğlu during the march. Koskela (1997) considers *spatial expertise* and Cahill (2000) considers *street literacy* as having knowledge about the potential risks of the urban context, which can make women challenge them by employing appropriate strategies. In this study, forming feminist solidarity and alliance is the prominent way to negotiate these disadvantages. In addition to this, participants assert that having the knowledge of safe and unsafe spaces in Beyoğlu eliminates unwanted encounters, while creating a chance to encounter reliable people and possible allies. Stavrides (2021 [2016]) states that walking causes people to negotiate their social identities and explore and face their otherness in metropolises. In this study, based on the participants' narratives, I assert that women ease their otherness and unfamiliarity with Beyoğlu through feminist activism. As well as they have the risk to encounter dangerous actors in this place, the more they attend the march the more they get familiar with the space, so as to feel safe therein.

> [Beyoğlu] is a place that we know. This is an advantage. We know it very well. Maybe I haven't gone there for years, but I know where Mis Street is, from which street in Sıraselviler to leave? Spaces are being changed, but after all, those streets remain the same. I know to where I go down from Taksim is Karaköy, Kabataş, or Tophane. We know those places very well (Güllü).[150]

> There are many streets and venues [in Beyoğlu], where we can feel safe. For example, İstiklal or Sıraselviler are long streets. In any intervention, we can disperse all around the side streets or we can walk to Karaköy… The place has physical advantages for us. … the police have to blockade the whole place… but they can be insufficient in most places. I mean, in terms of safety… side streets are more advantageous because we own them, because there are places where we feel safe (Lisa).[151]

---

[150] Bildiğimiz bir yer. O bir avantaj. Çok iyi biliyoruz orayı. Belki ben yıllardır gitmiyorum ama Mis Sokak nerede, Sıraselviler'in hangi sokağından, neresine çıkılır? Mekânlar değişiyor ama sonuçta o sokaklar değişmiyor yani. Hani Taksim'den nereye inersem Karaköy, nereye inersem Kabataş, nereye inersem Tophane? Oraları iyi biliyoruz.

[151] Kendimizi güvene alabileceğimiz çok sokak, çok mekân var [Beyoğlu'nda]. Uzun bir cadde mesela İstiklal Caddesi ya da Sıraselviler Caddesi. Herhangi bi müdahalede ordaki hareketliliği ara sokaklara dağılarak devam ettirebiliyoruz ya da Karaköy'e yürüyebiliyoruz… Mekânın fiziksel olarak bize sunduğu avantajlar var. …polis her yeri tutmak zorunda kalıyor… ama çoğu yerde yetersiz kalabiliyo. Yani güvenlik açısından da… ara sokaklar daha çok bizim olduğu için, kendimizi güvene alabileceğimiz alanlar olduğu için avantajlı.

Beyoğlu is at the center, and it is an accessible place, where almost everyone can easily access. … It is an opportunity that it locates in a vibrant part of the city. For example, it is different from Yenikapı. Yenikapı is not a place you normally use… but Taksim is such a place. That is also valuable. During the march, it creates a chance to encounter the public. It provides an opportunity to meet with not only those who attend the march, but others who did not participate in the march but see and stay there just out of curiosity (Leyla).[152]

During that march, "come, come, come" we say. Some people sitting on those cafés come and join us. I think… [The Feminist Night March] began to welcome more people other than its veteran participants. … So I think there are now people with different backgrounds there (Oya).[153]

First of all, there are so many streets there… (she laughs) you can run around. That's why it's such a beautiful place. …I think its way… there is advantageous (smiles). I mean, it's comfortable to run, and leave the place. … There's also this: There are people out there who think like us. There are rational people, like us, who take care of each other there. Of course, this used to be more obvious. There are also people who will open their door as soon as you run… actually there were! (Çiçek).[154]

Moreover, participants argue that marching in Beyoğlu, which is perceived as the most symbolic place in Turkey, provides women with collective visibility. Since it is in the center of İstanbul, it makes it easier for participants to gather by a massive public transportation network. Yet, the government limits the public transportation service to prevent women from gathering for the FNM, as it targeted other political demonstrations before. So, the fact that it is in the center of İstanbul and political debates is both an opportunity and constraint for the participants. They gain symbolic

---

[152] Çok merkezi ve nerdeyse herkesin büyük bi rahatlıkla gidebildiği… erişebildiği bi yer Beyoğlu. … Şehrin yaşayan bi yerinde olması da ayrıca bi olanak. Yenikapı'dan farkı o mesela. Yenikapı normalde gidilen bi yer değil… ama Taksim öyle bi yer. O da çok değerli yani. O esnada bi kamuyla buluşma şansı da yaratıyor yani. Sadece eyleme gidenlerin değil, eyleme gitmeyip o esnada fark eden, "Aaa bugün neymiş?" diyen insanlarla da bi karşılaşma olanağı yaşatıyor.

[153] Mesela o yürüyüş sırasında hep bi "Gel gel" yaparız. Kenarda kafelerde oturanlardan gelip katılanlar olur. Bence… sadece bu işlere kafa yoran insanların geldiği yer olmanın ötesine geçti [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü]. … Yani bence çok farklı kesimlerden insanlar geliyo artık.

[154] Bi kere çok sokak var orda… (gülüyor) kaçabilirsiniz sağa sola. İşte o yüzden özellikle güzel bi yer orası. …yolu iyi bence oranın, yolu (gülümsüyor). Yani çünkü koşturma açısından rahat, çıkma açısından rahat. … Bi de şey var, eskiden daha da çok vardı: orda bizim gibi düşünen insanlar da var; kafası aydın, bizim gibi, hani birbirine sahip çıkan insanlar da var. Koştuğun anda kapısını açacak insanlar da var orda… var dı!

and physical visibility in both the media and the street; however, it ends up with harsh police intervention and limitations over the participants' mobility in Beyoğlu.

> It seems to me that foreign press can be reached more quickly [while walking in Beyoğlu]. Well, even foreigners can see how women are treated there. In fact… Why was it chosen during the Gezi events? You can reach all over the world so quickly. If I walk in my neighborhood or Yenikapı, who will see me, and to what extent? I mean, I can say that Beyoğlu is the center of İstanbul (Bengi Su).[155]

> Because Beyoğlu is very crowded, you have an opportunity to be visible therein. People, from every district and region of İstanbul, come here. Also, it is the central place (Gönül).[156]

> [Beyoğlu] has a symbolic value for the police as it has for us. This is a disadvantage. The police know that place very well. It's a place where they are ready to intervene. Well… just think about it… there is a barricade erected in Galatasaray [Square] and has been standing there for years. … It is a place where the police are on guard. There are too many cops, and they hate us like sin. … That is another disadvantage of Beyoğlu. Cops' attitude is more compelling. Also… shopkeepers are skunk (Güllü).[157]

Public spaces' fluid dynamics necessitate different strategies. Entering an ostensibly forbidden space and a time period forces women to be aware of their individual and collective backgrounds, read authoritarian strategies, and devise contra strategies to fight back. In parallel with Koskela's (1997) *spatial expertise* and Cahill's (2010) *street literacy*, participants indicate the importance of having knowledge about the material features as well as the potential risks of the urban context, which provides them to understand where and with whom to form an alliance, at what point to run away, or where to hide during police intervention.

---

[155] [Beyoğlu'nda yürürken] yabancı basına daha çabuk ulaşılabilir gibi geliyo bana. Yani yabancı halk bile görebiliyo kadına ne uygulandığını. Hatta… Gezi olaylarında da niye orası seçildi? Dünyaya çabuk ulaşabilirsiniz. Ben mahallemde ya da Yenikapı'da yürüsem kim, ne kadar görücek? Yani Beyoğlu, İstanbul'un merkezi diyebilirim.

[156] Beyoğlu çok kalabalık olduğu için orda görülme şansın fazla. İstanbul'un her semtinden, her bölgesinden insanlar buraya geliyo. Artı bi de merkezi bi yer.

[157] [Beyoğlu] bizim için ne kadar sembolse, polis için de o kadar büyük bir sembol. Bu bir dezavantaj. Polisin de çok iyi bildiği bir yer. Aşırı hazırlıklı olduğu bir yer. Yani… düşünsene… Galatasaray [Meydanı'n]da işte senelerdir kurulu bir barikat var. … Sürekli polisin beklediği bi yer. Çok fazla polis var. Olan polis de… bizden aşırı nefret ediyor. … Hani Beyoğlu'nda o da bir dezavantaj yani. Biraz daha sert polis. Esnaf da tekinsiz.

6.1.2. Beyoğlu as *Secondspace*

Besides the physical organization of Beyoğlu, its political meanings exclude, marginalize, include or promote some movements and their actors: Since the Pride Parade, the FNM, the march on the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women (November 25), the Saturday Mothers' sit-in protests, the May Day Celebration, etc. were banned by the government(s), women, LGBTI+ individuals, workers, the Saturday Mothers, and many other actors are excluded from İstiklal Street and Taksim Square that politically functions together with the street in the political formation of Beyoğlu. Eventually, Beyoğlu is a place of struggle between ostensible rightful subjects who have access and right to public space and those out of place. The difference between these included and excluded actors is correlated with power relations. So, the state of trespassing or transgression of space makes sense in a particular context, within particular power relations.

Beyoğlu has become a place of struggle among different actors, ideologies, and time periods. Within the accompaniment of Taksim Square, Gezi Park, and Atatürk Cultural Center (abbreviated AKM), İstiklal Street served the envisagement of the Republican ideology. Grande Rue de Pera, which Europeans called, and Cadde-i Kebir, the Ottoman name, indicated the street's size. On the other hand, its name became İstiklal Caddesi, which means independence of the nation with the proclamation of the Republic. Placing the Republic Monument in Taksim Square and removing other nations and the backward history's traces through the condemnation of their properties were major steps fueled by nationalism and modernism. The early Republic's imagined spaces were a part of Henri Prost's, who was invited to design a modernized look for Beyoğlu, plan (Gül, Dee & Cünük, 2014). Regarding the mosque[158] and the AKM's situation, Bartu (1999) sees the meanings assigned to Beyoğlu through Turkish nationalism (and actually Turkification of the district) in the early Republican era and the revitalization of the Ottoman[159] history as part of cultural identity politics within the city. As she considers, all these projects can be read as strategies that "modernizers" and "conservationists" employ to claim and take back the quarters in

---

[158] Taksim Mosque was a preplanned Project by the Welfare Party [Refah Partisi] in the 1990s.

[159] The author suggests readers to read the Ottoman rule as the Islamic authority.

Beyoğlu to realize their own ideologies. Tanyeli (2017), identifies architecture in-between Orientalism and Occidentalis, likewise. Beyoğlu has had more than its fair share of both intellectual projects in the matter of its material existence, which goes hand in hand with its symbolic meanings.

Today, Beyoğlu, with other places and cases, represents different ideologies and serves different authorities. From 2004 to 2019, the AK Party held the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality (abbreviated IBB). During this period, Beyoğlu witnessed several projects that changed its atmosphere and ascribed political meanings and economic functions to it. By destructing some organizations and constructing others, Beyoğlu became a place where the government could practice its projects: The insistency on rebuilding the Artillery Barracks, the newly built Taksim Mosque, and the new AKM enforce the image of "AKP's Taksim," as Batuman (2015) calls it. The construction of the Demirören Shopping Mall and the Taksim Mosque, the attempts to transform Gezi Park into the Artillery Barracks, and other closures or constructions mentioned earlier were the "mega projects" that the AK Party government announced. The Tarlabaşı Renewal Project, with the accompaniment of bomb attacks in İstiklal Street, ended up with the district's privatization for the sake of secure areas (Zengin, 2019 [2014]). So, streets and the conceptualization of streets have been criminalized to build new places, transform old places imbued with undesirable memory, and limit those areas for the "other" by the government and private capital owners (Düzcan, 2014: 187-211). Here, space matters as a field where the AK Party government forms its aspirations like the Republican ideology once defined itself through space production. Eventually, the spatial changes throughout Beyoğlu politically formed people's profile and created included and excluded actors. That's why Beyoğlu transformed and currently shapes the actors and their socio-spatial experiences.

On the other hand, the change in the administration of the IBB is currently changing the real and imagined portrayal of Beyoğlu. With the 2019 İstanbul Mayoral Election, the AK Party lost the election for the first time during its sovereignty. The administration passed into the CHP. After that, the spatial contestations and the tension reached the peak among the contradictory administrations. Although the AK Party won the Beyoğlu Municipality, the projects and exhibitions run by the IBB portrayed—and continue to portray—the ideological shift in Taksim and İstiklal

Street: After the mayor changed, İstanbul witnessed a strategic plan called "İstanbul Senin, Karar Senin" [İstanbul is Yours, Let's Decide for Your Future Together]. The project, which is still in progress, aims to reconstruct İstanbul's squares, within pre-elected projects, with İstanbulites'[160] online votes. As a part of the project, a mobile platform with an exhibition was prepared. The first station of the platform was Taksim Square. At the exhibition, called "İstanbul'un Kalbi Taksim" [Taksim: The Heart of İstanbul], some photos were displaced under the title of "Taksim Hakkı" [Right to Taksim.] The FNM, the Pride Parade, and the Gezi Park protests that took place in İstiklal Street and Taksim Square were represented at this exhibition. However, the platform was replaced by a council as it was unauthorized. With the same decision, "15 Temmuz Milletin Zaferi" [July 15: the Victory of the Nation] exhibition as part of the Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Directorate of Communications' Digital Display Center was removed. Both exhibitions were removed, a few days after the platform was built and almost seven months after the center was set.

Within the real and imagined construction of İstiklal Street, Taksim Square, etc. Beyoğlu became a palimpsest, where different meanings and ideologies were embedded. As Güllü says, "…the memory of the city there is disappearing. Perhaps it becomes a place where the AKP overwrites [the previous memory] to create a new memory that serves its ideology."[161] With its inconstant political portrayal, its actors and their choices are in change. İstiklal Street, with the conjunction of Taksim Square, Galatasaray Square, and Tünel Square, was reorganized and redefined for the sake of different authorities many times. As a physical entity, it still has the marks of political tension between different sides. Within the political turns, conceived spaces can turn into lived spaces where the flow of life transforms imagined meanings attributed to spaces. As a result, Beyoğlu, which is organized and reorganized by governments and all other power holders, creates room for resistance and women's appropriation, *albeit* to a limited degree and temporarily.

---

[160] Here, İstanbulites correspond to those with a certificate of residence. The project does not include migrants, refugees, tourists, or anybody who does not have a document. That's why it excludes these actors in the decision-making process in and about the city.

[161] …oradaki kent hafızası yok oluyor. [Beyoğlu] AKP'nin kendi ideolojisine hizmet eden yeni bir hafıza yaratmak [için] [önceki hafızanın] üstüne yazdığı bir yer oluyo belki de.

People and governments have attributed different meanings to Beyoğlu. Regarding the participants' expressions, the *secondspace* dimension of Beyoğlu is all related to the representation of different political stances and counter meanings. The most symbolic places in Turkey, like İstiklal Street, Gezi Park, and Taksim Square, are located in Beyoğlu. Therefore, it has been a contested space for various protesters and governments since they became symbols for identity politics and human rights activism in Turkey. Beyoğlu bears traces of social movements like the FNM, the Gezi Park protests, the Pride Parade, the Saturday Mothers' sit-in protests, etc. Participants, who attended these protests at least once, identify their political and activist selves through their appropriation of Beyoğlu. They feel attached to it because they see Beyoğlu as part of "güç gösterisi" [a show of force]. Considering the most repeated expressions, participants define İstiklal Street as the redline of the AK Party government. Since the government intensified its interventions and violence toward protestors who aimed at walking in Beyoğlu after the Gezi Park protests, participants interpret the ban on İstiklal Street and the FNM as a reflection of the current government's fear of losing ground. They believe that the Gezi Park protests challenged the government's power. That's why they think occupying Beyoğlu for a protest makes the government remember their "kuyruk acısı" [grudge] against the Gezi Park protests and be terrified to experience their defeat again.

> [Beyoğlu] represents enlightened, liberal ideology… There is a life settles there, which [the government] wants to suppress. Well, they insisted on Taksim Mosque for this reason. The AKM and churches locate there. It is a place where non-Muslims used to live… It welcomes nightlife… alcohol! … [Beyoğlu] represents the lifestyle they oppose, and as if that weren't enough, people's insistence on Gezi… All these issues made the government want to take over Beyoğlu. [Gezi was] a defeat, grudge [for them]. He (Erdoğan) built the mosque, but [Gezi] Park is still there. He could not build the Artillery Barracks. Erdogan... [By banning İstiklal Street for demonstrations]... I guess he's tryna say, "We won't let you get it " (she laughs) (Damla).[162]

> [Beyoğlu] became the most important redline for the government after [the] Gezi [Park Protests] because the government saw something different there: the rebellion, the resistance, the bridge between the opposition groups... and then Beyoğlu,

---

[162] [Beyoğlu'nun] aydınlık, liberal bir temsili [var]… [Hükümetin] baskılamak istediği bir hayat yaşanıyor orda. Yani Taksim Camisi'ndeki ısrar da buydu. AKM var, kiliseler var; gayrimüslimlerin eskiden yaşadıkları bi yer orası… eğlence hayatı var, içki var! … [Beyoğlu] karşı oldukları yaşam tarzını temsil ediyo. Üstüne bi de Gezi inadı bindi çünkü bir yenilgi, bir kuyruk acısı [onlar için]. Camiyi yaptı ama [Gezi] Parkı hâlâ duruyo. Topçu Kışlası'nı yapamadı. Erdoğan... [İstiklal Caddesi'ni eylemlere kapatması]… "Orayı size yedirmiycez" demeye çalışıyo herhalde (gülüyor).

especially Taksim, turned into a battleground for them (she laughs)… they declared the ban (Ayşe).[163]

Their desire to eradicate Gezi Park and rebuild the Artillery Barracks or build an enormous mosque right in front of the AKM indicates [the importance of] Beyoğlu for the government. He [Erdoğan] aims to clean Taksim… from women, socialists, and other opponents so as to transform it into a place where he can appreciate his own hegemony. … Therefore, it is an important place for the state. And then there is [memory of] Gezi [Park Protests]. They can regard this march as a threat. That's why they're tryna close that area (Tülin).[164]

Previous governments [did the same thing]… but this government attaches great importance to certain places in particular. … because… "If I take over here, it will be easier after that" it says. I think they set such a role for Taksim. … Maybe, they want to eradicate the memory of social movements that identify with Beyoğlu, demonstrations that took place therein, and its past by interfering the space. That's why incredible precautions are set, at [and for] the Feminist Night Marches... I mean, they probably see it as a place to be conquered from their own perspective (Oya).[165]

Participants see the AK Party government's politics in Beyoğlu as a matter of politics of memory. As they call it, "the İstiklal ban", together with the governments' other interventions in Beyoğlu, serves to rip off "other's" memories and the representations of this symbolic place. Although none of the participants go back in time and search for its political roots in the Republican era, contrary to the relevant literature, they make sense of the politics in Beyoğlu through having different political stances with the government. They relate the governments' aims at taking over Beyoğlu to their

---

[163] Gezi meselesinden sonra bence [Beyoğlu] iktidarın büyük kırmızı alanı oldu çünkü bambaşka bi şeyi gördüler: isyanı, direnişi, farklı muhalif kesimler arasındaki köprüyü. O noktadan sonra Beyoğlu, özellikle Taksim iktidar için (gülüyor)… mücadele alanına dönüştü… orayı yasaklı ilan ettiler.

[164] [Erdoğan'ın] Gezi Parkı'nı Topçu Kışlası yapması isteği ya da AKM['nin] hemen karşısına devasa bi cami yapması aslında oraya verdiği önemi [gösteriyor.] Yani biraz Taksimi… kadınlardan, sosyalistlerden; çeşitli muhalif olan kitlelerden uzaklaştırıp kendi hegemonyasını yaratçak bi alana dönüştürmeye çalışıyo. … O yüzden devlet açısından önemli bi yer. Bir de Gezi [Parkı Protestoları'nın hafızası var.] … Kendileri için bu yürüyüşü bi tehdit gibi görebilirler yani. O yüzden kapatıyolar orayı.

[165] Daha önceki iktidarlar da [yaptı]… ama özellikle bu iktidar belirli yerlere çok büyük önem atfediyo. … çünkü… "Orayı ele geçirirsem ondan sonrası daha kolay olucak" diyo. Taksime böyle bi rol biçtiler bence. …bu mekâna müdahale ederek aslında biraz o mekânla özdeşleşmiş hareketlere, orda olmuş olaylara, geçmişe de belki müdahale etmek istiyolar. O nedenle zaten inanılmaz bi önlem alınıyo yani hani Feminist Gece Yürüyüşlerinde [ve bu yürüyüşler için]… Yani onlar da orayı fethedilicek bi yer gibi görüyolar herhalde kendi açılarından.

conservative approaches and their will to erase the secular history of Turkey, which they regard as alcohol consumption and nightlife in Beyoğlu:

> The government… has changed Taksim and İstiklal [Street], it actually rebuilt the place. … It is trying hard for a different perception building there… so as to change these places where once political gains were made, erase their history, and disperse the masses away (Güz).[166]

> This place has a symbolic meaning. … that represent the secular thought more. Beyoğlu has always been like that. … Taksim is always a place to where everyone goes and somehow attach, yet it always represents the secular stance. Especially during the Gezi [Park Protests], it was emphasized more than ever. That's why... Going to Taksim... and New Year's Eve… it was celebrated there in the past. I know there are people who don't feel attached to Taksim because of the images [it represents] (Leyla).[167]

On the other hand, participants state that the government featured Beyoğlu as a center to attract the Middle Eastern capital. According to their interpretation, it ends up with the closure of some places of entertainment for the sake of the Middle Easternization of Beyoğlu and Muslim tourists. As they constantly repeat, Beyoğlu stands for counter meanings, and the government aims to prolong the one it supports while trying hard to erase its opponents' memories from the field.

> We are talking about a 20-year [authority] that has caused a sea change in [spatial reorganization.] … Beyoğlu is a contested space. We know that the government and its supporters want to be there as well as their opponents. So all these conflicts are both for economic and political reasons (Elif).[168]

> I think [the government's Beyoğlu policies] are meant to end the entertainment industry. Well, their insistence... on the pedestrianization of Taksim Square, building a mosque there… By replacing venues… removing tables in the street in Asmalı

---

[166] Hükümet… Taksim ve İstiklal üzerinde biçok değişim yaptı, hatta mekânı baştan inşa etti. … Farklı bir algı inşa etmeye çalışıyo orada… [Böylece] politik kazanımların elde edildiği mekânları değiştirmek ve oranın hafızasını kazımak, kitleyi ordan uzaklaştırmak istiyo.

[167] Buranın sembolik bi anlamı var. …daha böyle seküler dünyanın içerisinden olan bi yer. Beyoğlu her zaman için öyleydi. … Herkesin gittiği ve görece sahiplendiği bi yer ama yine de seküler dünyaya yakın bi yerde her zaman Taksim. Özellikle Gezi zamanında hiç olmadığı kadar vurgusu arttı. O yüzden… Hani Taksim'e gitmek… bi de eskiden yılbaşı kutlanırdı. Hep böyle şeyle… eee o tarz imgelerle birleşen bi şey olduğu için Taksim'e gitmenin kendisinin daha uzak olduğu insanlar biliyorum.

[168] [Mekânın yeniden düzenlenmesinde] keskin değişimlerin yaşandığı 20 yıllık bi [iktidardan] bahsediyoruz. … Beyoğlu çekişme alanıdır. Muhalifler gibi iktidarın ve yandaşlarının da orda olmak istediğini biliyoruz. Yani tüm bu çekişmeler hem ekonomik hem de politik [sebeplerden ötürü].

Mescit blah blah… they aim to transform Taksim into an attractive place for Muslim tourist rather a place for entertainment or a cultural center (Güllü).[169]

Maybe, the [government] tries to eradicate the secular image of Turkey in İstiklal Street, by banning this type of demonstrations, because they aim to draw Arabs' capital to this place. They can predict that their target customer won't be comfortable about a woman's march that takes place in the *field* of investment. Maybe the government regard the Feminist Night March as a movement that will transform İstiklal Street's brand value and image into something different other than the government's ideals (Deniz).[170]

Beyoğlu is a symbolic place where the government and the subjects of this study try to challenge each other both in their everyday lives and at the FNM. Because the participants perceive Beyoğlu as an important political venue to become visible with their intersecting identities, they insist on gathering there, especially in İstiklal Street for feminist activism. Besides the march, the participants use Beyoğlu in their everyday lives despite the risk and fear of violence. Thus, as they argue, taking up space in Beyoğlu gives them visibility, consolidates their sense of belonging, and makes them familiar with the history of feminist activism in Turkey.

It's a symbolic and central place. [When you walk there] many people see you. Since the entertainment venues and cultural areas locate there… You know, going out and walking in the street after a certain hour… can be a problem for a woman. [In everyday life] you either get harassed or raped, or if you are alone, you may experience other problems. That's why walking in Beyoğlu [for the Feminist Night March] is like putting an emphasis on the symbolic meaning of this place (Gönül).[171]

---

[169] [Beyoğlu'yla ilgili yürüttükleri politika] eğlence sektörünü bitirmenin bir simgesi bence. Yani inat eder gibi, Gezi'yle birlikte başlayan; Yayalaştırma Projesi'yle, "Taksim'e cami yapıcaz" diye tutturmayla, oradaki mekânları yok etmekle, Asmalı Mescit'te masaların kaldırılmasıyla vesaireyle Taksim'i bir eğlence ve kültür merkezi olmaktan çıkarıp Müslüman turist odağına çevirmek [istiyorlar]. Bu onlar için temsili bir kazanım gibi geliyor bana.

[170] [İktidar] belki de Arapların sermayesini İstiklal Caddesi'ne çekmek için Türkiye'nin seküler profilini —böyle yürüyüşleri yasaklayarak— ortadan kaldırmaya çalışıyor olabilir. Mesela bir kadın yürüyüşünü İstiklal'i pazarlayacakları… kitlenin pek hoş karşılamayacağını düşünüyorlardır. Hani belki de Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü, İstiklal'in marka değerini, imajını onların çekmeye çalıştığı yerden başka bi şeye dönüştürecek bi harekettir.

[171] Orası sembolleşmiş... merkezi bi yer. [Orada yürüdüğünde] pek çok kişi seni görüyo. Eğlence ve kültürel alan da orda olduğu için… Hani kadınların bi saatten sonra sokağa çıkıp yürümesi… sorun yaşıyosun yani. [Gündelik hayatta] ya tacize ya tecavüze uğrarsın ya da tek başınaysan başka sorunlar yaşayabiliyosun. O yüzden [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü için] Beyoğlu'nda yürümek sembol gibi.

As they confirm, participants' fear and anger they experience in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu transform into trust and hope when they participate in the FNM. In this case, walking in a symbolic place turns into a symbolic movement that allows women to feel able and confident because they take over the symbolic place and experience authority with their allies as agents rather than fearful users of the city. They consolidate their attachment to some places in Beyoğlu while transforming some unsafe spaces into safe spaces to a limited degree and temporarily. Moreover, they appropriate places that do not have a special meaning to them. Eventually, it causes these women to remember these places with the memory of feminist activism and enlarge the proportion of "our safe space" in Beyoğlu.

> In my everyday life, I never go to Sıraselviler… but when I somehow pass by the street, it reminds me of that moment… when we were there for the Feminist Night March in 2019 and 2020. I feel like… "Ah we walked in this street on March 8… and we leave this place by…" It reminds of me those days now (Eylül).[172]

> I was in a different part of Taksim Square in 2020. I haven't been there at all. … I was encircling on and on… I couldn't find a way to reach the route… Finally… I encountered a girl whom I did not know in person… She was trying to reach the participants… there to attend the march. We went around the AKM. We walked through Gezi Park again and again. That girl [whom I did not know] and I walked all over Taksim [to attend the march]. … Now, I keep it as a memory (Leyla).[173]

> In İstiklal Street, which I call the most important street in Turkey, women used to organize the Feminist Night March… [This march] turns March 8 into a day in which that we take over the street that was taken from us. [In that day] that place completely belongs to us! …but of course… after the march ends, (she laughs) everything gets back to its place (Veronika).[174]

---

[172] Sıraselviler'e ben gündelik hayatımda hiç gitmiyorum… ama bi şekilde yolum düştüğünde artık o günü [2019-2020 Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü]nde yürüdüğümüzü, o anı anımsatıyo. İşte "Ya 8 Mart'ta burasında yürümüştük… şurasından çıkmıştık" gibi… o günleri bana anımsatıyor.

[173] 2020'de… Taksim Meydanı'nın alakasız… daha önce hiç bilmediğim bi yerine düştüm… bi döngüye girmiştim. Bi türlü kendimi aşağı indirecek bi yol bulamadım. En son artık… bi kızla denk geldik… hiç tanımıyorum. O da yürüyüşe katılmak için gelmiş, ordakilere katılmaya uğraşıyo. AKM'nin etrafından dolandık. Gezi'nin etrafından tekrar gittik falan. Baya [hiç tanımadığım bir] kızla [yürüyüşe katılabilmek için] Taksim'in her yerini gezdik. …bi hafıza olarak duruyo bende bu.

[174] Kadınların Türkiye'nin en önemli caddesi olarak adlandırdığım İstiklal Caddesi'nde Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü yapmış olmaları… [Bu yürüyüş] elimizden alınan o caddeyi geri aldığımız bi gün oluyo. [O gün orası] tamamen bize ait oluyo. Ha tabii (gülüyor) yürüyüş bittikten sonra her şey eski haline geri dönüyo.

6.1.3. Beyoğlu as *Thirdspace*

Although *secondspace* tends to be hegemonically powerful, *thirdspace* challenges *secondspace*'s domination with its radically open aspect. It encompasses physical and envisaged spaces: Everything comes together in *thirdspace* (Soja, 1996a: 56). Accordingly, I perceive Beyoğlu as a place where all other spaces and actors come together. In the scope of the thesis, I give the central place to street activism rather than everyday life. So, Beyoğlu as *thirdspace* functions to illustrate the relationship between relevant protests and the street. In addition to the FNM, in this chapter, I cover several annual protests to describe the politicization process of İstiklal Street, which necessitates being analyzed with Taksim Square, Galatasaray Square, and Tünel Square.

The politicization of Beyoğlu illustrates a spatial shift from Beyazıt Square to Taksim Square in the 1950s (Fidan, 2019). Protests, marches, and celebrations designed the square along with İstiklal Street as a prominent political public platform in the 1960s and the 1970s (Batuman, 2015; Yurdadön-Aslan & Yavan, 2018). The military coup in 1980 ended up with the silencing of political protests. Accordingly, the street encompassing three squares saved political tension until it came out. The first attempt to organize the LGBTI+ Pride Week in İstiklal Street, in 1993, was banned as it was not appropriate for "our manners and customs" by the Governorship of İstanbul (Özel Bülten – Türkiye'de Onur Yürüyüşü: Yasaklar ve Müdahaleler 2016-2017-2018-2019). However, many people tried to reach Tünel Square, despite the risk of custody. In 1995, the Saturday Mothers politicized Galatasaray Square, which hosts the 50th Anniversary of the Republic Monument, with their weekly silent appropriation. Finally, the FNM began to be organized in 2003, İstiklal Street. Although the march's route changed many times, participants walked between Tünel Square or Galatasaray Square and Taksim Square. Even though the May Day celebration was not permitted after 1977 in Taksim Square, the ban was lifted in 2010. In 2013, it was again banned due to "ongoing construction works in Taksim." At the end of the month, the Gezi Park protests began. They soon became country-wide protests. This year was a climax in terms of political contestations in Beyoğlu between the government and the people. The protesters claimed their right to the city while appropriating the area for months

with antagonism towards "the AKP's projects" that ignored people's participation in the decision-making process for the city (Baytok, 2014).

The FNM began to be organized in Turkey in 2003. It was the last annual demonstration permitted in İstiklal Street until 2019 due to preplanned bans of other protests. Protesting in İstiklal Street was no bed of roses. However, after the Gezi Park protests, the state intensified violence against protesters and limitations over the public space. Since the authority's perception of İstiklal Street has changed, its spatial politics and attitudes towards the protesters via police have changed. This study assumes women need to employ strategies more to reach and walk collectively in Beyoğlu after the Gezi Park protests, as the government found a base to limit the political actions in this symbolic place. Before the ban, protesters, police, politicians, and associations were already using some strategies and contra strategies to challenge their power and stay in the site of politics, the street. However, it was the time that was open to negotiation to some degree. When it is considered that the negotiation process came to a dead end with the Gezi Park protests and İstiklal Street continues to represent the authority's power, it was tried to be "cleaned up" from protests and protesters that aim to challenge this power.

Beyoğlu, along with Gezi Park, Taksim Square, and İstiklal Street, was a battlefield that enforced the political meaning attribution for both the government and the people. Pro-Islamic politics on urban, the commodification of urban space, the designation of Beyoğlu as a building lot, and the accumulation of counter ideas derived from the government's top-down decisions about the city fed contestations. Thus, the ban, which addresses İstiklal Street most, is rooted in the area's symbolic meanings. After all spatial and political interventions, Beyoğlu creates meanings that stand for different actors' representations: As it includes material places—Tophane, Tarlabaşı, Cihangir, etc.—that represent different and diverse lifestyles, cultural identities, political stances, etc., Beyoğlu appears to be a palimpsest, so it fits in *thirdspace*. Even though the government and previous governments created spaces for the sake of their beloved ideologies, these spaces are being used by people for various purposes in the flow of life. Thus, eternal sovereignty for those who hold power does not exist. Space is reproduced through spatial practices.

After the projects that gentrified the neighborhoods and relocated the notable shops and centers, İstiklal Street [and Beyoğlu in general] was open to the Middle Eastern capital while dismissing a particular group of people (Yurdadön-Aslan & Yavan, 2018, p. 312). The acceptable actor's inconstant definition excludes women, LGBTI+ individuals, the Saturday Mothers, etc., in İstiklal Street and other political platforms. The Saturday Mothers' weekly silent protests were repressed but permitted due to subtle legitimation. Their protests could be tolerated as they fit in heteronormative familial relationships for years. Despite their insistence on the square, they were then forced to relocate their protests from Galatasaray Square to Kazlıçeşme (Baydar & İvegen, 2006, p. 704). They were frequently associated with terror; for this reason, their protests were banned in 2018 ("Soylu: Eminönü'nde Gezerken mi Kayboldular?", 2018).[175] The Pride Parade, on the other hand, was an exceptional march, including people of various gender identities and sexual orientations that do not fit in cissexist, and heteronormative frames. Thus, they keep experiencing harsh police intervention and violence since 2015, without suggesting an alternative place for the parade. With the COVID-19 pandemic, some of these protests were moved to online platforms for almost two years.

Then, women awaited a ban that would prevent the last annual protest in İstiklal Street. In 2019, the FNM was banned. It is still a banned but experienced march in Beyoğlu, even though the Minister of Interior Süleyman Soylu warned participants and suggested to walk in any place from Yenikapı to Kadıköy, but not in İstiklal Street.[176] The FNM, within these protests, takes a unique place as its participants' major claim is literally spatial. Thus, Beyoğlu, where many women are assumed to feel out of place is the march's locus and focus. Although İstiklal Street, including Taksim Square, Galatasaray Square, and Tünel Square, was not organized and reorganized for the sake of relevant protests, it was chosen and appropriated by protesters with different

---

[175] The Minister of Interior Süleyman Soylu entitled the Saturday Mothers' protests as "the abuse of motherhood by the terrorist organization."

[176] The Minister of Interior Süleyman Soylu's speech was an answer to Journalist Özlem Gürses's question about attending the Feminist Night March in İstiklal Street.
CNN TÜRK. (2020, March 5, 2:31:13-2:33:37). *İçişleri Bakanı Süleyman Soylu Gündemdeki Tüm Gelişmeleri Tarafsız Bölge'de Değerlendirdi-04.03.2020* [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/CVdJoZy4Ztw

motivations: Commemoration ceremonies, national and religious holidays, and days that fit in the government's perceptions are welcome in the area. On the other hand, the street hosts protests that unaccepted people organize or participate, despite all constraints and frustrations.

Eventually, İstiklal Street carries meanings that attract both power holders and opponents. It provides the sources that the government uses to prevent the participation of unwanted actors. On the other hand, it ensures these actors find a way out. The protests contradict the conceived meanings and organization of İstiklal Street. The government creates a surveilled, controlled, and gentrified place full of discourses that canonize fear and conservatism, and yet the street cherishes the memory of the FNM and women's experiences. Participants' place attachment originates in their resistance in İstiklal Street, in spite of governmental discourses and planning. *Thirdspace*-characterized İstiklal Street consists of all actors, functioning not only with and for authority.

Regarding participants' narratives, Beyoğlu takes an in-between position. It indicates the coexistence of safe and unsafe spaces, advantages and disadvantages, reliable allies and fear-triggering men. Eventually, it allows women to make room for themselves on their own terms in the city because neither space is fixed and impermeable nor power is total and monopolized in the *thirdspace*. That's why marching at the FNM in Beyoğlu gives women a chance to appropriate the space with their allies despite the constraints.

> [Beyoğlu] is important as it offers you visibility and diversity there. I love Kadıköy, but Kadıköy will never be like İstiklal [Street]. [Beyoğlu] is a place where Tarlabaşı locates… and wherein transgender women "can" live. Kadıköy is more of a homogenous place. Taksim is more representative because of its diversity. I think it is important to gather for the Feminist Night March in Beyoğlu… because it needs to include all women… or LGBTI+ individuals (Güllü).[177]

> … we regard Beyoğlu as the area that includes İstiklal Street, Sıraselviler, Cihangir, and Şişhane. … These places are not those that host the supporters of the government. They could took over the municipality management thanks to votes of people who were living in fascist-dense quarters of Beyoğlu, like Halıcıoğlu and Kasımpaşa…

---

[177] Görünür olmak ve oradaki çeşitlilik açısında [Beyoğlu] önemli. Kadıköy'ü çok seviyorum ama Kadıköy hiçbir zaman İstiklal gibi olmayacak. Bir tarafta Tarlabaşı'nın olduğu, bir tarafta trans kadınların "yaşayabildiği…" Kadıköy biraz daha… tek tip bir yer. Taksim o çeşitliliği açısından daha kapsayıcı bir yer. Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü için bunun önemli olduğunu düşünüyorum çünkü orada bütün kadınları kapsaması gerekiyor ya da işte LGBTİ+'yı.

> So… we cannot say the government has a strong influence on Beyoğlu. Residents of these fascist neighborhoods… These potential voters mean nothing. We have been in Sıraselviler, Cihangir, İstiklal, Mis Street, Şişhane… for years and years. Well, we appropriate that space in every single protest. People from marginalized identities have been living and exist here! (Anahit).[178]

As Soja's *thirdspace* dimension builds a theoretical ground for this study, I discuss women's socio-spatial experiences at the FNM in Beyoğlu through fluidity. In this way, from the point of the participants' spatial experiences before and after participating in the FNM in Beyoğlu, I explored that the FNM provides women with spatial control, authority, and confidence that temporarily eases their fear of verbal and sexual violence. Yet, it triggers their fear of physical violence by the same or similar actors besides their in-group contestations. Eventually, as well as allowing women to experience agency, the FNM in Beyoğlu transforms women's fear and anger into trust and hope. The coexistence of opportunities and constraints paves the way for women's placemaking in this symbolic place. Although their feminist activism and placemaking efforts are being challenged by different actors, including but not limited to the government, and the conduct of politics of memory, women find a way to create a safe space where they think Beyoğlu belongs to them to a limited degree and temporarily.

> Sometimes I turn around and look at the side streets [in Beyoğlu]. It reminds me of the things we went through. I mean our movements… I remember the friends we lost. İstiklal Street makes me have mixed feelings. Sometimes it gives hope and excitement; and sometimes it makes me sad… because [LGBTI+ individuals'] true life experiences imbued in that street… Actually, for all members of the society… for Gezi [Park Protests], the Feminist Night March… people tryna to exist there, their struggle to survive there... Actually, İstiklal Street has a special meaning not only for us but everyone (Anahit). [179]

---

[178] …bizim Beyoğlu dediğimiz yer İstiklal Caddesi'ni, Sıraselviler'i, Cihangir'i ve Şişhane'yi barındıran bölge aslında. … Hani hükümetin… kendi seçmenlerinin bulunduğu yerler buralar değil. Onlar yine Beyoğlu'na bağlı olan; işte Halıcıoğlu, Kasımpaşa gibi daha faşist bölgelerden oylarla hani zaten belediyeyi alabildiler. … O yüzden şey diyemeyiz bence: Hani hükümetin burda güçlü bi şeyi yok yani. İşte oy potansiyeli bi şey ifade etmiyo bence. … Sıraselviler, Cihangir, İstiklal, işte Mis Sokak, Şişhane. E zaten buralar bizim yıllardır var olduğumuz yerler! Yani her eylemlerde orda oluyoruz. …ötekileştirilmiş kimliklerin var olduğu ve yıllardır yaşadığı yerler de buralar.

[179] Bazen böyle dönüp ara sokaklara baktığımda yaşadığımız şeyleri hatırlıyorum yani hareket açısından: Kaybettiğimiz arkadaşlarımız aklıma geliyor. Bana böyle bi duygu karmaşası yaşatıyo yani İstiklal Caddesi: Kimi zaman umutlandırıyo, heyecanlandırıyo; kimi zaman da hüzne boğuyo beni çünkü İstiklal Caddesi tam anlamıyla bir yaşanmışlık barındırıyo bizim [LGBTİ+'lar] açımızdan… aslında toplumun her kesimi açısından yani: Gezi [Parkı Protestoları], Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü; orda var olmaya çalışan insanlar, bu insanların verdiği

> This is where we have been living. Our places located in Beyoğlu. The Socialist Feminist Collective, Amargi, Lambda… That is where we got organized and held our meetings. So we were already living there in the daytime and at night. That's why it was important to gather for the Feminist Night March in Beyoğlu… As a feminist person, a feminist woman, a feminist human rights activist woman, I can say that "İstiklal Street has witnessed a lot." Let's consider Saturday Mothers… I was a part of that movement. For the first 2 years, I sat there on every week. Therefore… indeed, Beyoğlu is also a site of memory (Ayşe).[180]

Actors attribute different meanings to Beyoğlu. In line with this argument, like other actors therein, the research participants recall their individual memories and attach to Beyoğlu through their multiple identities. They generate a sense of belonging in Beyoğlu and stake a claim in this place because Beyoğlu appears to be a contested space where different actors, and even opponents, find a relatable ground to exist and express their ideas.

> … Beyoglu is still "of no lands and of all lands." It embodies different pasts and presents for different actors. What Herzfeld (1991) suggested in another context is relevant for Beyoglu, too. Monumental history has its place in Beyoglu, but Beyoglu has, and is a place in, many histories (Bartu, 1999, p. 44).

The *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu, which shows it is "of no lands and of all lands" and not possessed by an individual master but by multiple actors, still maintains its importance, especially for social movements. Besides its physical structure, it is a social reproduction that is being redefined through social interactions. Concerning Soja's (1996a) representation of *thirdspace* as a fluid mode, Beyoğlu keeps being reinterpreted and redefined by different actors. Therefore, neither its physical organization nor sociopolitical contestations imbued in Beyoğlu are fixed. In line with his *trialectics of spatiality*, Beyoğlu as a social product and women's social practices interrelatedly shape each other. Eventually, women can find a way to challenge their choices and preferences in the urban context with feminist activism and within the *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu because they create a moment together.

---

yaşam mücadelesi... Aslında sadece bizim için değil, herkes için bi şey ifade ediyo İstiklal Caddesi.

[180] Hayatımızın geçtiği yer orası. Yani bizim mekânlarımız ordaydı. Sosyalist Feminist Kolektif, Amargi, Lambda… Yani bizim örgütlendiğimiz, toplantılarımızı yaptığımız yer orasıydı. Yani biz gece gündüz [Beyoğlu'nda] yaşıyoduk zaten. O yüzden Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nü orda yapmak önemliydi … Feminist bir insan, feminist bi kadın, feminist bi insan hakları savunucusu kadın olarak söylüyorum, "İstiklal Caddesi çok fazla şeye tanıklık etti." Cumartesi Anneleri mesela… Ben orda da çok aktiftim. İlk 2 sene sürekli oturdum. Dolayısıyla… hakkaten yani orası bir hafıza mekânı aynı zamanda.

6.2. Women's Right to Public Spaces and Potentials of the FNM in Beyoğlu

The participants' narratives show that the FNM is related to women's right to the city and night. Participants establish this connection regarding spatial access and taking up space in Beyoğlu, which they define as the most important symbolic place among urban public spaces in Turkey. However, not all participants consider this march an urban social movement. Some participants emphasize that "Geceleri de sokakları da meydanları da terk etmiyoruz" [We are not leaving the nights, neither the streets nor the squares]. However, some of them say that they only attend the march to "feel good," dance, etc. Although some have no direct motivation for reclaiming the city, their participation in the march makes the place temporarily safe, so it has the potential to make these participants feel like they have got the city back for a while. Even some participants, who do not intend to take Beyoğlu back, say that their self-confidence and spatial confidence increases during and after the march, and they feel more attached to this place more than ever.

> You know, the slogan "We are not leaving the nights, neither the streets nor the squares"… [This march] has a very serious claim about women's own lives and the city. ... It transforms the night. Overall, it means, "I will not leave this place. I will not leave it. It belongs to me" (Sena).[181]

> People do not prefer to be in the streets at night because they do not find it safe, but these streets are ours, the night belongs to us, the day is ours, we always have them all! I wish it could be possible not only for one day but every single that in a year so as to know this: We will be able to walk on that street at 3:00 AM without fear because we will be surrounded by other women who feel and can raise their voice (Güz).[182]

> … we raided the meyhanes in Beyoğlu in 1989. At that time, women could not enter the meyhanes that much. When we started to organize the Feminist Night March in 2003, most meyhanes were open to both women and men. İstiklal Street is an important symbol in the sense that the night and the streets are forbidden for women. [Therefore] walking in İstiklal Street is objection to the fact that the night, the street,

---

[181] "Geceleri de sokakları da meydanları da terk etmiyoruz" sloganı var ya… [Bu yürüyüşün] kadınların hem kendi yaşamlarına hem de kente dair çok ciddiii bir iddiası var. ... Geceyi dönüştürüyor. Bütünde de zaten "Ben bu alandan gitmiycem. Bu alanı terk etmiycem. Burası benim" demek aslında bu.

[182] İnsanlar geceyi güvenli bulmadığı için gece sokakta olmayı tercih etmiyo ama bu sokaklar bizim, gece de bizim, gündüz de bizim, her zaman bizim! Bu… yılın bir günü değil de her gün sokaklarda yükselen ses olsa ki biz de şunu bilsek: Gece 3'te de rahat bir şekilde o sokakta yürüyebileceğiz çünkü o sokakta başka kadınlar da var, kendini güvende hisseden ve sesini yükselten, yükseltebilen.

some behaviors, and some places for social interactions are closed to women's appropriation (Ayşe).[183]

Although the relevant literature indicates that women employ negotiation strategies in the urban struggle, which mainly limit the boundaries of their mobility, the FNM has become a proactive strategy for women's collective visibility, placemaking and history-making in Beyoğlu. It gives trust, hope, and especially confidence to the participants. After the İstiklal ban and the closure of Sıraselviler, women had to find an alternative route to gather in Beyoğlu. Thus, they explored new sideways and formed new alliances, which provided them with spatial competence and confidence in the field. In this way, the FNM consolidates women's sense of belonging and right to public spaces in Beyoğlu because women experience physical and symbolic placemaking as visible social actors rather than fearful users of the city at the FNM. Regarding the participants' narratives, the FNM is interwoven with the idea of women's right to the city in parallel with Harvey's (2012) approach. As he suggests, the right to the city transgresses the borders of an individual right. Harvey (2012) argues that this right "…is, moreover, a collective… right, since reinventing the city inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power…" which ensures "the freedom to make and remake ourselves and our cities…" (p. 4).

> The Feminist Night March is the only time when a woman walk in the street at night without fear... That's why it completely meets women's right to the city. … Normally, in a place like Taksim, you hesitantly step onto the street... but on March 8, you enter this street with thousands of women… with bells on… Also… we put [excessive make-up] and wear whatever we want for this march… we feel safe despite that. That's why the Feminist Night March inspires confidence and happiness in me (Zeynep).[184]

> I have a conservative family. If I come [home] late at night, this would be a problem. [On March 8] despite my family, being in the street, for this march, until 11:00 PM or

---

[183] … 1989'da biz [Beyoğlu'nda] meyhane baskını yapmıştık. O zamanlar meyhaneleri kadınlar çok kullanamıyodu. 2003 yılında Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ne başladığımız zaman artık çoğu meyhane hem kadınların hem de erkeklerin gidebildiği alanlar olmuştu. İstiklal Caddesi gecelerin ve sokakların kadınlara yasak olması anlamında önemli bi sembol. [Bu sebeple] İstiklal Caddesi'nde gece yürümek gecenin, sokağın, kimi davranışların, kimi sosyallik alanlarının kadınlara kapalı olmasına bi itiraz aynı zamanda.

[184] [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü] bi kadının gece sokakta … güvenle yürüyebildiği tek zaman. O yüzden kent hakkını birebir karşılıyo. … Normalde Taksim gibi bi mekânda, tereddütle adım attığın bi caddeye yanında binlerce kadınla güle oynaya, zıplayarak giriyosun ki 8 Mart'larda ne [abartı] makyajlar ne kıyafetlerle [istediğimizi giyerek] gideriz yani... buna rağmen… güven verir. Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü bu yüzden bende güven ve mutluluk uyandırıyo.

the midnight… chanting slogans, "spitting your heart out", finding strength from someone next to you… running hand in hand with a woman you never knew when the police fired teargas… It is a very phenomenal, very different experience you cannot encounter in your everyday life. That's why the Feminist Night March makes me feel free (Eylül).[185]

From its physical structure to imagined meanings, Beyoğlu is an amorphous place that paves the way for contestations. It has been instrumentalized by different governments to realize their political aims, while their discontents have always found a way to use this place for the sake of their own needs and purposes. In this study, I claim that Beyoğlu is a place composed of three spatial moments where constraints and opportunities coexist and give everyone a chance to appropriate the city. The AK Party government charges Beyoğlu as a place to realize its neoconservative and neoliberal urban politics as the early Republican period once aimed to disseminate its' particular ideology through space, while their discontents use the same place in order to make room for their counter ideas and identities in the city. For example, the Mega Projects of the AK Party government aim to erase the backward memory of the discontents as Prost's Plan aimed at the same thing decades ago (Akpınar & Gümüş, 2012; Aksoy, 2019 [2014]; Batuman, 2015; Yıldırım & Erdem, 2015). As Zengin (2019 [2014]) explores, power holders' interventions like gentrification, police raid, custody, state violence, etc. function as strategies that result in income-oriented reproduction of Beyoğlu and its spatial purification. In that sense, the contestation within Beyoğlu is a matter of the intersection of identity politics, cultural politics, and politics of memory that go hand in hand with profit-oriented policies of the government. As is understood from the relevant literature and the participants' experiences, the contestations in Beyoğlu indicate what Smith (1996) calls *revanchist urbanism* as "an effort to retake the city [from the] minorities, the working class, women, environmental legislation, gays and lesbians, immigrants" (p. xix).

On the other hand, I claim that both the amorphous structure of Beyoğlu, which I consider under the title of the *thirdspace* dimension in this study, and the feminist

---

[185] Muhafazakâr bi ailem var. [Eve] gece çok geç dönmem normalde sorun edilen bi şey. [8 Mart'ta] buna rağmen gece yürüyüşü için 23.00-00.00'a kadar sokakta olmak… orda çeşitli sloganlar atmak, "içini dökmek" bi nevi ve yanındakinden güç bulmak… polis gaz attığında hiç tanımadığın bi kadınla el ele koşmak… Bu çok büyük, çok değişik, her gün yaşayamayacağın bi şey. O yüzden [Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'nün] benim için çok özgürleştirici bi yanı var.

solidarity and alliance that participants form at the FNM enable them to appropriate public spaces of Beyoğlu for their own needs and own their own terms despite the power holders. Since they encounter their allies in familiar and safe spaces in Beyoğlu, they find a chance to respond to those who bother them in their everyday lives. At the FNM, participants bring their full selves into view and feel confident with their multiple intersecting identities in Beyoğlu because they take strength from each other, where the FNM creates a safe space and a spatial moment.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1. Summary

Gender role beliefs indicate diverse representations of women and men in the city: public man versus domestic woman and vulnerable woman versus dangerous man. According to this dichotomy, women are supposed to be passive and fearful users of the city. The risk of being subjected to crime is supposed to stick women in their houses, which are depicted as a safe space for women. In contrast, men are assumed to be confident urbanites in public spaces in the daytime or at night. Fear of violence prevents women from appropriating the city at night. This emotion not only limits or prevents women from accessing urban public spaces but reproduces itself in this way. While the fear of being subjected to different types of violence in the city reduces the possibility of women's use of urban public spaces, it places women in an "uncanny" position and makes them vulnerable to violence in the street. The participants of this study are activist women. So, it cannot show a complete representation of women's fear perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors in Beyoğlu. Yet, it endeavors to refute the vulnerable, passive, and fearful image of women in the city through the representation of women involved in the FNM. On the other hand, as they are supposed to transgress the cultural codes of the street and the representation of proper womanhood in Turkey when they take up space in Beyoğlu at night, even the activist women who do not give up on appropriating urban public spaces at night feel forced to negotiate fear and employ some strategies.

Fear of being subjected to violence is a gendered emotion that inculcates women with the mystification of home as a safe space while preventing them from appropriating

urban public spaces, especially at night. In the matter of their urban mobility, women's avoidance shows that fear of violence and the violence itself are the spatial and timewise reflection of patriarchy. It sets the boundaries of women's mobility in the city. Although women are mainly exposed to familiar men's violence at their houses, their perceptions of violence are mainly about stranger men in the street, which makes them employ some negotiation strategies that mainly end up with their avoidance of using particular places at certain hours in the city.

I take participants' perceptions of safety, attitudes, and actual behaviors in Beyoğlu through lived experiences in their everyday life and at the FNM in this study. I explored that since the participants regard some places as unsafe for women in Beyoğlu, they employ some strategies to negotiate the risk of being subjected to violence. On the contrary, I found that they give up maintaining awareness and employing strategies in the places they deem safe. So, their mental maps of safety and unsafety in Beyoğlu determine the boundaries of their mobility, especially when they are alone in the urban context. Although there are common tendencies among the participants, like perceiving the men in the street as the major trigger for fear of sexual violence, their intersecting identities provide them with different emotional and practical reactions toward different people and places.

I aimed to deconstruct the image of women as fearful subjects of the city by centering my research around the lived experiences of 22 participants (self-identified women) of the FNM, wherein participants stake a claim on being visible, taking over spatial control, and placemaking in Beyoğlu. I built this study on the thesis statement that indicates the FNM shifts women's fear into trust in Beyoğlu. However, as not all women experience fear of violence at the same level, the reasons for women's trust, anger, and hope differ according to their intersecting identities. Based on Soja's conceptualization of *the trialectics of spatiality*, I assert that Beyoğlu is a social actor that shapes participants' spatial experiences rather than being a stage or an empty container of their social activities. In order to understand the mutual relationship between space and gender, I aimed to explore the role of feminist activism in the form of the FNM in Beyoğlu in women's placemaking in the city. That's why I designed the following interrelated questions to comprehend the relationality between the

190

characteristics of Beyoğlu, the characteristics of the participants, the possibilities of feminist activism, and women's spatial experiences in the urban context:

Research Questions:

RQ1: How do women's characteristics and participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu form their spatial experiences in this fluid and symbolic place?

RQ2: How do their intersecting identities and the multidimensional structure of space shape these women's claims to Beyoğlu, as part of feminist activism in Turkey?

SQ1: How do these participants experience Beyoğlu in their everyday life?

SQ2: How do women's perceptions of safety, attitudes, and actual behaviors take form during and after their participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu?

SQ3: What are the social characteristics and spatial dimensions of Beyoğlu?

First of all, women's elimination of public spaces because of the gendered fear of violence is a well-studied topic in academia. The negotiation strategies that women employ to respond to the risk of violence, likewise, have been covered by many feminist researchers. However, not all studies that center around women's right to the city regard fear of violence as a factor in the deprivation of women's right to appropriate public spaces in the city. On the contrary, one of my main aims of this study is to understand how fear of violence causes women to step back from using urban public spaces that they consider dangerous. I argue that feminist activism is one of the negotiation strategies that ask for women's right to take up space in the city at night without fear of being exposed to violence while transforming women's fear of violence into trust and hope to a limited degree. I think that the FNM has the power to turn women's fear of sexual violence upside down as an assertive strategy because it paves the way for feminist solidarity and alliance.

In this study, I consider the participants' fear of being subjected to verbal, sexual, and physical violence by three groups of men: men in the street, law enforcement officials, and foreigners in their everyday lives in Beyoğlu. On the other hand, it offers a chance to contrast fear triggers and fearful actors they perceive at the FNM therein. Eventually, I understood that women's socio-spatial experiences in the city are all related to their emotions that are not natural or intrinsic to their gender identity but

socially constructed. For example, the participants demonstrated that their fear transforms into trust and hope at the FNM when they know they are surrounded by their allies. However, their trust weakens because they begin to lose ground a few hours after the march ends. When Beyoğlu begins to welcome its residents and daily users, whose majority are comprised of men whom women deem dangerous, the place begins to resemble a labyrinth where women feel forced to negotiate fear.

Beyoğlu, where the FNM takes place since the first day, is not a tabula rasa, stage, or an empty container of social activities and relations, as many urban sociologists have explored. On the contrary, space is a social actor that determines the boundaries of women's urban mobility and social experiences therein. Soja's (1996a) conceptualization of the *thirdspace* builds the theoretical frame for this study. In order to better understand the fluidity of Beyoğlu in a way that opens up space for both power holders and their opponents, I consider Beyoğlu as *thirdspace*, which is one of the spatial moments that indicate possibilities. This multi-layered structure of Beyoğlu has been studied in academia through different social movements without giving particular importance to the *thirdspace*: the Pride Parade (Mutlu, 2012), the Gezi Park protests (Baytok, 2014; Gül, Dee, & Cünük, 2014), etc. Finally, Kocabıçak's master's thesis locates *thirdspace* in the Saturday Mothers' sit-in protests in Beyoğlu, while Akdemir's (2021) master's thesis centers around the FNM in Beyoğlu with a focus on President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's claim on the FNM participants' "disrespect" toward the call to prayer in 2019. In my study, I aim to contribute to the existing literature by locating feminist activism in women's spatial experiences in the city through *thirdspace* theory.

The FNM participants, who are limited to all-women subjects in this study, are not passive users of Beyoğlu. Although fear determines the boundaries of their urban mobility in this symbolic place in their everyday lives, the FNM enables them to make room for themselves through the feminist solidarity and alliance they form at the march. Far from consuming the city with fear, these women have a chance to transform and reproduce the place through feminist activism. Since they become collectively visible in the symbolic place that they take over for that night (March 8), they appropriate the place with trust and hope rather than doing a tightrope walking with fear in their everyday lives. During their participation in the FNM, these women

consolidate their political identity with the symbolic meaning they attribute to Beyoğlu. The FNM also has the potential to deconstruct the invisible or gazed woman image. At this march, women become who gaze at men in contrast to their everyday life experiences: They look nonparticipant men in the eye and tell them the march is open for women and transgender individuals' participation. They gaze at men whom they do not consider as the rightful subjects of the march. They roll their eyes and frown at men as they frown on their attendance rather than being gazed at by them.

Participants stake a claim on Beyoğlu. While doing so, they transform their selves from invisible or gazed-at individuals into visible subjects of the city and this symbolic place. Therefore, women's participation in the FNM in Beyoğlu has the power to transform the fearful image attributed to women as well as Beyoğlu itself. All these aspects indicate the fluid structure of Beyoğlu and its role as the social actor shaping women's spatial experiences. The coexistence of constraints and opportunities in Beyoğlu makes it possible for women to make use of feminist activism and take up space in the city. However, as women come from different backgrounds, the choices available to them in the city are different. Not all women have the same opportunity, and not all constraints apply to them on equal terms. I explain this situation as follows: The FNM in Beyoğlu creates a fluid space. Marching in Beyoğlu at the FNM offers women a slippery ground where they can encounter their opponents as well as their allies. Also, their multiple intersecting identities make these women more vulnerable or more resilient to cope with the constraints in Beyoğlu.

In this study, I explored that women, as the organizers and participants of the FNM, are agents with limited control. Yet, their spatial experiences at the FNM in Beyoğlu are beyond the representation of women as passive users of urban public spaces. Since I regard Beyoğlu as the *thirdspace*, Beyoğlu takes an in-between position. Walking in Beyoğlu is like getting through the labyrinth between unsafe and safe spaces. As Soja (1996a, p. 81) emphasizes, the *thirdspace* dimension of space engenders "endless possibilities." Regarding the role Soja casts for *thirdspace*, I explored that Beyoğlu keeps opportunities with constraints, so it offers both the participants and their opponents a chance for placemaking. It hosts safe and unsafe spaces, advantages and disadvantages, and reliable allies and fear-triggering men. Eventually, it allows women to make room for themselves on their own terms in the city because neither space is

fixed and impermeable nor power is total and monopolized in the *thirdspace*. That's why participating in the FNM in Beyoğlu gives women a chance to appropriate the space with confidence and provides them with the strength they take from their allies, but it makes them encounter fear-triggering actors and other constraints. Eventually, this study frames women's spatial experiences through their socially constructed emotions in Beyoğlu instead of regarding vulnerability and fear as natural states for women.

As Wilson (1992) indicates the liberating power of cities for women, Beyoğlu offers some participants anonymity that makes them feel relieved in their everyday lives. However, it is not available to everyone and is not desired by everybody, as Garber (2000) points out through black, butch, or drug individuals' experiences in the city. Participants do not confirm that anonymity brings women freedom. On the contrary, they feel powerful, invincible, and confident as much as they gain collective visibility. It is especially evident in the statements of the participants whose gender identities overlap with other unaccepted identities in the eyes of society. Participants such as Muslim feminists and transgender women talk about how they feel able to exist and take up space in Beyoğlu as the FNM creates a moment in which participants can bring their "full selves" into existence without hiding themselves or filtering their behaviors. The FNM is a movement that opens the way for so-called abnormal performances, bodies, and identities.

7.2. The FNM: Women's Placemaking Experience in Beyoğlu

During the march, particular places of Beyoğlu shape into fluid places where women enable themselves to seek their rights. By hiding placards from police, creating pathways within passages, chasing whistle sound, sharing locations and information about closed roads and entrances via social media, doing live streams to create evidence, which is hard to delete after it goes viral, about police intervention, etc., women use Beyoğlu, *even* it gets dark, as agents. Accordingly, I mount an argument about women's spatial control in Beyoğlu while questioning the role of the feminist activism and the *thirdspace* dimension of Beyoğlu in shaping women's perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors therein.

The data that I derived from the fieldwork partially confirms the relevant literature. Feminist activism paves the way for women to create a safe space (Baytok, 2014; Bonu 2021; Hvala, 2012; Sandberg & Coe, 2020; Koskela, 1997; etc.). However, in this study, I also came to the following conclusion: Women, who are afraid of being exposed to sexual harassment and sexual assault in their everyday lives, overcome their fear of sexual violence at the FNM. However, they experience fear of in-group contestations that end up with implicit and explicit forms of sexism, transphobia, Orientalism, etc., besides their everyday fear of being exposed to verbal and physical violence by men in the street. Therefore, the potential of the FNM is not limited to the emotional shift from fear to trust. Depending on participants' characteristics, the FNM allows them to have different emotions. According to the participants' experiences, women's mobility in the city is often restricted by the men in the street. During the march, their mobility is facilitated by other women and LGBTI+ individuals whom they regard as their allies. Eventually, a safe space is never complete. On the contrary, it is socially produced and constantly negotiated.

Unlike placemaking approaches in urban planning and design, placemaking in this study means creating a safe space and symbolic place where women generate a sense of belonging and feel confident through feminist activism. In my conceptualization, participants of the FNM imbue Beyoğlu with their physical (bodily and vocal) and symbolic existence. Participants appropriate particular places that are already symbolic to them or attribute meanings there after participating in the march. This march is implicitly about the participants' claims on the symbolic place, Beyoğlu, and other urban public spaces in the city. The FNM, contrary to the characteristics of what Stanko (1995) calls self-controlling *defensive maneuvers* for women's prevention strategies for street violence and sexual attack, appears as an assertive strategy that claims a safe space for women and LGBTI+ individuals and their right to access and be mobile in urban public spaces.

Crowded and armed police with different forces mediate the government's power, thus its strategies. Police operations like rub-down searches, encircling the street and the square, ID controls, using violence towards the participants, etc. aim to end the march by deterring participants. Water canon vehicles, panzers, rubber bullets, pepper spray, and an excessive number of police officers per capita denote governmental power

while escalating fear and anger among the participants. On the other hand, women create a temporary safe space by carrying banners and posters and chanting slogans imbued with their claims within the temporary women and trans-inclusive street. Slogans indicate women's rightful affiliation with the street and night: "Geceleri de sokakları da meydanları da terk etmiyoruz" [We are not leaving the nights, neither the streets nor the squares.] and "Sokaklar bizimdir, hesap sorulmaz; 12'den sonra büyü bozulmaz." [The streets are ours; no one can ask for an explanation. The spell will not be broken at midnight.] Visuals made with stencils or handcraft represent gender symbols and feminism signs in purple and pride rainbow colors. Unlike uncanny street surrounded by toxic masculinity, men as the majority, and sexist swearwords, Beyoğlu forms into a living entity where the participants commemorate women subjected to femicide and express complaints about all forms of male violence while giving voice to their claims and protecting each other.

This study also shows that women discover new ways in Beyoğlu due to the attempts to prevent the march, such as intense police blockade. The participants, who had passed through the same roads before the ban to reach the marching route, say that after the ban, they appropriated "Beyoğlu'nun çatlakları" [Beyoğlu's cracks], side streets, and hidden places for them. They claim that they attribute a different and symbolic meaning to those places through their memories at the FNM, which contributes to their place attachment and the history of feminist activism in Beyoğlu. In this way, they learn the codes of places where they were once unaware of the social and spatial dynamics. So they gain the *spatial expertise* that Koskela (1997, p. 310) regards as "an ability to interpret the signs of danger," which enables them to "identify situations that should be avoided or that one should be careful in." They learn to identify potential dangers and negotiate them in Beyoğlu as "experts in urban semiotics." So, I assert that the FNM turns from a simple movement where women and LGBTI+ individuals walk together for their rights into a spatial moment that makes women consolidate their spatial competence and placemaking in Beyoğlu at night, where and when they feel excluded in their everyday lives.

Since they get spatial expertise here, they become more responsive in the space than ever. As a result, they get a sense of spatial confidence. Their participation in FNM strengthens the relationship these women establish with the city and transforms

196

Beyoğlu to a limited extent, as women experience physical and symbolic placemaking through feminist activism. Women gain spatial control as a result of participating in the FNM. However, the control that women establish in space is not equally accessible to all women. The most important factor determining this situation is women's identities. This state of having different backgrounds not only differentiates the spatial experience of women but causes in-group contestations. In other words, besides the duality like "Them versus Us," the FNM reveals that there is a struggle between "Us versus us" among the participants.

At the FNM, participants become visible to each other as well as to others. By having something purple on, bringing pride flags, and carrying banners, they present themselves in the streets of Beyoğlu, where they generally do not seek to be visible in their everyday lives. They use stencils to paint and write on the walls and windows of shops and paving stones throughout Beyoğlu. They chant feminist slogans, play the tambourine, blow a whistle, shout, and sing. Besides being visible to others, they aim at making others hear their voice. They dance and use their body in the way they want, although they feel forced to control their bodies in their everyday lives, especially in public spaces they deem unsafe for women. At the FNM, participants are not afraid of taking up space in Beyoğlu. On the contrary, as women, they ache for collective visibility in the street at night, where and when they are supposed to avoid social interactions with others. They become collectively visible in the media and the urban politics of Turkey, besides their bodily existence in the street. Since they gather with their friends, "comrades," etc. before the march but refuse to leave Beyoğlu after the march ends, women make physical placemaking in the streets of Beyoğlu at night for different reasons: They attend the afterparty where they do not access in their everyday lives as men do, have a beer on the pavements with confidence, walk throughout the streets in clothes they feel forced to eliminate in their everyday lives, which ends up with their space appropriation and physical placemaking in Beyoğlu.

Moreover, participants state that they lay a claim to the places in Beyoğlu that are important to their individual memory and the history of feminist activism in Turkey. Regarding their everyday life and marching experiences, these women stake a claim on their existence in Mis Street, Tel Street, Bayram Street, etc., where they feel attached because of their intersecting identities. For example, they imprint Tel Street

onto Feminist Mekan, which has hosted several women and LGBTI+ individuals for feminist gatherings in Beyoğlu for years. Mis Street, on the other hand, is a place where the FNM began, so participants give special importance to it. Because the places bear traces of feminist activism and feminist identity, participants think they have the right to appropriate Beyoğlu. They regard Beyoğlu as a part of their history and a symbol of their resilience. On the other hand, they make sense of places where they once do not have a sense of belonging. For example, as they recall their memories from 2019 and 2020, they appropriated Sıraselviler Street at the FNM because İstiklal Street was closed by the government, which transformed Sıraselviler into a site of remembering their feminist solidarity and alliance. Eventually, the FNM made the participants familiar with Beyoğlu more than ever, despite and due to the ban, and paved the way for their symbolic placemaking in addition to their physical appearance.

7.3. Research Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Because this study is a master's thesis, some limitations made it impossible to consider the research topic with all its dimensions. After all, as the researcher, I had to frame the research around the limitations, which ended up with a study on 22 self-identified women's spatial experiences at the FNM in Beyoğlu, although participants of the FNM are not limited to women. Moreover, I admit that the study does not represent each woman attending the march. I employed purposive, snowball, and quota sampling methods in order to access the research participants, which led to a convenience, non-representative, and non-probability sample. Therefore, I acknowledge that the study indicates a partial pattern instead of making a complete representation of reality.

As I pointed out in the Introduction Chapter, women and LGBTI+ individuals' urban struggle has been issued by both the international and national academia in regard to their perceptions of urban safety and street violence. However, not one of them could indicate a representative study including subjects of different social identities, such as gender, class, ethnicity, etc., specific to Turkey. They limit the subjects to women and men through the gender binary as TURKSTATS does every year to conduct the Life Satisfaction Surveys, or LGBTI+ individuals as mainly independent researchers do for their articles. Therefore, the findings do not elaborately indicate the intersectionality and the subjects' multiple identities. Considering the current situation in academia, I

did what I criticized by limiting the subjects of this study to women. I believe there is a need to conduct research with participants of different ages, socioeconomic statuses, ethnic backgrounds, sexual orientations, and especially different forms of their gender identity (cisgender, transgender, gender-fluid+).

Having completed the fieldwork for this study, I found what I expected to find: Women's sociodemographic characteristics shape their socio-spatial experiences. Although there are some common tendencies among them, their experiences become more authentic as their gender identity intersects with their other identities. As there are different experiences between women, it is not hard to see that a sample composed of participants who come from different backgrounds has the power to illustrate a more representative pattern of social reality. Patriarchy also hurts men with unacceptable identities while it favors and equips others with some privileges. So, a study that also considers men's spatial experiences in the city has the power to refute the well-accepted yet missing representation of men as the landlords of the city, as I aimed at refuting the fearful image of women in this study. As the mystification of home as a safe space for women has been challenged by feminist studies, I believe there is a need to explore the mystification of men's complete domination and bravery in urban public spaces through their own narratives.

Because the COVID-19 pandemic caused firm precautions on intercity transportation, it was hard for me to go from Ankara to İstanbul and do face-to-face interviews with the participants. Actually, the pandemic was not the only reason that made me prefer to do interviews via Zoom and Microsoft Teams, except for one participant who especially asked me to meet in İstanbul. Although doing interviews via online platforms provided me with a cost and time-effective fieldwork experience, as a researcher studying women's spatial experiences in the city, I would really like to meet all these participants in İstanbul, especially in Beyoğlu, even in their perceived safe and unsafe spaces therein. It would result in more authentic research. In parallel with the expected opportunities of doing face-to-face interviews, I regard doing interviews with the subjects of this study via online platforms as one of the most important constraints that shape the findings of this research.

Before doing the analysis, I formed a thematic schema. In that schema, the most recurring factor that limits mothers, daughters, and pet parents' mobility in the urban context is caregiving. Since they feel responsible for their children, pets, spouses or partners, and parents who are in need of care, the subjects of this study do not experience the city as much as participants, whose responsibility is limited to their own care. The family is one of the institutions that imbue women with cultural codes and gender role beliefs, so it triggers women's fear in different ways, which results in some women's avoidance of using particular places at certain times or makes them employ some self-controlling behaviors in the city. Besides, I regard caregiving as a factor undermining women's right to the city. So, I find it important to study the cost of motherhood in relation to women's urban mobility, which appears as limited access to the city in this study. However, I could not focus on this issue as it is beyond my main considerations about the FNM.

REFERENCES

Acuner, D. (2016). Canavarlaş(tırıl)an Kent Sokakları: Kadının Kent Deneyimi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. *Fe Dergi*, 8(1), 1-14.

Ahıska, M. (1992). "Metropol ve Korku." *Defter,* 19, 118-129.

Ahmed, S. (2017). Conclusion 1 A Killjoy Survival Kit. In *Living a Feminist Life* (pp. 235-250). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Akdemir, E. (2021). *Listening to Possible Worlds: The 2019 Istanbul Feminist Night March and Its Acoustic Conflicts* [Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University]. Retrieved from:
https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Akpınar, İ. Y., & Gümüş, K. (2012). Taksim, dün-bugün: İdeolojik Bir Okuma. *Mimarlık Dergisi,* 28, 38-46.

Aksoy, A. (2019). İstanbul'un Neoliberalizmle İmtihanı. In A. Bartu Candan & C. Özbay (Eds.), *Yeni İstanbul Çalışmaları: Sınırlar, Mücadeleler, Açılımlar* (pp. 26-46). (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Alkan, A. (2005). *Yerel Yönetimler ve Cinsiyet: Kadınların Kentte Görünmez Varlığı.* Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

———. (2012). Şehircilik Çalışmalarının Kayıp Halkası: Cinsiyet. In S. Sancar (Ed.), *Nermin Abadan Unat'a Armağan – Birkaç Arpa Boyu: 21. Yy'a Girerken Türkiye'de Feminist Çalışmalar* (pp. 343-414). İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Almanza Avendaño, A. M., Romero-Mendoza, M., & Gómez San Luis, A. H. (2022). From Harassment to Disappearance: Young Women's Feelings of Insecurity in Public Spaces. *PloS one,* 17(9), e0272933.

Altuntaş, D. (2019). *Collective Subjectivity in Feminist Activism Against Femicide in Turkey: Collective Subjectivity as an Intersectional Strategy in the Struggle Against Femicide in Turkey* [Master's Thesis, the University of Gothenburg]. Retrieved from: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/60778

Archibald, M. M., Ambagtsheer, R. C., Casey, M. G., & Lawless, M. (2019). Using Zoom Videoconferencing for Qualitative Data Collection: Perceptions and Experiences of Researchers and Participants. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 18. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919874596

Baltacı, A. (2017). Nitel Veri Analizinde Miles-Huberman Modeli. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 3 (1), 1-14. Retrieved from: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/aeusbed/issue/30008/290583

Bartu, A. (1999). Who Owns the Old Quarters? Rewriting Histories in a Global Era. In Ç. Keyder (Ed.), *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local* (pp. 31-45). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Başdaş, B. (2010). Kadınların Haritası: Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Kamusal Alan ve Farklılıkların Merkezi Beyoğlu. *Mimarlık Dergisi,* 19, 75-80.

Batuman, B. (2015). "Everywhere is Taksim." *Journal of Urban History,* 41(5), 881-907.

Baydar, G. & İvegen, B. (2006). Territories, Identities, and Thresholds: The Saturday Mothers Phenomenon in İstanbul. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 31(3), 689-716.

Bayram, D. (2013). Feminist Politika ve Kent Talebi. *Feminist Politika,* 20, 14-15.

Baytok, C. (2014). *Integrating the "Transforming" City into Feminist Activism: the Urban and Gender Politics in the 2000s in Turkey* [Master's Thesis, Central European University]. Retrieved from: https://sierra.ceu.edu/record=b1173762

Beebeejaun, Y. (2017). Gender, Urban Space, and the Right to Everyday Life. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 39(3), 323-334.

Bektaş-Ata, L. (2020). Çocukluk Mahallesinin Kapısını Feminist Bakışla Aralamak. In E. Erdoğan & N. Gündoğdu (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Feminist Yöntem* (pp. 251-277). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's Position and Reflexivity in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Research,* 15(2), 219-234. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112468475

Biricik, A. (2010). Öteki'nin Ürettiği Mekânlar ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet/Cinsellik Kurguları. *Mimarlık Dergisi,* 19, 81-85.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on Reflexive Thematic Analysis, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health,* 11(4), 589-597, DOI: 10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Weate, P. (2016). Using Thematic Analysis in Sport and Exercise Research. In B. Smith & A. C. Sparkes (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise* (pp. 191-205). London: Routledge.

Brooks, A. (2007). Feminist Standpoint Epistemology: Building Knowledge and Empowerment Through Women's Lived Experience. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. L. Leavy (Eds.), *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer* (pp. 53-82). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cahill, C. (2000). Street Literacy: Urban Teenagers' Strategies for Negotiating their Neighbourhood. *Journal of Youth Studies,* 3(3), 251-277.

Casey, R., Goudie, R., & Reeve, K. (2008). Homeless Women in Public Spaces: Strategies of Resistance. *Housing Studies,* 23(6), 899-916.

Castells, M. (1978). *City, Class, and Power.* Macmillan Education.

Coe, A. B., & Sandberg, L. (2019). Gender Beliefs as a Dimension of Tactical Choice: the 'Take Back the Night' March in Sweden. *Social Movement Studies,* 18(5), 622-638.

Condon, S., Lieber, M., & Maillochon, F. (2007). Feeling Unsafe in Public Places: Understanding Women's Fears. *Revue Française de Sociologie, 48,* 101-128.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). Five Qualitative Approaches to Inquiry. J. W. Creswell (Ed.), *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches* (pp. 53-84). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Çağatay, S., Liinason, M., & Sasunkevich, O. (2022). *Feminist and LGBTI+ Activism across Russia, Scandinavia and Turkey: Transnationalizing Spaces of Resistance – Thinking Gender in Transnational Times.* Springer Nature Switzerland AG: Palgrave Macmillan.

Çakır, S. (1994) *Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

⸻. (2017). Osmanlı'da Kadınların Mekânı, Sınırlar ve İhlaller. In A. Alkan (Ed.), *Cins Cins Mekân* (pp. 76-101). (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Çiçekoğlu, F. (2018). *Vesikalı Şehir.* (3r ed.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

de Certeau, M. (1988). *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London: University of California Press.

Deniz, A. (2020). Bedenden Mekâna Taşan İktidara Özdüşünümsel Bir Bakış: Heteroseksüel Bir Kadının LGBTİ Bireylerin Ankara'sına Yolculuğundan Notlar. In E. Erdoğan & N. Gündoğdu (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Feminist Yöntem* (pp.9-13). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

DeVault, M. L. (1990). Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis. *Social Problems,* 37(1), 96-116. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.1990.37.1.03a00070

Dinçer, P. (2019). Feminist Araştırmada İçeriden ve/veya Dışarıdan Olmak: Akademi ve Aktivizm Arasında Bir Köprü Olarak Düşünümsellik. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi,* 8(4), 3728-3745.

Düzcan, B. (2014). Toplumsal Hafızada "Sokak" İmgesinin Dönüşümü: "Sokak Ortasında" Söylemi ve Sokağın Kriminalleştirilmesi. In D. Fırat (Ed.), *Sokağın Belleği: 1 Mayıs 1977'den Gezi Direnişi'ne Toplumsal Hareketler ve Kent Mekânı* (pp. 187-211). İstanbul: Dipnot Yayınları.

Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 8(1), 54-63. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800105

Eichler, M. (Ed.). (1995). *Change of Plans: Towards a Non-Sexist Sustainable City.* University of Toronto Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/j.ctt2ttv77

Elkin, L. (2018). *Flanöz: Şehirde Yürüyen Kadınlar – Paris, New York, Tokyo, Venedik ve Londra.*(2nd ed.). İstanbul: Paloma Yayınevi – Nebula Kitap.

England, M. R., & Simon, S. (2010). Scary Cities: Urban Geographies of Fear, Difference and Belonging. *Social & Cultural Geography,* 11(3), 201-207.

English, L. M. (2004). Feminist Identities: Negotiations in the Third Space. *Feminist Theology,* 13, 97-125.

Eralp, F. (Guest) (2022, March 3). Yürümenin Adaleti (No. 2.3) [Audio podcast episode]. In *Adalet Atlası.* Anadolu Kültür. https://open.spotify.com/episode/7bf2H91MxqEiSZ0gODJvfy?si=af13504194bb48dd

Ergun, A., & Erdemir, A. (2010). Negotiating Insider and Outsider Identities in the Field: "Insider" in a Foreign Land; "Outsider" in One's Own Land. *Field Methods,* 22(1), 16-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X09349919

Falú, A. (2014). Inclusion and Right to the City: Exercising Women's Citizen Rights: The Women's Agenda for Resario, Argentina. *City, Social Inclusion and Education,* 58-67.

Fenster, T. (2005). The Right to the Gendered City: Different Formations of Belonging in Everyday Life. *Journal of Gender Studies,* 14(3), 217-231.

Fidan, G. (2019). *History of Protest Spaces in Istanbul* [Master's Thesis, Kadir Has University]. Retrieved from: https://academicrepository.khas.edu.tr/handle/20.500.12469/2775

Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry,* 8(4), 777-795.

Garber, J. A. (2000). Not Named or Identified: Politics and the Search for Anonymity in the City. In K. B. Miranne, & A. H. Young (Eds.), *Gendering the City: Women, Boundaries, and Visions of Urban Life* (pp. 19-38). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Garber, J. A., & Turner, R. S. (1994) *Gender in Urban Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Greed, C. H. (1994) *Women and Planning: Creating Gendered Realities.* London ; New York : Routledge.

Guano, E. (2007). Respectable Ladies and Uncouth Men: The Performative Politics of Class and Gender in the Public Realm of an Italian City. *The Journal of American Folklore,* 120(475), 48-72.

Gül, M., Dee, J., & Cünük, C. N. (2014). İstanbul's Taksim Square and Gezi Park: The Place of Protest and the Ideology of Place. *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism,* 38(1), 63- 72.

Günal, A., & Çelikkan, M. (2019). *A City they Remembers: Space and Memory from Taksim to Sultanahmet* (F. Eralp, Trans.). İstanbul: Hakikat, Adalet, Hafıza Merkezi.

Hamdan-Saliba, H., & Fenster T. (2012). Tactics and Strategies of Power: The construction of Spaces of Belonging for Palestinian Women in Jaffa–Tel Aviv. *Women's Studies International Forum,* 35, 203-213.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies,* 14(3), 575-599.

Harding, S. (1987). Introduction: Is There a Feminist Method?. In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and Methodology* (pp. 1-14). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

_____. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

_____. (1993). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is "strong objectivity?". In L. Alcoff and E. Potter (Eds.), *Feminist Epistemologies* (pp. 49-82). New York: Routledge.

_____. (1995). Strong Objectivity: A Response to the New Objectivity Question. *Synthese* 104(3), p. 331-349.

_____. (Ed.). (2004). *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader.* New York: Routledge.

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities — From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution.* Verso.

Hatiboğlu-Kısat, B., & Odabaş, A. (2020). *Çankaya'nın Sitemli Yurttaşları, Kentsel Hareketlilik ve Kentsel Hizmetlere Erişim Ekseninde Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliğinin İzleri: Ankara, Çankaya Örneği.* Yeryüzü Kalkınma Kooperatifi Yayınları, 1.

Hayden, D. (1980). What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work. *Signs,* 5(3), S170–S187. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173814

_____. (1981). *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: The MIT Press.

Haykır Susma, İğneyi Batır. (1990). *Kampanya Özel Sayısı,* K. Yayınları.

Hellawell, D. (2006). Inside–out: Analysis of the Insider–Outsider Concept as a Heuristic Device to Develop Reflexivity in Students Doing Qualitative Research. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 11(4), 483-494.

Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2007). The Practice of Feminist In-depth Interviewing. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer* (pp. 111-149). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Hill Collins, P. (1986). Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. *Social Problems,* 33(6), S14-S32.

_____. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. (Revised Tenth Anniversary Edition).

Hollander, J. A. (2001). Vulnerability and Dangerousness: The Construction of Gender through Conversation about Violence. *Gender and Society,* 15(1), 83-109.

Howlett, M. (2022). Looking at the 'Field' through a Zoom Lens: Methodological Reflections on Conducting Online Research During a Global Pandemic. *Qualitative Research,* 22(3), 387-402.

Hvala, T. (2012). Streetwise Politics: Feminist and Lesbian Grassroots Activism in Ljubljana. In E. Zobl & R. Drüeke (Eds.), *Feminist Media: Participatory Spaces, Networks and Cultural Citizenship* (pp. 123-135). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Kadınlar! Cinsel Tacize Karşı Dayanışmaya. (1989). *Sosyalist Feminist Kaktüs, 9*, İstanbul: K Yayınları.

Kadınlar Gece Yürüyüşü için 14. Kez Sokaklarda Olacak. (2016, March 8). *bianet.* https://bianet.org/english/women/172829-women-on-streets-14th-time-for-night-march

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender and Society,* 2(3), Special Issue to Honor Jessie Bernard, 274-290.

Kanes, J., Shomaker, J., Carlise, A. (2019). *Women, Cultural Rights, and Public Spaces — Analysis and Recommendations to Advance Women's Human Rights.* International Action Network for Gender Equity and Law. Oakland.

Kern, L. (2019). *Feminist City: A Field Guide.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. Medical Teacher, 42(8), 846-854. DOI: 10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030

Kocabıçak, E. (2003). *Locating Thirdspace in the Specifities of Urban: A Case Study on Saturday Mothers, in İstiklal Street İstanbul* (Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University]. Retrieved from: http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/130766/index.pdf

Koskela, H. (1997). 'Bold Walk and Breakings': Women's Spatial Confidence versus Fear of Violence. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography,* 4(3), 301-319.

_____. (1999). 'Gendered Exclusions': Women's Fear of Violence and Changing Relations to Space. *Geografiska Annaler,* 81(2), 111-124.

_____. (2000). 'The Gaze without Eyes': Video-Surveillance and the Changing Nature of Urban Space. *Progress in Human Geography,* 24(2), 243-265.

      . (2005). Urban Space in Plural: Elastic, Tamed, Suppressed. In L. Nelson & J. Seager (Eds.), *A Companion to Feminist Geography* (pp. 257-270). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Lefebvre, H. (2000). *Writing On Cities.* (E. Kofman & E. Lebas, Eds. & Trans.). (4th ed.).Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

      . (2015). *Mekânın Üretimi.* (I. Ergüden, Trans.). (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.

LGBTI Survey Data Explorer. *FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights.* Retrieved from: https://fra.europa.eu/en/data-and-maps/2020/lgbti-survey-data-explorer#main-content

Listerborn, C. (2016). Feminist Struggle over Urban Safety and the Politics of Space. *European Journal of Women's Studies,* 23(3), 251-264.

Lordoğlu, C. (2020). *İstanbul'da Bekâr Kadın Olmak.* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Mack, N., Woodsong, S., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide.* Family Health International.

Magid, P. (2017, September 15). The Changing Nature of Lubunca, Turkey's LGBTQ Slang. *Atlas Obscura.* https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/lubunca-lgbtq-language-slang-turkey

Martinius, E. (2021, June). From "Lost in Translation" to "Found in Translation." *Ethnography Atelier.* https://www.ethnographyatelier.org/post/from-lost-in-translation-to-found-in-translation

Massey, D. (2001). Part III. Space, Place, and Gender. In *Space, Place, and Gender* (pp. 175-273). (3rd ed.). University of Minnesota Press.

McDowell, L. (1999). *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Merton, R. K. (1972). Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(1), 9-47.

Mies, M. (1979). Towards a Methodology of Women's Studies. *ISS Occasional Papers,* 77, 1-28. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1765/37973

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A.M. and Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook.* (3rd ed.). Sage, London.

Misgav, C., & Fenster, T. (2016). Day by Day — Protest by Protest: Temporal Activism and the Feminist Mizrahi Right to the City. *Cities,* 76, 29-35.

Mor İğne Satış Metni. (1989). *Sosyalist Feminist Kaktüs, 9,* İstanbul: K Yayınları.

Mutlu, E. (2012). *Something Queer in Istiklal* [Master's Thesis, Kadir Has University]. Retrieved from:
https://academicrepository.khas.edu.tr/handle/20.500.12469/2317

Neuman, W. L. (2007). *Basics of Social Research — Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Novella Abril, I., & Sánchez de Madariaga, I. (2021). Participatory Planning with Women for Everyday Life and Safety: the Case of Madrid. In F. Coppola, M. Grimaldi & I. Fasolino (Eds.), *Safe Urban Space: Strategies and Actions for an Integrated Approach to Settlement Quality* (pp. 313-334). Napoli: Federico II University Press.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 16(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Orhon, G. (2014). Alan Araştırması Deneyimini Tartışmaya Açmak: *İçeriden* ya da *Dışarıdan* Olmak, Çoğul Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet. *Fe Dergi,* 6(1), 54-67.

Ortiz Escalante, S., & Gutiérrez Valdivia, B. (2015). Planning from Below: Using Feminist Participatory Methods to Increase Women's Participation in Urban Planning. *Gender & Development,* 23(1), 113-126.

Özel Bülten – Türkiye'de Onur Yürüyüşü: Yasaklar ve Müdahaleler 2016-2017-2018-2019. (2019, September). Retrieved from: https://www.esithaklar.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/toplanti_ve_bariscil_gosteri_bulten_pride.pdf

Pain, R. H. (1991). Space, Sexual Violence and Social Control: Integrating Geographical and Feminist Analyses of Women's Fear of Crime. *Progress in Human Geography,* 15(4), 415-431.

_____. (1994). *Crime, Social Control and Spatial Constraint : A Study of Women's Fear of Sexual Violence* [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Edinburgh].

_____. (1995). Elderly Women and Fear of Violent Crime: The Least Likely Victims?: A Reconsideration of the Extent and Nature of Risk. *The British Journal of Criminology,* 35(4), 584-598.

_____. (2001). Gender, Race, Age and Fear in the City. *Urban Studies,* 38, 899-913.

Panelli, R., Kraack, A., & Little, J. (2004). A Community Issue? Rural Women's Feelings of Safety and Fear in New Zealand. Gender, Place and Culture, 11(3), 445-467.

_____. (2005). Claiming Space and Community: Rural Women's Strategies for Living with, and beyond, Fear. *Goeforum,* 36, 495-508.

Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Pereira, M. M., Marhia, N., & Scharff, C. (2009). Interrogating Language Difference and Translation in Social Science Research: Towards a Critical and Interdisciplinary Approach. *Graduate Journal of Social Science,* 6(S3), 1-12.

Punch, K. F. (1998). Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. London: Sage Ltd.

Rader, N. E. (2008). Gendered Fear Strategies: Intersections of Doing Gender and Fear Management Strategies in Married and Divorced Women's Lives. *Sociological Focus,* 41(1), 34-52.

Rai, R., & Rai, A. K. (2020). Is Sexual Assault Breaking Women's Spatial Confidence in Cities of India? Some Explorations from Varanasi City. *Children and Youth Services Review,* 118.

Rainero, L., Rodigou, M., & Pérez, S. (2006). *Tools for the Promotion of Safe Cities from the Gender Perspective.* CISCSA - Centro de Intercambio y Servicios Cono Sur, Argentina.

Ramazanoğlu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices.* London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Regmi, K., Naidoo, J., & Pilkington, P. (2010). Understanding the Processes of Translation and Transliteration in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 9(1), 16-26. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691000900103

Reinharz, S., & Davidman, L. (1992). *Feminist Methods in Social Research.* Oxford University Press.

Rodó de Zárate, M. (2014). Managing Fear in Public Space: Young Feminists' Intersectional Experiences through Participatory Action Research. *Cahiers du CEDREF* (online) Vol. 21.

Ryan, M. (1990). "Everyday Space: Gender and the Geography of the Public." In *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots, 1825-1880* (pp. 58-95). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to Identify Themes. *Field Methods,* 15(1), 85-109. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239569

Salman Yıkmış, M. (2015). Kadınlarla Mülakat Yapmak. *Fe Dergi,* 7, 95-107.

Sancar, S. (2012). *Türk Modernleşmesinin Cinsiyeti: Erkekler Devlet, Kadınlar Aile Kurar.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.

Sandberg, L. (2011). *Fear of Violence and Gendered Power Relations: Responses to Threat in Public Space in Sweden.* Gerum: Umea˚ Universitet.

————. (2020). "City in Fear": Media Representations of Single Repeat Perpetrators and Gendered and Racialized Fear of Violence in Public Space. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies,* 19(2), 519-544.

Sandberg, L., & Coe, A. B. (2020). Taking Back the Swedish Night: Making and Reclaiming Space. *Gender, Place & Culture,* 27(7), 1044-1062.

Secor, A. (2004). "There Is an Istanbul That Belongs to Me": Citizenship, Space, and Identity in the City. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* 94(2), 352-368.

Seidenberg, R., & DeCrow, K. (1983). *Women Who Marry Houses: Panic and Protest in Agoraphobia.* McGraw-Hill Companies.

Selek, P. (2014). *Maskeler Süvariler Gacılar – Ülker Sokak: Bir Alt Kültürün Dışlanma Mekânı.* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Ayizi Yayıncılık.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research Projects. *Education for Information,* 22, 63-75. https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-2004-22201

Siegel, S. (2018). Participant Observation. In B. Frey (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation* (pp. 1215-1216). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781506326139.n505

Singleton, C., & Green. E. (2006). Risky Bodies at Leisure: Young Women Negotiating Space and Place. *Sociology,* 40(5), 853-871.

Sirman, N. (2020). Sunuş. In E. Erdoğan & N. Gündoğdu (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Feminist Yöntem* (pp. 9-13). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Smith N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City.* Routledge.

Soja, E. (1996a). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

———. (1996b). Afterword. *Stanford Law Review,* Vol. 48(5), 1421-1429.

———. (2010). *Seeking Spatial Justice.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Solnit, R. (2002). *Wanderlust: A History of Walking.* UK: Verso.

Soylu: Eminönü'nde Gezerken mi Kayboldular?. (2018, August 27). *bianet.* https://m.bianet.org/bianet/insan-haklari/200226-soylu-eminonu-nde-gezerken-mi-kayboldular

Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2020). Expanding Approaches for Research: Understanding and Using Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Developmental Education,* 44(1), 26-29.

Stanko, E. A. (1995). Women, Crime, and Fear. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 539, 46-58.

――――. (1996). Warnings to Women: Police, Advice and Women's Safety in Britain. *Violence Against Women,* 2(1), 5-24.

Stavrides, S. (2021). *Kentsel Heterotopya: Özgürleşme Mekânı Olarak Eşikler Kentine Doğru* (A. Karatay, Trans.), (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.

Şener, G. (2021). Digital Feminist Activism in Turkey. *Media@LSE Working Paper Series.*

Tan, P. (2007). Tophane: The Closing in of an Istanbul Neighborhood. *Sarai Reader 2007: Frontiers,* 484-489.

Tandoğan, O., & Şimşek İlhan, B. (2016). Fear of Crime in Public Spaces: From the View of Women Living in Cities. *Procedia Engineering,* 161, 2011-2018.

Tanyeli, U. (2017). *Yıkarak Yapmak: Anarşist Bir Mimarlık Kuramı için Altlık.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Tekeli, Ş. (1988). 8 Mart ve Yeni Feminizm. In *kadınlar için* (pp. 109-114). İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık.

Tivers, J. (1988). Women With Young Children: Constraints on Activities in the Urban Environment. In J. Little, L. Peake & P. Richardson (Eds.), *Women in Cities: Gender and the Urban Environment* (pp. 84-97). Palgrave, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-19576-3_5

Tuncer, S. (2014). *Going Public: Women's Experience of Everyday Urban Public Space in Ankara Across Generations between the 1950s and the 1980s* [Doctoral Dissertation, Middle East Technical University].

Ural, H. (2016). *Nocturnal Neoliberalism in Beyoğlu: The Construction of Attractive and Safe Nightlife* [Doctoral Dissertation, Middle East Technical University].

Ussher, J. M. (1992). *Women's Madness: Misogyny or Mental Illness?* University of Massachusetts Press.

Uysal, A. (2017). *Sokakta Siyaset: Türkiye'de Protesto Eylemleri, Protestocular ve Polis.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Vaiou, D., & Kalandides, A. (2009). Cities of "Others": Public Space and Everyday Practices. *Geographica Helvetica,* 11-20.

Valentine, G. (1989). The Geography of Women's Fear. *The Royal Geographical Society,* 21(4), 385-390.

van der Burgt, D. (2015). Spatial Avoidance or Spatial Confidence? Young People's Agency in the Active Negotiation of Risk and Safety in Public Space. *Children's Geographies,* 13(2), 181-195.

van Nes, F., Abma, T., Jonsson, H., & Deeg, D. (2010). Language Differences in Qualitative Research: Is Meaning Lost in Translation? *European Journal of Ageing,* 7(4), 313-316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-010-0168-y

Vanlıoğlu Yazıcı, N. (2020). Kadınların Sesinden Kamusal Alanda Toplumsal Cinsiyet Söylemleri: Türkiye'de 8 Mart Kutlamaları. *Kent Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 11(31), pp. 1657-1675.

Vestbro, D. U., & Horelli, L. (2012). Design for Gender Equality: The History of Co-Housing Ideas and Realities. *Built Environment* (1978-), 38(3), 315-335. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23290266

Visakha, S. (2021). *Making a Feminist City: Planning Safety and Autonomy for Women: A Legal and Policy Perspective.* Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, (report).

Walby, S. (1994). Is Citizenship Gendered?. *Sociology,* 28(2), 379-395.

Wekerle, G. (1984). A Woman's Place is in the City. *Antipode,* 16(3), 11-19.

Wilson, E. (1992). *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women.* The USA: University of California Press.

Wilson, E., & Little, D. E. (2008). The Solo Female Travel Experience: Exploring the 'Geography of Women's Fear'. *Current Issues in Tourism,* 11(2): 167-186.

Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) Index 2017/18: Tracking sustainable peace through inclusion, justice, and security for women. (2017). Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security and Peace Research Institute Oslo. Washington. DC: GIWPS and PRIO. (report)

Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) Index 2021/22: Tracking sustainable peace through inclusion, justice, and security for women. (2021). Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security and Peace Research Institute Oslo. Washington. DC: GIWPS and PRIO. (report)

Women Who Walk — Women and walking in Victoria. *Victoria Walks.* Retrieved from: https://www.victoriawalks.org.au/Women_And_Walking/ (Date of access 26.05.2022)

Wooden, J. M. (2000). *Sexual assault in our society: women (and men) take back the night* [Master's Thesis, Iowa State University]. Retrieved from: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/7101

Yardımcı, S., & Bezmez, D. (2019). Normativite Sınırlarında İttifak İmkânları: Heterotopya olarak Queer, ve/ya Sakat Bedenler ve Kamusallığı Beden Üzerinden Okumak. In A. Bartu Candan & C. Özbay (Eds.), *Yeni İstanbul Çalışmaları: Sınırlar, Mücadeleler, Açılımlar* (pp. 309-326). (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Yaşam Memnuniyeti Araştırması, 2021. (2022, February 17). TÜİK. Retrieved from: https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Yasam-Memnuniyeti-Arastirmasi-2021-45SS832#:~:text=Bireylerin%20mutluluk%20kayna%C4%9F%C4%B1%20olan%20de%C4%9Ferler,3%20ile%20i%C5%9F%20takip%20etti.

Yılmaz, V., & Göçmen, İ. (2015). Türkiye'de Lezbiyen, Gey, Biseksüel ve Trans (LGBT) Bireylerin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Sorunları Araştırmasının Özet Sonuçları. *Türkiye Politika ve Araştırma Merkezi (Research Turkey).* 4(6), 94-101. Retrieved from: https://docplayer.biz.tr/53382534-Turkiye-de-lezbiyen-gey-biseksuel-ve-trans-lgbt-bireylerin-sosyal-ve-ekonomik-sorunlari-arastirmasinin-ozet-sonuclari.html (Date of access: 24.05.2022)

Yurdadön-Aslan, P., & Yavan, N. (2018). Mekânın Üretimi ve Lefebvre'in Mekânsal Üçlü Kavramsallaştırmasının Görünürlüğü: Taksim Gezi Parkı Örneği. *Planlama,* 28(3), 302-314.

Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, İ., Çavlin, A., & Ergöçmen, B. A. (2015). *Türkiye'de Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet Araştırması.* Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbaacılık, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü, T.C. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı.

Zengin, A. (2019). Trans Beyoğlu: Kentsel Dönüşüm, Şehir Hakkı ve Trans Kadınlar. A. Bartu Candan & C. Özbay (Eds.), *Yeni İstanbul Çalışmaları: Sınırlar, Mücadeleler, Açılımlar* (pp. 360-375). (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Zihnioğlu, Y. (2022). *Kadınsız İnkılap: Nezihe Muhiddin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliği.* (5th ed.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları

A. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS / GÖRÜŞME SORULARI

Mülakat tarihi: …/…/2021 - …/…/2021   Süre: …. dk
Çevrimiçi mülakat   ☐   Mecra: Microsoft Teams ☐ Zoom ☐
Yüz yüze mülakat   ☐   Görüşme yeri: ………………………

GÖRÜŞME SORULARI

BÖLÜM 1
Demografik Bilgiler

1. Adınız nedir?

2. Kaç yaşındasınız?

3. Kendinizi en çok hangi cinsiyet kimliğiyle tanımlarsınız? (Kendini atanmış cinsiyetiyle uyumlu (cisgender), atanmış cinsiyeti dışında (transgender), akışkan bir cinsiyet kimliğiyle (gender-fluid), ya da bunlardan başka (+) bir deneyimle tanımlayan kadın)

4. Cinsel yöneliminiz nedir?

5. Medeni durumunuz nedir?

6. Eğitim seviyeniz nedir? (En son mezun olunan derece)

7. Çalışma durumunuz nedir? (Ücretli/ücretsiz çalışma deneyimi)

    7.1. Mesleğiniz nedir?

    7.2. Varsa, gelir aralığınız ve bu gelirin kaynağı nedir? (2021 yılı asgari ücret miktarı: 2.825,90; 0-2.825,89 TL/asgari ücret altı, 2.825,90–3.000 TL/asgari ücret civarında, 3.001-6.000 TL, 6.001-8.000 TL, 8001 TL-10.000 TL, 10.001 TL ve üzeri)

8. Kendinizi hangi gelir grubuna ait görüyorsunuz? (Alt, alt orta, orta, üst orta, üst+)

9. Bakımından sorumlu olduğunuz kişi/kişiler var mı? Varsa, kim/kimler? (Çocuk, yaşlı, hasta, evcil hayvan, vs.)

    9.1. Bu kişi/kişilerle günün hangi zamanlarında, nerede ilgileniyorsunuz?

    9.2. Birisinin bakımıyla ilgilenmek dışarı (kamusal alana) çıkabildiğiniz/çıkmayı tercih ettiğiniz saatleri ve yolları belirlemenizde etkili oluyor mu? Oluyorsa nasıl?

10. Nerede yaşıyorsunuz? (yaka, ilçe, semt, mahalle, vs.)

BÖLÜM 2
İstanbul ve Beyoğlu'yla (İstiklal Caddesi) ilgili Sorular

11. Ne zamandır İstanbul'dasınız? Ne sebeple buradasınız?
(Yaşadığı, çalıştığı, ziyaret ettiği, vs. yer)

12. Gündelik yaşamınızda İstiklal Caddesi'ne neden gidersiniz? Caddeyi hangi amaçlarla kullanırsınız?

    12.1. Bu caddeyi günün hangi zamanlarında kullanmayı <u>tercih edersiniz</u>? Neden?

    12.2. Bu caddeyi günün hangi zamanlarında kullanmayı <u>tercih etmezsiniz</u>? Neden?

    12.3. Bu caddede (ve Beyoğlu'nda) bulunmak size nasıl hissettirir? Neden?

13. Sizce, İstiklal Caddesi'nin (ve Beyoğlu'nun) Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü için değeri nedir?

14. Platform, son yürüyüşü (2021) "18 yıldır olduğumuz yerdeyiz" diyerek duyurdu. Yürüyüş başladığı yıldan (2003) bu yana İstiklal Caddesi'nde yapılırken Valilik yasağı sebebiyle, Sıraselviler Caddesi'nde gerçekleşti. Bu rota değişikliğini nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?

15. Sizce Beyoğlu'nun iktidar (hükümet) için değeri nedir?

16. İçişleri Bakanı Süleyman Soylu (2020 Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü öncesi katıldığı CNN Türk'teki "Tarafsız Bölge" programında Gazeteci Özlem Gürses'in İstiklal Caddesi'nde yürümekle ilgili sorusuna) Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ne katılanların Yenikapı'dan Kadıköy'e kadar her yerde yürüyebileceklerini; ancak İstiklal Caddesi'nin bundan <u>muaf</u> olacağını söylemişti. İstiklal Caddesi'nin bu "muaf" olma hâlini ve bu yasağı nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?

17. Kendinizi feminist olarak tanımlıyor musunuz? Öyleyse, ne zamandır ve neden feministsiniz?

18. Feminist aktivizm yapan herhangi bir örgütle bağınız bulunuyor mu? Bulunuyorsa, hangi örgütle (karma topluluklar, kadın dernekler, vs.) nasıl bir bağ kuruyorsunuz?

19. Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ne neden katılıyorsunuz? Burada bulunma motivasyonunuz nedir?

20. (Ulusal ve uluslararası alanyazın kadınların gece, kentin kamusal alanlarında güvende hissetmediklerini; özellikle cinsel şiddete uğrama korkusuyla genellikle gece, sokakta olmaktan kaçındıklarını gösteriyor.) Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü özellikle karanlık çöktükten sonra, İstanbul'un merkezi konumundaki bir yerde, Beyoğlu'nda yapılıyor. Bu durumu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz? Kadınların kentteki güvenlik algılarını kadınların kent hakkı temelinde nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

21. Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü, 2021'de 19. kez yapıldı. Siz bu yürüyüşe ne zamandır katılıyorsunuz? Yürüyüşe hangi yıllarda ve ne sıklıkla katıldınız?

22. Bu yürüyüşteki rolünüz nedir? (Katılımcı, örgütleyici, vb.)

23. Yürüyüşe kiminle/kimlerle katılıyorsunuz?

24. Sizce bu yürüyüşün özneleri kimlerdir?

25. Öznelerin hepsini bu yürüyüşte görüyor musunuz? Sizce yürüyüşe katılabilenler kimlerdir?

26. (Tüm deneyimlerden) erkeklerin bu yürüyüşe katılması hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?

27. Yürüyüşe katılmasından rahatsızlık duyduğunuz kişiler var mı? Varsa, bu kişilere alanda nasıl davranırsınız?

28. Yürüyüş sırasında, Beyoğlu'ndaki mekânsal deneyimleriniz (algı, tutum ve davranış) gündelik yaşamınızdaki deneyimlerinizden farklılık gösteriyor mu? Öyleyse neden ve nasıl?

29. Bu yürüyüşün -yıllar içinde yönü değişiklik gösterse de- Taksim Meydanı, Galatasaray Meydanı ve Tünel Meydanı arasında; İstiklal Caddesi üzerinde yapılageldiğini biliyoruz. İstiklal yasağı sonrası, (Sıraselviler'den Karaköy'e çizilen) rota değişikliği hakkında ne düşünüyor, nasıl hissediyorsunuz?

30. Yürüyüş hakkında (özneler, rota, vs.), karar alma aşamasında tüm bileşenlerin söz sahibi olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? Neden böyle düşünüyorsunuz?

BÖLÜM 4
Mekândaki Müzakere Yöntemleri: Beyoğlu'nun Mekânsal Boyutları

31. Sizce bir eylem mekânı olarak Beyoğlu'nun avantajları nelerdir?

32. Peki, katılımcılar için Beyoğlu'nun handikapları/kısıtları nelerdir?

33. Yürüyüş günü İstiklal Caddesi'ne ve Taksim Meydanı'na bağlanan Metro ve otobüs durakları kapatılıyor. Seferler azaltılıyor. Getirilen bu ulaşım kısıtını aşmak ve alana ulaşmak için neler yapıyorsunuz?

    33.1. Katıldığınız son yürüyüşte yürüyüşün yapılacağı yere nasıl/hangi yollardan gittiniz?

    33.2. Yürüyüşe yasaktan önce nasıl giderdiniz, şimdi nasıl gidiyorsunuz?

34. Yürüyüşe götürdüğünüz eşyalar nelerdir? Neden?

35. Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü için teknolojiyi nasıl kullanıyorsunuz? (sosyal medya, internet, şehir kameraları, telefon, vs.)

36. Yürüyüşe katılmanızı engellemeye çalışan biri/birileri var mı? Varsa, sizi neden ve ne şekilde engellemeye çalışıyorlar?

37. Yürüyüşün yapıldığı alanda karşılaştığınız aktörler yürüyüş sırasında neler yapıyorlar? Bu kişilerle karşılaşmalarınızı anlatır mısınız?

38. Peki bu kişilerden yürüyüş sonrasında ne gibi tepki/tavır/yaptırım görüyorsunuz? Deneyimleriniz nelerdir?

39. Başka ne eklemek istersiniz?

Interview date: …/…/2021 - …/…/2021   Duration: …. min.

Online interview   ☐   Medium: Microsoft Teams ☐ Zoom ☐

Face-to-face interview   ☐   Place: ………………………

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

SECTION 1
Demographic Information

1. What is your first name?

2. How old are you? (Month and year)

3. Which gender do you identify yourself the most? (Forms: cisgender, transgender, gender fluid, + woman)

4. How do you identify your sexual orientation?

5. What is your marital status?

6. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

7. What is your employment status? (Paid or unpaid work experience)

   7.1. What is your occupation?

   7.2. What is the income range, and the source of income? (Minimum wage in 2021: 2.825.90; 0-2.825.89 TL/Below the minimum wage, 2.825.90-3,000 TL/Around the minimum wage, 3.001-6,000 TL, 6.001-8,000 TL, 8001 TL-10,000 TL, 10.001 TL and above)

8. To which class do you most identify? (Income group: lower, lower middle, middle, upper middle, upper+)

9. Are you responsible for (a) dependent(s)'s care? If the answer is yes (children, elderly, ill people, pets, etc.), who are they?

   9.1 When and where do you take care of them?

   9.2 Does this responsibility affect the boundaries (the time and the place) of your mobility in the city? If so, how?

10. Where do you live? (side, district, neighborhood, etc.)

SECTION 2
Questions about İstanbul and Beyoğlu (İstiklal Street)

11. How long have you been in İstanbul? Why are you here?
    (The place where she lives, works, visits, etc.)

12. Why do you go to İstiklal Street in your everyday life? For what purposes do you use this street?

    12.1. When do you <u>prefer to use</u> this street? Why? (certain hours)

    12.2. When do you <u>avoid</u> using this street? Why? (certain hours)

    12.3. How do you feel when you are in this street (and in Beyoğlu)? Why?

13. Do you think İstiklal Street (and Beyoğlu) has a special meaning for the Feminist Night March? If the answer is yes, what is it?

14. The organizing committee announced the last march (2021) by saying, "We will be where we have been for 18 years." While the march was held in İstiklal Street from the beginning (2003), it took place in Sıraselviler Street because of the Governor's Office's ban. What do you think about this situation?

15. Do you think Beyoğlu has a special meaning for the authority (the government)? If the answer is yes, what is it?

16. The Minister of Interior, Süleyman Soylu, said (for Journalist Özlem Gürses's question about walking in İstiklal Street at the FNM) that participants can walk wherever they want, from Yenikapı to Kadıköy, but İstiklal Street would be exempt from this. What do you think about this issue? What are the reasons for this exemption and the Governor's Office's ban on İstiklal Street?

SECTION 3
Questions about Feminism(s) and Feminist Activism | the Feminist Night March

17. Do you identify as a feminist? If the answer is yes, from when and why are you a feminist?

18. Are you affiliated with an organization through feminist activism? If the answer is yes, how do you describe your affiliation with this organization/community? (Mixed-gender organizations, women's organizations, etc.)

19. Why do you participate in the Feminist Night March? What is your motivation to attend?

20. (Literature indicates that women do not feel safe in urban public spaces, especially at night, so they usually avoid using certain places at certain hours because of the fear of sexual violence.) The Feminist Night March has been

held in Beyoğlu, the center of İstanbul, especially after it gets dark. How do you evaluate this situation? How do you make sense of women's perceptions of safety in the street at night in the matter of <u>women's right to the city</u>?

21. In 2021, the 19th Feminist Night March was held. How long have you been participating in this march? In which years and how often did you participate in the march?

22. What is your role in this march? (participant, organizer, etc.)

23. Who do you attend the march with?

24. Who are the subjects of this march?

25. Do you encounter all subjects of the march therein? Who can attend the march?

26. What do you think about men's participation?

27. Are there any people you feel uncomfortable with, at this march? If the answer is yes, how do you treat them during the march?

28. Do your spatial experiences (perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors) at the march differ from your everyday life experiences in Beyoğlu? If so, why and how?

29. Although the route of this march has changed over the years, we know that it has been held in İstiklal Street; between Taksim Square, Galatasaray Square and Tünel Square. What do you think, and how do you feel about the route change (from Sıraselviler to Karaköy) after the Governor's Office's ban?

30. Do you think all components have a say in the decision-making process about the march (about subjects, route, etc.)? Why do you think so?

SECTION 4
Negotiating the Space: Spatial Dimensions of Beyoğlu

31. What are the advantages of Beyoğlu as a place of protest?

32. What are the constraints of Beyoğlu for participants/protesters?

33. Stations connecting to İstiklal Street and Taksim Square were not operational at certain hours on March 8 according to the Governor's order. What did you do to overcome this restriction?

33.1. How (by using which roads/paths/streets) did you access where the march took place at the last march you attended?

33.2. How did you access the place of protest before and after the Governor's Office's ban?

34. What objects do you take with you when going to the march? Why?

35. How do you use technology for the Feminist Night March? (social media, the internet, city cameras, smartphone, etc.)

36. Does anybody try to prevent you from participating in the march? If the answer is yes, why and how are they trying to hinder your participation?

37. Who are the actors you encounter during the march in Beyoğlu? Can you tell me more about your encounters?

38. What kind of reactions/attitudes/sanctions do you get from these people after attending the march? Can you tell me more about your experiences?

39. What else would you like to add?

B: APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

Sayı: 28620816   /

24 Mayıs 2021

Konu   : Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi   : İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Prof. Dr. Ayşe SAKTANBER

Danışmanlığını yürüttüğünüz Öznur Uşaklılar'ın "Feminist Aktivizm Vasıtasıyla Sokağı ve Geceyi Talep Etmek: Kadınların İstiklal Caddesi "Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü"ndeki Stratejileri" başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve **245-ODTU-2021** protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız.

Dr.Öğretim Üyesi Şerife SEVİNÇ
İAEK Başkan Vekili

C: INFORMED CONSENT FORM / GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Sayın katılımcı,

Bu form, sizleri araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Araştırma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Programı öğrencilerinden Öznur UŞAKLILAR tarafından, Prof. Dr. Ayşe SAKTANBER danışmanlığında yürütülmektedir. Araştırmaya veri sağlayacak olan görüşmeler araştırmacının yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında analiz edilecektir.

Bu tez Beyoğlu'nda yapılan Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ne katılan ve bu yürüyüşü organize eden kadınların deneyimlerini feminist aktivizm temelinde değerlendirmeyi amaçlar. Tezde, bu değerlendirme sonucunda kadınların gece ve sokağı deneyimlemeleriyle feminist aktivizmi araçsallaştırmaları arasında ilişki kurmak amaçlanmıştır.

Araştırma katılımcıların feminist aktivizm, Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü ve Beyoğlu'yla ilişkilenmeleri ve deneyimleri hakkında soruların sorulduğu derinlemesine görüşmelerden oluşur. Görüşmelere katılım ortalama 90 dakika sürebilmekte ve görüşmeler gerekli görüldüğünde, katılımcıların onayı dahilinde tekrarlanabilmektedir.

Görüşmeler kişisel rahatsızlık verecek nitelikte değildir. Ancak herhangi bir nedenden dolayı kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz, görüşmeyi sonlandırabilirsiniz. Böyle bir durumda vermiş olduğunuz bilgilerin araştırmacı tarafından kullanılması ancak sizin onayınızla mümkün olacaktır.

Araştırma süresince ve sonrasında kimlik bilgileriniz rızanız dışında araştırmacı ve tez danışmanı dışında kimseyle paylaşılmayacaktır. Katılımcıların sağlayacağı bilgiler akademik yayın ve yayımlarda anonim olarak kullanılacaktır.

Araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katılıyorum. Talep etmem durumunda görüşmeyi sonlandırabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin akademik üretim amaçlı yayın ve yayımlarda anonim olarak kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. Görüşme sırasında ses kaydı alınacağını biliyorum. Bu ses kayıtlarının verdiğim bilgilerin analiz edilme sürecini kolaylaştırmak için alındığını, rızam dışında hiçbir şekilde kullanılmayacağını ve kimseyle paylaşılmayacağını biliyorum.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve onaylıyorum.

Katılımcının,

Adı ve Soyadı   İmzası   Tarih

Araştırmacı olarak bilgilerinizi üçüncü kişilerle rızanız dışında paylaşmamayı, görüşmeler sırasında alınan ses kayıtlarının teze veri sağlamak dışında kullanılmayacağını ve kimlik bilgilerinizin teze dahil edilmeyeceğini garanti ederim.

Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz ve vakit ayırdığınız için teşekkürler.

Araştırmacının,

Öznur UŞAKLILAR
 Adı ve Soyadı   İmzası

Araştırma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak, soru ve öneri bildirmek için araştırmayı yürüten Öznur UŞAKLILAR'a mail (_____@metu.edu.tr) ya da telefon (05-- --- -- --) aracılığıyla ulaşabilirsiniz.

Formu okuyup imzaladıktan sonra araştırmacıya geri veriniz.

TRANSLATED VERSION

Dear participant,

This form was prepared to inform you about the research conditions.

This research is being conducted by Öznur UŞAKLILAR, a student at Middle East Technical University, Gender and Women's Studies Program, under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Ayşe SAKTANBER. The interviews that will provide data for the research will be analyzed within the scope of the researcher's master's thesis.

This study aims to analyze the experiences of women who attended and organized the Feminist Night March in Beyoğlu. As a result of this evaluation, it aims to explore the effects of feminist activism on women's spatial experiences therein.

The research consists of semi-structured in-depth interviews in which the participants will be asked about feminist activism, the Feminist Night March, and their association with and experiences in Beyoğlu. Interviews will last approximately 90 minutes and can be repeated when necessary, with the consent of the participants.

Interviews are not intended to cause personal discomfort. However, if you feel uncomfortable, you can end the interview. In such a case, the information you have provided can only be used by the researcher with your consent.

During and after the research, your credentials will not be shared with anyone other than the researcher and the supervisor without your consent. The information provided by the participants will be used anonymously in academic publications.

I participate in the research voluntarily. I know that I can end the interview if I request it. I accept the anonymous use of the information I provide in publications for academic purposes. I know that my voice will be recorded during the interview. These recordings will contribute to the study but will not be used without my consent and will not be shared with anyone else.

I read and confirmed the above information.

Participant's,

      Name and Surname   Signature   Date

As a researcher, I guarantee that I will not share your credentials with third parties without your consent, the audio recordings will not be used other than to provide data for the study, and your personal identifying information will not be included in the thesis.

Thank you for your participation in the research and for your time.

The researcher's,

Öznur UŞAKLILAR
Name and Surname   Signature

In order to get more information about the research, ask questions or give suggestions, please contact the researcher via e-mail (_____@metu.edu.tr) or phone (05-- --- -- --).

After reading and signing the form, please return it to the researcher.

FEMİNİST AKTİVİZMİN DÖNÜŞTÜRÜCÜ GÜCÜ: İSTANBUL, BEYOĞLU FEMİNİST GECE YÜRÜYÜŞÜ'NDE KADINLAR İÇİN GEÇİCİ GÜVENLİ ALAN YARATMAK

GENEL BAKIŞ

Kadınların toplumsal cinsiyet, etnik kimlik ve sosyoekonomik statü gibi özellikleri; kenti farklı şekillerde deneyimlemelerine yol açar. Bu çalışma, kadınların kesişen çoklu kimlikleriyle kentte edindikleri mekânsal deneyimler arasında karşılıklı bir ilişki olduğu argümanı üzerine kurulmuştur. Mekân bu deneyimlere sahne olmakla kalmaz, katılımcıların dört temel duygusunu —korku, öfke, güven ve umut—, bu duygular üzerinden de kentteki hareketliliklerinin sınırlarını şekillendirir. Çalışma, bu argümanları kendilerini kadın olarak tanımlayan 22 katılımcının yaşanmış deneyimlerini anlayabilmek üzere yaptığım yarı-yapılandırılmış derinlemesine görüşmeler ve katılımcı gözlem yöntemiyle elde ettiğim bulgulara dayanarak oluşturur. İstanbul, Beyoğlu'ndaki Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ne (FGY) katılan 22 kadının buradaki gündelik yaşam deneyimleriyle yürüyüşteki güvenlik algılarını, tutumlarını ve davranışlarını analiz ettiğim bu çalışma; kadınların farklılıklarının, kent mekânının dinamiklerinin ve feminist aktivizmin; kadınların kentsel kamusal alanlardaki hareketlilikleri üzerindeki etkisini görmeyi mümkün kılar.

Çalışma, veri toplama ve veri analizinde kullandığım yöntemler sebebiyle nitel bir araştırmadır. Feminist bir duruş benimsediğim bu çalışma, araştırma sorularını kurmak ve örneklemi oluşturmak gibi tüm adımlarda araştırmacı için özdönüşümsel bir süreç işlediğini göstermektedir. Tematik analize (TA) göre, araştırma öznelerinin deneyimleri şu temalar çerçevesinde birbirini tekrarlamaktadır: Kadınların kentteki hareketliliğinin kurucu duygusu: korku, FGY'nin kadınların korku ve öfkesini güven ve umuda dönüştürme potansiyeli, kadınların kentsel deneyimlerini şekillendiren

toplumsal bir aktör olarak Beyoğlu, kadınların feminist dayanışma ve ittifak kurmak vasıtasıyla kentte kendileri için mekân yaratmaları [placemaking].

Araştırma sonucunda katılımcıların hem gündelik yaşamlarında hem de bu yürüyüş sırasında, Beyoğlu'nda birtakım kısıt ve imkânlarla karşılaştıkları görülmüştür. Beyoğlu'nun bu özelliğinin (kısmen *üçüncü mekân* boyutu) kadınların kentte, kabul görmeyen kimlikleriyle *de* var olabilmelerine ve hak talebinde bulunabilmelerine alan açan ya da kapatan; bu deneyimleri kolaylaştıran, zorlaştıran ya da engelleyen bir etmen olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Beyoğlu'nun bazı yerleri, katılımcıların kadınlar için tehlikeli buldukları —çoğunluğunu erkeklerin oluşturduğu— potansiyel şiddet faili aktörlerle karşılaşmak durumunda kaldıkları bir yer olarak katılımcılar tarafından cinsiyet kimliklerini, cinsel yönelimlerini, etnik ve politik kimliklerini gönül rahatlığıyla ortaya koyamadıkları, güvensiz alan olarak tarif edilmektedir. Ancak, katılımcıların aynı kimlikleri sebebiyle ittifak içinde oldukları aktörlerin buradaki varlığı bu mekânı kısmen ve geçici olarak güvenli kılar. FGY, katılımcıları ittifaklarıyla bir araya getirmektedir, bu sebeple kadınların gündelik yaşamda deneyimledikleri sözlü, cinsel ve fiziksel şiddete maruz kalma korkusunu güven duygusuna dönüştürme potansiyeline sahiptir. Bu çalışma kadınların feminist aktivizm vasıtasıyla kentte, kendileri için geçici güvenli alan yarattıklarını ortaya koyar.

Bu yürüyüşte, katılımcılar kadının kentteki yeriyle ilgili kabul görmüş kültürel kodları kırmak pahasına, gece, kentsel kamusal alanda yer kaplamakta; mekânsal yetkinliklerini [spatial competence] ve özgüvenlerini artırmaktadır. Kadınların, kentte sergilemeleri beklenen imge ve davranışların —çekingen ve korku dolu olmak, (eve doğru) hızlı şekilde hareket etmek, vs.— ve bunları besleyen ön kabullerin aksine; yürüyüş öncesinde, sırasında ve sonrasında mekânı kendiledikleri [space appropriation]; birbirlerinden aldıkları güçle Beyoğlu'nda cüretkâr bir tavır sergiledikleri; mekân aidiyetlerini [sense of belonging] artırdıkları ve mekânın feminist hafıza için simgesel önemini pekiştirdikleri gözlenmiştir. Tüm bu deneyimler, kadınların Beyoğlu'nda mekânsal özgüvenlerini [spatial confidence] inşa etmekte; yarattıkları bu mekânda sahiplik [ownership] talep etmelerine yol açmaktadır.

Nihayetinde, bu çalışma *üçüncü mekân*ın olasılıklarıyla feminist aktivizmin kadınların gündelik yaşamlarında deneyimledikleri korkuyu güven ve umuda dönüştürme

232

potansiyeline dikkat çeker. Yürüyüş kadınların kendilerini Beyoğlu'nda güvende hissettikleri bir an [moment] yaratmakta, katılımcıların gündelik yaşamlarında kullanmak zorunda hissettikleri —çoğunlukla kendilerini sınırlamalarıyla sonuçlanan— stratejileri kullanma gereği duymadan mekânda yer kaplamalarını sağlamaktadır. Ancak, bu yürüyüş, sosyodemografik özellikleriyle ilişkili olarak katılımcılara güven ve umut verebildiği gibi, katılımcıların gündelik yaşamlarında edindikleri korku ve öfkeyi—benzer ve farklı nedenlerle— tetiklemeye devam etmektedir.

BÖLÜM 1

GİRİŞ

Pek çok toplumsal harekete sahne olmuş —ve olmaya devam eden— Beyoğlu, hem bireysel belleğim hem de feminist aktivizmin Türkiye'deki tarihi için simgesel bir öneme sahiptir. İstiklal Caddesi, Taksim Meydanı ve Gezi Parkı'nın kesiştiği; farklı yönetimler tarafından farklı anlamlar ve işlevler yüklenmiş olan bu yer, Türkiye'nin dönüşen sosyopolitik ve sosyoekonomik durumunun kristalleştiği bir *üçüncü mekân*dır: Beyoğlu, taştan ve topraktan bir yer olmanın; farklı kültürlerin ve politik konumlanışların izlerini taşıyan mekânlara ev sahipliği etmenin ötesinde, buraya atfedilmiş simgesel anlamlarla birlikte düşünülmeyi hak eder. Nitekim, bu çalışma FGY katılımcısı olan kadınların yaşanmış deneyimlerine odaklanarak Beyoğlu'nda hak talep eden pek çok aktörün buraya yüklediği anlamlardan katmanlı bir resim sunma potansiyeline sahiptir.

"Yılbaşı gecesi, Taksim'de yabancı turist kadınları taciz eden erkekler" imgesini hafızama kazıyan medya temsilleri nedeniyle Beyoğlu, çocukluğumdan itibaren korku duyduğum; aidiyeti sonradan kurduğum bir yer. Bu kişisel —ve tabii politik— ilişki dışında Beyoğlu, kenti korku nedeniyle sınırlar çerçevesinde, edilgen biçimde kullanması beklenen kadınların, beklenenin aksine cüretkâr bir şekilde, 80'li yıllardan bu yana hak talebinde bulunduğu bir eylem alanıdır. FGY, bu tarihin bir parçası olarak kadınların, kadınlar için tehlikeli olduğu varsayılan kent merkezinde, gece vakti, politik taleplerini dile getirdikleri; 20 yıldır özgüvenle yürüdükleri toplumsal bir

hareket olarak karşımıza çıkar. Beyoğlu'nda özellikle Gezi Parkı protestoları sonrası tırmanan politik gerilimler ve 2019 yılında Valilik tarafından getirilen yasak neticesinde, 18 yıl boyunca FGY'nin güzergâhı olan İstiklal Caddesi artık FGY katılımcıları için *de* yasaklı hâle gelmiştir. Bu yasak, katılımcıları yürüyüş için farklı rotalar —Sıraselviler, Cihangir, Karaköy— kullanmak zorunda bırakmış; bu çalışma neticesinde, birçok katılımcının bu yürüyüşü özellikle İstiklal Caddesi'nde yapma ısrarının sürdüğü gözlenmiştir.

Beyoğlu, feminist aktivizm tarihi açısından simgesel değerini korumaktadır. Mis Sokak, Tel Sokak ve Bayram Sokak gibi, katılımcıların çoğunun bir dönem yaşadığı, çalıştığı ya da aktivizm yaptığı yerlerin burada olması, katılımcıların mekâna aidiyet hissetmeleriyle sonuçlanmaktadır. İstiklal Caddesi ve Gezi Parkı gibi simgesel yerlerin burada olmasıysa katılımcıların ifade ettiği üzere, Beyoğlu'nu "AKP'nin kırmızı çizgisi" hâline getirmektedir. Bu nedenle Beyoğlu, farklı aktörlerin kimlik mücadelesi içinde olduğu ve mekânı ele geçirmeyi umdukları bir yer olarak bu tezin merkezinde yer alır. Özetle, bu çalışma Beyoğlu'nu toplumsal olayların yalnızca sahnesi olarak görmek yerine, kadınların mekânsal deneyimlerini feminist aktivizmle birlikte şekillendirme gücü olan toplumsal bir aktör olarak ele alır.

BÖLÜM 2

ALANYAZIN TARAMASI VE ÇALIŞMANIN TEORİK ÇERÇEVESİ

İlgili alanyazın kadınların kent merkezlerinde zarar görmekten —hırsızlık ve kapkaça uğramaktan; sözlü, cinsel ve fiziksel şiddete maruz bırakılmaktan— korktuklarını göstermekte; bu korkuyu kadınları kenti ve kentsel hizmetleri kullanmaktan alıkoyan toplumsal cinsiyetli bir duygu olarak çerçevelemektedir: Bu doğrultuda korku, patriyarkal düzenin zaman ve mekân boyutlu bir yansıması olarak ele alınır. Savunmasız ve zarar görebilir özellikleri olduğu söylenen, "doğası gereği" kentlerde edilgen şekilde var olması beklenen kadın ve kentte doğal olarak hak sahibi olduğu düşünülen erkek temsilleri, kültürel beklentiler ve toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri hakkındaki inanışlar bir araya gelerek kadınların kentteki korkusunu körüklemektedir. Tüm kadınların kenti dezavantajlarla kullandıklarını söyleyemeyeceğimiz gibi, kentte

aynı derecede ve aynı sebeplerle korku duyduklarını iddia etmek de mümkün değildir. İkili cinsiyet sistemini temel alan araştırmacılar, kentte erkekler ve kadınlar arasında deneyim farkı olduğunu söylemektedirler. Bazı araştırmacılarsa kadınların kendi aralarındaki farklılıklara odaklanarak bu tartışmayı bir adım öteye taşır. Kadınlar kesişen çoklu kimlikleri sebebiyle, kentte farklı deneyimler edinirler. Bu çalışmanın bir amacı da bu alanyazına katkıda bulunmaktır.

Kadınların kentte şiddete maruz bırakılma korkusuyla baş etmek ve potansiyel şiddet failleriyle karşılaşma ihtimalini ortadan kaldırmak maksadıysa kullandıkları stratejiler, alanyazınında önemli bir yer tutar. Bu baş etme stratejileri bazı araştırmacılar tarafından etken ya da edilgen stratejiler olarak sınıflanmaktadır. Kadınların özellikle şiddet görme ihtimali varsaydıkları mekânlarda bulunmaktan kaçınmaları ya da bu mekânları kültürel kodlara ters düşmeyecek biçimlerde —örneğin hava kararmadan önce, erkek bir eşlikçiyle, vs.— kullanmaları sebebiyle alanyazın, bazı stratejileri kadınların kentteki varlıklarını kendi kendilerine sınırladıkları müzakere yöntemleri [self-limiting strategies] olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Kent mekânının kadınlar için korku üreten bir yer olduğuna işaret eden alanyazın, yurttaş olmakla ilgili bazı tespitlerde bulunur. Coğrafi yakınlık şartını sağlamış herkesin eşit şartlar altında kullanabileceği düşünülen kent merkezleri, sanıldığının aksine bazı aktörlerin kullanımından tecrit edilmiş durumdadır. Toplumsal cinsiyet — sanırım Türkiye'de bu durumunun etnisiteyle de doğrudan ilişkili olduğunu söylemek isabetli olur— kimlikleri başta olmak üzere, içinde yaşadıkları toplum tarafından kabul görmüş kişilerin kent mekânını diğerlerine oranla daha özgürce kullanabilmeleri beklenmektedir. Walby'nin (1994) vurguladığı üzere, yurttaşlık toplumsal cinsiyetli bir kavram olarak kentlilerin deneyimlerini farklı şekillerde etkiler. Cinsiyetsiz olduğu ifade edilen yurttaş kavramı, kültürel beklentileri yerine getiren kişileri kapsamakta; diğerleriyse Secor'un (2004) ifade ettiği gibi, *yabancı* veyahut *öteki* özneler olarak yurttaşlık haklarından mahrum kalmaktadır. Kadınların kente erişimlerinin önünde yatan zorluklar ve kentteki zarar görme korkuları pek çok araştırmacının dikkat çektiği üzere; liberal yurttaşlık idealinin sanıldığının aksine herkesi kapsamayan, eril bir kavram olmasıyla ilişkilendirilir. Bu tarif kadınları belirli durumlarda kent ve kentli haklarına erişmekten mahrum bırakmaktadır.

Kentin kadınlar açısından özgürleştirme potansiyeli olduğunu savunan Wilson'ın (1992) bakış açısını referans alan araştırmacılar için kent; kadınlara kalabalıklar içinde görünmez olma, bakılmaktan çok bakma imkânı verir. Fakat bu yaklaşım pek çok araştırmacı tarafından ve gözetim mekanizmalarının artışıyla çürütülmüş, kadınlar ve erkekler arasında deneyim farklılıkları olduğu gibi, kadınların kenti kendi aralarında da farklı deneyimledikleri vurgulanmıştır. Kadınların kent deneyimlerini genellemek, tamamının kentte zarar görmekten korktuğunu ya da kent mekânının tamamı için özgürleştirici olduğunu söylemek imkânsız hâle gelir.

Alanyazın kadınların kentte zarar görmeden var olabilmek adına, etken stratejiler kullandıklarını da söyler. Bu yaklaşıma göre; feminist aktivizm kadınların *korkunun üzerine yürüdükleri*, feminist dayanışma ve ittifak kurarak kentin kamusal alanlarını kendiledikleri bir şemsiye strateji olarak görülmelidir. Kentte bir yerden bir yere —özellikle gece— hareket ederken anahtarı elde silah pozisyonunda tutmak gibi kimi stratejiler, kadınların sokakla bağlarını kesip atmadan, riskli alanda bulunmalarının yolunu açar. Feminist aktivizm çerçevesinde yapılan eylemlerse bireysel stratejilerin ötesinde, kadınların ittifaklarıyla çevrili oldukları, kolektif bir yöntemdir. Zarar görme korkusunun kadınların kentteki hareketliliğini kısıtlaması gibi, feminist talepleri olan yürüyüşler kadınların kent hakkından bir ölçüde faydalanmalarına imkân verir.

Çeşitli aktörlerle karşılaşma ihtimalimizin bulunduğu mekânlar deneyimlerimizin yalnızca sahnesi değil, bu deneyimleri şekillendiren sosyal bir aktördür. Lefebvre (2015 [2014]) ve Soja'nın (1996a) işaret ettiği gibi, mekân tek bir iktidarın gücünü önceleyen tanımlı bir yer değil, farklı aktörlerin güç yarışında avantaj elde etmelerine imkân tanıyacak ölçüde çok boyutludur. Soja'nın (1996a) bir mücadele alanı olarak düşünülmesi gereken mekân tasviri, *üçüncü mekân*, toplumsal olarak dezavantajlı konumdaki aktörlerin mutlak bir biçimde kentte güçsüz olduğunu söyleyen düşünceyi ters yüz eder. Mekân; anıtlar ve meydanlar gibi somut yerlerin ve bu yerlere yüklenen politik anlamların üst üste gelerek yeni bir temsil ürettiği, burayı deneyimleyerek dönüştürdüğümüz bir varlıktır. Beyoğlu simgesel yerleri ve burada hak talep eden özneleri bir arada bulundurduğu, gündelik yaşamda ve eylemler sırasında dönüştüğü ve bu özneleri dönüştürdüğü için Soja'nın *üçüncü mekân* tarifine uymaktadır.

BÖLÜM 3

METODOLOJİ

Bu çalışma kenti zarar görme korkusu sebebiyle edilgen olarak kullanmaları beklenen kadınların feminist aktivizmi araçsallaştırarak kentte cüretkâr bir biçimde var olup olmadıklarını anlamayı amaçlar. Argümanlarımı test edebilmem için çalışma aşağıdaki araştırma sorusu ve bu soruyu farklı boyutlarda destekleyen alt sorularla birlikte düşünülmelidir:

- Kadınların geldikleri arka planların farklılaşması ve Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ne katılmaları Beyoğlu'ndaki mekânsal deneyimlerini nasıl şekillendirir?

- Kadınların kesişen çoklu kimliklere sahip olmaları ve Beyoğlu'nun (*üçüncü mekân* boyutunu içeren) çok katmanlı yapısı; yürüyüş katılımcılarının Beyoğlu üzerindeki hak taleplerini nasıl şekillendirir?

- Kadınlar gündelik yaşamlarında Beyoğlu'nu nasıl deneyimlerler?
- Feminist Gece Yürüyüşü'ne katılmaları sonrası kadınların Beyoğlu'ndaki (ve hakkındaki) güvenlik algıları, tutumları ve davranışları nasıl şekillenmektedir?
- Beyoğlu'nun (bu deneyimleri mümkün kılan) toplumsal özellikleri ve mekânsal boyutları nelerdir?

Yürüyüşün katılımcılarını kadınlarla sınırlamıyor olsam da birtakım kısıtlar ve *bilinçli taraflılık* ilkesi gereği, bu çalışma FGY'ye en az bir kez katılmış ya da bu yürüyüşün örgütlenmesinde yer almış kadınların yaşanmış deneyimlerini merkeze alır. Tezde, farklı sosyodemografik özelliklere sahip olan 22 kadının deneyimleri yarı-yapılandırılmış derinlemesine görüşmelerle; yürüyüşün genel dinamikleri ve aktörler arası karşılaşma anlarıyla ilgili veriyse katılımcı gözlemim neticesinde elde edilmiştir. Bu veri toplama yöntemlerinin yanı sıra TA veri analiz yöntemini kullanmam dolayısıyla bu çalışma nitel bir araştırmadır. Bunlara ek olarak, araştırma katılımcılarına; amaca yönelik örnekleme [purpossive], kartopu örnekleme [snowball] ve kota örnekleme [quota sampling] yaparak ulaşılmış, örneklem gönüllülük esasına dayanmasının yanı sıra birtakım kriterler çerçevesinde tasarlanmıştır.

Zaman içinde birebir aynı değişkenleri gözlemleme imkânı bulamasam da bir grup olarak FGY katılımcılarını ve yürüyüşteki dinamikleri yıllar içerisinde gözlemleme şansı edinmem sebebiyle çalışma kesit çalışmasının [crosssectional study] sınırlarını aşmaktadır. Yürüyüşle ilgili çalışmamı 2019'dan bu yana sürdürmem; ancak görüşmeleri belirli bir zaman dilimi içerisinde gerçekleştirmem sebebiyle çalışma hem kesit çalışmaya hem de boylamsal çalışmaya [longitudanal study] ait özellikler taşımaktadır. Yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmeler, COVID-19 salgınının şiddetlendirdiği birtakım kısıtlar sebebiyle çevrimiçi platformlar —Microsoft Teams ve Zoom— üzerinden yapılmıştır. Tezin bulgularının yer aldığı 4. 5. ve 6. Bölüm ve tezin özetini sunmanın ötesinde mekân yaratma bulgusunu ele aldığım sonuç bölümü TA çerçevesinde şekillenmiştir.

Katılımcısı ve araştırmacısı olduğum bu yürüyüş, tezde aracı bir konum [in-between position] almamı, dolayısıyla ürettiğim bilgiye özdönüşümsel tavırla yaklaşmamı gerektirmektedir. Kendini kadın ve feminist olarak tanımlayan bir araştırmacı olarak, çalışmanın desenini ve yaklaşımını belirlerken tezimi Feminist Duruş Kuramı odağında, Harding'in (1987) *strong objectivity* [güçlü nesnellik], Haraway'in (1988) *situated knowledges* [konumlu bilgiler] ve Mies'ın (1979) *conscious partiality* [bilinçli taraflılık] kavramlarıyla örmeyi tercih ettim. Hem kendi deneyimlerimin hem de katılımcıların anlatılarının sahip olunan sosyodemografik özelliklerin ve toplumsal ilişkilenmelerin ürünü olduğunu, bu çalışmada yer alan 22 kadının deneyimlerinin yürüyüşteki tüm kadınları eksiksiz bir şekilde temsil edemeyeceğini biliyorum. Tüm bu nedenlerle kadınların deneyimlerini merkeze alarak kurduğum bu tezde bütün bir resim sunma imkânımın olmadığını kabul ediyor, bu resimden bir örüntü sunma iddiası taşıyorum.

Katılımcıların yaşları 21 ila 61 arasında değişmektedir. Alanda gözlemlediğim katılımcı profilleriyle uyumlu bir şekilde, bu katılımcıların çoğunluğunu 20 ve 30'lu yaşlardaki kadınlar oluşturur. Katılımcıların tamamı, araştırma kriteri gereği, kendilerini kadın olarak tanımlayan öznelerdir. Bu kadınlardan 16'sı atanmış cinsiyetiyle uyumlu [cisgender], 5'i atanmış cinsiyeti dışında [transgender], 1'iyse akışkan [gender-fluid] bir cinsiyet deneyimiyle ancak yine de trans bir kadın olarak kendisini tanımlamaktadır. 15 katılımcı cinsel yönelimini heteroseksüel, 4 katılımcı biseksüel, 2 katılımcı lezbiyen, 1 katılımcıysa aseksüel olarak tarif etmektedir.

Katılımcıların 6'sı resmi bir evlilik sürdürmekte, 16 katılımcıysa bekârdır (daha önce evlenmemiş *n*=13, boşanmış *n*=3). Sınıf bakımından, toplumsal hareketler literatürünün belirttiği gibi, katılımcılar arasında alt ve alt-orta sınıf olma hâli hakimdir. Ancak çalışma sosyoekonomik statü açısından ilkokul, lise, üniversite ve doktora mezunu kadınlarla geliri olmayan kadınlardan maaşı —asgari ücretin 2.825,90 TL'ye tekabül ettiği zamanda yapılmış olan görüşmeler sırasında— 10.001 TL ve üzeri olan kadınlara kadar çeşitli bir temsil sunmaktadır. Katılımcıların yaşadıkları yakalar (Anadolu Yakası: *n*=8, Avrupa Yakası: *n*=11, İstanbul dışı: *n*=2) ve örgütlülük durumları (örgütlü: *n*=10, bağımsız: *n*=12) neredeyse eşittir. Son olarak katılımcıların 4'ü feminist olarak tanımlanmak istemediklerini beyan ederken 18'i feminist olduğunu söylemektedir. Tüm bu özellikler kadınların kenti farklı şekillerde deneyimlemeleriyle sonuçlanır.

BÖLÜM 4

KADINLAR İÇİN GÜVENSİZ VE GÜVENLİ ALANLAR ARASINDA KALAN BEYOĞLU

FGY'nin kadınların Beyoğlu'ndaki mekânsal deneyimlerine olan etkisini anlamaya çalıştığım bu araştırma, kadınların yürüyüş deneyimlerinin yanı sıra gündelik yaşam deneyimlerine de bakmamı gerektirmekteydi. Yaptığım analiz neticesinde çalışmanın bulgularının alanyazının işaret ettiği birçok meseleyle örtüştüğü görülmektedir. Tezin bu bölümü, zarar görme korkusunu kadınların kentsel kamusal alanlardaki hareketliliklerinin sınırlarını çizen kurucu ve toplumsal cinsiyet temelli bir duygu olarak ele alır. Bununla birlikte, katılımcıların Beyoğlu'na erişme, burada bulunma ve hareket etmeleri sırasında öfke, güven ve umut hissettikleri, kenti bu duygularla deneyimledikleri gözlenmiştir. Bu duyguların tüm kadınlar tarafından eşit oranda ve aynı sebeplerle hissedildiğini söylemek mümkün değildir. Kadınların geldikleri arka planların farklılaşması kentteki hareketliliklerinin sınırlarını değiştirmektedir.

Katılımcıların gündelik yaşamlarında Beyoğlu'nu zihinlerindeki güvenli ve güvensiz alan haritalarıyla kullandıkları; kendilerini tanımladıkları cinsiyet kimliği ve etnik kimlik gibi etmenler sebebiyle bu haritaların sınırlarının genişleyip daraldığı

anlaşılmıştır. Beyoğlu'ndaki güvenlik algıları, tutum ve davranışları, katılımcıların burada korktukları ve güven duydukları mekânlar, aktörler ve zaman dilimleri olduğuna işaret eder. Katılımcıların anlatıları, aralarında zarar görme konusunda farklılıklar olduğunu; özellikle tacize maruz bırakılma riskinin bu senaryolar arasında kadınlar için müşterek bir korku hâline geldiğini göstermektedir. Bazı katılımcılar, korku sebebiyle Beyoğlu'ndaki kamusal alanların bazılarını —özellikle belli saat aralıklarında— tek başlarına kullanmaktan kaçındıklarını ya da buraları bazı kısıtlar ve stratejilerle kullanmaya mecbur hissettiklerini belirtir. Dolayısıyla, bu tezin bulgularını esas alarak, korkunun kadınların kentle kurdukları bağı zayıflattığını, kadınları kent hakkından yoksun bıraktığını söylemek mümkün hâle gelmektedir. Ancak bu çalışmanın katılımcısı olan 22 kadın, korku sebebiyle kaçınma eğilimi göstererek sokağı hepten terk etmemişlerdir. Her ne kadar tamamı kendisini aktivist ya da feminist olarak tanımlamasa da bu kadınlar feminist aktivizm vasıtasıyla kentte kendilerine ait bir an ve yer yaratma gayreti içerisindedir.

Alanyazınla paralel olarak katılımcıların kentteki korku algılarını oluşturan ve tetikleyen aktörlerin başında erkekler gelmektedir. Katılımcıların, "mekânın kullanıcıları" ve "mekân sahipleri" olarak niteledikleri, gündelik yaşamlarında Beyoğlu'nda kendilerine zarar verme potansiyeli gördükleri aktörler; —kadınların ifadeleriyle— madde bağımlıları, sarhoşlar, polisler, faşistler, seks işçilerinin müşterileri ve Arap turistler gibi; "sokaktaki erkekler," "kolluk kuvvetleri" ve "yabancı erkekler" olarak sınıfladığım kimselerden oluşmaktadır. Bulgular, alanyazınındaki "zarar görme potansiyeli olan kadın" ve "tehlikeli erkek" ikiliğini kısmen doğrularken korkunun temelde ikili cinsiyet sistemine dayanan toplumsal cinsiyetli bir duygu olduğunu söylemeyi mümkün kılar. Ancak —özellikle trans deneyimli kadınların belirttiği üzere— trans dışlayıcı olduğu bilinen feminist kadınların mekândaki varlığı bazı kadınlar için erkeklerin varlığı kadar tehlike arz eder.

Kadınların Beyoğlu'ndaki güvensiz ve güvenli alanları belirlemelerinde o mekânın materyal durumu [*firstspace*] —örneğin tenha, ışıksız bir yer olması— kadar bu mekândaki aktörlerin ve yerlerin yüklendiği anlamlar [*secondspace*] da önemlidir. Mekânların temsil ettiği cemaat ilişkileri katılımcıların Beyoğlu'ndaki belirli yerleri "tehlikeli", "faşist", "güvensiz alan" olarak tanımlamalarına; bazılarınaysa "dost

240

mekân", "güvenli alan", "sığınak", "ev" gibi olumlu anlamlar yüklemelerine sebep olmaktadır. Örneğin, Tophane ve Kasımpaşa, tüm katılımcılar için, "muhafazakâr", "faşist", "AKP yandaşı" olarak tarif edilen ve "eril" olduğu vurgulanan mahallelinin temsil ettiği düşünceler sebebiyle —özellikle yalnızken ama ittifaklarla birlikteyken dahi—girilmemesi gereken, tehlikeli bir yerdir. Bu aktörlerin bazı durumlarda katılımcıların öfkelerini tetikledikleri görülür; ancak öfke, kadınların kentteki hareketliliği üzerinde korku kadar etki sahibi olan bir duygu değildir. Bazı yerlerse hem ittifakların hem de tehlikeli aktörlerin yoğunlukta olması sebebiyle çelişkiler yaratmakta; bazı katılımcıların korkusunu tetiklemekte, bazı katılımcılaraysa güven vermektedir. Örneğin, Bayram Sokak, seks işçisi trans kadınların Başkurt Sokak ve Ülker Sokak gibi yerlerden *sürülmeleri* sonrasında sığındıkları bir sokak olarak katılımcıların çoğuna güven verir. Buradaki seks işçisi trans kadınların müşterisi olan erkekler, kendini *cisgender* heteroseksüel olarak tanımlayan üst sınıf mensubu bir katılımcıya (45) taciz edilme korkusu yaşatırken, trans deneyimli lezbiyen ve alt sınıf mensubu diğer katılımcı (30) burada seks işçisi trans kadınların "borusunun öttüğünü", dolayısıyla Beyoğlu'nda en özgüvenli dolaştığı yerin burası olduğunu söyler. Tel Sokak ve Mis Sokak gibi yıllardır feminist buluşmaların ve eylemlerin yapıldığı yerlerse tüm katılımcılara güvenli yerler olarak görünür. Buraları kısmen güvensiz yapan etmen zaman dilimidir. Gece, kadınların en yoğun korku duydukları, kendilerini güvene almak amacıyla en fazla strateji kullandıkları zamandır. İttifakların birer birer sokağı terk ettikleri karanlık saatleri Beyoğlu'nun güvenli alanlarını pek çok katılımcı için güvensiz hâle getirmektedir. Neticede, katılımcıların Beyoğlu'nun gündelik akışında korktukları aktörler, yerler ve saatler; bu kadınların kimlikleri ve ilişki ağlarıyla mekânın dinamikleri sonucunda şekillenir.

BÖLÜM 5

KADINLARIN DUYGULARI VE BEYOĞLU: FEMİNİST GECE YÜRÜYÜŞÜ'NDE MEKÂNI GEÇİCİ SÜRELİĞİNE KENDİLEMEK

Kadınların gündelik yaşamlarında Beyoğlu'nda bulunurken hissettikleri dört temel duygu —korku, öfke, güven ve umut— arasından deneyimleri üzerinde en çok tesiri

bulunan duygular korku ve güvendir. Katılımcılar mekânda bu duyguların etkisiyle güvenli ve güvensiz alan tarifi yapmaktadırlar. FGY sırasında Beyoğlu'nda bulunmalarıysa katılımcıların güvenlik algılarını, tavırlarını ve davranışlarını benzer şekilde duygular üzerinden şekillendirmekte; bu kez dört temel duyguyu güçlü bir şekilde deneyimlemelerine yol açmaktadır.

Alanyazının işaret ettiği gibi, katılımcıların kadınların kentte deneyimledikleri korkuları deneyimledikleri görülmektedir. Bunlarla başa çıkabilmek amacıyla kullandıkları stratejiler de aynı alanyazınla örtüşür. Sokağın ve gecenin kadınlar için erişilebilir ve güvenli olmasını talep etmek gibi aksiyonlar barındıran FGY, bu stratejiler içinde cüretkâr bir yerde durmaktadır. Aynı zamanda politik olarak kaybettiklerini, erişilmez hâle geldiğini düşündükleri Beyoğlu, katılımcıların bu yürüyüş marifetiyle geçici ve kısmen de olsa kontrolünü ele geçirdikleri, güvenli alana dönüştürdükleri ve nihayetinde kendilerine hem fiziksel hem de simgesel görünürlük sağladıkları bir yere dönüşmektedir.

Gündelik yaşamlarında, özellikle üç grupta sınıfladığım erkeklerin Beyoğlu'nun kamusal alanlarındaki sözde sahipliği, katılımcıların "kaygı", "huzursuzluk" ve "gerilim" olarak derecelendirdikleri korkuyla karşı karşıya kalmalarına sebebiyet verir. Yürüyüş sırasındaysa Tophane'nin "faşist" ve "muhafazakâr" olmak gibi özelliklerle tarif edilen sakinleri gibi erkekler, bu katılımcıların korkusunu tetiklemeye devam ederken gündelik yaşamlarında bu kadar sık karşılaşmadıkları çevik kuvvet, özel harekât, sivil gibi birimleriyle mekânda "gövde gösterisi yapan" polis potansiyel şiddet failleri listesinin başını çeker. Yürüyüşe katılmakta ısrarcı olan —özellikle *cisgender* heteroseksüel— erkekler, birçok katılımcının "yaratılan güvenli alanın kırılması" olarak yorumladığı, istenmeyen bir karşılaşma sunar. Bunlara ek olarak, medya mensubu erkeklerin görüntü almak için baskıcı davranması ve esnafın "yandaşlığı" da bazı katılımcıların öfke duygusunu tetiklemektedir. Yürüyüşün öznesi ve doğal katılımcısı olmadığı düşünülen bu aktörler, temelde "O/Onlar" ve "Biz" ikiliği içinde düşünülmektedir. Ancak, "Biz"in üyelerinden gelen ve trans deneyimli kadınlara yöneltilen "gizil transfobik" ve Müslüman feminist kadınlara yöneltilen "gizil oryantalist" davranışlar (örneğin yersiz bir sevgi ve ilgi gösterilmesi) bu kadınların öfkesini tetiklemektedir. Ayrıca, rota değişikliği, feminist özne tartışması, bazı kadın katılımcıların yürüyüşe erkeklerle birlikte gelmeleri gibi grup içi gerilimler

242

yaratan, katılımcıların birbirlerine karşı öfke ve korku duymalarına neden olan durumlar da söz konusudur.

Tüm bunların ötesinde, kadınların bu yürüyüşte "bizim gibi düşünen insanlar"la bir arada olmaları sebebiyle, birbirlerinden güç alarak korku ve öfkeden çok güven ve umut hissettikleri görülmektedir. Gündelik yaşamda hissedilen tacize maruz kalma korkusu; yürüyüşte "görünmez", "önemsiz", "azınlık" hâle gelen erkeklerin değil, kadın ve LGBTİ+ bireylerin kolektif olarak görünür ve söz sahibi olması sebebiyle önemli ölçüde azalmaktadır. Böyle bir şiddete maruz kalma durumundaysa kadınlar onları çevreleyen ittifaklarıyla bu tehlikeyi kolayca savuşturabileceklerini, kırılan güvenli alanı yeniden inşa edebileceklerini düşünmektedirler. FGY kadınların "kendileri gibi" olabildikleri, gündelik yaşamlarında giymeyi riskli buldukları "kısa" ve "açık" kıyafetlerini giyebildikleri, ses çıkarabildikleri, vs. güvenli alan ve bir an yaratmaktadır. Feminist aktivizm, kadınların güvenlik haritalarını genişletme potansiyeline sahiptir. Yürüyüşte, Türkiye'nin en simgesel yerini kısıtlı ve geçici süreliğine de olsa kendilemek ve yasak öncesi bilinmeyen yolların ve yerlerin *mecburen* öğrenilmesi sebebiyle mekânsal yetkinlik kazanmak; katılımcıların mekâna duydukları aidiyeti ve buradaki mekânsal özgüvenlerini artırmaktadır. FGY hem mekânın dinamiklerini ve buradaki güç ilişkilerinin dengesini hem de kadınların hissettikleri duyguları dönüştürmekte ve kentin korkak ve edilgen kullanıcısı olduğu varsayılan kadın imajını ters yüz etmektedir.

BÖLÜM 6

TOPLUMSAL BİR AKTÖR OLARAK BEYOĞLU: *ÜÇÜNCÜ MEKÂN*

Kente dair çalışan pek çok araştırmacı kent mekânını, kısıtların ve imkânların iç içe geçtiği bir yer olarak tanımlar. Bu tezin kuramsal çerçevesinin temellendiği Soja'nın (1996a) *mekân üçlemesi*, kentin farklı aktörler tarafından atfedilmiş, birbirinin aksi anlamlarla fiziksel yapıları bir arada bulundurma hâline dikkat çekerek kent mekânının toplumsal bir üretim olduğunu göstermektedir. Beyoğlu, Türkiye'deki farklı sosyopolitik ve sosyoekonomik tahayyüllerin yarış içinde olduğu, anlamlar yüklü bir yerdir. Fiziksel olarak kentin merkezinde yer almasının yanı sıra, bu yer üst üste

giyindiği anlamlar sebebiyle Türkiye gündeminde hem iktidarın hem de iktidar karşıtlarının görünür olmak için yarışa tutuştuğu bir alandır. "Çelişkili" ve "akışkan" olduğu söylenen *üçüncü mekân*; Soja'nın (1996b) ifade ettiği gibi, *either/or* [şu ya da bu] değil, *both/and also* [hem…hem] konumlanmalara hitap eden bir mekândır ve tüm aktörlere mekânda var olma hakkı tanır. Tam da bu sebeplerle *üçüncü mekân* olarak tanımladığım Beyoğlu toplumsal olarak dezavantajlı konumda yer alan aktörlere kentte yer kaplama, görünür ve söz sahibi olma imkânı verir. Otoritenin mutlaklığını kıran bu bakış açısı, kadınların kentteki deneyimlerini şekillendirme potansiyeliyle mekânın *tabula rasa* değil, toplumsal bir aktör olduğunu kanıtlamaktadır.

Katılımcılar Beyoğlu'nu, AKM, Taksim Camisi; Tophane, Cihangir; "palalılar", tehlikeli *diğer* erkekler, kadınlar, LGBTİ+'lar gibi farklı yerler ve aktörler arasında kalan bir karşılaşma alanı olarak tanımlar. "Biz" ve "Onlar" arasında paylaşılmayı bekleyen bu mekânın ne o ne de bu ideolojiye bütünüyle hizmet etmediği, ideolojilerin burada daima karşıtıyla birlikte var olduğu bilinmektedir. Osmanlıcı ve İslamcı temsilleri canlandırma pratiklerinin karşısında; Cumhuriyetçi ideoloji, gece hayatı, alkol tüketimi, toplumsal hareketler gibi karşıt temsillerin olduğu görülür. AK Parti hükümetinin Gezi Parkı protestoları (2013) sonrası izlediği politikalarla toplumsal hareketlerden giderek *arındırılan* mekân, toplumsal hareketlerin hem yeri olmayı hem de talep ettiği temsilleri üretmeyi sürdürmektedir. Zıtlıkların bir aradalığı, kentte edilgen olması beklenen kadınlara feminist dayanışma ve ittifak kurarak kendileri için alan açmalarının ve mekânı dönüştürerek anlamını yeniden üretmelerinin kapısını aralar. Böylesine bir simgesel yerde feminist aktivizmin dönüştürücü gücüyle hareket etmek, kadınların kısa ve uzun vadede —mekânsal erişim ve hareket imkânı bularak— kent hakkından yararlanmalarını sağlamaktadır.

BÖLÜM 7

SONUÇ

Kadınlar kenti yalnızca korkuyla deneyimleyen edilgen aktörler değildir. 22 kadının deneyimlerinden hareketle, bu tez kadınların feminist aktivizm vasıtasıyla kentte

244

evlerinin duvarlarıyla çizilmiş olan sınırlarını esnettiklerini gösterir. Kültürel beklentilerin ve toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri hakkındaki inanışların aksine, kadınlar bu yürüyüşte kendilerini kısıtlayan, kendilerinin polisi olmalarıyla sonuçlanan yöntemler dışında bir yol izleyerek, Türkiye'nin merkezinde yer alan en simgesel yeri, Beyoğlu'nu kendilerler. Gündelik yaşamlarında büyük oranda korku duydukları bu yer, somut bir yer olmasının ötesinde, kendisine atanan anlamlarla her gün yeniden üretilen toplumsal bir inşa ve toplumsal etkinlikleri şekillendiren aktördür. Kadınların bu simgesel yerde feminist dayanışma ve ittifak kurmasının yolunu açan FGY, katılımcılarına mekânı ve kendilerini dönüştürme imkânı tanır. Kadınların geldikleri arka planlar kadar mekânın sahip olduğu dinamikler de kadınların Beyoğlu'ndaki mekânsal deneyimlerini biçimlendirmektedir.

Gündelik yaşamlarında güvensiz ve güvenli alanlar arasında ip cambazlığı yapmak zorunda hissettikleri Beyoğlu; yürüyüş öncesinde, sırasında ve sonrasında sokakta olmaya devam bu kadınların zihinlerindeki güvenli alanlar haritasını genişletip mekânda özgüvenli ve yetkin olmalarını sağlamaktadır. Beyoğlu'nda, 8 Mart gecesi yapılan bu yürüyüş kadınların mekânda birkaç saatliğine bulunmakla yetinmediği; Beyoğlu'nun dününe, bugününe ve yarına talip oldukları toplumsal bir harekettir. Bu yürüyüş kentte *emeği* görünmez olan ya da bakılan/izlenen bir nesne olarak sunulan, zarar görmeye müsait kadın imajını dönüştürme potansiyeline sahiptir. Beyoğlu'nda politik bir yürüyüş sergilemek kadınların kentte sahip oldukları yeri ve mekânın feminist aktivizmin Türkiye'deki tarihi için değerini pekiştirerek mekânı yeniden üretmeleriyle ve geçici süreliğine de olsa kendilerine ait kılmalarıyla sonuçlanmaktadır.

E. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

(Please fill out this form on computer. Double click on the boxes to fill them)

<u>ENSTİTÜ</u> / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

<u>YAZARIN</u> / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname   : UŞAKLILAR
Adı / Name   : Öznur
Bölümü / Department : Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları / Gender and Women's Studies

<u>**TEZİN ADI**</u> / <u>TITLE OF THE THESIS</u> (**İngilizce** / English): THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF FEMINIST ACTIVISM: CREATING A TEMPORARY SAFE SPACE FOR WOMEN AT THE FEMINIST NIGHT MARCH IN BEYOĞLU, İSTANBUL

<u>**TEZİN TÜRÜ**</u> / <u>DEGREE</u>**:**   **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ☒   **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☐

2. **Tez <u>iki yıl</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **<u>two years</u>. *** ☐

3. **Tez <u>altı ay</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of <u>**six months**</u>. ***** ☒

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ....   **Tarih** / Date ....
                                              (Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
                                              (Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)
Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.