A NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT AS A REACTION TO THE URBAN REGENERATION

[1]SEDEF ZEYREKLI YAS, [2]SELIN ARABULAN

[1] Management and Organization Department, Havsa Vocational School, Trakya University, Turkey
[2]Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture, Trakya University, Turkey
E-mail: [1]sedefyas@trakya.edu.tr, [2]selinarabulan@trakya.edu.tr

Abstract- Urban regeneration is defined as a set of extensive visions aiming to transform the urban areas which are about to collapse physically and socially into liveable and dynamic areas. The conception of metropolitan urban regeneration in Turkey has changed over the last fifty years due to different structural, contextual, socio-economical, administrative and physical dynamics in different periods. In our study, urban regeneration project that is thought to be put into practice in squares of İstanbul and the social movement against this regeneration are assessed. In this context, the questions for this study are "can social movements change the decisions of political power about urban regeneration?", "How can the civil actors effect on urban areas?" and "have the social movements got the power to change the decisions on urban?" The study is examined in accordance with the domestic and foreign literature. Moreover, the news in the national newspaper and the articles about social movements occurred in the case of the events are sought and evaluated.

Keywords- Social movements, urban regeneration, urban squares.

I. INTRODUCTION

Urban regeneration can be defined as a set of actions and integrated and extensive visions aiming to transform the urban areas which are about to collapse physically and socially into liveable and dynamic areas by triggering local economical dynamics (Roberts, 2000).

During historical process, industrial cities began to transform into modern cities with the development of modernisation and technology, and reconfiguration of the urban spaces is required because of the abandonment of heavy industry. Changes in cities because of the dynamics of globalisation in1980s lead the parts of the city which couldn't keep pace with these changes to be outdated. The obsolete areas and vacant industrial areas have become favourite subjects of urban regeneration so the involvement of these areas to urban economy is provided with new functions and physical qualities (Knox, 1994).

The phenomenon of metropolitan urban regeneration in Turkey changed over the last fifty years due to different structural, contextual, socio-economical, administrative and physical dynamics in different periods. The implementations are made in this direction (Ataöy and Osmay, 2007).

In our study, in this context, urban regeneration project that is thought to be put into practice in Taksim Square is handled and the social movement against this regeneration is studied. So, it will be fruitful to give information about social movements.

Social movements are defined as permanent, informal social networks which are in solidarity with each other, share the common thought and emotions, protest against actors or institutions determined as the source of their issue (Bayhan, 2014: 26). According to Castells, organized social unrest, uprisings, pressure groups and oppositional fronts can be defined as urban social movements (Uysal, 2012). This motion proposes a new relationship between space and society (Castells, 1983: xv). Spaces are parts in a city where collective consumption, again it's the Castells' definition, is concentrated (Castells, 1978: 15). So, social movements have begun to be associated with cities for decades. The dominant movements in the first years of modernism focus on economic benefits and they organise centrally to seize the political power with the members consisting of only one social class, so this kind of movements are named as "Old Social Movements" to imply that these movements belong to the old (industry) type of community. The rapid change and regeneration change the type and quality of social movements. These social movements whose actors, aim, manner of application, time and impact area have new extent, aimed to draw attention to an issue that bothers rather than change itself (Bayhan, 2014: 26).

In this context, the social movements that began with labour movements at the end of the 19th century are named as old social movements because they aimed political power, and were class-structure movements focused on economic benefits (Karagöz, 2013: 134). There are two approaches which conceptualise the social movements that emerge from 1960; American-based Source Mobilisation Theory and European-based New Social Movements Theory (Demiroğlu, 2014: 135). Source mobilisation theory focuses on economic and political aspect of social movements but new social movements' theory focuses on the cultural aspect of movements (Bayhan, 2014: 27). Hence, the new social movements constitute the theoretical structure of our study, and these movements were mostly focused on.

New social movements not only include the dynamics of social movements named as "old" movements that are constituted to seize the benefit-based political power by using mostly labour class in the first period of modernism, but also -different from the previous

period- consist of flexible, acentric and local collective reactions (Demiroğlu, 2014: 136). The expression "new" draws attention to the difference of the movements based on interest groups and old class, not the chronological order (Coşkun, 2007: 107).

Since the public policy can cause social movements to appear, social movements can also cause new public policies to appear. In this context, the aim of this study is to research whether urban public have any influence on decisions of urban regeneration with the help of movements. The preparation and practice of urban regeneration plans is a process with many actors, and in this study merely the urban public is studied. Not all new social movements against urban regeneration is not studied, but the events of (the sample event) Gezi Park in Taksim is studied. Besides, the political aspect of these events is left out of the search, and focus on the demands and results of urban regeneration.

In this context, the questions for this study are "can social movements change the decisions of political power about urban regeneration?", "can the public areas be reorganised without asking public opinion?" and "have the social movements got the power to change the decision taken by political power?"

The main hypothesis of the study is; "The urban regeneration plans made by political power can be changed by the urban public". The secondary hypotheses of the study are: "Social movements affect the political policies". "For the urban regeneration plans, urban public opinion should be asked".

In this study, literature review and case study examine is tried to be achieved. For the literature review, the domestic and foreign resources about the topic of the study are examined. Moreover, the news in the national newspaper and the articles about social movements are sought and evaluated. In the case study examine, the events of Gezi Park are researched in the context of the questions of the study and hypotheses.

II. A BRIEF HISTORY OF TAKSIM SQUARE

The area, where there is Taksim Square today, has changed many times over time. In 16th century, there were cemeteries of Galata and other cities on both sides of the road from Taksim to Pangaltı. Beyoğlu neighbourhood grew further throughout İstiklal Street due to intensive population growth of Pera, thus the area including Taksim Square began to gain importance (Karaman and İçözen, 1987).

The growth of Pera towards Taksim, is due to Taksim Maksem which was built by Mahmut the 1st between 1731 and 1732. In 17th century, the Maksem had gone to be an important trip area (Carbognano, 1993). In 1802, Armenians refuged to İstanbul from Rumelia and Bursa were settled in the area between Taksim and cemeteries (İnciciyan, 1976). In 19th century, many buildings were constructed for military requirements in order to protect and pacify the Dolmabahçe Palace and the valley. Most of these buildings have the features of barracks architecture which are re-formed because of westernisation. Taksim Barracks, one of the oldest buildings, was in the large area whose borders were from Taksim Maksem to Surpagop Cemetery (the area afterwards used as Divan Hotel) (Tuğlacı, 1990). Built in the years between 1803 and 1806 by Mıgırdıç Balyan, the Barracks was restored by Hafız Mehmet Efendi, making a few changes in plans in 1811 (Cezar, 1991: 486).

The barracks building which witnessed the March 31 Incident was harmed in the clashes. The building that was used as Artillery Barracks till the 1st World War, wasn't used for military purposes during and at the end of the war. The yard of the building was used as a stadium in 1923 and used as stadium till it's demolished (Kuruyazıcı, 1998: 89-98).

With the establishment of electrical tram between Beyoğlu and Şişli in 1913, Taksim has become more important in terms of transportation. The Republic Monument that was built in 1928 –first years of the Republic-, the ritual wideness around the monument and the traffic regulation which's shaped like ring at the outer wall of the wideness, give an original identity to the Square (Dökmeci and Çıracı, 1990: 37).

In the first years of republic, as an ideological attempt, the capital city was moved to Ankara and the construction of nation centred on Ankara. In 1930s, as a continuation of this ideology, it's aimed to create representation of modern Turkey Republic by removing the traces of Ottoman Empire from urban area. After long-term searches, the mission of construction of modern İstanbul was given to Henri Prost, French urban planning expert.

The ceremonial area in İstanbul used at national holidays and important dates was Beyazıt Square. It's, however, considered inadequate for reflecting the magnificence of the Republic as it has not been designed for such purpose. The primary work that Henri Prost was asked for doing was to design a ceremonial area that would reflect the power and magnificence of the Turkish Republic. Accordingly, Prost designed two major city parks for İstanbul. One of the parks he offered was the area positioned on Historical Peninsula, from Sarayburnu along Hagia Sophia, which was described as "Archaeological Park" (Bilsel and Pinon, 2010). The other park was a green space that's regulated so as to include Maçka Valley, called as Taksim Republic Square designed as a ceremonial area, starting from the square following İnönü Gezisi that's adherent to the square with a ritual entrance and going along Nişantaşı.

Taksim Artillery Barracks has lost its function for military a long time ago and is now used as a stadium in which some exhibitions are arranged in special dates. Nevertheless, considering the aim and the

period it's built, it indicates a building that's the symbol of westernisation of Ottoman Empire. So, there are ideological reasons behind the demolishment of barracks and especially the collapse of this area in order to make way for a wide park and a ritual area to represent modern Turkish Republic. Taksim Republic Square, initially, was inaugurated after the demolishment of barns of the Barrack. During the demolishment, made gradually, first the walls forming facades of the barns cut so as to shape a square form in the periphery of Taksim Republic Square, then it was inaugurated after by completely demolishment of the walls. İnönü Gezisi, renewed Taksim Municipal Mess and Garden were inaugurated in 1939-1940 by the demolishment of Artillery Barracks.

The demolishment of the Barracks had been gradually made; first, three facades of it had been demolished, and lastly the facade at the main entrance of the Barracks were demolished (Göğüş, 2014: 70-72).

In the early 1940s, Power Administration building, where there is Atatürk Culture Centre now, was demolished and an international competition was held in order to construct an opera building instead of it. The winning Project was implemented by F. Kip and R. Günay in 1946 (Kuruyazıcı, 1998).

In front of the park and the area between monument and opera building was planned as Republic Square. In this area, where Prost located many buildings in İstanbul such as İnönü Stadium, Broadcasting Studio of TRT, Open-air Theatre, Sports and Exhibition Centre, 160.000 m^2 area was socialised and afforested between the years 1940 and 1947 (Özsavaşçı, 1999: 17-20).

Interferences between 1930 and 1950 had been criticized as decision makers merely engaged in the process. Lütfi Kırdar, both the governor and the mayor is the one taking the control of whole changes and developments in the area. As the management of İstanbul was controlled by one hand, only one organization aiming the development of the city was formed. The opera building restructured in 1969 so as to meet the needs such as theatre, exhibition, and other needs, was used as a culture centre, and then has been named as Atatürk Culture Centre as of 1977 (Öztürk, 2009: 57).

Post 1980s period is, particularly, a period that neoliberal politics and special space-oriented urbanization form were embraced in Turkey. The primary seeds of these developments, however, had been sown in 1950s in which the Democrat Party which came to power thanks to the transition to multi-party election system, began to carry the closed economy onto international platform by the help of foreign relations that was developed by the neutrality attitude protected during The Second World War. The reflection of the period into the urbanization of İstanbul may be encountered in the dates called "operations of Menderes".

Coming into agenda of construction of Hilton Hotel in the middle of the Park No. II, constituted by Prost, serve as a good example for the reflection of this policy. Although the discharge of the Mayor, who's against the construction of the hotel because of interruption of the greenness of that area and the resignment of the city planner Aron Angel, Prost's assistant, by his speech "I feel shame for working in an organization where individual interests are in great request", the construction of Hilton Hotel could have been completed in 1954. At the beginning, this area was decided to be a public area because it's a public domain, however, it's closed to the public showing reason of security problems. Thus, Hilton Hotel became the first "occupant" disrupting the continuity of the Park No. II (Göğüş, 2014: 75).

The construction of Hilton Hotel was followed by the construction of Divan hotel in 1956, Sheraton (Ceylan Intercontinental) and Etap Marmara (The Marmara), respectively. The occupation of the wide public areas in Prost's Plan by privatising, continued rapidly as the expression of bringing İstanbul into a World city, to the extent that increasing its effect on urbanisation policies in 1980s. On the contrary to the Prost's Plan, it was observed that policies locating capital and tourists instead of citizens were adopted. Swiss Hotel (1991), Hyatt Regency Hotel (1995), Ritz Carlton (1999) and Taxim Residence (2006) lead to other examples of spaces closed to public use due to privatization. As a result of Prost's Plan, the area, which has the quality of "valley of recreation and culture", has got to be named as "Congress Valley" after the "United Nations Habitat Conference" hold in 1996. Then, in 2009, Lütfi Kırdar Congress and Exhibition Centre enhanced as İstanbul Congress Centre (Göğüş, 2014: 76). Moreover, this area declared as "culture-based Tourism Region" in Landscaping Plan 1/100.000 in 2009.

In parallel with the Prost's Plan, the permanent public and green area and space have been eradicated by part-by-part privatization in order to make it a centre of culture in which the international congresses, fair and activities could be arranged in the process of globalisation of İstanbul. Today, only İnönü Gezisi / Taksim Gezi Park remains as public space in this area. But Gezi Park is also under the threat of destruction by reason of the "Construction of Taksim Artillery Barracks Plan" which is decided to be constructed by the functions expected to contribute global urban image of İstanbul.

1. Hilton Hotel (1954)	2. Divan Hotel (1956)	3. Sheraton Hotel (1975)	4. Etap Marmara (1975)
5. Swiss Hotel (1991)	6. Talimhane Hotels Area (1994)	7. Hyatt Regency Hotel (1995)	8. Gökkafes (1999)
9. G-Mall (2003)	10. Taxim Residence (2006)	11. İstanbul Congress Centre (2009)	12. Taksim Artillery Barracks Reconstruction Project (2012)



Figure 1. Privatizations in Taksim and Its Peripherals (Göğüş, 2014: 77)

III. THE EVENTS OF GEZI PARK IN TAKSIM AS A REACTION TO URBAN REGENERATION

Taksim Square and Its periphery has always been a space where the governments always tried to interfere with the influence of ideological and political local dynamics. These arguments centred on the issues such as a mosque, building the roads under the ground, Atatürk Culture Centre, during 1980s and 1990s (Göğüş, 2014: 77).

At the centre of the interference which also came into agenda as in the period studied in this paper, there is a Pedestrianisation Project in which the roads will be built under the ground. But, this time, next to the square thought to be pedestrianised, "Reconstruction Project of Taksim Artillery Barracks", which was transformed to "trip" by collapsing, has come into question.

The process has begun with the explanation of the current power, made just before the local election hold on the 12th of June in 2011, about the "Pedestrianisation Project" and "Reconstruction Project of Taksim Artillery Barracks" in Taksim chosen among the "crazy" projects. After the elections, the amendment -as a first step to realize the projects- to be made in 1/5000 city master plan for protect and 1/1000 implementary development plan for protect was unanimously approved by Istanbul Metropolitan Municipal Council on the September 16, 2011 and confirmed by the District Board for Conservation of Cultural Heritage on January 4, 2012 (Göğüş, 2014: 78).

The decision has drawn reaction by the academicians who're experts in urban planning, trade associations and non-governmental organizations. In the process of objection, some of the organisations such as Taksim Platform, Taksim Solidarity has become the prominent organisations by prosecuting, registration applications and declarations.

In a period of four and a half months that passed between the approval of the projects and the suspension on the February 14, 2012, many visuals were shared with the public via press (Figure 2).



Figure 2: Reconstruction Project of Taksim Artillery Barracks,1 (http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/taksimdeki_kisla_dondurul du-1117414, accessed: 21.03.2016).



Figure 3: Reconstruction Project of Taksim Artillery Barracks, 2 (http://www.haberboyu.com/2013/02/28/taksim-topcu-kislasi-icin-son-karar-verildi, accessed: 21.03.2016)

After the contractor company for the Pedestrianisation Project that let out by stages, became clear On September 24, 2012, the excavations between Tarlabaşı and Cumhuriyet Street where are defined as the first diving tunnel according to the Project started on October 30, 2012 (Göğüş, 2014: 81).

"Taksim Artillery Barracks Project", however, was firstly rejected by 2nd District Board for Conservation of Cultural Heritage with the verdict on December 11, 2012 with the reason that "the reconstruction project of barracks doesn't have information and document about the trace of previous periods properly." But, later, due to the pressure of central power about "Denial of denial" and the verdict on February 27, 2013 by High Council for Conservation of Cultural Heritage, the project was approved with the cancel of the verdict by 2nd District Board for Conservation of Cultural Heritage in İstanbul http://www.arkitera.com/haber/index/detay/topcu-kislasina-onay-cikti-mimarlarkarara-tepkili/12438, accessed: 21.03.2016).

After the approval of the project by District Board and the common view that the central power had a role in taking this decision, the reactions against

demolishment of Gezi Park that has an important part in social memory, intensified. On May 28, 2013, because a construction equipment has removed a tree in the border of Gezi Park, non-governmental organisations and the public rushed into the park, protested against the project, during the protests they're exposed to the stern interferences of security forces growing in a short time, it transformed into a protest against the government.

In this context, on May 29, 2013, the events of Gezi Park, starting as an environmental movement by a small group of people, transformed into an urban social movement as a result of harsh expressions of the political power and the stern interferences of security forces, so simply became a rebellion against the political power. In this study, not all the aspects of the movement are discussed, but the rebellion of the movement about urban regeneration.

In this frame, following the start of the collapse of the wall of Gezi Park, where the President Erdoğan declared that it'll be transformed, a group, organised in social media and named themselves "Constituents of Taksim Solidarity", stopped the demolishment and kept watch till morning. With the precaution of riot police and municipal police team, the demolishment started again and the police interfered the protestors reacting against it. After a 3 hours clash, Sırrı Süreyya Önder, İstanbul Deputy of BDP came to scene, stopped in front of the construction equipment by passing through the police barricade. Then the mobile forces and the construction equipment, which was demolishing the big part of the wall of Gezi Park, have left and the protestors have expressed that they would go on keeping watch (Erçiçek, 2013: 9).

After Erdoğan said "You can do whatever you want. We took decisions about that place and we'll implement."; at 5 am, the riot police began an operation to the group who keep watch for avoiding the cutting down the trees, and the tents and some stuff of the protestors who woke up with pepper spray, were burnt on May 30, 2013 (Erçelik, 2013: 6). After the group left, the construction equipments started to work again, and stopped when Sırrı Süreyya Önder came and stopped the machines by sitting in front of them again. Then the group, consisting of nearly 200 people, went on keeping watch (Sözal and Kaya, 2013: 22).

Nearly 700 policemen interfered the group with TOMA vehicles and pepper spray at 5 am on May 31, then the protestors responded with bottles, stones and sticks. After the interference, the group were removed from the park, and the group gathered on the area near Divan Hotel, and with the people, hearing about the interference via social media and coming to support that group, there were nearly 2000 people. As the group went towards Gezi Park, the policemen interfered with pepper spray (Erollu, et.al, 2013: 16).

While the events were going on, on May 31, 2013, the 6st Administrative Court in İstanbul passed a verdict to stop the execution about the construction of shopping mall and Artillery Barracks in Gezi Park with unanimity ("Mahkeme Yürütmeyi Durdurma Kararı Verdi", Sabah, 01 Haziran 2013, p. 17). The President criticised the verdict of the Administrative Court about Artillery Barracks, and remarked that they have the right for objection, and used these words: "If you want more trees, we shall give. You, in any case, do not want Artillery Barracks, it is going to be constructed, regardlessly. We've the right for objection and it'll be done and we'll see everything. Then these steps will be taken. Then the result will be achieved." ("Başbakan Erdoğan, İdare Mahkemesinin Verdiği Kararı Eleştirdi: Topçu Kışlası için İtiraz Hakkımız Var", Milliyet, 02 Haziran 2013, p. 21). He emphasized that they wouldn't step back.

Muammer Güler, the Minister of Interior, defending that there's obstinacy for Gezi Park, said that some groups didn't leave there and prevented the services of municipality for pedestrianisation, and remarked that the police has no choice but to defuse the community (Özmen, et.al, 2013: 17). Hüseyin Avni Mutlu, the Governor, and Kadir Topbaş, the Mayor of Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, held press conference about the events, remarked that the groups, who try to get value by using happy tree love, continued their efforts and the aim of these groups wasn't the love of nature. Kadir Topbaş said that he got upset for the exploitation of pure-minded, sincere and environmentalist people by the people who are rent-seeking (Erdem, 2013: 23).

Consequently, the Reconstruction Project of Taksim Artillery Barracks and Pedestrianisation Project for Taksim Square were abolished by the verdict - the abolishment of changes in the plans on June 6, 2013- passed by 1st Administrative Court in İstanbul in the case which was prosecuted by Union of Chamber of Turkish Engineers and Architects (UCTEA) Chamber of Landscape Architects, UCTEA Chamber of Architects and UCTEA Chamber of City Planners for the amendment of construction plan aimed to be made for conservation at the beginning of Project process. In accordance with the verdict, the front part of the construction of Barracks was closed. One of the points that's is full of unclear and contradictory expressions during the Project is the issue of what the functions of the barracks will be, if it's reconstructed. During this process, lots of functions such as shopping mall, city museum, hotel, residence and even skating rink are uttered by political authorities and the people guiding the Project. These utterings are the functions which are declared via press but there isn't any certain decision about it. Nevertheless, a declaration by the architect of the Barracks via press gives some crucial clue about the utilization of the Project which is to be provided by the transformation of an open public space, moreover, most importantly about the profile of beneficiaries of the space (http://www.dunyabulteni.net/?aType=haber&ArticleID=234108, accessed: 21.03.2016)

CONCLUSION

As a result of the considerations made for this study, the main hypothesis formulated as "urban regeneration plans decided by the political power can be changed by the urban people" is accepted. Likewise, the secondary hypotheses "Social movements affect the policies of the political power" and "The opinion of urban people should be asked for the urban regeneration plans that're decided to be made", are accepted and it can be said that it'll be more rational and more efficient for the political power to incorporate the urban people in the urban generation process.

However, today, carrying out some parts of the pedestrianisation project, which came into question in 1980s but wasn't implemented, indicates that it may come into question again in the years ahead. At this stage, in what direction the publicity of the place will change, is an important issue.

REFERENCES

[1]. Ataöv, A.; Osmay, S., Türkiye'de Kentsel Dönüşüme Yöntemsel Bir Yaklaşım, METU, JFA, pp. 57-82, Ankara, 2007

[2]. Bayhan, V., "Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler ve Gezi Parkı Direnişi", Birey ve Toplum Dergisi, Cilt 4, Sayı 7, pp. 23-57, Bahar 2014

[3]. Bilsel, C., Pinon, P., İmparatorluk Başkentinden Cumhuriyet'in Modern Kentine: Henri Prost'un İstanbul'u Planlaması (1936 – 1951), Suna ve İnan Kıraç Vakfı İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 2010

[4]. Carbognano C. C., 18. Yüzyıl Sonunda İstanbul, (1794), Çev: E. Özbayoğlu, Eren Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 1993

[5]. Castells, M., The City and The Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements, Edward Arnold, London, 1983

[6]. Castells, M., City, Class And Power, The Macmillian Press Ltd, New York, 1978

[7]. Cezar, M., XIX. YY. Beyoğlu'su, Akbank Yayınları, No:55, İstanbul, 1991

[8]. Coşkun, M. K., Demokrasi Teorileri ve Toplumsal Hareketler, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara, 2007

[9]. Dökmeci, V., Çıracı, H., Tarihsel Gelişim Süreci İçinde Beyoğlu, Türkiye Turing ve Otomobil Kurumu Yayınları, İstanbul, 1990

[10]. Erçiçek, S., "Gezi Parkı Arbedesi", Hürriyet, 29 Mayıs 2013

[11]. Erçiçek, S., "Sabaha Karşı Gezi Baskını", Hürriyet, 31 Mayıs 2013

[12]. Erdem, U., "Polisin Müdahaleden Başka Çaresi Yoktu", Hürriyet, 01 Haziran 2013

[13]. Erollu, E.; Karakuş, G.; Dinç, Ş.; Bilgenoğlu, S.; Yıldız, A.; Cirik, A.; Yıldırım, Z., "Gezi Gaza Boğuldu", Haber Türk, 01 Haziran 2013

[14]. Göğüş, Y. Barış, Küreselleşen Kentlerde Kamusal Mekanın Dönüşümünün Sosyo-Mekansal Ayrışma Bağlamında İncelenmesi: Taksim Gezi Parkı Örneği, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul, 2014

[15]. İnciciyan, G., 1976: XVIII. Asırda İstanbul, Çev: A. Hrand, İst, Fetih Cemiyeti, İst. Enst. Yayınları, No:43, 2. Baskı, İstanbul

[16]. Karagöz, K., "Yeni Medya Çağında Dönüşen Toplumsal Hareketler ve Dijital Aktivizm Hareketleri", İletişim ve Diplomasi: Yeni Medya, Sayı 1, s. 131-157, 2013

[17]. Karaman, A.; İçözen, E., Taksim ve Yakın Çevresi Tarihsel Gelişimi, Taksim Meydanı Proje Yarışması Kitabı, İstanbul, 1987

[18]. Knox, P. L., Urbanization: An Introduction to Urban Geography, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1994

[19]. Kuruyazıcı, H., "Cumhuriteyin İstanbul'daki Simgesi Taksim cumhuriyet Meydanı", 75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık, Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, Ed: Y. Sey, Bilanço 98 Yayın Dizisi, İstanbul, 1998

[20]. Özmen, E.; Sözal, B.; Kaya, M.; Şahin, A.; Sarıboğa, V.; Yaman, Z.; Canıpek, S.; Şengül, M., "Doğa Sevgisi Bahane", Sabah, 01 Haziran 2013

[21]. Özsavaşçı, A., Taksim-Maçka yeşil alanının değişim sürecine eleştirel bir bakış, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul, 1999

[22]. Öztürk, A. A., Kentsel Kamusal Alan Olarak Meydanlar: Mekan Ve Yaşamla Kurduğu İlişki, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Y.Lisans Tezi, İstanbul, 2009

[23]. Roberts, P., The Evolution, Definition and Purpose of Urban Regeneration, Urban regeneration a handbook, SAGE Publications, London, 2000

[24]. Sözal, B.; Kaya, M., "05.00'te Gezi Gazı", Sabah, 31 Mayıs 2013

[25]. Topal Demiroğlu, E., "Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler: Bir Literatür Taraması", Marmara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt 2, Sayı 1, s.133-144, Mart 2014

[26]. Tuğlacı, P., 1990: The Role of the Balian Family in Ottoman Architecture, Yeni Çığır Bookstore, İstanbul

[27]. Uysal, Ü.E., "An urban social movement challenging urban regeneration: The case of Sulukule, İstanbul", Cities, 29, 2012

[28]. "Mahkeme Yürütmeyi Durdurma Kararı Verdi", Sabah, 01 Haziran 2013

[29]. "Başbakan Erdoğan, İdare Mahkemesinin Verdiği Kararı Eleştirdi: Topçu Kışlası için İtiraz Hakkımız Var", Milliyet, 02 Haziran 2013

[30]. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/taksimdeki_kisla_dondurulu-1117414, accessed: 21.03.2016

[31]. http://www.haberboyu.com/2013/02/28/taksim-topcu-kislasi-icin-son-karar-verildi,/ accessed: 21.03.2016

[32]. http://www.arkitera.com/haber/index/detay/topcu-kislasina-onay-cikti-mimarlarkarara-tepkili/12438, accessed: 21.03.2016

[33]. http://www.dunyabulteni.net/?aType=haber&ArticleID=234108, accessed: 21.03.2016

★★★