

COUNTER-MONUMENTALIZATION OF TREES AFTER THE GEZİ PARK RESISTANCE

Gezi Parkı Direnişisi Sonrası Ağacın Karşı Anıtlaşması

Gözde Cöbek*

gcobek@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to explore the relationship between politics and aesthetics by analyzing the growing emphasis on and importance of the concept of tree in the AKP (the Justice and Development Party) government's discourse after the Gezi Park protests. Following both Jacques Ranciere's theory of "the distribution of the sensory", and Marc Redfield's concept of "imagi-nation" for my theoretical framework and making use of the narratives of the protesters that I interviewed with during the Gezi Park protests in 2013 and the narratives of the government about these events for my discourse analysis, I argue how the Gezi events are an aesthetic movement as well as a political and social one, and how this aesthetic movement leads trees to become a special kind of monument, "counter-monument" which challenges and inverts the monuments that allow us for imagi-nation.

Keywords: Aesthetics, politics, imagi-nation, the distribution of the sensory, counter-monument, the Gezi Park protests.

Özet

Bu çalışma, Gezi Parkı olaylarından sonra AKP (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi) hükümetinin söyleminde artan ağaç vurgusunu ve önemini analiz ederek politika ve estetik arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın teorik çerçevesi için Jacques Ranciere'in "duyusalın dağılımı" teorisi ile Marc Redfield'in "hayal-i ulus" (imagi-nation) kavramından ve söylem analizi için 2013'teki Gezi Parkı olayları sırasında eylemcilerle yaptığım mülakatlarla hükümetin olaylar üzerine yaptığı açıklamalardan faydalandım. Bu teorik çerçeve ve söylem analizi ışığında, Gezi Parkı olaylarının nasıl politik ve sosyal olduğu kadar estetik bir hareket olduğunu ve bu estetik hareketin nasıl ağacı özel bir anıt türüne, hayal-i ulusu mümkün kılan anıtları zorlayan ve evirten bir "karşı anıt" haline getirdiğini tartışmaktayım.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Estetik, politika, hayal-i ulus, duyusalın dağılımı, karşı-anıt, Gezi Parkı olayları.

Introduction

Just as it is certain that one leaf is never totally the same as another, so it is certain that the concept 'leaf' is formed by arbitrarily discarding these individual differences and by forgetting the distinguishing aspect.

Nietzsche¹

The word aesthetics which is derived from the Greek, referring to “sense perception”, was appropriated and coined with a new meaning in the German form and defined as a special kind of judgment, activity, experience about the beautiful. The appropriation of the term in modernity is significant in terms of its relation to politics: According to Marc Redfield (2003), even though this new definition of aesthetics claims to be disinterested in politics, they are very entangled with each other because aesthetics “is always in principle and at the end of the day a political discourse”, “a discourse fundamentally *about* modernity” (Redfield, 2003, p. 1 and 10).

Redfield sees this relationship between aesthetics and politics in what he calls “imagination”: Since a nation-state, a nation, is fundamentally and irretrievably faceless, “it can only be visualized, imagined, through the mediation of a catachresis, an arbitrary sign” (Redfield, 2003, p. 49). In other words, because we cannot touch, hear, see, feel or taste a nation, a nation-state, aesthetic discourse allows us to imagine, to sense it through flags, anthems, monuments, architecture etc. Therefore, imagination is an aesthetic figure which requires also education: With a view to imagining the nation, one must learn how to imagine; thus, aesthetics is not only a political model, but also a pedagogical one.

On the other hand, Jacques Ranciere looks at politics and its relation to aesthetics from a different perspective, that he calls “the distribution of the sensible/sensory” which means “a

distribution of spaces, times and forms of activity that determines the very manner in which something in common lends itself to participation and in what way various individuals have a part in this distribution” (Ranciere, 2004, p. 12). Therefore, at the core of politics, there is an aesthetics because this distribution of the sensory, i.e. distribution of spaces, times and forms of activity, is itself aesthetic. In other words, since politics is “a reconfiguration of the way we share out or divide places and times, speech and silence, the visible and the invisible”, it is an aesthetic matter (Ranciere, 2003, p. 203). In this sense, a so-called political and social movement which acts upon this distribution is also an aesthetic movement.

These two different ways of associating aesthetics with politics can be seen in the Gezi Park protests during and after which there is a growing emphasis on and importance of trees in the government’s discourse, and thus in the media’s discourse: Trees have become a topic of discussions in television channels, a topic of public speeches of the government, a headline for news channels. Why do trees gain such a visibility? What does Gezi Park as a political and aesthetic movement mean, what does it signify in this regard? What is its role on this emphasis on trees? What do trees signify and how can they be situated into the relationship between aesthetics and politics both in Redfield’s and Ranciere’s terms? What are the role of trees and the protests in this relationship? What do they tell us about aesthetics and politics?

Following both Ranciere and Redfield for my theoretical framework and making use of the narratives of the protesters that I interviewed with during the Gezi protests in 2013² and the narratives of the state about these events for my discourse analysis, I am going to argue how during and after the Gezi Park protests, trees have become a special kind of monument, that I am going to call “counter-monument” which challenges and inverts the monuments that enable us for, as Redfield says, imagi-nation. In order to be able to demonstrate the process of counter-monumentalization of trees, I shall begin, first of all, with the analysis of the Gezi Park protests as a political and aesthetic movement, then continue with its meaning in and its role on the counter-monumentalization process and, lastly, with the analysis of the signification of trees as a counter-monument.

The Gezi Park Protests

The fact that imagi-nation is sine qua non of nation-states leads them to a “statue-mania”³ since monuments are used as the means of creating and celebrating of the past by nation-states. Even though imagi-nation is pivotal, the way we imagine our nation and nation-state varies according to political preferences of governments. For instance, the early Republican architecture and art, used in the construction of new cities and city centers, is different from the Ottoman tradition: New city centers had become the epitome of Turkishness, Turkish state, modernity and secularism through the sculptures of Atatürk, the monuments which tell the stories of War of Independence and the revolutions (Yaman, 2011, p. 52-57).

Nonetheless, today the meaning of monuments and sculptures have changed when the Justice and Development Party (AKP) came into power: They became “new elements at mosques and squares. Images became more diverse, and besides Atatürk, other Turkish figures such as the Ottoman sultans, viziers, and admirals as well as Anatolian poets, logos of provinces (cock, cotton, cherry, watermelon etc) as figures took their place in the public domain” (Yaman, 2011, p. 80).

Furthermore, in terms of imagi-nation and different political preferences of governments, Taksim plays a significant role. As Zeynep Yasa Yaman predicates,

Taksim Square which had regulated by the French architect Henri Prost in the early years of the Republic has become one of the most important spheres that demonstrates the Ottoman-Republic dichotomy and political differentiations since then. Taksim Square, which is tried to be subjugated by opposite or different ideologies in every epoch, with its history and its political, cosmopolitan identity, has become the place of political conflicts, art and political demonstrations. The first opposition against the Taksim Monument’s semiological solitude in the square was made during the Democratic Party period in 1952 by suggesting to construct a mosque, and this endless discussion has continued until today (2011, p. 59).

The Gezi Park events must be understood in relation to Taksim's above mentioned political, and thus aesthetic, significance since the AKP government tries to reconstruct Taksim Square through pedestrianization of the square, transformation of the park into artillery barracks, and demolition and reconstruction of Atatürk Culture Center (AKM). The protests can be separated into three phases: The first is called the Beginning Phase (May 27-30, 2013) which "encompasses the initial protests by a limited number of activists protesting against the project for the pedestrianization of Taksim Square... During this period, the aim of the group was limited to the protection of Gezi Park from being destroyed"; the second one is the Politization Phase (May 31 – June 15) in which the protests "turned into an anti-government rally that clearly included more general claims and demands in addition to motives with regard to Gezi Park"; and after the police intervention in Gezi Park in the evening of June, in the Weakening Phase (June 15-beyond), "most protesters reverted back to peaceful activities and engaged in public forums", gathering in parks (Ete and Taştan, 2014, p. 11).

These three phases are evident in the narratives of the protesters and help us understand how trees, and thus parks, gain a political meaning: Following the narratives, we might say that the Gezi Park protests began as a resistance of a neoliberal attack on nature and turned into a resistance against the government's intervention in "individual freedoms", individual lifestyles and a resistance against police brutality: "I didn't come here for 2-3 trees, but for my fundamental rights and freedoms. I came here to say stop to police brutality."⁴ Nonetheless, as Nilüfer Göle says, if we see trees only as a pretext, then we fail to notice the meaning of the movement because its anatomy has a close analogy to the roots of trees (Ete and Taştan, 2014, p. 47). This analogy is evident in the narratives, as well: Even though they say that they are not here for trees, they emphasize that Gezi Park is the only place where they can *breathe* now because very different groups can live together here and because there is no police so they feel safe in Gezi Park (Cöbek, 2013, p. 26).

It might be concluded that they can breathe in Gezi Park because parks provide air for people and cities by producing oxygen – like a heart (Senneth, 1994). Nevertheless, parks are not solely green places, but they are a part of this distribution of the sensible, a part of distribution and regulation of activities, leisure time (Hollier, 1993). As then Governor of

Istanbul, Hüseyin Avni Mutlu, who defined parks as a place to visit (*ziyaret yeri*) and not a field to protest (*gösteri alanı*), said during the Gezi Park protests:

Parks are not fields to protest. Parks should be used as parks... They are made for people... We will allow to protest in the places that we determine if permission is asked. However staying in Gezi Park for hours is out of question (Bianet, "Vali Mutlu: Gezi Parkı'nda Gösteriye İzin Vermeyeceğiz", 06.07.2013).⁵

Gezi Park is a park. It is not a place in which 7-8 thousand individuals crowd into and wait. Gezi Park is a space where the public can sit and *breathe*. (Bugün, "Vali Mutlu'dan Flaş Gezi Parkı Açıklaması", 08.07.2013) (emphasis is mine)⁶

Therefore, the emphasis on the word "breathe" in the narratives and the government's discourse has different meanings: Parks, and thus breathing, belong to distribution and regulation of places, forms of activity. The narrative that the protesters can only breathe in Gezi Park means that they can breathe because the Gezi Park protests as a political movement (which acts upon this distribution, as Ranciere argues) show the possibility of another way of distributing and regulating places and forms of activity, show that another way of breathing, a place where everybody can participate and breathe without any intervention of the police, whose job, according to Ranciere, is the supervision of this distribution (2004, p. 12), is possible. At this point, it is crucial to underline the fact that the protesters was not aware of Gezi Park before the protests, therefore it is important to remember that if Gezi Park didn't gain a political character, then this another way of breathing would not be possible:

Here groups very different from each other can live together. That is why I love Gezi Park. There is no uproar, no police. I feel safe here. Here makes me happier than any other places... I've never came to Gezi Park before, but now here is the only place I can breathe (Personal interview, 2013).⁷

Then, where do trees stand in this relationship between breathing and Gezi Park? What do they mean?

Tree as a Counter-monument

After James Young's conceptualization of counter-monument (Young, 1992) as "a new, critical mode of commemorative practice" (Stevens, Franck and Fazakerley, 2012, 951), the notion of counter-monument has become a cornerstone of memory and monument studies and since the 1980's it has been considered "as the only appropriate form by which to remember the Holocaust" (Crowshaw, 2008, p. 213).

What makes a monument a counter-monument, according to Elizabeth Strakosch, is that

[C]ounter-monuments aim to challenge and invert the nation-building agenda of traditional state memorials. Instead of presenting a simple story of triumph or martyrdom, they confront the nation-state with its own crimes and exclusions. In contrast to traditional pedagogical monuments, they use abstract rather than literal forms to accommodate ambivalence, multiplicity, and change... They appear to allow the stories of victims and perpetrators to share a single representational space without either dominating, and are able to genuinely contribute to peaceful post-conflict coexistence (Strakosch, 2010, p. 268).

In this respect, Stevens, Franck and Fazakerley suggest that counter-monuments can be separated into two: counter-monuments which, by adopting anti-monumental strategies, oppose to traditional monument principles, and counter-monuments which are designed specifically to oppose an existing monument and the values it represents (2012, p. 951). They regard the former as "the anti-monumental" which rejects and renegotiates "the traditional forms and reasons for public memorial art" (2012, p. 952) and the latter as "the dialogic" which is named as *Gegendenkmal*, referring to "a monument that is intentionally juxtaposed to another, pre-existing monument located nearby and that critically questions the values the pre-existing monument expresses" (2012, p. 962).

Nevertheless, some scholars criticize the aim of these counter-monuments. For instance, Strakosch argues that counter-monuments which are supposed to be nation-challenging are in fact nation-building, that they "fail to challenge the authority of the surrounding traditional memorials and the story of the victims remains untold and unreflected" (2010, 269). Richard Crowshaw has a similar critique: "...counter-monumental architecture, in its self-disruption,

is only capable of pursuing the absences that structure it... rather than the historical losses it is supposed to memorialise" (2008, p. 213).

These scholars might be differentiated from each other by looking at whether they favor or criticize counter-monuments, however this differentiation might miss the crucial point: What they have in common is that they all regard counter-monument in relation to past, to memory, i.e. to memorialized past.⁸ In this sense, trees are a special kind of counter-monument which, I am going to argue in a minute, is imagi-nation-challenging, aesthetic-challenging and refers not to the past, like other counter-monuments do, but to the future.⁹

As I mentioned in the previous part, the Gezi Park protests as a political, and thus aesthetic, movement reveals the possibility of another way of distribution of spaces, times, forms of activity, i.e. another way of distribution of the sensory. Therefore, Gezi Park challenges state's distribution of the sensible, state's aesthetics and creates a different distribution of the sensory, a different aesthetics, without any authority:

Here nobody intervenes anyone. There is no prime minister who tells me how I should behave appropriately, no police... Everybody is together. For example there they [Kurds] are, dancing the halay under the picture of that man [Abdullah Öcalan]. I don't like it but noone says to anyone like "You can't do this or do that here." There they can dance the halay easily and here we can say "How happy is he who says I'm a Turk" easily... I am glad to be here (Personal interview, 2013).¹⁰

In contrast to Bakhtin's and Bataille's notions of carnival in which we witness a loss of "I" (Hollier, 1993, p. 15), in this carnivalesque place, there is an emphasis on "difference", on "I", which reminds us of Nietzsche's example of leaf: Just like one leaf which is never totally the same as another leaf, an individual is never totally the same as another, and just like these leaves with individual differences that can live together in a single tree, different individuals can live together in a single society. Therefore, trees during and after the Gezi Park protests reveal not only the possibility of another way of distribution, but also another way of imagining which counters the imagi-nation we have learnt throughout our lives. Through these possibilities, trees refer to the future: "Within the framework of tolerance and respect we all can fraternally live together. We can see this in Gezi... I want to see a

Turkey where people who have been accustomed to see differences and who have absorbed them live.”¹¹

Trees, with Gezi Park, demonstrate us that it is possible that peoples with different political, religious, ethnic, social, cultural, sexual tendencies can live together without any authority. In this respect, we might say that trees represent the aesthetic revolution in Ranciere’s sense, even though he talks about the aesthetic revolution in art (2003, p. 205), the aesthetic revolution in the political and in the social where there is no hierarchical distribution, no hierarchical conception of individual. In other words, trees in which one leaf is not superior than the other, in which there is no hierarchical relationship between leaves, represent (the possibility of) a society where there is no hierarchy, no superiority between individuals.

Because trees have gained such a meaning during and after the Gezi Park protests, they have gained such a visibility in media and the government’s discourse. In order to intervene, to redistribute and regulate the sensory, to intervene this representation, the government closed the park after the police intervention on the 15th of June, removed the plants the protesters have planted and constructed re-planting works. Trees became a part of the government’s discourse as we can see in then Prime Minister’s public speeches:

During the period of my mayorship, I had made afforestation of near that highway (TEM) that it had never been done in any other periods. Now we have planted more than approximately 2 billion saplings across Turkey. We have planted near 750 million trees that are 3 or more years old and we are planting... We are building national parks, forestlands everywhere across Turkey... We have built 120 forest cities in 10 years. We have brought in 900 thousand hectare forests to Turkey. Are these ever spoken in televisions? Do you read them in newspapers? No. It is not just to show this government as against environment, against tree, against green.

Sometimes 3-5 trees can be removed and instead 50 trees can be planted for the sake of serving people (Sabah, “Başbakan’dan Gezi Parkı Açıklaması”, 01.06.2013).¹²

If we have removed 70 thousand trees, we have planted 780 thousand trees instead... Now I am asking for God’s sake. Are

these environmentalist or Tayyip Erdoğan and his team?
 (Hürriyet, “Başbakan: Bu Tayyip Erdoğan değişmez”,
 12.06.2013)¹³

Following these speeches, we can conclude that the re-organization of Gezi Park, thus the intervention in what trees represent, is also an attempt to re-monumentalize trees, to re-make them a part of the government’s distribution of the sensory, since parks are not merely green places and trees do not just provide oxygen for people and for cities, but they belong to distribution and regulation of places, i.e. distribution of the sensible, they are a part of the concern of who may and who may not participate in those places. To put it in another way, it might be concluded that in the light of the Gezi events, trees have gained a counter-monumental significance which, thus, leads parks to become a place to engage in public forums where everybody can participate to discuss the current problems and where there is no hierarchy – even the Gezi movement have been weakened. This new regulation and distribution of parks is being intervened by the government whose attempt is to re-transform them into a place to visit, thus to re-monumentalize trees.

Conclusion

Aesthetics which is defined as a special kind of judgment, activity, experience about the beautiful may seem to claim to be disinterested in politics; however, it is very much involved with politics. According to Marc Redfield, for instance, aesthetics is, first and foremost, a political discourse essentially about modernity because the fact that nations and nation-states are abstract, rather than concrete, requires a way of imagining them. Thus, imagination, as he calls, which is possible through flags, monuments, anthems, architecture etc, is quintessentially an aesthetic figure and requires education: People have to learn how to imagine the nation and the nation-state.

On the other hand, Jacques Ranciere sees this relationship between aesthetics and politics in terms of distribution of the sensible: He argues that places, times and forms of activity are distributed and regulated, that this distribution is an issue of who may and who may not participate in and have roles in it. For him, because this distribution of the sensory is an

aesthetic matter, the political and social movement which acts upon the distribution of the sensible is also an aesthetic movement.

In this sense, the Gezi Park protests was also a political, social, thus aesthetic, action which acted upon the government's distribution of the sensory, showing that another way of distribution, without any authority which does not determine who may and who may not take part in, can be possible. The emergence of this possibility in Gezi Park led trees to become a counter-monument. Trees as a counter-monument counters to the government's distribution of the sensible, i.e. state's aesthetics, state's way of imagination and because they represent the possibility of another way of distribution and imagination, they refer to the future instead of the past – unlike other counter-monuments which are based upon remembering the past, the memorialized past (e.g. remembering the Holocaust). Furthermore, it is a dialogic counter-monument in the sense that it talks and counters to all the things which represent the government's way of imagination (imagination), distribution and aesthetics, such as shopping malls, urban renewal projects, the 3rd bridge and the 3rd airport in Istanbul, the pedestrianization project in Taksim, the government policies, like on alcohol, abortion, etc.

Therefore, trees represent the possibility of a society where there is no authority which determines who may and who may not participate in and share places and what activities can be made in these places, where there are people with their individual differences who are not hierarchically organized – the possibility of a society like a tree in which all the leaves with their individual differences live together without any authority, without any hierarchical order. In other words, with the counter-monumentalization of trees during and after the Gezi Park protests, the possibility of an aesthetic revolution in the political and in the social is revealed. It might be noted that because of this revelation, parks are transformed from a place to visit into a place for people to engage in public forums which everybody can join and there is no authority.

Since trees gained such a signification during the Gezi Park protests, it also gained such a visibility that it became a part of the government's, and thus media's, discourse – it became a topic of discussion in television channels, a headline for news channels, a subject of public

speeches: Now the government talks about how they have planted trees, constructed forests and parks by emphasizing the amounts of parks, forests and trees. Thus, it might be concluded that the counter-monumentalization of trees led state to be turned into a “tree-mania” rather than a “statue-mania”.

Since the Gezi Park protests, we are witnessing a counter-monumentalization of trees, on the one hand and a re-monumentalization of trees on the other. It is a dissensus (emphasizing the differences), as Ranciere calls, against consensus (fixing the differences): sense against sense, one way of distribution and regulation of the sensible against another, imagination against imagi-nation:

“LOOK AT WHAT 3-5 TREES ARE DOING TO YOU”¹⁴

*Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi.

Bibliography

Bianet. (06.07.2013). “Vali Mutlu: Gezi Parkı’nda Gösteriye İzin Vermeyeceğiz.” <http://bianet.org/bianet/toplum/148289-gezi-parki-nda-gosteriye-izin-vermeyecegiz>

Bugün. (08.07.2013). “Vali Mutlu’dan flaş Gezi Parkı Açıklaması.” <http://www.bugun.com.tr/gundem/vali-mutludan-flas-gezi-parki-aciklamasi-haberi/711062>

Cazeaux, C. (2000). “Introduction” in *The Continental Aesthetics Reader*, ed. Clive Cazeaux. Routledge.

Cöbek, Gözde. (2013). Gezi Parkı’nın Örgütsüz Kesiminin Sesi. *Parrhesia E-Dergi* 2(4), 25-27.

Crownshaw, Richard. (2008). *The German Countermonument: Conceptual Indeterminacies and the Retheorisation of the Arts of Vicarious Memory*. *Forum Mod Land Stud* 44(2): 212-227.

Ete, Hatem & Coşkun Taştan. (2014). *The Gezi Park Protests: A Political, Sociological and Discursive Analysis*. Istanbul: SETA Yayınları. 2014.

Hollier, Denis. (1993). "Introduction: Bloody Sundays" in *Against Architecture: The Writings of Georges Bataille*, trans. Betsy Wing. The MIT Press.

Hürriyet. (12.06.2013). "Başbakan: Bu Tayyip Erdoğan değişmez."
<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/23479966.asp>

Lerner, Adam J. (1993). "The Nineteenth-Century Monument and the Embodiment of National Time" in *Reimagining the Nation*, eds. Marjorie Ringrose, Adam J. Lerner. Open University Press.

Mitchell, Renae L. (2015). A Trans-Atlantic Vandal: Omeros and the Ekyphrastic Countermonument. *Callaloo* 38(1): 150-166.

Ranciere, Jacques. (2003). "Politics and Aesthetics: An Interview." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, vol 8. No. 2.

Ranciere, Jacques. (2004). *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. Continuum.

Redfield, Marc. (2003). *The Politics of Aesthetics: Nationalism, Gender, Romanticism*. Stanford University Press.

Sabah. (01.06.2013). "Başbakan'dan Gezi Parkı Açıklaması."
<http://www.sabah.com.tr/gundem/2013/06/01/basbakan-erdogan-konusuyor>

Sennett, Richard. (1994). *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization*. W. W. Norton and Company.

Stevens, Q. K. Franck & R. Fazakerley. (2012). Counter-monuments: the anti-monumental and the dialogic. *The Journal of Architecture*, 17(6): 951-972.

Strakosch, Elizabeth. (2010). Counter-Monuments and Nation-Building in Australia. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice* 22(3): 268-275.

Stubblefield, Thomas. (2011). Do Disappearing Monuments Simply Disappear? The Counter-Monument in Revision. *Future Anterior* Vol. VIII, No. 2.

Yaman, Zeynep Yasa. (2011). "Siyasi/Estetik Gösterge" Olarak Kamusal Alanda Anıt ve Heykel. *METU JFA* 28(1): 51-80.

Young, James. (1992). The Counter-Monument against Itself in Germany Today. *The University of Chicago Press: Critical Inquiry*, 18(2): 267-296.

Notes

1. The quote is taken from Cazeaux, C. (2000). "Introduction" in *The Continental Aesthetics Reader*, ed. Clive Cazeaux. Routledge.
2. During the Gezi Park protests in 2013 (on June 6-9), I interviewed with 26 people who did not see themselves as a member of any political party (*örgütlü*) and asked them why and when they participated in the protests, what they demanded from the state, what things they wanted to be changed and what they liked about Gezi Park. 3 of them were those who fought in front of the barricades, 3 of them were those supported the protests with cacerolazo, 7 of them gave support the protests from social media by informing the protesters and the rest of them were at the streets, protesting, since 31st of May. The majority was high school and/or university students, but there were also people who were 25-30 years old and there were few who was retired.
3. See: Lerner, Adam J, "The Nineteenth-Century Monument and the Embodiment of National Time" in *Reimagining the Nation*, eds. Marjorie Ringrose, Adam J. Lerner (Open University Press, 1993).
4. "Ben buraya 2-3 ağaç için değil, kısıtlanmış temel hak ve özgürlüklerim için, uygulanan şiddete bir dur demek için geldim."

5. "Parklar gösteri alanları değildir. Parkların park gibi kullanılması gerekiyor... Park halk için yapılıyor... İzin almak kaydıyla belirlediğimiz yerlerde gösteri yapılmasına izin vereceğiz. Ama saatlerce Gezi Parkı'nda kalıcım diye bir şey söz konusu değildir."
6. "Gezi Parkı, bir parktır. 7-8 bin kişinin doluşup parkın içinde bekleme alanı değildir. Gezi Parkı halkın oturacağı nefes alacağı bir alandır."
7. "Burda birbirinden çok farklı kesimler birlikte yaşayabiliyor. Gezi Parkı'nı bu yüzden seviyorum. Burda taşkınlık yok, polis yok. Kendimi burda güvende hissediyorum. Burası beni diğer her yerden daha mutlu ediyor... Daha önce Gezi Parkı'na hiç gelmedim, şimdiyse nefes alabildiğim tek yer burası."
8. In addition to these scholars, see also Renae L. Mitchell, Thomas Stubblefield. The names of their work are listed in bibliography.
9. I do not claim, however, that there is no past, no memory in this kind of counter-monument, but the emphasis is on the future, rather than the past.
10. "Burda kimse kimseye karışmıyor. Nasıl oturup kalkmam gerektiğini söyleyen bi başbakan yok, polis yok... Herkes bi arada. Mesela orda onlar [Kürtler], o adamın [Abdullah Öcalan'ın] resmi altında halay çekiyorlar, bu benim hoşuma gitmiyor ama kimse kimseye 'sen burda bunu yapamazsın şunu yapamazsın' demiyor. Onlar orda rahatça halay çekiyor, biz de burda rahatça 'ne mutlu Türk'üm diyene' diyebiliyoruz... Burda olmaktan memnunum."
11. "Hoşgörü ve saygı çerçevesinde hep birlikte kardeşçe yaşayabiliriz. Gezi'de bunu görebiliyoruz... Farklıyı görmeye alışmış ve bunu sindirebilmiş insanların yaşadığı bi Türkiye görmek istiyorum."
12. "Belediye başkanlığım döneminde şu TEM'in, E-5 üzerinde ve yanlarında hiçbir dönemde olmayan ağaçlandırmayı yaptım. Şimdi ise yaklaşık 2 milyarın üzerinde Türkiye genelinde fidan diktik. 750 milyona yakın 3 yaş ve üstü ağaç diktik, dikiyoruz... Türkiye genelinde her yerde milli parklar, ormanlık alanlar inşa ediyoruz... Biz, 10 yılda 120 şehir ormanı kurduk. Türkiye'ye 900 bin hektar yeni orman kazandırdık. Hiç bunlar televizyonlarda konuşuluyor mu? Gazetelerde okuyor musunuz? Hayır. Bu hükümeti çevre karşıtı, ağaç karşıtı, yeşil karşıtı diye lanse etmek büyük haksızlıktır. İnsana hizmet için yeri geldiğinde 3-5 ağaç sökülür yerine 50 ağaç dikilir."
13. "70 bin ağaç söktüysek 780 bin fidan ve ağaç diktik onun yerine... Şimdi Allah aşkına soruyorum. Bunlar mı çevreci, Tayyip Erdoğan ve ekibi mi çevreci?"
14. "3-5 AĞAÇ BAK SANA NELER YAPIYOR": This is a graffiti which was written on the wall during the Gezi Park protests.