Sercan Mutlu*
Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2236-6965

Gezi Park analysis as an example of social movement

Introduction

Gezi Park is a green area in Taksim Square, which is located in a very cultural and social centre of Istanbul. The protest, which was carried out by a small activist group here in 2013, grew in a short time and affected first Istanbul and then all of Turkey. This protest wave, known as the Gezi Park resistance, has left a permanent mark on Turkish political history, both in scope and content. To summarize the events with its main points, everything started when the Istanbul Municipality of the period wanted to change this area as part of the pedestrianization project. Within the scope of this project, it was aimed to demolish Gezi Park and cut the trees in it, and instead to build the Artillery Barracks from the Ottoman period and to establish a shopping centre within this structure. Before the project was implemented, a small environmental group started a campaign and sued for the cancellation of the project. However, this lawsuit could not be successful and on May 27, 2013, tree cutting and park demolition began. Protesting against these developments, a small group of activists set up a tent in Gezi Park to protect the park and started a night watch. BDP's Sırrı Süreyya Önder and CHP's Gürsel Tekin came to Gezi Park on May 28 to support the vigil and demand the cancellation of the project. The movement met with the harsh intervention of the police on the morning of May 29. With the reflection of the said intervention in social media, a big agenda emerged and the Gezi Park watch gained serious momentum. So much so that the activism of a small group increased to thousands between May 27-30 (Yörük, Yüksel, 2014: 104-105). Despite the intervention of the police, the number of participants increased and barricades began to be erected in Taksim Square and the streets leading to it. By May 31, the Gezi Park movement had spread beyond Istanbul and protests began in different cities such as Ankara, Izmir, Adana, Zonguldak and Izmit.

As the events developed, the Istanbul 6th Administrative Court decided to stop the Artillery Barracks project with a delay. However, this decision was not sufficient to stop the protests that quickly spread to different parts of Istanbul. Thousands of people from the Anatolian side of Istanbul crossed the bridges and set out in Taksim to support the Gezi Park protests. Due to the insufficiency of the hospitals, the Turkish Medical As-

---

* Correspondence address: Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, BAIBU Gölköy Campus, 14030, Bolu, Turkey, e-mail: mutlusercan92@gmail.com.

sociation established an emergency response unit (*Timeline*, 2016). By June 1, it was declared that Taksim was a liberated zone and the Taksim Commune was established. Within the scope of the commune, the use of money was removed from circulation and needs such as food, drink, medicine and books were met by sharing. The existence of the Taksim Commune came to an end with the police retaking the square on June 11. In the period until this date, the movement spread to many cities of Turkey and gained the support of trade unions, professional chambers, political parties and many non-governmental organizations. After June 11, Taksim Square was closed to protesters and demonstrations continued in many cities, especially in many centres of Istanbul. While Disk and Kesk unions went on a general strike on June 17, professional chambers such as TMMOB, TTB and TDB also supported the strike (*DISK ve KESK ile meslek odaları iş bıraktı*, 2013). After June 17, pacifist actions were added to the active protests in Istanbul, and standing actions began both in Istanbul and in many cities (Girit, 2013).

To summarize, the Gezi Park resistance is a movement that emerged as a reaction against the urban transformation of a public park located in Istanbul, Taksim Square, into a shopping centre, Artillery Barracks and a mosque. The movement in question reached 3.5 million participants in a few weeks and spread to 79 cities in Turkey (Savran, 2015: 296). The movement later took the name of Taksim Solidarity Platform, which was formed by the coming together of many smaller units, and the demands for Gezi Park were represented through this platform. Despite many detentions, injuries and deaths, the construction of a shopping mall in Gezi Park was prevented.

The Gezi Park movement carries many aspects that make it unique and important. For example, the first thing to notice is the political position of Gezi Park and Taksim. Beyoğlu region, where Taksim is located, is one of the regions that was restructured within the scope of neoliberal urbanization. In this sense, the socio-cultural structure of the city has been undermined and commodified, and by being flooded by foreign capital, it has become one of the important value areas for capital with buildings such as business centres, hotels, banks, etc[1]. What makes Taksim Square so important for the working class is that it is a historically important field of struggle, especially for the events that took place on May 1, 1977[2]. Another factor that makes the Gezi Park events important is its unique structure compared to the social movements that had taken place in Turkey before. The main source of its originality is that it could be seen all over Turkey, surpassing the regional feature. Another factor is that it is a movement formed by the combina-

---

[1] The neoliberal urbanization process of Istanbul, and therefore Beyoğlu, undoubtedly exceeds the limits of this article. But it started with the project of Gezi Park events to commodify a public space and turn it into a shopping mall. Therefore, in order to understand the events, the transformation of the space should also be included in the analysis. For this reason, the relationship between neoliberalism and the commodification of space will be discussed in the following sections of the study.

[2] On this date, also known as the Bloody May Day 1977, unidentified people attacked participants of the parade celebrating the Labour Day in Taksim. In the attack, 34 people lost their lives and 126 people were injured.

tion of many different groups, such as students, environmentalists, white-collar service sector workers, LGBT members, various left factions, opposition religious formations, etc. At this point, it is very important that these groups, which have different political positions, came together and create a common action and political position[3]. And this situation gives rise to the potential of creating a new political space, which makes the Gezi Park movement truly unique. It is a new experience of collectivity, in which resources are not distributed by the power, and public life is not shaped by the power. In this sense, it can be argued that the events that had been experienced broke the dominant political language and reconstructed it (Parlak, 2013: 139-141).

Social movements

Throughout human history, there have always been uprisings and resistances. The roots of these emerged resistance movements are thought as old as the separation of the ruler and the ruled. These movements in historical process have shown themselves in a different manner in every society in their unique condition. Sometimes they emerged as a claim of a fundamental right, but also as protests against a regime, ruler or elites. These movements that were seen in Pre-Modernism and have transformed into social movements in historical process. For the first time in history, this concept was used by German sociologist, Lorenz Van Stein, to describe the organized labour movements' self-consciousness. In the 19th century, content of the concept had been expended by involving farmer, woman, and the other parties that claimed their rights (Yaylacı, 2014: 36). Even if the scope of the concept has changed, the aforementioned resistance movements must meet a certain conditions to become social movements. According to Charles Tilly, a resistance movement must have three common qualities to be treated as a social entity: "1) a sustained, organized public effort making collective claims on target authorities; 2) employment of combinations from among the following forms of political action: creation of special-purpose associations and coalitions, public meetings, solemn processions, vigils, rallies, demonstrations, petition drives, statements to and in public media, and pamphleteering; 3) participants' concerted public representations of WUNC: worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment on the part of themselves and/or their constituencies" (Tilly, 2014: 3-4). These three qualities that Tilly referred to are quite important to come from a resistance to a social movement. With these qualities the already existing movement gets socialized by coming from local values and overcomes being reactionary to continue its activity. By this way, the movement avoiding being trapped in time, can reproduce itself in the direction of common aim. The meaning of the concept in dictionary supports this notion: "An organized effort by a significant number of peo-

---

[3] The actors of the Gezi Park movement and the fact that these actors struggle on the same side despite their heterogeneous appearance is one of the main focal points of the study. For this reason, this subject will be examined in more detail within the scope of the 'middle class' discussions in the following sections of the study.

ple to change (or resist change in) some major aspect or aspects of society" (Marshall, 2005: 746). As it can be seen in that statement, the concept defined in these terms excludes a wide range of movements. For instance, a revolutionary movement may aim to change the system as a whole in a reformist line, can also aim[4] to correct the still working sides of the system or can take a conservative stand against the existing changes.

The validity of the concept had been started to be discussed along with the radical changes that had been come in the 20th century. In particular in 1968 with the mass protesting movement, it had been thought that the concept had lost its validity. It had been brought forward that it is an entering of a new period of post-Fordism, post-industrial phase. Therefore, it had been thought that both societies' and social movements' structure had been changed. For this reason, it was claimed that the social movements of the time can be explained with a new concept – the concept of new social movements (NSMs). At this point of analyzing the asserted approaches to the relations with the NSMs, it is important to understand the theorical background of Gezi Parkı movement which is the main subject of the article. As a consequence, it should be put in context of the theories that are related to the NSMs.

The theory of the NSM is analyzed by many social scientists from different perspectives. Basing their relationship with the old social movement relationship two different approaches to the NSMs can be distinguished as – cultural and political. The cultural approach claims a radical break with old social movements, while the political approach, contrary to this, claims that there has been a continuity between the NSMs and old social movements. Cultural approach is represented by most social scientist especially Jürgen Habermas, Alaine Touraine, Manuel Castells, Alberto Melucci, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. Despite of the differences that they have in this approach, they share a common idea of the NSMs. Accordingly, old social movements are the acts of the alternative world design that both carries definite narrow economy purposes and desire to capture the government. The base of this movements is working class, therefore class consciousness acts as a connective element. The disengagement theorists in the NSMs bring forward that together with society's changes also this relationships changes. Accordingly, the NSMs are not related to prosperity shared with economic concern but mostly related to identity, autonomy, participation. Therefore, the focus of the conflict is no longer class struggle. Touraine, one of the important thinkers of the NSMs theory, supports this by arguing that social classes have changed fundamentally. According to him the working class lost its revolutionary role and gave its place to the new social movements (Touraine, 2002: 274). For this reason, the actors of the revolution do not belong to any specific class anymore. On the contrary, these are the individuals that

---

[4] The second and the third can be seen as an important example of aforementioned revolutionary-reformist attitude. Even if it is asserted that they adopt the same Marxist legacy and the aim of socialism, at the approach point, there is a sharp conflict between the Social Democrats and the Communists (Wallerstein, 2004: 38).

have different class, statue, ethnicity and identity. Therefore, the values are submitted to diversity. The diversity of these actors and the differentiation of requests feed into to their organization manners. Rather than a central organization the movements are decentralized, flexible and leaderless. Aforementioned goal of these movements is not to take over the government, but to exist in the democratic social borders with their identities in an autonomous way (Çayır, 1999: 18).

The political approach is represented by Claus Offe, Rhys Williams, Giovanni Arrighi, and Immanuel Wallerstein. According to this approach capitalist relationships still rule over. Therefore, if there is made reference to a new world, it will be again a phase of capitalism. Hereof, social classes build the basis of the NSMs. New conflicts or antagonisms (disagreements) arise from the complicated mediation of the conflict of labour-capital, and they cannot be separated from relations of production (Savran, 1992: 9). In other words, the demands of the NSMs are not autonomous from the economy and are a reaction to the class structure of capitalism. For this reason, the NSMs are a representation of class struggle. The NSMs consist of middle-class, the unemployed, students, and the retired. Therefore, these movements rely on an interclass alliance. In this sense, gender- or race-based discriminations are not independent from the existence of capitalist relationships. Because these and similar distinctions raising stratification in society make the labour exploitation more convenient (Coşkun, 2006: 74-75).

As it has been outlined, today's resistance movements, despite important differences, are defined as a new social mobility by both rupture theorists and continuity theorists. Gezi Parkı movement, the topic of the study, is analyzed within the concept of the NSMs in a common way in literature. But to discuss this movement within the NSMs in advance, some further explanation is needed. For this reason, before getting into the subject of the study, it has to be surveyed whether Gezi Parkı movements can be analyzed within the context of the NSMs. Because trying to examine the movements of Gezi Park directly with the concept of the NSMs that originating in Western Europe, can cause to miss out both Gezi Park movements' also Turkey's unique dynamics. For that purpose, relating to the NSMs theory with definite questions answered, it can be helpful to look at these answers' reflections practically.

First of all: Is it possible to discuss social movements that occur at the present time as a whole within the NSMs? Can the NSMs involve different resistance movements and requests truly? To answer these questions, one may look at current resistance movements. It should not be forgotten that in the NSMs movements the emphasis is put on the fact that there is no universal identity[5] and objective interest – in this sense it is a claim of di-

---

5 At this point, Eric Hobsbawm's interpretation of the identity-based NSM movements is important. According to him: "Real-life identities are not unique, they are interchangeable and can be worn together like clothes. Because, as all opinion pollsters know, no one has a single identity" (Hobsbwam, 1996:74). The point Hobsbawm wants to draw attention to here is that most identities are not natural, they are socially constructed (Adaklı, 2001: 19). Therefore, the author has argued that specific identity politics are not the basis of a general policy.

versity of struggle. This claim is supported by showing examples of ethnic, feminist and gay movements, which are the main movements within the scope of the NSMs. However, this claim cannot be explained with the movements that carry universal values like environmental and peace movements (Kaygalak, 2001: 42). This silence subject can be seen in the difference of movements' solution seeking. For example, some ethnic movements' purpose is recognition of own culture and identity, and feminist movement's aim is to end male-dominant society. The difference in solution seeking like taking into account residence, transportation, and poverty directly becomes insight in class-based revolution movements (Savran, 1992: 8). For this reason, different social movements that are brought together within the NSMs cannot be explained. Despite the emphasis of struggle's diversity, it remains limited with definite movement categories.

Secondly: what are the structural differences in-between current social movements and old social movements? When asked more succinctly: What makes the new movements completely new? As mentioned earlier, the answer of the NSM theory to these questions is, instead of past narrow economic demands like identity and autonomy, emerging of out-of-class different kind of demands and resistance movements. When it is compared closely to old social movements, it can be seen that these claims do not reflect historical truth. Because contrary to what is claimed, old social movements are not shaped with narrow economic income. When one analyses the content of protests from the past, it can be seen that it has a wide repertoire from wage struggle to woman and children's work, education and shortening the working hours of public services, to ballot and anti-war (Çetinkaya, 2015 :22). Moreover, when to the resistance movements that are said to be new at the present time are closely looked at, it can be seen that they are rooted in 19th century. We can see that in the history on the examples of women's movement, the environmental movement, the peace movement and alternative life communes (Bora, 1990: 49).

As a third question, one can ask about the modern-day social movements' class structure. Are the NSM basis is really the non-working class? According to the NSM theory, as a reflection of the difference in demands, nowadays resistance movement's participants come from different classes, cultures, identities and strata. It is claimed that the movements are formed in a pluralistic structure. When one look closely at the representatives of these movements, they are mainly the service sector workers who are the subject of the old-new middle class, students, the unemployed and the housewives who are not directly on the labour market (Coşkun, 2006: 74). It's good to point out that analysis of the composition is done based on class as a narrow economic category and that is why the movements participants seem to be out-of-class. In fact, the concept of class is a quite misleading, because it is created to try to solve problems that emerged in new conflict areas by ignoring capitalist relations at the conceptual level. This approach, tackling the problem in a one-dimensional way, decontextualizes the problem and, thus, leads one to the conclusion of classlessness. However, class relations are realities that cannot be

isolated from gender, ethnic and religious relations (Çetinkaya, 2014: 77), because social classes are in constant motion and formation, as opposed to being opaque categories. This situation finds a clear expression with Ellen M. Wood's "class as a relationship and process" (Wood, 2016: 115)[6]. When one looks at social classes using this concept, on can see different proletarianization processes and re-proletarianization processes with important cultural elements that shaped them (Wood, 2016: 85). At this point, it is important to look at the articulation of class contradiction and other contradictions. In other words, the relations between class exploitation and other inequalities and forms of oppression must be absorbed as a systematic whole (Savran, 1992: 22). This approach gives to researcher a more holistic level of analysis rather than a perspective that absolutizes identity and differences. This approach gives also an opportunity to see the originality and internal dynamics in the combination of social problems with capitalist relations. With this aspect, departing from the continuity theory, in a reductionist way, does not ignore different forms of articulation and internal dynamics by melting them in the pot of capitalist relations (Savran, 1992: 24)[7].

The reciprocal criticism that occur between the old and new social movements is tried to be conveyed. The reason for this is an attempt to find a healthier theoretical background for the subject of study. Within the framework of this criticism, when one look at the powerful social movements that emerged in quite different geographies in the 21st century, from Egypt to Tunisia, from Turkey to Spain, from Greece to Brazil, it is seen that a distinction of the old and the new is invalid. Therefore, in this study, Gezi Park events will be handled as a social movement. In order to better understand the social structure that the Gezi Park events emerged from, its contradictions and the dynamics of change, the study will deal with it in a class-oriented analytical framework. For this purpose, first of all, it will be discussed what the Gezi Park events are, why they are important, and the points where the movement differs from previous movements will be described. Afterwards, it will be explained in outline how the movement got rid of local-

---

[6] According to Wood, this concept indicates two types of relations: the relationship between classes and the relationship of a class to its own members (Wood, 2016: 115). With this concept, Wood emphasizes that historical and cultural features should be added to the class formation of workers in different production modes. Because, in Wood's words, classes are: "It is not something that stands there waiting for consciousness to be brought to it from the outside, but something that is established and formed in the process and relationship between classes and between a class's own members" (Wood, 2016: 115). Therefore, Wood understands class formations not as mechanical processes, but as a reality created by people who live in full of health and make their own history within the culture and history they have inherited.

[7] At this point, the women's movement can be shown as an important example of the class reductionist approach of the continuity theory. For example, attributing importance to feminism as an anti-capitalist movement and explaining this approach with purely class relations obscures the original aims of the movement. Such an approach may ignore or subordinate basic demands such as the gendered division of labour, invisible domestic labour, or the free enjoyment of sexuality (Savran, 1992: 24-25). At this point, the important thing is not to deal with differences indiscriminately – it is to deal with social problems with their originality and internal dynamics and to look at the relationship they develop with capitalist relations.

ity and became a social movement throughout Turkey. Secondly, the social movement itself will be analyzed with focus on class dynamics and contradictions.

Thoughts on Gezi Park

At first glance, the Gezi Park movement can be seen as the dissonant music of a polyphonic choir. There are many studies in the literature that claim to find this harmony. However, it can be seen that many studies claim that they find the harmony in question by remaining constant in the melodies of certain chorus members. Therefore, the identification of these works is insufficient to make a holistic explanation about the choir. In order not to make a similar methodological mistake, this study aims to find the harmony of the choir by focusing both on the timbre of the choir members and the melody developed among the members within the framework of a critical analysis. For this purpose, the study will use the analytical approach in accordance with certain methodological principles. First of all, the historical transformation of the society in which the Gezi Park events emerged will be examined. Thus, it will be emphasized that the movement is not coincidental, on the contrary, the contradictions inherited from the past had shaped how the fault lines developed and led to forming the movement. Secondly, in order to analyze the movement, the struggle with the social power it faced will be examined. The identity of the movement and the nature of the rebellion will be discussed within the scope of social contradictions. Finally, the analyses will be handled holistically and the relationship between them will be examined to better comprehend social reality.

Historicity

Turkey has experienced very important structural-social transformations from the 1980s to the present. After the 1980 military coup, Turkey's capital accumulation regime has changed and the export-oriented accumulation period in which commercial capital has been internationalized has started (Ercan, 2006: 11). In order for this transition to take place, the process of restructuring of society and the state under the leadership of neoliberal economic policies has been initiated. The beginning of the new era started with the implementation of the "structural adjustment reforms" originating from the WB and the IMF and their integration into global capitalism. As an inevitable result of this situation, there has been a tendency for commodification in every area of social life. The reflection of this trend in society has been in the form of marketization and privatization (Ercan, 2005: 6). Within the scope of the new capital regime, the labour market was disciplined legally and institutionally, distribution policies were adopted against the working class, public expenditures were reduced with contractionary fiscal policies, and high-rate devaluations were experienced (Altıok, 2002: 91). In the light of all these developments, the naming of Korkut Boratav sums up this period: "Capital's Counter-Attack" (Boratav, 2013).

By the 1990s, there was a pass to a period of accumulation based on international capital movements. The main element of this period was financial liberalization and the promotion of international capital inflows (Gültekin-Karakaş, 2011: 101). The incentive here is that the markets become an attractive, lucrative place for capital. Responsibility for such an environment was given to the state, which was restored in favour of the market. With the 1990s, the "regulatory state" formulation was implemented under the leadership of the WB and the IMF. The practical reflection of this has been the change in the institutional structure of the state by moving from structural adjustment policies to structural transformation policies (Ercan, 2006: 11). In this context, independent administrative authorities, called supreme councils, have been established in the state. These structures are new tools of state intervention for the creation of a profitable market. The practical reflection of this transformation in the state is, on the one hand, the abolition of protective social security regulations on labour and the creation of new value areas for capital (Bayramoğlu, 2003: 152-153), on the other hand, institutions, companies and households have entered into indebtedness relationships with new financial market instruments (Bedirhanoğlu, 2019: 374).

When it comes to the 2000s, it can be seen that the limit of the capital accumulation model has been reached. The 1994 Mexican crisis, similar to the one experienced in East Asia in 1997-98, showed itself in the form of a financial crisis in 2001 in Turkey (Ercan, Yaman-Öztürk, 2011: 59)[8]. The reflection of the crisis that had been experienced, has been quite heavy in society. While both the public and private sectors contracted, the unemployment increased, real wages declined, and household debts increased[9]. The effect of the crisis experienced in this period was tried to be eliminated with the restructuring programmes prepared under the leadership of the IMF and WB[10].

The process changed course with the 2002 elections. Instead of coalition governments, the power went into the hands of the AKP government. With the AKP government, the economic and social transformation gained momentum, and the authoritar-

---

[8] The reason why the crisis experienced in 2001 is mentioned together with the crises seen in different geographies is the common neoliberal transformation prescriptions and financial liberalization policies given to developing countries between 1980-2000 (Bedirhanoğlu, 2019: 376).

[9] Household debts are important to understand the damage caused by the crisis. Because the household indebtedness rate arises from financial liberalization as mentioned before. The inevitable result of this situation for the workers is dispossession, re-indebtedness or restructuring of debts. In other words, it is the clinching of the place of the labourer in the debt cycle and the discipline of the labor in this way (Bedirhanoğlu, 2019: 379).

[10] At this point, it is not surprising that the programmes prepared to get out of the crisis internalized and institutionalized neoliberal relations even more, considering the developments experienced. With the crisis, Kemal Derviş, one of the vice presidents of the WB, resigned from his duty upon the call of the government and was appointed as the head of the Ministry of Economy. The process continued with the new stand-by agreements with the IMF and the moves known as 15 laws in 15 days passed by the Parliament under the name of structural adjustment (Demirer, Orhangazi, 2003: 353). To outline these laws, which were quickly passed by the Parliament, it can be summarized as follows: private sector incentives to stimulate privatization; disciplining public expenditure and personnel regime; restructuring the banking sector, privatizing public banks and strengthening private banks (Ercan, 2005: 30-31).

ian form of the state showed itself more[11]. Important examples of authoritarianism in the state are clearly seen in the decisions taken. 2002 Turkey's capital accumulation regime was export-based productive capital. In this accumulation regime, certain steps were taken to make productive capital resistant to international competition and to reduce its costs. In this sense, the steps taken regarding the labour regime can be seen in the Labour Law, which was amended in 2003, and the Omnibus Law, which started to be discussed in 2011. With the changes made, part-time employment contracts were expanded and new forms of work such as working from home and teleworking were introduced; it was ensured that they benefited less from wages, compensation, bonuses, etc.; contracted (insecure) working forms in the public sector had been expanded and the dependence of the worker on the employer had been increased (Aydoğanoğlu, 2010: 8). The destruction in the field of labour had also been seen in the social security of the employees. General Health Insurance was restructured and designed according to private insurance techniques, and a new area was opened for private capital. When the privatization of local and national public services was added to these changes, the employment of subcontracted workers had become widespread in the provision of new services (Bağımsız Sosyal Bilimciler, 2015: 276-279).

At this point, the effects of the 2008 global crisis should also be emphasized in the developments. Because the reflection of the financial crisis experienced in Turkey has been observed in the real sector due to the decrease in foreign currency input and the contraction in the export market (Sönmez, 2010: 36). Therefore, the public justification for the regulations made was to overcome the crisis and increase employment, and they were implemented (Oğuz, 2011: 14). This situation may be an important element about the period when these radical regulations were implemented. Judging by the results of the relevant regulations, it can be seen that a flexible, insecure and despotic labour market had been established in accordance with the capital accumulation regime. Thus, an important cost factor for capital had been alleviated by providing cheap labour in sectors where production was labour-intensive and establishing control mechanisms over this labour force.

Another step taken to support the capital accumulation regime is the foundation of the Investment Environment Improvement Board (YOIKK), which was established in 2001. This board was established to remove the managerial-institutional barriers faced by productive investments. In other words, the aim of the board is to improve the in-

---

[11] An important point to be made here is that the authoritarian state form did not emerge with the AKP. Because the formation process of the neoliberal authoritarian state is not independent of the transformation described so far. The articulation of global capitalism, the emergence of structural adjustment packages and its internal mechanisms, the establishment of new institutions in this direction, that is, the systematic reproduction of social contradictions in favour of capital are the footprints of this process. All these developments are moments of a process in which the executive becomes stronger and autonomous depending on the capital accumulation process and the legislature weakens accordingly (Oğuz, 2012: 3). Therefore, AKP's neoliberal authoritarian character is not independent of the legacy it inherited.

vestment environment and remove the obstacles to the global capital accumulation regime (Oğuz, 2011: 7). In this board, ministries related to different capital groups come together and analyze the investment environment and create various reforms. The importance of the board here is that many actors are involved in the policy-making process with the concepts of integration and coordination, and a common policy (Dik, Demirci, 2017: 44). The importance of the board becomes even more evident when one recalls the reforms carried out in the state[12].

Up to this point, the transformations experienced in the state and the labour market according to different capital accumulation regime strategies in different periods have been addressed. At this point, by making a small addition, it is necessary to mention the reflection of the said transformations on the space. This point gains importance when it is remembered that the Gezi Park events started to protect a public space. Turkey's transition to neoliberal policies in the 1980s also meant the adoption of capitalist urbanization as a method. Within the scope of this method, legal and institutional ground was prepared[13] until the 2000s, and the Mass Housing Administration (TOKI) was established and entered the state housing market as a producer and credit provider. By the 2000s, the production and marketing of urban spaces started[14] to be the subject of WB reports and became an important element for the new capital accumulation regime. In this context, public lands, old town squares, slums, public buildings and coasts were intervened with urban transformation and gentrification projects. With these interventions, urban space was reproduced in line with the personal imagination of the power and the demands of the capital. Thus, the distribution of urban rent by the state was ensured (Uğurlu, 2013: 4-11). This process, which David Harvey calls creative destruction[15], is the transfer of urban space to certain classes as a new value area, an urban rent, by taking it from its real owners. Thus, power reproduces and constructs urban space in

---

[12] A closer look at the work of the board reveals that it mainly focuses on increasing the flexibility of the labour market and improving the employment structure (Dik, Demirci, 2017: 62). Considering the aforementioned reforms that made the labour market flexible and precarious, it can be said that the board was really effective in the policy-making process.

[13] In this period, the main laws that formed the legal basis for the state's intervention in the space were Law on Improvement Plans No. 2805 (1983), Law on Reconstruction Amnesty Law No. 2981 (1984), Mass Housing Law No. 2985 (1984), Zoning Law No. 3194 (1985), No. 2946 Public Housing Law (1983).

[14] According to the World Report on the Urban Future prepared under the leadership of the WB, the principles on how to develop cities according to neoliberal antecedents have been adopted. Accordingly, cities are defined as the locomotive of economic growth. In other words, urban space is considered as an investment tool for the capital group. On the other hand, the privatization of urban public services in accordance with neoliberal policies was emphasized. The practical reflection of this is the dominance of market relations in the city. Another principle emphasized is the opening of urban spaces to global markets by ensuring coordination between local and global markets (Jessop, 2002: 464-470).

[15] According to Harvey, the process of creative destruction is that urban spaces become more profitable production and consumption areas and support the capital accumulation process. In other words, it is the reproduction of urban spaces in order to absorb excess capital and labour (Harvey, 2013: 58). This process includes the privatization of public goods, especially land, the suppression of different forms of ownership (collective, public, state, etc.), the undermining of social gains and the rapid financial inclusion in society (Harvey, 2007: 33-39).

line with its political views, through urban transformation and gentrification projects. With this reproduction, on the one hand, the historical heritage of the city, its life becomes goods that can be bought and sold in the market, on the other hand, its social relations are rebuilt in a way that strengthens its own power (Özuğurlu, 2012: 154). This is exactly what happened in mega projects built with similar discourses such as brand cities and global cities in Turkey in the 2000s. In many cities, especially in Istanbul, the centrally located old settlements were subjected to urban transformation, the inhabitants of the city were displaced and buildings such as shopping malls, trade centres, hotels, private hospitals, etc., which were incompatible with the historical and cultural texture, were built. While the process means the transfer of new value areas to the capital with the difficult and non-coercive devices of the state (Genç, 2019: 24), it means a serious dispossession process for the residents of the city.

To sum up, Turkey has entered a period in which it has been socially, politically, and socially reorganized by neoliberal policies since the 1980s. In this process, the state has undergone a radical transformation to meet the needs of the dominant capital accumulation regime. The practical reflections of this transformation, as outlined above, have penetrated into the capillaries of society in a wide spectrum such as the labour market, pension regime, social security system, public services, dispossession, gentrification, etc. On the one hand, the social state gains were quickly liquidated, on the other hand, the state apparatus took a neoliberal authoritarian form[16]. Gezi Park events emerged in such a historical context.

Antagonism

When one looks at the analyses on the Gezi Park events in general, studies based on the concept of the new middle class can be noticed. According to this approach, people's class positions are determined by their relations, income, status, consumption patterns and even their lifestyles. It is claimed that this diversity in class determinants stems from the intricate, complex and stratified state of society. This social stratum, which is mentioned as the middle class, corresponds to the people in the middle stratum of the society, after the distinctions between the bourgeoisie and the working class (Çetinkaya, 2014: 74). Based on this explanation, the common analyses in the literature can be briefly looked at.

---

[16] The change in the state apparatus, of course, goes beyond the limits of this study. But the role of the state in a social movement is too critical to be overlooked. For this reason, in order not to disperse the study, only what is meant by the authoritarian state form will be mentioned. At this point, Bob Jessop's definition of the authoritarian state form is useful. According to him, there are four elements of the authoritarian state form. These are: "first, a transfer of power from the legislature to the executive and the concentration of power within the latter; second, an accelerated fusion between the legislature, executive, and judiciary, accompanied by a decline in the rule of law; third, the functional decline of political parties as the leading channels for political dialogue with the administration and as the major forces in organizing hegemony; and finally, the growth of parallel power networks cross-cutting the formal organization of the state and holding a decisive share in its various activities" (Jessop, 2014: 11).

The Gezi Park events are widely discussed in the literature through the perspective of the concept of the new middle class and, in connection with it, the participant profile of the movement. According to this approach, the movement in question consists of urban, young, educated, company managers, professional employees and white-collar service sector employees. The components of this movement are people who are close to the global culture, against the hierarchy and fond of protecting their own space (Keyder, 2013: 2-3). In other words, they have a certain social and cultural capital, and they are different from other classes with their cultural characteristics. According to this approach, although the demands and expectations of the masses in question are different, they are dependent on democratic values and are against a "commandist" politics (Bayhan, 2014: 31). It is thought that exactly for this reason the movement became socialized in a short time and spread throughout the country.

This analysis was developed by feeding on the NSM theory mentioned in the first part of the study. Therefore, it shares the weaknesses of this theory. Accordingly, it is thought to have been created by a mass that transcends classes, independent of economic demands, and acting with similar democratic concerns. But this point of view is misleading to say the least. It is unrealistic to think that the middle class formed by these thousands of the dissimilar belonging to different professions and income groups have the same cultural and political values. Moreover, to claim that a social movement that started in Istanbul and spread all over Turkey is based on democratic sensitivity as a whole is no less reductive than classical class analyses (Çetinkaya, 2014: 5)[17]. When the cultural, economic and social participants of the movement are remembered from different sections of the society, it can be seen that there is a greater social contradiction here. If we look at the components of the movement using class analysis, this contradiction can be seen more clearly. If we look at the students who participated first, it can be seen that this segment will be an element of the skilled labour supply in the near future. This means that they will join the ranks of the reserve army of labour and objectively become part of the working class. If we refer to the white-collar segment working in the service sector, they are in a wage relationship due to their role in the production process. As an inevitable consequence of this situation, it can be said that they are a part of the working class[18]. If we look at the objective class position of another com-

---

[17] Here, of course, it is not claimed that the social movement in question is detached from or lacks democratic values. The point to be emphasized is the misleading approaches of the studies examining the Gezi Park events in this way. The fact that the participant profiles can be easily classified as the middle class, based on their education and age range, that this is done despite the differences they have, and moreover, that an identical moral value judgment is given to the same thousand and one dissimilar masses makes the current analyses suspicious. Identical moral value judgment aside, even the class positions of the current mass increase this suspicion. Because this classification is for the student group without looking at the class profile of their parents – it is done by assuming that university graduates have a job and without looking at the business relations and positions of the employees (Tonak, 2015: 293).

[18] The white-collar-blue-collar distinction that emerged in parallel with the development of capitalism has occupied the current class discussions for a long time. Accordingly, Taylorist and Fordist models and

ponent of the movement, such as lawyers, architects and doctors, it can be seen that this group stands more apart. Because their objective position in the production relations is not in the position of wage labour, but the source of their livelihood is their own service sales (Boratav, 2013). For this reason, if there is a segment that can be described as middle class, it can be argued that it consists of professionals.

To sum up, the approaches that try to explain the Gezi Park events with the concept of the middle class are insufficient to explain the nature of the current social movement, the social integrity from which it emerged, and the character of the social/political power it confronts. At this point, the perspective mentioned at the beginning of the study, the approach that considers classes as a relationship and process can be applied. It cannot be said that the Gezi Park protests were carried out by the organized working class. However, this does not mean that the Gezi Park movement was an ordinary movement devoid of a class structure. It can be said that the movement in question was realized by the coming together of a class formation process, labourers who experienced different proletarianization processes, young people who were deprived of a future, people who were oppressed due to their sexual orientation, women who were victims of patriarchy, and other oppressed elements (Çetinkaya, 2014: 85). In other words, a class formation process can be put forward, in which the basic social contradiction and different contradictions and inequalities come into contact and are articulated. Of course, this process works together with the neoliberal authoritarian state and the capital accumulation regime. The steps taken for the continuity of capital accumulation are in constant motion with the state's reproduction of itself and social inequalities, proletarianization and re-proletarianization processes. The point that should not be forgotten here is that the classiness of social movements cannot be determined only by economic demands. On the contrary, political and ideological agendas and disturbances, which play a key role in the reproduction of the existing order, may lead to the establishment of classism (Saraçoğlu, 2017: 61). If it is remembered that the Gezi Park movement emerged when the government wanting to build a shopping mall and mosque on a public space, this determination becomes even more meaningful.

---

today's technological innovations have divided the labour process and differentiated labour within itself. In this differentiation, on the one hand, the unqualified labour force, also called the blue collar, emerged. On the other hand, professionals who deal with managerial and technical tasks such as the management and operation of capital and the control of the labour process, or the so-called white-collar segment have emerged. This distinction becomes even more complex when considering the workers employed by the state for public services. Contemporary class discussions are divided into two from these distinctions. Accordingly, one view claims that the traditional working class is dead, or a new working class is born. Another view against these claims argues that the essence of class conflict has not changed, and that class relations, that is, relations of dependency and conflict, have not changed. Because the phenomenon of exploitation, which is the root of social inequality, still exists (Öngen, 1994: 326-344).

Holism

While social movements are taking place, on the one hand they carry the political, ideological and economic structural contradictions and opportunities of the social formation, on the other, the historical heritage and current situation. In this environment from which the movement itself emerges, it is the product of a reaction against the contradictions in question. Considering that this reaction did not emerge suddenly, it can be said that it is the result of a history of struggle that accumulates historically and eventually and turns into action. Therefore, the social movement itself is not independent in the past of struggle (Saraçoğlu, 2017: 54). All of these pieces mentioned are important in explaining the social movement. But what is even more important here is the holistic consideration of the relationship between the parts, the development and interaction of the parts. Understanding social reality can only be possible with this holistic understanding. Because otherwise, all of the parts do not go beyond being an element of an equation with many unknowns.

Based on this explanation, the following questions can be asked to address the Gezi Park movement holistically: What is the relation of the Gezi Park movement to social contradictions and to what extent? In a society dominated by the capitalist mode of production, what is the nature of the rebellion at the political, ideological and economic level? Of what historically accumulated social reaction it is the expression? The answer to these questions can of course be the subject of a much more comprehensive study. Therefore, it is not claimed that these questions will be answered in this study. However, with these questions in mind, the nature of the Gezi Park movement can be questioned.

First of all, the social formation from which the movement emerged can be looked at together with the historical accumulation. As previously mentioned in the historical heritage section, Turkey's integration into global capitalism has undergone a radical transformation in line with neoliberal policies. The pole star of this transformation was the dominant accumulation regime of the period. The course of the transformation has been shaped by the three essential elements of the capital accumulation regime. The first of these has been experienced in production, that is, the appropriation of surplus value. According to this factor, working conditions have deteriorated, social rights have been lost, the labour force has been flexible and insecure. The second element is realization, that is, the process of passing commodities from producer to consumer. Commercialization of public services and privatizations can be given as examples to this factor. The final element is revalorization, that is, finding new areas of value for capital. We can see an example of this in the commodification of cities, public spaces and nature. The Gezi Park movement, which is the subject of the research, is a concrete example of this element. While the social structure was transformed by these three elements of capital accumulation, it inevitably affected the dynamics of class struggle. The proletarianization and re-proletarianization processes in society had gained momentum. Despite the di-

visions in the labour process and different proletarianization processes, this new class formation shares the same level of insecurity and futurelessness (Ercan, Oğuz, 2015: 115-132). This plane has the capacity to create a collective consciousness. As a matter of fact, this potential realizes itself when other working people in the society interact with each other and participate in the class struggle and have a common experience. Now, what is mentioned here is a new class formed by the established relations and the process.

What should not be forgotten at this point is that the process of class formation is formed by articulating different inequalities with social inequality. A concrete example of this situation can be seen in different components such as environmentalists, LGBT, women's movement, artists, Alevis and anti-capitalist Muslims who participated in the Gezi Park movement. Because the reproduction of social inequalities in the shadow of the neoliberal authoritarian state also means the power to reproduce itself. The practical reflection of this is the narrowing of political channels, the erosion of democratic values and the increase in state authority. Its reflection in society is the shaping of society according to the political view of the government. In other words, it is the construction of society with conservative codes, the creation of an acceptable citizen prototype, and the suppression or exclusion of alternative lifestyles. The class formation process in Gezi Park is not independent of the inequalities that emerged in these areas. On the contrary, it has been formed by the articulation of these inequalities with their own internal dynamics and originality. This may be the key to the question of how people living different lives in different cities come together and create a common consciousness.

Conclusions

This study is focused on how the Gezi Park movement could be explained as a social movement. In order to establish a sound analysis framework, the theoretical background of the movement was first examined. In this context, it was questioned to what extent the NSM theories could explain the current reality. An alternative critical approach was tried to be established against these theories, which are frequently used in the literature. With this class analysis-centred approach, Gezi Park events were questioned in context of historicity, antagonism and holism. As a result of the investigations, it was revealed that the rebellion was not a movement that emerged on its own but was the product of a certain structural and historical process. It has been tried to determine what kind of relationship there is between the social movement and the capital accumulation regime and what its internal dynamics are. As a result of these inquiries, the study claims that the Gezi Park movement is an example of a class formation process. Efforts were made to demonstrate this claim concretely with different proletarianization and re-proletarianization processes, which have also been shown historically. Thus, it was tried to explain together with the class struggle dynamics, which historically accumulated social reaction was the Gezi Park movement.

Bibliography

Adaklı G. (2001), *Post-Marksizmin Kuramsal ve Siyasal Açmazları*, "Praksis", No. 1, pp. 13-32.

Altıok M. (2002), *Yeni Liberal İstikrar ve Yapısal Uyum Programları: Türkiye Ekonomisinde Sermaye Birikimi ve Krizi*, "Praksis", No. 5, pp. 77-130.

Aydoğanoğlu E. (2010), *Torba Yasa: Esnek, Kuralsız, Korunmasız ve Güvencesiz Çalışma*, "TTB Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi", No. 36, pp. 4-10.

Bağımsız Sosyal Bilimciler (2015), *AKP'li Yıllarda Emeğin Durumu*, Istanbul.

Bayhan V. (2014), *Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler ve Gezi Parkı Direnişi*, "Birey ve Toplum", No. 4(7), pp. 23-57.

Bayramoğlu S. (2003), *Düzenleyici Devlet Düzenlenirken: OECD Türkiye Raporu Üzerine Eleştirel Bir Çözümleme*, "Praksis", No. 9, pp. 143-162.

Bedirhanoğlu P. (2019), *Finansallaşma, Yeni Sınıfsal Çelişkiler ve Devletin Dönüşümü*, "Çalışma ve Toplum Dergisi", No. 60(1), pp. 371-387.

Bora T. (1990), *Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler'e Dair Notlar*, "Birikim", No. 13, pp. 49-53.

Boratav K. (2013), *Olgunlaşmış bir sınıfsal başkaldırı*, "Sendika", 22.06.2022, https://sendika. org/2013/06/her-yer-taksim-her-yer-direnis-bu-isci-sinifinin-tarihsel-ozlemi-olan-sinir-siz-dolaysiz-demokrasi-cagrisidir-korkut-boratav-120919/ [access on: 22.02.2022].

Coşkun M.K. (2006), *Süreklilik ve Kopuş Teorileri Bağlamında Türkiye'de Eski ve Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler*, "Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi", No. 61(1), pp. 67-102.

Çayır K. (1999), *Yeni Sosyal Hareketler*, Istanbul.

Çetinkaya Y.D. (2014), *Gezi ve Toplumsal Sınıflar: Liberaller ile Karikatür Marksizm Arasında Sıkışmak*, "Başlangıç Dergisi", No. 1, pp. 73-90.

Çetinkaya Y.D. (2015), *Tarih ve Kuram Arasında Toplumsal Hareketler*, [İn:] *Toplumsal Hareketler Tarih, Teori ve Deneyim*, edit. Y.D. Çetinkaya, Istanbul.

Demirer Y., Orhangazi Ö. (2003), *Kemal Derviş Mit(leştirilme)ini Tersinden Okumak*, "Praksis", No. 9, pp. 337-356.

Dik E., Demirci A.G. (2017), *Türkiye'de Yatırım Ortamının İyileştirilmesi Politikalarının Oluşturulmasında Düzenleyici ve Uygulayıcı Bir Yapı Olarak Yatırım Ortamını İyileştirme Koordinasyon Kurulu-İstihdam Teknik Komitesi*, "Memleket Siyaset Yönetim (MSY)", No. 12(27), pp. 41-96.

DISK ve KESK ile meslek odaları iş bıraktı (2013), "BBC News", 17.06.2013, https://www.bbc.com/ turkce/haberler/2013/06/130617_kesk_disk_grevde [access on: 27.01.2022].

Ercan F. (2005), *Türkiye'de Yapısal Reformlar*, [in:] *Kapitalizm ve Türkiye I*, edit. F. Ercan, Y. Akkaya, Ankara.

Ercan F. (2006), *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Süreklilik İçinde Değişimi (1980-2004)*, [in:] *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Gelişimi*, edit. F. Ercan, K.D. Yılmaz, Ankara.

Ercan F., Oğuz Ş. (2015), *From Gezi Resistance to Soma Massacre*, "Socialist Register", No. 51, pp. 114-135.

Ercan F., Yaman-Öztürk M. (2011), *1979 Krizinden 2001 Krizine Türkiye'de Sermaye Birikimi Süreci ve Yaşanan Dönüşümler*, "Praksis", No. 19, pp. 55-93.

Genç F. (2019), *Çitlemeler ve Politikanın Yitimi: Türkiye'de Güncel Kentsel Rejim*, "Praksis", No. 49, pp. 9-38.

Girit S. (2013), *Kimdi peki bu #duranadam?*, "BBC News", 18.06.2013, https://www.bbc.com/ turkce/haberler/2013/06/130618_duranadam_kim [access on: 27.01.2022].

Gültekin-Karakaş D. (2011), *Sermayenin Uluslararasılaşması Sürecinde Türkiye'de Banka Reformu ve Finans Kapital-içi Yeniden Yapılanma*, "Praksis", No. 19, pp. 95-131.

Harvey D. (2007), *Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction*, "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science", No. 610(1), pp. 21-44.

Harvey D. (2013), *Asi Şehirler, Şehir Hakkından Kentsel Devrime Doğru*, Istanbul.

Hobsbawm E. (1996), *Kimliğe Dayalı Politika ve Sol*, "Sosyalist Politika", No. 11, pp. 71-82.

Jessop B. (2002), *Liberalism, Neoliberalism and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective*, "Antipode", No. 34(3), pp. 452-472.

Jessop B. (2014), *Poulantzas's State Power Socialism as a Modern Classic*, https://bobjessop.word-press.com/2014/03/27/poulantzass-state-power-socialism-as-a-modern-classic/ [access on: 20.02.2022].

Kaygalak S. (2001), *Post-Marksist Siyasetin Sefaleti: Radikal Demokrasi*, "Praksis", No. 1, pp. 33-59.

Keyder Ç. (2013), *Yeni Orta Sınıf*, "Bilim Akademisi", https://bilimakademisi.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Yeni-Orta-Sinif.pdf [access on: 22.02.2022].

Marshall G. (2005), *Toplumsal Hareketler*, [in:] *Sosyoloji Sözlüğü*, edit. G. Marshall, Oxford, pp. 746-748.

Oğuz Ş. (2011), *Krizi Fırsata Dönüştürmek: Türkiye'de Devletin 2008 Krizine Yönelik Tepkileri*, "Amme İdaresi Dergisi", No. 44(1), pp. 1-23.

Oğuz Ş. (2012), *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Küreselleşmesi ve Neoliberal Otoriter Devletin İnşası*, "TTB Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi", No. 45(12), pp. 2-48.

Öngen T. (1994), *Tekelci Kapitalizm ve Sınıf Yapısı*, "Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi", No. 49(3), pp. 303-349.

Özuğurlu A. (2012), *Afetler ve Kentleşmenin Neoliberal Dönüşümü*, "Mülkiye Dergisi", No. 274(36), pp. 149-158.

Parlak D. (2013), *Gezi Direnişi Bağlamında Başka Bir Siyasallığın Olanaklılığı Üzerine*, "Praksis", Special Issue, pp. 135-141.

Saraçoğlu C. (2017), *Toplumsal Hareket Teorilerinde Anaakımı Aşmak: Bütünlük ve Antagonizma*, [in:] *Anaakım Bilime Marksist Müdahaleler*, edit. A. Dizdar, Istanbul.

Savran G. (1992), *Marksizm ve 'Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler' Tartışması*, "Sınıf Bilinci", No. 11, pp. 7-27.

Savran S. (2015), *Halk İsyanının Sınıf Karakteri Üzerine Notlar*, [in:] *Marksizm ve Sınıflar: Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Sınıflar ve Mücadeleler*, edit. S. Savran, K. Tanyılmaz, E.A. Tonak, Istanbul.

Sönmez M. (2010), *'Teğet'in Yıkımı*, Istanbul.

Tilly C. (2014), *Social Movement 1768-2004*, London.

Timeline (2016), "Gezi Archive", https://www.geziarchive.net/timelines/timeline-tr [access on: 27.01.2022].

Tonak E.A. (2015), *Haziran Direnişi Tahayyülleri*, [in:] *Marksizm ve Sınıflar: Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Sınıflar ve Mücadeleler*, edit. S. Savran, K. Tanyılmaz, E.A. Tonak, Istanbul.

Touraine A. (2002), *Modernliğin Eleştirisi*, Istanbul.

Uğurlu Ö. (2013), *Neoliberal Politikalar Ekseninde Türkiye'de Kentsel Mekanın Yeniden Üretimi*, "TTB Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi", No. 47(13), pp. 2-12.

Wallerstein I. (2004), *Sistem Karşıtı Hareketlerin İkilemi*, [in:] *Sistem Karşıtı Hareketler*, edit. I. Wallerstein, Istanbul.

Wood E.M. (2016), *Kapitalizm Demokrasiye Karşı: Tarihsel Maddeciliğin Yeniden Yorumlanması*, Istanbul.

Yaylacı A.F. (2014), *Toplumsal Hareketler ve Eğitim*, [in:] *Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler*, edit. B. Kartal, B. Kümbetoğlu, Eskişehir.

Yörük E., Yüksel M. (2014), *Class and Politics in Turkey's Gezi Protests*, "New Left Review", No. 89, pp. 104-105.

Abstract: This article aims to analyze the Gezi Park social movement, which started in Istanbul in 2013 and spread all over Turkey in a short time, in the context of class dynamics. In this context, firstly, the adequacy of examining the Gezi Park movement within the scope of new social movements will

be emphasized. Secondly, the study will attempt to establish an alternative critical approach based on class. With this approach, class dynamics of the Gezi Park movement will be sought under the titles of historicity, antagonism, and holism.