COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY REVISITED IN A WORLD OF RISING POPULISM, DEEPENING POLARIZATION AND RAMPANT NEOLIBERALISM

HANDE PAKER



IPC | ISTANBUL POLICY CENTER
SABANCI UNIVERSITY
STIFTUNG MERCATOR INITIATIVE

COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY REVISITED IN A WORLD OF RISING POPULISM, DEEPENING POLARIZATION AND RAMPANT NEOLIBERALISM

HANDE PAKER

EDITOR

July 2017

About Istanbul Policy Center

Istanbul Policy Center (IPC) is a global policy research institution that specializes in key social and political issues ranging from democratization to climate change, transatlantic relations to conflict resolution and mediation. IPC organizes and conducts its research under three main clusters: the Istanbul Policy Center–Sabancı University–Stiftung Mercator Initiative, Democratization and Institutional Reform, and Conflict Resolution and Mediation. Since 2001, IPC has provided decision makers, opinion leaders, and other major stakeholders with objective analyses and innovative policy recommendations.

www.ipc.sabanciuniv.edu

About Mercator-IPC Fellowship

The Mercator-IPC Fellowship Program is the cornerstone of the IPC–Sabancı University–Stiftung Mercator Initiative. The program aims to strengthen the academic, political, and social ties between Turkey and Germany, as well as Turkey and Europe, by facilitating excellent scientific research and hands-on policy work. It is based on the belief that in an increasingly globalized world the acquisition of knowledge and an exchange of ideas and people are the preconditions for meeting the challenges of the 21st century.

Authors*

Senem Aydın-Düzgit – Sabancı University, Istanbul Policy Center (IPC)
İlke Toygür – 2015/16 Mercator-IPC Fellow & Elcano Royal Institute
Fikret Adaman – Boğaziçi University
Feyzi Baban – Trent University
Helen F. Wilson – University of Manchester
Ethemcan Turhan – 2014/15 Mercator-IPC Fellow & KTH Royal Institute
Hande Paker – 2015/16 Mercator-IPC Fellow & Bahçeşehir University
Duygu Avcı – International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University
Zeynep Kadirbeyoğlu – Boğaziçi University
Nazlı Konya – Cornell University
Defne Kadıoğlu – 2015/16 Mercator-IPC Fellow

* The interpretations and conclusions in this report belong solely to the authors and do not reflect IPC's offical position.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 6

COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY REVISITED IN A WORLD OF RISING POPULISM, DEEPENING POLARIZATION AND RAMPANT NEOLIBERALISM 7
Hande Paker

CHALLENGES TO COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY 12

POPULISM TRANSCENDING REGIONS: THE CASES OF TURKEY AND INDIA COMPARED 13
Senem Aydın-Düzgit

POPULISM AND BEYOND: ELECTORAL CHALLENGES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION 15
İlke Toygür

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES UNDER NEOLIBERAL THINKING 18
Fikret Adaman

CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVES 21

CULTURAL PLURALITY AND RADICAL COSMOPOLITANISM 22
Feyzi Baban

THE RISE OF INTOLERANCE? BREXIT AND THE PROBLEM WITH STASIS 25
Helen F. Wilson

ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF ORGANIZATION AND PRACTICES OF COEXISTENCE 28

CONTENTIOUS POLITICS IN A WARMER WORLD: SOME THOUGHTS ON THE RADICAL POTENTIAL OF CLIMATE JUSTICE FOR TURKEY 29
Ethemcan Turhan

LOCAL COMMONS, COSMOPOLITAN SOLIDARITIES AND CLIMATE JUSTICE NETWORKS 33
Hande Paker

TRANSFORMATIVE POLITICS IN ENVIRONMENTAL STRUGGLES: COMPARING THE MINING CONFLICTS IN INTAG, ECUADOR, AND KAZ DAĞLARI, TURKEY 36
Duygu Avcı

ALTERNATIVE FOOD INITIATIVES IN TURKEY 39
Zeynep Kadirbeyoğlu and Nazlı Konya

CONTESTED NOTIONS OF COSMOPOLITANISM IN THE CONTEXT OF GENTRIFICATION 42
Defne Kadıoğlu

INTRODUCTION

COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY REVISITED IN A WORLD OF RISING POPULISM, DEEPENING POLARIZATION AND RAMPANT NEOLIBERALISM

Hande Paker

Borders are being consolidated geographically, politically, and socially. Rising right-wing populism taps into and feeds increasing fears of the "Other" using a powerful discourse of "us versus them." The influx of refugees into the EU, arguably the most cosmopolitan political project, as a result of war in the Middle East presents a context in which populism can gain ground, making the adoption of a collective humanitarian solution to the issue increasingly improbable. The ideas of participatory democracy and pluralism are eclipsed by the democratic deficit characterized by a growing distance between decision-makers and their electoral bases, polarization, and the increasing power of authoritarian tendencies in various geographies (e.g., in India, Hungary, Brazil, Turkey, China, Russia). Neoliberalism erodes spheres of solidarity and democratic engagement through the commodification of the commons. In short, increasing populism, extremism, authoritarianism, and the commodification of the commons weaken the loosely defined values cultivated by cosmopolitan democracy such as difference, diversity, and participation on the basis of recognition of rights of individuals by virtue of their humanity. The two major responses to dealing with diversity—assimilation and multiculturalism—have failed.[1] The former generates injustice and violence and cannot hold together increasingly plural and transnational societies. The latter emphasizes cultural belonging but cannot really address interaction between different groups.

In such a context, can cosmopolitan democracy provide a viable alternative political project? How prevalent is everyday cosmopolitanism? In what ways do people cross borders into different geographies, identity groups and ways of living? How can ordinary encounters and interactions transfer into transnational and national politics? Can the analysis of concrete conflicts in the local-transnational nexus re-politicize increasingly technical and bureaucratic solutions?

These are some of the questions we have addressed in the two-day conference convened at Istanbul Policy Center in October 2016. The speakers have unpacked the challenges of rising racism, populism, and intolerance brought to light by such political developments as Brexit, Orban's referendum, Trump's election campaign, and the European response to the refugee crisis. They have also reflected on the increasing intractability of neoliberalism manifested especially through the commodification of services, enclosures of commons, extractive policies, and land grabs. Such methods contribute to exacerbating inequalities, which in turn makes it difficult for democracy to deliver, as evidenced by ecological and urban struggles. The conversation started with the conference and the publication of this report will contribute to furthering efforts to make the notion of cosmopolitan democracy measure up: first, by exploring challenges to cosmopolitan democracy such as right-wing populism that deepens polarization among diverse groups, increasing intolerance that makes coexistence more difficult and neoliberalism

1 F. Baban and K. Rygiel, "Snapshots from the margins: Transgressive cosmopolitanisms in Europe," *European Journal of Social Theory* 17, no. 4 (2014): 461-478.

that undercuts solidarities and alternative practices constructed around the commons; and second, by debating how right-wing populist, neoliberal, and exclusionary trends can be counteracted by inquiring into everyday interactions, solidarities, and local political action transpiring around democracy, justice, and ecological concerns.

One set of challenges that cosmopolitan democracy faces is related to what Saskia Sassen has identified as a systemic shift manifested in rising inequalities and political exclusions. In today's global phase (of capitalist development) people are no longer valued as workers and consumers anymore. This leads to what Sassen calls expulsions—immiseration and exclusion of growing numbers of people to the point they are permanently forgotten.[2] The dominant logic of capitalism today is extractive since high finance develops instruments to extract value, much like mining, to feed its needs as well as that of global capitalist production. In her critical intervention, Sassen has underlined the need to get rid of thick protective walls academia has built around concepts such as populism and neoliberalism. Relying too much on existing categories may result in missing the "innards of a system," which have brutally marginalized and impoverished people (as in the case of the housing crisis in the United States) and nature (as in the case of "dead land" and "dead water"). Defining an emerging condition shaped by populism (or neoliberalism for that matter) requires delving into the dynamics that underlie the populisms of today, which are different from populisms of the past.

In response, Fuat Keyman acknowledges the enduring systemic crisis in which complexity goes hand-in-hand with brutality and distinguishes between populist movements and populist rule with a view to deepening our understanding of populism. Populism is an important category characterized by majoritarianism, democratic deficit, myths about history, apathy towards existing political parties and systems, and demarcations of "us vs. them." Populism turns "people" into a mystical category to be glorified but devalued and demonized if they resist (inequality, land grabbing, climate change, right to the city). Majoritarianism values people as long as they subscribe to the populist rule and renders them subversive when they resist. Populism as such constitutes a major challenge to cosmopolitanism.

Aydın-Düzgit sheds light on how right-wing populism manifests itself through similar dynamics by comparing historically, geographically, socially, and politically distinct cases. Both India and Turkey have experienced an increase in societal polarization, rising (Hindu and Turkish) nationalism, and deterioration of basic rights and freedoms. The practice of the governments of Turkey and India to legitimize their rule by playing on the dichotomy of the "people" and the "(discredited former) elites," reinforced by the use of a dominant nationalism and religion, underlines once more the central trait of the populisms of today: the tendency to construct politics around categories of "us" versus "Others." The similarities between these two contexts are not limited to top-down polarizing politics but also include the existence of strong and charismatic leaders, their discursive styles, their innovative and full use of the mass and social media, and mobilization of diaspora communities.

An important question that Toygür raises is whether Europe will be immune to rising populism with elections in sight in quite a few EU member states. The 2017 elections are critical in the sense that they will constitute a scene for both Euroskepticism and populism, but Toygür argues that these concepts need to be carefully differentiated. Observing that they are often casually used, Toygür underlines that Euroskepticism refers to opposition to the European integration process, while populism is a

2 S. Sassen, *Expulsions* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).

concept not specific to the European context and more generally denotes a loosely defined ideology based on a dichotomy of "corrupt elites" and "the people." Distinguishing the two concepts can contribute to not only understanding how they are linked but also counteracting populist tendencies, especially if the policy-making process integrates dialogue with citizens.

Populist rules have become highly developmentalist and growth oriented. This developmentalism is increasingly neoliberal, marked by policies of integration into competitive global markets and the reorganization of the state to incorporate the extension of market forces.[3] In his piece on the pervasiveness of neoliberal thinking, Adaman crucially discusses how neoliberalism depoliticizes social and political spheres via their economization, situating humans and their social relations on a cost-benefit axis. Economization, which replaces rights-based perspectives and solidaristic relations of reciprocity, leads to a commodification process from which neither the services that used to be a part of the public sphere, e.g., education, health, and public transportation, nor nature is exempt. Environment is not only one of the areas where the impact of neoliberalism has been deeply felt but also an issue in relation to which neoliberal policies have been designed. Adaman carefully notes that policymakers who desire to direct the behavior of economic agents towards a more environmentally aware economy resort to market and market-like mechanisms in the rather hastily formed belief that this can only be achieved through said mechanisms. The ensuing commodification of nature constitutes yet another challenge to cosmopolitan democracy since it erodes relations formed around reciprocity, solidarity, and the commons. Alternatives exist in the form of local practices that cultivate non-exploitative and non-extractive economies of cooperation and resistance to economization of the environmental sphere.

The contributors also explore in the following pages, both conceptually and empirically, the possibilities of building an alternative in the face of these challenges. In his contribution, Baban proposes to focus on the "radical potential of the cosmopolitan ideal." Baban emphasizes relationality as a basic principle of the human condition and the basis upon which negotiations around difference become possible. Radical cosmopolitanism argues that engaging with and negotiating reciprocal differences, especially the experiences of the marginalized and the excluded, can build the common ground required to construct an alternative politics. In doing this, radical cosmopolitanism substantially transforms old cosmopolitanism, which rejected differences in seeking a universalism that was at once hierarchical and disempowering. Baban points out that the diversities now common in the multiethnic, multicultural societies of late modernity can become part of the commons forged around a loosely defined principle of common humanity. Contrary to the exclusion and polarization that populist politics generates, radical cosmopolitanism takes the interactions of diverse groups as a starting point to negotiate the commons and establish solidarities. Baban rightly asks in what ways common bonds of living together and solidarities beyond specific identities and (sometimes conflictual) commitments can be developed.

The question of how to establish common bonds and solidarities may partly be addressed by unpacking the thin values of cosmopolitan politics, which are to underlie everyday interactions between diverse groups. To that end, Wilson takes issue with "tolerance," a value that is regularly evoked in the context of Brexit and often perceived, especially by cosmopolitan approaches, as crucial to the cultiva-

3 Bob Jessop, "Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: A state-theoretical perspective," *Antipode* 34, no. 3 (2002): 452-472; Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell, "Neoliberalizing space," *Antipode* 34, no. 3 (2002): 380–404.

tion of the commons. Wilson criticizes the concept of tolerance because it is inevitably associated with negative values. There needs to be dislike, disdain, and disapproval for the need for tolerance to rise. Objection to and exclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities, on which the campaign for Brexit was based, is implicitly accepted and not challenged at its core when people call for tolerance in the face of rising racism and xenophobia. This problematization of tolerance helps build an agenda that politicizes cosmopolitanism. Wilson points out that tolerance is valuable in so far as it "suspends" violence but should be temporarily used as an opportunity to address racism.

The authors have also focused on alternative forms of organization and everyday practices of living and contending together. These encounters transpire in public spheres, and solidarities are forged across borders to contend against the risks of climate change, financial insecurity and various forms of exclusion, and terrorism and insecurity. The daily, ordinary engagements across social and political borders are in fact embedded in grassroots dynamics of collaboration and conflict. The recognition of these dynamics in a variety of geographies and issues may help repoliticize the cosmopolitan agenda, often criticized for lacking a solid basis for political action. It might also help problematize depoliticized understandings of global issues such as climate change.

A key concept around which transnational solidarities and an alternative vision on how to cope with the risks of climate change are built is climate justice. Turhan differentiates three varying frames of climate justice. Climate justice emphasizes the unequal outcomes created by climate change, raising questions in relation to uneven responsibility, resources, vulnerability, and degree of damage to be suffered. Initially, climate justice focused on North-South differences, arguing that industrialized countries of the North incurred a "climate debt" by overburdening atmospheric space to pursue their development. Climate justice asks for the right to development as well as compensation. The second frame follows a similar line, albeit with an explicit emphasis on market-based solutions. The third frame that Turhan identifies is a grassroots approach, which criticizes global economic and political power structures that generate inequality and exclusions as well as the ineffectiveness of market-based solutions and technological fixes that fail to address these structures. Social struggles that adopt this approach also integrate "gender equality, migrant rights struggles, rights of non-human nature, and *buen vivir*" to offer an alternative framework.

Paker proposes to think about two spatialities—the local/national and the transnational—to understand how local commons expand to incorporate solidarities created around cosmopolitan concerns such as climate change. The cosmopolitan idea of a common ground relevant beyond local and national spheres of action and particularistic identities, supported by "thin values," has been criticized as a vague political basis of social integration. Paker argues that this idea can be substantiated by analyzing encounters and interactions that help build a common ground, which can only be made sense of as an intersection of commonalities and contestations. To that end, she analyzes local-national-transnational networks emerging around climate justice in Turkey. These networks are crucial because they facilitate the localization of climate action and the transnationalization of local commons. Both transnational processes (e.g., the organization of a campaign such as Breakfree) and national environmental organizations play an important role in connecting diverse local mobilizations, expanding local frames, and building capacity.

As Avcı notes as well, environmental issues have become a major political sphere around which

alternatives and solidarities are articulated. In the case of Intag, Ecuador, and Kaz Dağları, Turkey, anti-mining struggles have sprang up to protect the livelihoods and ways of life of local communities as well as the environment from the adverse impact of the projects. Avcı shows that the mobilization in Intag was able to construct an alternative model of local development based on self-organization, grassroots participatory decision-making, and promotion of economic activities that improve the well-being of communities while protecting the environment—values that can all strengthen a cosmopolitan frame. Avcı asserts that the hegemonic developmentalist practices and discourses of the state can explain the fact that mobilization remained more local and interest-based in Turkey.

The search for alternative forms of organization has also emerged in relation to food production. Kadirbeyoğlu and Konya present findings from their research on alternative food initiatives (AFIs). Different types of AFIs such as urban/community garden projects, farmers' markets, consumer cooperatives, and community-supported agriculture aim to create a broad alliance based on mutual aid and trust between growers and consumers to conserve ecosystems and replace the dominance of agrifood corporations with socially embedded markets and democratic governance. Analyzing 55 food initiatives in Turkey, Kadirbeyoğlu and Konya find that AFIs play important roles such as eliminating intermediaries between urban and rural dwellers, incorporating local crop varieties into urban diets, conserving and promoting heirloom and local seeds, and reviving forgotten but viable and efficient techniques of production. In doing this, AFIs also promote an awareness and shared responsibility for the livelihoods of small-scale farmers and provide democratic and participatory spaces in which producers and consumers can engage one another regarding the conditions under which food is brought to the table.

Kadıoğlu uses the case of gentrification in Neukölln, Berlin, to show how commodification can constitute a challenge to a cosmopolitan politics that is embedded in actual encounters among people with ethnic, linguistic, and religious diversities. Gentrification was an integral part of the project of presenting Berlin as a cosmopolitan metropolis, with diversity conceived as constitutive. Ironically, Neukölln was not considered part of the cosmopolitan landscape of Berlin despite "encounters and exchange between the 160 nationalities that was part of daily life." The local government as well as others involved in the gentrification of the neighborhood (e.g., landlords) underlined the lack of a cosmopolitan social mix. Kadıoğlu shows that this contradicts the strong sense among the pre-existing residents of Neukölln that their neighborhood was already a cosmopolitan space prior to gentrification. She identifies the active role of the local government in accelerating gentrification by renting out vacant places to artists, creative users, and middle-class groups and the commodification of social housing as leading to a "market cosmopolitanism." Commodification threatens embedded cosmopolitan politics by glossing over and perhaps displacing existing everyday cosmopolitan practices.

CHALLENGES TO COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY

POPULISM TRANSCENDING REGIONS: THE CASES OF TURKEY AND INDIA COMPARED

Senem Aydın-Düzgit

At first sight, India and Turkey do not strike one as ideal country cases for comparative analysis. The two countries have vast differences in terms of their geography, societal set up, history, and political systems. They have thus generally been treated as both geographically and politically distanced cases in the literature. Nonetheless, recent developments in both country cases suggest significant similarities that need to be explored further. Both countries are suffering from a recent surge of a particular variant of right-wing populism, characterized by the rise of authoritarian rule legitimized through its claim to represent the "people" and the "general will" against the "(former) elites."

In Turkey, the Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*, AKP) under President Erdoğan's rule has intensified its right-wing populist policies and rhetoric particularly after 2011, when it came to power with a third consecutive electoral victory at the expense of curtailing basic rights and freedoms, increasing societal polarization, strengthening Turkish nationalism, and reversing efforts made towards democratic consolidation in the country in the first decade of the 2000s. In the case of India, the Indian People's Party under Modi's leadership came to power in 2014 and progressively employed populist measures and discourse serving to marginalize religious minorities, boosting Hindu nationalism, and curbing fundamental rights and freedoms in the country. In both cases, a *Kulturkampf* between the religious masses and the secular elites was mobilized to play a central role in garnering support for the governing parties represented as the "voice of the people and/or the genuine members of the nation." This cultural divide was closely tied with the dominant religion (Islam in Turkey and Hindu in India) to form the core of the articulated nationhood in both settings. These developments took place against the background of rampant neoliberal policies in both contexts, with a specific emphasis on the construction sector as a key driver in economic development.

One way of approaching this striking resemblance is through adopting the prism of conventional comparative politics, which focuses on the role of political parties, the elites, the economy, and state-society relations in understanding the causes behind this convergence. This lens provides us with useful analytical tools, which demonstrate that the roots of this similarity can be found in the role that the elites have played in the formation of the modern nation-state in both settings. The main argument here is that imposed secularism as an elite project coupled with state-driven economic development has produced a reactionary type of populism that rests on an exclusive understanding of culture and religion in representing the interests of the masses (hence the nation) against the elites.[4]

While this approach is necessary and particularly valuable in showing the political, economic, and societal causes behind the overwhelming similarities in the types of populism espoused in both

4 Yaprak Gürsoy, "Varieties of Populism: A New Type Based on Turkey, Thailand and India," (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadephia, September 1-4, 2016).

settings, more is needed to explain the ways in which such similar populisms can be sustained in these societies. Doing that requires the lenses of critical theories where populism is treated as more than just the implementation of certain policies: it is "a political style that is performed, embodied and enacted across a variety of political and cultural contexts."[5] Political style is hereby understood in a wide sense, including, but not limited to, the act of representation through use of particular discourses, specific uses of new media technologies, and performances of charismatic leaders.

Treating populism as such gives further insight into not only the ways in which populism as an "enacted political style" are similar across these cases but also into the mechanisms through which its appeal is sustained across a wide segment of the "people." Both in Turkey and in India, the recent right-wing populist wave is headed by two strong and charismatic leaders, namely Erdoğan and Modi, respectively. Both actors engage in very similar discursive strategies in the representation of key actors in the countries' social and political life. While they claim to represent the "true" voice of the "people," domestic opposition is discredited as the "former elites" and/or "internal enemies of the people" who ally with external enemies of the nation. The supremacy of sovereignty is of key importance in the articulation of the binary divide between the "people" and the "elites" since it is through the alliance of the "external forces" and the "domestic enemies" that national sovereignty is targeted. While these "external forces" can be Europe and/or the West for Turkey, they can be represented by Pakistan in the case of India. While the new populist discourse represents Turkey as a "just" and "active" foreign policy actor in its wider region, with reference to its Ottoman past; an imagined "ideal past" is sought in the ancient Hindu civilization as the founding basis of India's assigned civilizational grandeur and aspirations to "big nation" status in its wider region.

It is not just the presence of charismatic leadership and the contents of the populist discourse that bring the two cases close to one another. Comparisons can also be drawn from the ways in which these charismatic leaders perform and thus enact their populist discourse in public to their "audiences." For instance, both have full command over the tools of mass and social media. They are both known to have used novel technological instruments like holograms in the past in delivering speeches to audiences in cases where they are not physically present. In a similar vein, both attach special emphasis to reaching out to their diaspora populations abroad by holding mass rallies attended by thousands of people, thus enacting a form of "national transnationalism" through mass mobilization of the diaspora communities.[6]

These similarities demonstrate two key challenges to scholars working on the increasingly fashionable issue of populism in light of the rise of populist movements in the contemporary world. One is a conceptual challenge concerning the necessity to approach the issue with broader lenses that incorporate not only policies but also discourses and styles of performance by populist leaders and parties. The second is an empirical challenge, relating to the necessity to move beyond a focus on individual cases or strictly regional categories, to adopt a more global outlook to understand how seemingly disparate cases converge and what this can tell us about the dynamism, sustainability, and appeal of these movements in the wider global scene.

5 Benjamin Moffitt, *The Global Rise of Populism: Performance, Political Style, and Representation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016).

6 Zeynep Kadirbeyoğlu, "National Transnationalism: Dual Citizenship in Turkey," in *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*, ed. Thomas Faist, 127-147 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010).

POPULISM AND BEYOND: ELECTORAL CHALLENGES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

İlke Toygür

European integration is one of the biggest multi-governance projects this world has ever seen. Over six decades ago, Jean Monnet and his colleagues dreamed of a united Europe. For them, this unification process would secure peace in the continent and contribute to welfare and stability. Today, this dream is in trouble. There have been many challenges, such as the wavering economies of some member states, the survival of the common currency, and most recently, the refugee flows from Syria, that keep European Union (EU) leaders very busy. Meanwhile, the gap between citizens and elites is widening. Even though structural problems related to European institutions as well as external dynamics constitute challenges, the real harm comes from inside: populist leaders and political parties challenge the core dynamics of the EU and its member states. Existential discussions on the matter dig further, raising many questions about both the future of European integration and liberal democracy itself.

Distinguishing Concepts: Euroskepticism and Populism

Recently, both scholarly literature and expert discussions related to populism in Europe have been growing rapidly. The concept of populism itself has been revisited frequently in order to help us understand the political developments subsequent to the multiple crises that have emerged as of late. This piece aims to, first, differentiate between Euroskepticism and populism, and second, focus on elections in 2017 in Europe to show how they are different. First of all, there is an urgent need for a conceptual and practical differentiation between Euroskepticism and populism. Parties and leaders are named "populists" without reference to theoretical conditions associated with populism. Populism is sometimes used as a synonym for Euroskepticism, challenging nationalist and extremist political leaders, parties, and movements. In short, it is a catchall concept. It covers a very broad variety of "host ideologies" on both sides of the spectrum, from extreme left to the extreme right. Secondly, this piece aims to focus on critical elections of 2017, since they are very much related to and could clarify both concepts if taken as case studies.

The theoretical discussion related to Euroskepticism and populism requires more dedication. On the one hand, Euroskepticism "expresses the idea of contingent or qualified opposition, as well as incorporating outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration," according to Taggart.[7] There is an important connection between Euroskepticism and politicization of European integration. According to Kriesi and Grande, Euroskeptic parties of the extreme right exploit European integration for electoral gain.[8] This is more in line with the concept of politicization of European integration defined by Kriesi et al. as part of the process of globalization and a new cleavage

7 Paul Taggart, "A touchstone of dissent: Euroscepticism in contemporary Western European party systems," *European Journal of Political Research* 33 (1998): 363-388.

8 Hanspeter Kriesi and Edgar Grande, "The Europeanization of the National Political Debate," in *Democratic Politics in a European Union Under Stress*, ed. O. Cramme and S. B. Hobolt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 67-86.

along "integration-demarcation."[9] According to research on globalization, there will be a rise in the number of non-mainstream political parties as a result of the process of denationalization. All these discussions blend into 21st century politics, putting the discussions related to the European Union at the center as an important actor of governance.

Populism, on the other hand, is a concept with a long history, which goes beyond that of the EU. Populism is widely defined as "a thin-centered ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogenous and antagonistic groups, 'the pure people' versus 'the corrupt elite' based on the idea that politics should be an expression of the general will of the people."[10]

That said, specifically in the EU context, the issue of non-mainstream political parties with a very high level of support in key countries became a deal breaker for the future of European integration. Historically, in Western Europe a more right-wing variant of populism emerged in the 1980s.[11] Today, it appears on both sides of the ideological spectrum. Being an elite-initiated project, the EU is at the crossroads of criticism that is coming from both sides. The dichotomy of the "people versus corrupt elites" is commonly used to target EU officials. In any case, the critical elections of 2017 in Europe will be a scene for both.

9 Hanspeter Kriesi et al., "Globalization and the transformation of the national political space: Six European countries compared," *European Journal of Political Research* 45, no. 6 (2006): 921-956; Hanspeter Kriesi et al., *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Hanspeter Kriesi et al., *Political Conflict in Western Europe* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

10 Cas Mudde, "The Populist Zeitgeist," *Government and Opposition* 39, no. 4 (2004): 542-563.

11 Hans-George Betz, "The New Politics of Resentment: Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe," *Comparative Politics* 25, no. 4 (1993): 413-427; P. Norris, *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Cas Mudde, *Populist radical right parties in Europe* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Electoral Challenges of 2017 and Beyond

We have clearly been witnessing discontent with the European Union as a whole since the beginning of the 2000s. Although there have been ups and downs in support of European integration,[12] it is clear that today there are stronger sentiments against further integration. As a result, not only objections against European integration are increasingly voiced, but also there are more political entrepreneurs that are exploiting these ideas in elections. Both the vocalization of anti-European integration and its exploitation by political entrepreneurs have been catalyzed with the economic crisis and had an impact on election results.[13] Both left- and right-wing political parties exploit reactions to policies of the European Union. Political parties on the left of the spectrum mainly use the economy and position themselves on anti-austerity stances, while right-wing extremists focus on the cultural aspects, trying to mobilize nationalist sentiments with anti-migration stances, especially using the current refugee crisis to their own advantage.

In this context, the crisis of mainstream politics became more visible than ever. An important demonstration of this situation has been in the European Parliament (EP). Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) have elected their president for the next 2.5 years until elections in 2019. Normally, the presidency is a rotating position between the two biggest groups of the European Parliament, namely the Socialists and Christian Democrats, as a grand coalition for the EP presidency. However, this time it was different since there were as many candidates as groups. The Christian Democrat candidate ended up being the president thanks to

12 R.C. Eichenberg and R. J. Dalton, "Post-Maastricht blues: The transformation of citizen support for European integration, 1973–2004," *Acta politica* 42, no. 2 (2007): 128-152.

13 Enrique Hernandez and Hanspeter Kriesi, "The electoral consequences of the financial and economic crisis in Europe," *European Journal of Political Research* 55, no. 2 (2015): 203-224.

the last-minute agreements that were made behind closed doors. This indicates the potential intensity of the forthcoming European Parliament elections in 2019. Even if it requires further research, it is another sign that mainstream political parties will not be directing the political scene any longer.

When we look at the national scenes for the year of "critical elections," three out of six founding members of the EU have already or will go to the ballot box in 2017. The dates are set for the Netherlands (March 2017), France (two rounds in April and May for the presidency; two rounds in June for the legislative), and Germany (September 2017). A fourth founding member, Italy, is also figuring out its electoral calendar after its controversial constitutional referendum. In the meantime, the leader of the country that is leaving the European Union, Theresa May, also decided to renew the mandate before the Brexit negotiations. The most powerful non-mainstream force in all these elections is Front National (FN) in France, together with Movimento 5 Stelle (M5S) in Italy. In the first round of presidential elections in France, Marine Le Pen, the leader of FN, received the second highest percentage of the vote, running directly against Emmanuel Macron, the founder of the En Marche movement, who won the elections. None of the mainstream parties of the Republic of France made it to the second round. In Germany, while Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) is much less powerful compared to its French counterpart, it nevertheless demonstrated its potential in various state elections last year. Both elections are critical for the future, given that Germany and France are very important players in EU politics.

Conclusion

Wading through one of the most difficult electoral years, European leaders are trying to consolidate their positions. Since the liberal world order—and its systemic problems—may be related to all of these illiberal tendencies we are facing today, further analyses are required on how to tackle them. Long-term solutions are needed for overcoming populist tendencies in Europe. In the meantime, a clear classification of populist forces in each country would help scholars and policy makers, while further links and dialogue with citizens would strengthen democracy. The future of the European Union will depend mostly on these efforts and their application in its member states.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES UNDER NEOLIBERAL THINKING[14]

Fikret Adaman

In this note, I aim at critically positioning neoliberalism within environmental issues. As a prelude, I provide clarification on the definitions of both neoliberalism and environmental problems. Then, I show how neoliberal approach assesses, and proposes solutions to, environmental problems. In doing so, I also touch upon how the neoliberal project reproduces itself theoretically and practically in the context of environmental governance. Finally, I concisely hint at the counters of an alternative thinking as a path to deal with environmental issues.

Neoliberalism, in its traditional definition, is primarily associated with the Chicago (e.g., Friedman) and the Austrian (e.g., Hayek) schools of thought and is seen as a set of marketization, privatization, labor-market flexibilization, and (financial and trade) liberalization policies, with a minimal role assigned to governments.[15] I find this definition restrictive and, more importantly, to some extent superficial. I would like instead to offer a more comprehensive definition so as to better capture the existing varieties of neoliberalism.[16] I shall define neoliberalism as the drive towards *depoliticization* of the social and political realm through its *economization*.

By assuming that human beings comprehend and affirmatively respond to economic incentives, neoliberalism aims to solve *all* social and political problems by creating appropriate economic incentives. Once human behavior is conceptualized as a form of cost-benefit calculus, neoliberalism, I argue, can accommodate a range of theoretical and political positions with diverse policy implications. Apart from relying on markets and private property, neoliberal policies may well include those that can be identified as interventionist (exercised by state apparatuses or by other non-market devices).

The corollary of the claim that economic agents incessantly follow a cost-benefit logic is that they need not be approached through a rights-based grid of intelligibility. By that I mean by economizing (and thereby depoliticizing) the (social and ecological) milieu citizens find themselves in, neoliberalism can rely on a palette of (market as well as non-market) policies, replacing the rights-based perspective (historically speaking of the post-war social democratic programs of the left-leaning governments of Europe) with the incentives-based grid of intelligibility. Once governments are seen as associating themselves with the entire ensemble of social relations on the basis of a cost-benefit

14 This note heavily relies on my joint works with Yahya M. Madra: Fikret Adaman and Yahya M. Madra, "Theorizing the "third sphere": A critique of the persistence of the "economistic fallacy"," *Journal of Economic Issues* 36, no. 4 (2002): 1045-1078; Fikret Adaman and Yahya M. Madra, "Understanding neoliberalism as economization: The case of the environment," in *Global Economic Crisis and the Politics of Diversity*, ed. Y. Atasoy (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 29-51; Yahya M. Madra and Fikret Adaman, "Public economics after Neoliberalism: A historical-theoretical perspective," *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 17, no. 4 (2010): 1079-1106; Yahya M. Madra and Fikret Adaman, "Neoliberal reason and its forms: De-politicization through economization," *Antipode* 46 no. 3 (2014): 691-716.

15 David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (Toronto: Vintage, 2008).

16 Neil Brenner, Jamie Peck, and Nik Theodore, "Veriegated neoliberalisation: geographies, modalities, pathways," *Global Networks* 10, no. 2 (2010): 182-222.

logic and once all agents are read as calculably rational and responsive to economic incentives, neoliberalism can be seen as the *drive* not (only) towards marketization, privatization, and financial and trade liberalization, but rather more broadly speaking *towards an economization of the ensemble of social relations through governmental policies.* Economization, that is to say embarking on a cost-benefit calculus, comes to mean at the same time a continuous and relentless commodification process of all services and goods as well as all relational behaviors. It should not come as a surprise, therefore, that the four-decade-long history of neoliberal policies is very rich in providing example after example of commodification of those services that were once perceived as part of the public sphere: education, health, public transportation, and lately environment. At the same time, solidaristic relationships (as among friends or family members) that were once based on the principle of reciprocity (a term used in the Polanyian sense[17]) are transforming themselves into a kind of market or quasi-market exchange under neoliberal rule.

One of the areas where the impact of neoliberalism has been extensive is the environment. The post-2000s have witnessed, with an increasing rate, references to environmental problems, although attention was first drawn to these issues as early as the 1960s.[18] Nowadays, there is a near consensus that environmental degradation is growing at an alarming rate, threatening the entire civilization. People are now talking more and more about the interrelated dual crises of environmental pollution and natural resource overuse: on the one hand, waste disposal above the ecosystem's assimilative capacity is causing pollution at micro and macro cosmos, even extending to underground water as well as the outer space; on the other hand, the overuse of natural resources (including the exhaustion of non-renewable energy and material sources) is eroding the quality of life of current and certainly future generations.

In the last decades, environmental problems have globally become objects of neoliberal policymaking. What we have been observing is that markets (and market-like tools) are increasingly being used to provide economic incentives to protect the environment—ranging from marketable pollution permits (where polluters can bid for a permit that would allow them to create a fixed amount of pollution) to price-per-bag policies (a volume-based pricing system for household waste), from natural resource privatization (such as protected areas and forests) to reliance on the futures and derivatives in the energy and precious metal markets (where companies would use these financial instruments to hedge risk in energy and mining sectors), from payments for ecosystem services (where a monetary figure would be assigned as the "value" of an ecosystem under investigation) to biodiversity banking (where the goal would be to compensate for the loss of biodiversity at one location with conservation gains somewhere else). At the same time, governments in different geographies are taking an active role in environment-related issues. In industries like petroleum, energy, and mining, the so-called "public-private partnership model" is quickly becoming the standard rather than the exception, where the ultimate aim is profit maximization. The active participation of governments should therefore be read in line with our definition as part of the mounting dominance of neoliberal hegemony in the public sphere.

Under the assumption that everything is commodifiable, including the environment, the neoliberal project reproduces itself theoretically and practically in the context of environmental governance.

17 Karl Polanyi, *Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001 [1944]).

18 Kenneth Boulding, "Spaceship earth: The economics of the spaceship earth," in *Environmental Quality in a Growing World*, ed. Henry Jarrett (New York: Resources for the Future, 1966), 3-14.

Policymakers who wish to regulate the behavior of economic agents (consumers as well as producers) towards a more environmentally-tuned economy rather hastily jump to the conclusion that this can *only* be achieved through designing market and market-like mechanisms or through direct state involvement in accordance with the market logic so as to provide the right signal to agents in their relationship with the environment. This, in turn, necessitates the monetization of the environment, that is to say the commodification of nature (including pollution-generating activities), either explicitly or implicitly. And at a different level, monetization implies that the environment perfectly substitutes for money.

Despite the neoliberal hegemony on the environment, alternative approaches both at theoretical and practical levels have been advocating global justice and ecological salvation, promoting local practices in cultivating non-exploitative and non-extractive economies of cooperation (as in the example of fishers of a village who may cooperatively agree on the maximum fish caught so as not to overuse the fish population), developing policy suggestions based on the critique of monetary reductionism (as in the example of applying a multi-criteria technique, assessing the pluses and minuses of a project on a set of dimensions), and above all resisting economization of the realm of the environment.[19]

19 Begüm Özkaynak, Fikret Adaman, and Pat Devine, "The identity of ecological economics: retrospects and prospects," *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 36, no. 5 (2012): 1123-1142.

CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVES

CULTURAL PLURALITY AND RADICAL COSMOPOLITANISM

Feyzi Baban

Right-wing populist movements and political parties have been growing in popularity in Europe and elsewhere, putting post-war liberal democratic order to the test with their demands for closed borders, hostility towards migrants and refugees, and calls for cultural authenticity. Far-right parties, once relegated to the political margins, have now moved towards the center of the political mainstream, where they are having an impact on the policy decisions of their respective governments either as governing partners or effective oppositional forces. The Golden Dawn in Greece, the Front National in France, the Fidezs Party in Hungary, the National Democratic Party in Germany, the Freedom Party in Austria, the Danish People's Party in Denmark, the Northern League in Italy, and the British National Party in the UK are just a few examples that illustrate that far-right populist parties are gaining momentum in almost all European countries. All of these populist parties and movements share certain common characteristics: recreating a romanticized national past that is isolated from cultural exchange; refusing to accept cultural plurality as a condition of late modern societies; and demonstrating hostility towards and fear of others with different cultural, religious, and ethnic backgrounds. The refusal of far-right groups to embrace cultural plurality is increasingly at odds with the realities of many European countries that are increasingly culturally, ethnically, and religiously diverse. If returning to the past when it was once possible to imagine national identity as homogeneous is no longer possible, what would be the alternative way to respond to this romantic view of national social cohesion presented by the far right?

Two alternative visions of living together, namely assimilation and multiculturalism, have been intensely debated, and several European countries have implemented various forms of policies based on these visions.[20] Both of these visions have serious shortcomings: assimilation asks newcomers to shed their cultural, ethnic, and religious belonging in order to fully transform themselves into the image of their adopted country; multiculturalism, in contrast, acknowledges individuals' unique belonging as members of different groups but yet fails to problematize how these different groups intersect with one another and the mainstream culture through various forms of power and hierarchy.[21] While assimilation ignores the unique differences of each individual and their right to enjoy their specific group rights, multiculturalism fails to acknowledge that recognizing difference does not necessarily lead to a just and cohesive society in which individuals and groups have loyalties beyond their cultural, ethnic, and religious groups.

The governing complex and multiethnic and multicultural societies of late modernity require that we take an alternative approach to diversity, one that recognizes group rights without turning group identities into isolated identities that are fundamentally separated from each other. The crucial and pressing question is under what circumstances local populations share common bonds of living together with newcomers. Is it, in fact, possible to develop solidarities within the same polity among

20 Feyzi Baban and Kim Rygiel, "Snapshots from the Margins: Transgressive Cosmopolitanisms in Europe," *European Journal of Social Theory* 17 (November 2014): 461-478.

21 Ibid.

people who belong to different cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds? What forms of solidarity bind people together beyond their specific identities? Cosmopolitans, since the time of the Stoics, have tried to answer this question by indicating that what binds us is our common humanity, while our particular group belonging, whether cultural, religious, or ethnic, is what separates and divides us.[22] Cosmopolitans believed that in order to overcome our particular sense of belonging, we needed to discover our common humanity. In other words, traditional cosmopolitans thought that it was not possible to remain true to our particular identities while also identifying with others through a notion of common humanity. Traditional cosmopolitanism's skepticism about particularity and its insistence that we should eliminate it in favor of finding that which lay in common between all peoples resulted in many historical wrongdoings such as the colonial burden of civilizing "the natives" and modern nationalisms' attempt to create a single national identity from historically diverse populations.[23] This is why many remain skeptical about cosmopolitanism's proposition that we are all one, which always contains the potential for eliminating particularity in the quest for finding universal reference points.[24]

One may argue that demands in European countries for newcomers to fully assimilate into existing national identities is another example of such a false universality, which would inevitably lead to denying the particular group identities of newcomers. For instance, many in France and Germany believe that if only North Africans and Turks would fully assimilate into the national identities of their host nations, the current social problems would disappear. If traditional cosmopolitanism has such a problematic relationship with difference, then why insist on utilizing it as an alternative to multiculturalism and assimilation? Notwithstanding its shortcomings, cosmopolitan thinking is built on the assumption of the relationality of human beings as a basic characteristic of the human condition. Simply put, living together is the relationality of human beings or the ability to connect with others, a relationality that sometimes leads to solidarity and at other times exclusion of others. This relationality is a basic principle of the human condition and the basis upon which negotiations around difference become possible. Herein lies the cosmopolitan ideal's radical potential. While traditional forms of cosmopolitanism may no longer be relevant to late modern societies, radical cosmopolitanism is very much in tune with pluralistic societies of late modernity. Radical cosmopolitanism begins with the acceptance of difference as the fundamental human condition and as a concept must be constructed from the margins of societies.[25] The idea of accepting difference as a fundamental principle of the human condition is a necessary first step towards bringing about a radical cosmopolitanism that will not repeat the problems of past forms of cosmopolitanism, which sought the erasure of difference instead. In this radical reworking, the cosmopolitan ideal starts with the idea of accepting difference as part of the process of finding our common humanity. In other words, radical cosmopolitanism recognizes that

22 Martha Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," in *For Love of Country*, ed. J. Cohen, 3-21 (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996).

23 Feyzi Baban, "Living With Difference: Cosmopolitanism, Modernity and Political Community," *Studies in Political Economy* 77 (2006): 107-129.

24 Ulrich Beck, "The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies," *Theory, Culture & Society* 19, no. 1-2 (2002): 17-44; Pheng Cheah, *Inhuman Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006); Gerard Delanty, *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Critical Social Theory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Loren B. Landau and Irian Freemantle, "Tactical Cosmopolitanism and Idioms of Belonging: Insertion and Self-Exclusion in Johannesburg," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, no. 5 (2010): 375-390; Peters Nyers, "Abject Cosmopolitanism: The Politics of Protection in the Anti-deportation Movement," *Third World Quarterly* 24, no. 6 (2003): 1069-1093; Pnina Werbner, *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism: Rooted, Feminist and Vernacular Perspectives* (New York: Berg, 2008); Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006).

25 Baban and Rygiel, "Snapshots."

finding universality within our common humanity can only be achieved by acknowledging the reality of the plurality of human experiences. Rethinking the cosmopolitan ideal from the margins of societies enables us to find our common humanity by incorporating the experiences of those who are marginalized and excluded and through negotiating differences rather than seeking to eliminate them. Radical cosmopolitanism begins by recognizing the differences between people. Rather than trying to homogenize this diversity, it seeks to find common humanity through processes of negotiating differences as a basis on which to build new solidarities and find new social resolutions. Such an approach could avoid the problematic homogenizing tendencies of both assimilation and multiculturalism and provide a true and timely emancipatory alternative to the exclusionary forms of populism we see emerging in different parts of the world.

THE RISE OF INTOLERANCE? BREXIT AND THE PROBLEM WITH STASIS

Helen F. Wilson

On June 23, 2016, the UK voted to leave the EU. The outcome sent shockwaves through British politics and saw the Prime Minister, David Cameron, resign from his post.

There has been ongoing discussion about the circumstances behind the vote, much of which has little to do with the European Union but rather the breakdown of various forms of social relations and the inequities of resource distribution.[26] Regardless of the reasons, the vote to leave has (re)animated and redrawn relations of power, giving rise to new forms of collective and bodily life, forms of anticipation, and shared banalities that have presented new challenges for "living together."[27]

In taking up the conference focus on *living together in troubled times*, it is pertinent to ask: in the wake of Brexit, how do we imagine a commons that refuses to take the sovereign "fantasy" as the primary site for flourishing? How do we imagine a commons that, in Berlant's words, "refuses to intensify possessive attachments?"[28] These are not insignificant questions. Since the referendum, the media has been awash with reports of hate crime, calls for tougher immigration, EU nationals concerned about their status, family disputes, a spike in applications for dual citizenships, and repeated references to a divided country—to the division between remainers and leavers.

In this short piece, I want to focus on "tolerance" as a value that is routinely considered essential to a flourishing commons.[29] A focus on tolerance in the context of living in troubled times is pertinent, for, in the aftermath of the referendum, tolerance has regularly been held up as an antidote to the hate crime, violent attacks, and racist abuse that have been on the rise in the UK. In the wake of the decision to leave the EU, we have seen an emboldened toxicity. A negative leave campaign that was fought largely on issues of immigration has seemingly given racism and anti-immigrant sentiment legitimacy. Immigrants and non-white British citizens have been confronted with cries of "Go home! We voted you out" and calls for the start of repatriations. As Khalili has argued,[30] the leave result has highlighted just how thin the "veneer of civility" is and how easily it "can be peeled back to reveal the virulence of racism and xenophobia seething under the skin of British life."

In this context, I will argue that a return to tolerance will not provide the conditions out of which something more positive will emerge. Indeed, I argue that if the rise in hate crime is evidence of an infrastructure that has collapsed, a return to tolerance might be understood as no more than a temporary repair—a patch—that does little to address the cause of the collapse in the first instance. It is, I suggest, the erasure of the symptom but not the erasure of the problem.

26 Veit Bachmann and James D. Sidaway, "Brexit geopolitics," *Geoforum* 77 (2016): 47-50; Danny Dorling, "Brexit: the decision of a divided country," *BMJ* (2016): 354, doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i3697.

27 B. Anderson and H. Wilson, "(Post)Brexit Futures," (forthcoming).

28 Lauren Berlant, "The commons: Infrastructures for troubling times," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34, no. 3 (2016): 394.

29 Helen F. Wilson, "Brexit: On the rise of 'intolerance'," *Society and Space*, November 21, 2016, http://societyandspace.org/essays/.

30 Laleh Khalili, "After Brexit: Reckoning with Britain's Racism and Xenophobia," in *The Brexit Crisis: A Verso Report* (London: Verso, 2016), 30.

I make three points herein. First, it is important to challenge the notion that what we are witnessing is somehow exceptional. Second, a return to debates on tolerance—and its negative conditions—is important. Third, we need to rethink the possibilities of tolerance if we are to refashion ways of living together.

Shock

Whilst the scale and potency of recorded hate crime has been notable, these events have not occurred in a vacuum nor are they entirely new. Politicians and media outlets have been guilty of irresponsible campaigning, fear mongering, and years of hostile policies and stories that have legitimized intolerance without concern for the consequences. Indeed, as the recent report by the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) suggests, prominent political figures and politicians have not only failed to condemn racist and anti-immigrant rhetoric but have also "created and entrenched prejudices."[31] Thus, as anti-racist scholars have argued, the rhetoric of shock and outrage at the "unprecedented" nature of the recent spikes in racist and xenophobic hate can have the effect of wrongly recasting racism as somehow exceptional as linked only "to extraordinary events."[32] In accounts of shock, both racial harassment and violence are presented as an anomaly rather than something that exists—and has always existed—at the heart of British life. Furthermore, describing racism and xenophobia as issues of intolerance automatically implies—and indeed implicitly accepts—that non-white British citizens and migrants should be the focus of tolerance in the first place. As Wendy Brown forcefully argued over a decade ago,[33] political discourses of tolerance not only stabilize inequality but also actively produce it by naming those that are to be tolerated.

Tolerance and Its Negative Potentials

Tolerance is a second-order virtue that responds to dislike, disdain, and disapproval.[34] Without negative feeling there is no need for tolerance. Yet for years, tolerance has been hailed as a core British value and source of pride, taught as a mandatory part of values education and presented as evidence of a nation at ease with diversity. Such uncritical celebration has concealed the negative credentials of tolerance and the unequal forms of power that work to privilege some whilst subordinating others. It is thus paramount to ask, if tolerance is nothing more than a withholding of violence or action in the face of something that is disliked, what happens when the justification for tolerance is no longer there?

The current situation, in which appeals for tolerance are made as a direct response to the open and violent expression of xenophobia and racism, presents a paradox. Whilst it is without doubt that tolerance would be welcome over violence, if we call for xenophobes and racists to be tolerant, their objection to migrants and ethnic minorities is not directly challenged. Rather, it is implicitly accepted. The focus on the figure of the racist also detracts from the structural conditions, media rhetoric, and government policies that have played a role in shaping, legitimating, and creating the very "intolerance" that politicians and the media have been so quick to denounce in the wake of the Brexit vote.

To frame racism as a form of "inter-personal violence" is to "ignore the power relations that maintain and legitimize racial hierarchy."[35] It is to

31 The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) Report 2016: 4.

32 Akwugo Emejulu, "On the hideous whiteness of Brexit," Verso, June 28, 2016, accessed November 11, 2016, http://www.versobooks.com/blogs/2733-on-the-hideous-whiteness-of-brexit-let-us-be-honest-about-our-past-and-our-present-if-we-truly-seek-to-dismantle-white-supremacy.

33 Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

34 Ibid.

35 Emejulu, "On the hideous whiteness of Brexit."

ignore the austerity policies that have exacerbated inequality, the discourses of terror that have demonized communities, and the legacies of colonial violence and imperial governance upon which Britain is built.[36] It is to deny institutional racism[37] and to ignore how migrants have been blamed for economic dislocation, growing inequalities, rising unemployment, and a stretched social welfare system by those in positions of power.[38] To frame racism and xenophobia as matters of individual intolerance is to therefore depoliticize them. It is to absolve the government and the media of responsibility at a time when it is vital to question what made such hate possible in the first place.

The Value of Tolerance

So, what of the value of tolerance and how can it play a role in living together in times of crisis? The "suspension" that tolerance allows is key.[39] Critique, debate, and learning cannot take place until violence is suspended. Suspension, however, should be time sensitive. This period of suspension must be used constructively to target, discuss, and challenge the racism and xenophobia that made it necessary to call for tolerance in the first place.

Tolerance, then, is not an ideal solution but rather a temporary condition in circumstances where time is needed to address and dismantle the causes of hate. When a "simultaneous readiness" to move to respect or acceptance is unrealistic,[40] tolerance is valuable—but only ever as a temporary measure. As Schirmer et al. argue, "whilst tolerance might be a required minimum of social interaction, stagnancy on that level involves a life without dignity."[41] For too long, political discourses of tolerance have actively facilitated such stagnancy. When tolerance is necessary, its negative potentials have to be kept in sight, and the suspension that tolerance affords has to be used constructively. Only then will tolerance hold political potential as a way of allowing alternative forms of being in common to emerge.

We should therefore resist the urge to go back to the way things were—to go back to tolerance, or put the genie back in the bottle, as some commentators have suggested. Rather than asking how we might hide racism and xenophobia from the view of those who are privileged enough to ignore it, we should be asking how we address it head on.

Summary

It has been said that the vote to leave the EU has "ruptured" British life. Whilst I have focused on the place of tolerance in the context of xenophobia, infrastructural collapse of this kind can also offer a rare opportunity to rethink institutionalized images and idealizations of shared life. New forms of embryonic solidarity have offered alternatives to the regressive policies that are emerging in the wake of the Brexit vote and in the face of an increasingly hostile media. Pride in identities that stretch across multiple borders, the reclaiming of "migrant" as a positive attribute, and the development of educational resources that celebrate the UK's migrant history are all part of an effort to rethink the nation's past and to recognize migration as a fundamental part of the nation's story. As part of this work, we need to question what British values are and whether tolerance is really what we need.

36 Arun Kundnani, *The Muslims are coming!: Islamophobia, extremism, and the domestic war on terror* (London: Verso Books, 2014).

37 Sarah Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012).

38 Khalili, "After Brexit: Reckoning with Britain's."

39 Helen F. Wilson, "The possibilities of tolerance: intercultural dialogue in a multicultural Europe," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32, no. 5 (2014): 852-868.

40 Wendy Brown and Rainer Forst, *The Power of Tolerance: A Debate*, ed. Luca Di Blasi and Christoph F. E. Holzhey (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 95.

41 Werner Schirmer, Linda Weidenstedt, and Wendein Reich, "From tolerance to respect in inter-ethnic contexts," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 (2012): 1052.

ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF ORGANIZATION AND PRACTICES OF COEXISTENCE

CONTENTIOUS POLITICS IN A WARMER WORLD: SOME THOUGHTS ON THE RADICAL POTENTIAL OF CLIMATE JUSTICE FOR TURKEY

Ethemcan Turhan

Despite 25 years with the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) spending immense time, money, and effort, the planet is still heading towards a considerably warmer future. With the entry of the Paris Agreement into force, the global policy momentum is building rapidly towards a low-carbon transition. Yet, voluntary mitigation pledges such as NDCs (Nationally Determined Contributions) do not amount to avoiding extremely severe human and non-human consequences. At a moment when international politics falls short of preventing a climate-challenged world, an alternative vision on climate change action is thriving outside the walls of formal negotiations. In an attempt to understand this contestation between the state and non-state actors and their competing framings, this contribution focuses on diversifying and competing framings of climate justice. In its broadest sense, climate justice refers to taking justice seriously in terms of inter- and intra-generational distribution, procedures, rights, and compensation for loss and damage. These dimensions, however, are often perceived differently across a wide range of proponents including national institutions in the global South, academics, elite NGO groups, and grassroots organizations. Here I briefly review different framings of climate justice and reflect on its relevance for the environmental social movements and radical environmental politics in Turkey. This will also help us to identify the changing strategies deployed by the incipient global climate justice movement and its interaction with local actors in Turkey. A fair, equitable, and realistic climate action to stay within the planetary boundaries, I argue, cannot engage with the demands, framings, and values of climate justice actors across scales.

Multiple Meanings of Climate Justice

> "The idea that developing countries like India and China must share the blame for heating up the earth and destabilising its climate (...) is an excellent example of environmental colonialism."[42]

The appearance of the term "Climate Justice" in the mass media and its wider use in international climate change negotiations is relatively recent. Now engraved in the COP21 Paris Agreement's non-binding preamble with the clause "recognizing the importance for some of the concept of climate justice," the term seemed to gain more visibility as the climate change debate itself increasingly received attention from the general public. However the first emergence of the concept on the world stage was on December 12, 2009 during the global day of action where 100,000 protesters flooded the streets of Copenhagen, some of them to be detained and kept in the freezing cold under the state of emergency laws enacted in Denmark during the climate summit.[43] COP15 protests that day were full of banners such as "Climate justice now"; "Demand climate justice";

42 Anil Agarwal and Sunita Narain, *Global Warming in an Unequal World: A Case of Environmental Colonialism* (New Delhi: Centre for Science and Environment, 1991).

43 Paul Chatterton, David Featherstone, and Paul Routledge, "Articulating climate justice in Copenhagen: antagonism, the commons, and solidarity," *Antipode* 45, no. 3 (2013): 602-620.

"There is no planet B"; "Change the politics not the climate"; "Nature doesn't compromise"; and the infamous "System change not climate change." While different articulations exist, as I will revisit shortly, climate justice has its roots in the very source of the problem: Who caused the climate crisis, who will suffer from it and how, who may be set to benefit from it? As in any other environmental injustice, climate change results in unequal outcomes both regarding who will suffer most due to the effects and who has created the problem, who is expected to act, and who has the resources to do so.[44] Climate justice, as such, begins with an acknowledgement of climate injustice and views this problem not as an unfortunate byproduct of climate disruption but as one of its core elements, and one that must be confronted if climate disruption is to be reversed.[45]

Earlier accounts on the mainstreaming of justice in the climate debate, such as in the work of Roberts and Parks, suggest that there is a triple inequality in the climate change debates: acknowledging responsibility, reducing vulnerability, and ensuring mitigation to prevent intergenerational injustice.[46] This earlier formulation was mainly based on North-South relations, historical responsibilities, common but differentiated responsibilities (UNFCCC Article 3.1), and intergenerational justice in climate change, a matter that sits at the heart of the 20+ years of negotiations. However, as the climate crisis escalated with aggravated impacts in the past two decades, newer notions of loss and damage[47] and justice in adaptation[48] also appeared as key challenges for a justice-centric approach to climate change.

Broadly speaking, three approaches to climate justice can be identified as academic, elite NGO, and grassroots understandings.[49] In its earlier accounts, climate justice referred to a North-South division on the axis of development (as the quote above suggests) with the rich countries using up global atmospheric space to arrest the development ambitions of developing countries, justifying it as environmental protection and hence leading to neo-colonialism.[50] This framing, with its roots not only in environmental justice but also in the post-colonial tradition, can most typically be found in the demand for historical responsibility, reparations for the damage caused ("climate debt"), per-capita equity, and rights-based approaches of developing country positions.[51] The second approach is championed by elite NGOs in tandem with some of the governments of the global South.[52] In this approach (similar to the first one but now driven mainly by non-state actors), the emphasis is also on the right to development, right to industrialization, and an unquestioned commitment to market-based solutions, which is considered to be an advantageous deal for the climate finance receiving countries. Rather than critiquing the functioning of the global economy, this type of framing reduces climate justice to a matter of access and allocation in the first place. A

44 Agyeman et al., "Trends and Directions in Environmental Justice: From Inequity to Everyday Life, Community, and Just Sustainabilities," *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 41, no. 1 (2016): 321.

45 David Naguib Pellow, "Climate Disruption in the Global South and in African American Communities: Key Issues, Frameworks, and Possibilities for Climate Justice," Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies White Paper, 2010, http://jointcenter.org/sites/default/files/White_Paper_Climate_Disruption_final.pdf; Dale Jamieson, "Two Cheers for Climate Justice," *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 82, no. 3 (2015): 791-809.

46 J. Timmons Roberts and Bradley C. Parks, *A Climate of Injustice: Global Inequality, North-South Politics, and Climate Policy* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006).

47 Ivo Wallimann-Helmer, "Justice for climate loss and damage," *Climatic Change* 133, no. 3 (2015): 469-480.

48 Neil Adger et al., *Fairness in adaptation to climate change* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006).

49 David Schlosberg and Lisette B. Collins, "From environmental to climate justice: climate change and the discourse of environmental justice," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 5, no. 3 (2014): 359-374.

50 Agarwal and Narain, *Global Warming in an Unequal World*.

51 Henry Shue, *Climate Justice: Vulnerability and Protection* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

52 Schlosberg and Collins, "From environmental to climate justice."

typical example of an organization that advocates this approach is the Mary Robinson Foundation for Climate Justice, led by the charismatic former president of Ireland Mary Robinson. While being a champion of climate and gender issues, Mary Robinson's one-sided framing of climate justice in UN talks—ridden with corporate influence and carbon market enthusiasts—is also open for debate.

Yet, both of these framings are at best deceptive if not fully betraying the idea of climate justice according to the third and the most radical grassroots framing of climate justice. Stemming not from government bodies or elite NGOs, which seek to sustain their relevance in the global governance but are uncompromising with social movements, this approach utilizes climate justice as a political arsenal that connects various social justice struggles. In this regard, this latter framing of climate justice not only critiques the global economic-political power constellation but also market-based solutions, techno-fixes, exclusionary political processes, and state-centric approaches. In doing that, it also embraces gender equality, migrant rights struggles, rights of non-human nature, and *buen vivir*[53] as counter-hegemonic narratives. Between the first two reformist approaches and the latter radical politics of climate justice takes place what Docena[54] calls "a global battle for hearts and souls." Naomi Klein (2014) similarly underlines that "the right is right," referring to the well-placed fears of right-wing conservatives that addressing climate change will indeed require addressing gross economic inequalities. In this sense, reformist appropriation of climate justice as a tamable concept to fit into the global governance talk serves in essence to strip the radical implications of climate justice towards an overhaul of the global economic system and helps to restrain the anger built in pockets of the global South. A critique of annual climate summits under UNFCCC and the corresponding rise of temporary, mainstream attention on and appropriation of climate justice is but one dimension of the global battle for hearts and souls. For example, exposing the micro-geographies of the "summit theater,"[55] Weisser and Müller-Mahn[56] argue that a fixation on "the post-democratic delegate [as someone] who fantasizes about COP as a remedy for climate predicament" is highly problematic. These authors argue that rather than touching the political Achilles' heel of climate change, UNFCCC talks rather offer *the stage* for high politics, *the backroom* for undemocratic deal making and breaking, and *the tradefair* where global corporate power is exhibited in its most benign version with little to no room for alternative voices and dissent. The radical approach to climate justice, as Bullard and Müller narrate it, aims to go beyond the inside/outside[57] world of states, corporations, and elite NGOs and seeks to build alternatives by, for, and with social movements from the bottom up.[58]

53 *Buen vivir* refers to an indigeneous worldview synonymous with alternatives to development, which refers to good life beyond developmentalism in a broad sense. The term is frequently used by social movements, and it has been popularized by appearing in Ecuadorian and Bolivian constitutions. See also Eduardo Gudynas, "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow," *Development* 54, no. 4 (2011): 441-447.

54 Herbert Docena, "To Change the Heart and Soul: How Elites Contained the Climate Justice Movement," *The Bullet,* no. 1210 (2016), http://www.socialistproject.ca/bullet/1210.php.

55 Carl Death, "Summit theatre: exemplary governmentality and environmental diplomacy in Johannesburg and Copenhagen," *Environmental Politics* 20, no. 1 (2011): 1-19.

56 F. Weisser and D. Müller-Mahn, "No Place for the Political: Micro-Geographies of the Paris Climate Conference 2015," *Antipode* (2016), DOI: 10.1111/anti.12290.

57 Inside/outside world of UNFCCC here refers to the discrepancy between highly-controlled NGO activism and lobbying inside the formal accreditation-requiring UN-controlled Blue Zone (formal summit) and alternative summits and protests held outside the UN-controlled zone. See also: Phillip Bedall and Christoph Görg, "The climate justice coalition viewed in light of a theory of societal relationships with nature," in *Routledge Handbook of the Climate Change Movement*, ed. Matthias Dietz and Heiko Garrelts (London/New York: Routledge, 2014).

58 Nicola Bullard and Tadzio Müller, "Beyond the 'Green Economy': System change, not climate change?" *Development* 55, no. 1 (2012): 54-62.

What is the Promise of Climate Justice for Turkey?

The emergence of a climate justice movement (or climate justice movements, plural) in Turkey is a relatively recent phenomenon, if even that. Unlike post-colonial developing countries where social movements took on the climate justice debate early on and merged it with historical inequity concerns, the evolution of such movements in Turkey has largely been driven both by the debates in the international agenda as well as particular vanguard ecological struggles, which helped to set the tone of the climate justice argument. In essence, these grassroots struggles identify and operationalize climate justice insofar as it indicates "a system in which 'the people' decide on important questions such as what sources of energy to use and what activities to power and for whose benefit, how many trees to fell and to produce what goods for whom or, more generally, how to organize our relationship to nature and in pursuit of what ends."[59] Particularly, the popular opposition against coal and hydropower in Turkey in recent years seems apt to take the ownership of such important questions and link up with the global climate justice movement.

In these post-democratic times in which authoritarian developmentalism is on the rise globally, climate justice in Turkey may mean more than what meets the eye. Possessing the potential of linking multiple social justice struggles across the board—from a critique of unchecked international aid for neo-colonial projects to addressing uneven geographic development domestically—climate justice can prove instrumental both for engaged scholars and activists.[60] This will nonetheless require a better understanding of the historical conditions that gave rise to the current injustices and a better focus on the politics of environmental change in Turkey (including but not limited to those perpetrated by energy, mining, mega infrastructure, urban transformation, and agricultural projects). A careful appropriation of the concept of climate justice in the hands of its rightful owners to challenge the political-economic status quo can both provide bridges to global matters as well as address the woes of development itself. Lohmann observes that climate justice is often assumed to be all about re-energizing or reforming development and investment in the global South to steer towards a low-carbon direction, harnessing the potential of carefully constructed green markets, or making climate finance flow from North to South.[61] However, less discussed are the lessons gained from more than a half-century's popular and institutional experience of *what development actually does*.[62] No climate justice movement, not even one with state of the art public relations tools or funding available to them in different forms,[63] can evade this question if they seek transformative change on climate change. Despite being incoherent and incomplete, the rising tide of Turkey's climate justice movement is a good place to start seeking answers to such uneasy questions.

59 Docena, "To Change the Heart and Soul."

60 Ethemcan Turhan, "Right Here, Right Now: A Call for Engaged Scholarship on Climate Justice in Turkey," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 56, Spring 2017 (forthcoming).

61 Larry Lohmann, "Carbon trading, climate justice and the production of ignorance: ten examples," *Development* 51, no. 3 (2008): 359-365.

62 Ibid.

63 See also S.K. Orr, "Institutional Control and Climate Change Activism at COP 21 in Paris," *Global Environmental Politics* 16, no. 3 (August 2016): 23-30.

LOCAL COMMONS, COSMOPOLITAN SOLIDARITIES AND CLIMATE JUSTICE NETWORKS

Hande Paker

The discussion on cosmopolitan solidarities is timelier than ever. Given the rise of populist policies that push for polarization and the dichotomization of our social and political imaginaries into "us vs. Others," deliberation that focuses on cross-border encounters is inevitable in forging alternative politics. This piece situates the discussion within ecological politics and argues that the solidarities created around environmental issues and more specifically climate change carry crucial implications for building a common ground that can transcend the rigid categories that the populist zeitgeist imposes on participatory and inclusive political alternatives.

Cosmopolitanism as a theoretical framework and political project has long emphasized the recognition of the Other as a precondition for dealing with the question of how to integrate diversity into a common public sphere. The challenge of constructing a common sphere of political action without preempting pluralism can be met with promoting what cosmopolitanism labels "thin values"—loose, cross-cutting sources of belonging.

Thin values, however, may just be that: too thin to evoke the kind of commitment that particularistic attachments to ethnic, faith, or political conviction do. Cosmopolitanism has always had its fair share of critiques for offering a weak basis for political action and social integration—for not generating grounded stories. However, considerable work has been done to show that it is not an elite affair. Various crises—financial crisis, refugee crisis, and of course the ecological crisis—have forcefully pushed the reality of living with others in precarious conditions of economic and ecological instability, what Ulrich Beck has called the cosmopolitan imperative. Thus, researchers have analyzed how cosmopolitanism can be "from below," "embedded," "migrant," "contested," and "transgressive," all showing that the claims of cosmopolitanism such as openness to engaging with difference can be traced in the actual experiences and negotiations of individuals with diversity, with local or migrant backgrounds.[64] These studies confirm the existence of the cosmopolitan imperative rather than cosmopolitan elitism criticized as merely the "class consciousness of frequent travelers."[65] Cosmopolitan identities manifested in a willingness to cross cultural or political boundaries are often not situated in moral or ethical positions but arise out of strategies necessitated by market processes or political alliances that then transform through

64 T. Erskine, "'Citizen of nowhere' or 'the point where circles intersect'? Impartialist and embedded cosmopolitanisms," *Review of International Studies* 28 (2002): 457–478; Rachel V. Kutz-Flamenbaum and Brittany Duncan, "Contested cosmopolitanisms: global meetings and local mobilizations," *Sociological Forum* 30, no. 1 (2015): 188-208; Nora Fisher Onar and Hande Paker, "Towards Cosmopolitan Citizenship? Women's Rights in Divided Turkey," *Theory and Society*, 41 (2012): 375-394; Ulrich Beck, "The cosmopolitan society and its enemies," *Theory, Culture & Society* 19, no. 1–2 (2002): 17–44; Feyzi Baban and Kim Rygiel, "Snapshots from the Margins: Transgressive Cosmopolitanisms in Europe," *European Journal of Social Theory* 17 (November 2014): 461-478; Uma Kothari, "Global peddlers and local networks: migrant cosmopolitanisms," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26 (2008): 500-516.

65 Craig Calhoun, "The class consciousness of frequent travellers: toward a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101, no. 4 (2002): 869-897.

encounters into abstract norms.[66] Cosmopolitanism from below is politicized, as it is not so much about shedding (particularistic) attachments as it is about cherishing multiple belongings with which marginalized populations make demands to transform the prevalent imaginaries and offer alternatives.[67] In the case of refugees, it has to do with belonging to a common public sphere; in the case of ecological issues, it has to do with negotiating the commons.

In this political cosmopolitanism, negotiations are permeated by cross-border tensions as well as a willingness to engage with diversity, because thick attachments are part of the cosmopolitan identity. Crucially, political cosmopolitanism is shaped by and practiced through networks based on ethnic, national, and religious affiliations. Political cosmopolitanism recognizes that engaging with difference inevitably involves a process of solidarity building, negotiation, and contention without which alternative forms for organization of the commons and practices of co-existence cannot be constructed. Such alternatives come from cultivating a common ground with people with diverging and multiple commitments. That is why transgressive cosmopolitanism suggests thinking about common humanity from the perspective of the marginalized as well as local experiences.[68]

In this contribution, I propose to think about the interaction of two spatialities—the local/national and the transnational—to understand how local commons expand to incorporate solidarities created around cosmopolitan concerns such as climate change. I argue that the cosmopolitan idea of a common humanity can be substantiated by analyzing encounters and interactions that help build a common ground, which can only be read as an intersection of commonalities and contestations.

To that end, the piece draws attention to local-national-transnational networks emerging around climate justice in Turkey. They are highly pertinent in analyzing how cosmopolitanism is constructed from below in relation to the global commons. Climate change as a multilayered issue of global and massive scale as well as the frame of climate justice within which climate change can be made sense of are relatively novel concerns to the public in Turkey. In fact, it would not be pessimistic to say that climate change hardly finds room in a political agenda overcrowded with an attempted coup, an ongoing state of emergency since July 2016, refugee crisis, and most recently, a narrow referendum for regime change. Nevertheless, environmental conflicts have persisted since the beginning of the 2000s over a diverse range of issues regarding the construction of infrastructural megaprojects; hydroelectric, nuclear, and thermal power plants; mining; and urban renewal. Ecological destruction, the loss of livelihoods and "ways of living," and the environmental commons are at the forefront of these struggles.

More recently, climate change advocacy has gained momentum in Turkey in the context of transnational efforts that led to the signing of the Paris Agreement and local struggles that sprang up in opposition to the multiplying thermal power plants in support of the recent government policy centering on coal production. A striking element of climate mobilization in Turkey relevant to the discussion on political cosmopolitanism is the set of networks established among transnational, national, and local civil society. The platforms and channels available for participation in transnational environmental spheres have facilitated experience building, awareness raising, and campaigning among national environmental orga-

66 Kothari, "Global peddlers and local networks"; Fisher Onar and Paker, "Towards Cosmopolitan Citizenship?"

67 Kothari, "Global peddlers and local networks"; Baban and Rygiel, "Snapshots from the Margins."

68 Baban and Rygiel, "Snapshots from the Margins"; see Baban's chapter in this proceeding.

nizations that actively participated in the COP21 at which the Paris Agreement was signed and COP22 afterwards at which measures to implement the Agreement were negotiated. Platforms such as Climate Network and the Right to Clean Air have been especially important for connecting multiple but isolated local environmental struggles around Turkey. This means increased encounters not only between transnational, national, and local civil society organizations but also among disconnected local mobilizations with common goals. These encounters help create a common ground marked by both solidarities and contestations. A decisive instance of a translocal encounter made possible by increased networks is Breakfree 2016, which was a transnational protest event against fossil fuel use simultaneously organized in various locations around the world. The action in Aliağa, Turkey, was coordinated by representatives of transnational climate networks, national environmental organizations, and local movements.

Such networks are crucial because they facilitate the localization of climate action and the transnationalization of local commons. Both transnational processes (e.g., the organization of a campaign such as Breakfree) and the networking activity of national environmental organizations play an important role in connecting diverse local mobilizations, expanding local frames, and building capacity. The impact of transnational events such as the Paris Agreement or the globally mounting anti-coal wave in its immediate aftermath travels fast through these networks. The idea that the signing of the Agreement increases the legitimacy of anti-coal struggles is immediately recognized and owned at the grassroots. Links are made between the local impacts of environmentally hazardous energy and mega projects on communities' "living space" and climate change, renewable energy, energy justice, and the hegemony of developmentalism. Encounters enable deliberation and mutual transformation, albeit incrementally. However, these deliberations are shaped by cleavages that cut across the commons. Civil society actors diverge over questions on notions of justice, prioritization of the struggle, approaches to (renewable) energy uses, and alternative paths of development. Finally, deep political polarization in Turkey makes any political action taken to forge an alternative democratic common ground extremely challenging.

Cross-border solidarities, even if imbued with conflicts, are crucial if populist polarization and the process of "Othering" are to be replaced by inclusionary co-existence. Climate justice networks provide channels of participation in the negotiation of the commons and the possibility of coming together around cosmopolitan concerns such as climate protection. Through these channels, alternative practices of co-existence strengthen and multiply. Political cosmopolitanism, by explicitly upholding multiple encounters that undermine polarization while recognizing the contradictions of solidarity building, can provide an alternative with which populist politics can be resisted.

TRANSFORMATIVE POLITICS IN ENVIRONMENTAL STRUGGLES: COMPARING THE MINING CONFLICTS IN INTAG, ECUADOR, AND KAZ DAĞLARI, TURKEY

Duygu Avcı

In an era of intensifying encroachment of extractive industries into new territories and commodification of commons, struggles over the environment have increasingly become an important arena in which demands for the democratization of state-society relations are voiced, particularly as they pertain to the governance of the environment and achievement of more just and sustainable forms of development. In environmental struggles questions about access to and use of resources and the distribution of burdens of pollution are intertwined with broader issues around development, humans' relations to the environment, justice, and democracy.[69] These struggles are important analytically and politically precisely because they both reflect and bear upon those broader issues.

Many environmental struggles, particularly local ones, develop as resistance against specific projects, such as mining, thermal power plants, and dams. Local communities resist such projects principally to defend their livelihoods and ways of life from their actual or expected environmental impacts. Yet, as they mobilize, local actors need to (re)define their interests, values, and identities; link their concerns to broader political discourses to justify their position vis-à-vis the state and other relevant actors; and build alliances to garner support. The specific framing of particular local struggles in relation to the broader issues around development, environment, justice, and democracy is shaped in these processes and encounters. As such, environmental struggles provide possibilities for enacting transformative politics through which local actors can construct critical framings that challenge the dominant views that portray economic growth as indispensable for societal progress and prioritize it over social justice, democratic participation, ecological integrity, and sustainability. At the same time, they build alternative meanings that foster more egalitarian, just, and sustainable social and environmental relations.

In order to better understand how such transformative politics are enacted in environmental struggles, it is important to analyze the processes that enable or constrain the possibilities for the construction of critical framings and alternative meanings. Comparing different local environmental struggles can facilitate such an analysis. In this spirit, this essay offers a brief comparison between two struggles against large-scale mining projects in the Intag valley of Ecuador and Kaz Dağlari (Mount Ida) region of Turkey.[70]

69 Anthony Bebbington and Denise Humphreys Bebbington, "Actores y ambientalismos: conflictos socio-ambientales en Perú," *Iconos, Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 35 (2009): 117-128; Arturo Escobar, "Difference and Conflict in the Struggle Over Natural Resources: A Political Ecology Framework," *Development* 49 (2006): 6-13; Richard Peet and Michael Watts, *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004); Tom Perreault and Gabriela Valdivia, "Hydrocarbons, Popular Protest and National Imaginaries: Ecuador and Bolivia in Comparative Context," *Geoforum* 41 (2010): 689-699.

70 Duygu Avcı, "Mining conflicts and transformative politics: A comparison of Intag (Ecuador) and Mount Ida (Turkey) environmental struggles," *Geoforum* (2015), doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.07.013.

Alternative Development and Rights-based Discourses vs. Particularistic Defense of Place

Since the 1990s, mining extraction has expanded into new territories around the world, and many developing countries have liberalized the mining sector to attract foreign direct investment.[71] Although Ecuador and Turkey were not among the primary targets in the geographical expansion of mining, both attracted new mining investments that engendered local conflicts, two of which are Intag and Kaz Dağlari.

In both Intag and Kaz Dağlari, part of the rural population, civil society actors, and local governments have mobilized to stop the proposed mining projects. In both places, the rural communities' resistance has principally been based on their concerns over the impacts of these projects on their livelihoods, ways of life, and local environments. Hence, inequalities in the distribution of the costs and benefits of mining have been at the center of both conflicts. However, while contesting these inequalities, the peasants in Intag and Kaz Dağlari have articulated rather different understandings. The peasants in Intag condemned these inequalities as a violation of their rights to a dignified life, asked to be respected as equal citizens, and aimed to collectively build an alternative future for their territory; meanwhile, the peasants in Kaz Dağlari were principally concerned about defending their immediate material interests.

In Intag, the anti-mining resistance catalyzed a long-term process of collective reflection and action around alternative local development. The peasants and the local civil society organizations joined hands to develop sustainable economic activities such as organic coffee production, community-based ecotourism, and women's handicraft production as practical alternatives to mining. At the same time, in the canton of Cotacachi, to which Intag belongs, an indigenous politician, supported by the local peasant-indigenous movement as well as the national indigenous movement in Ecuador, came to power. The mayor, Auki Tituaña, initiated a process to build a participatory local governance model at the municipal level to promote territorial development and democratic territorial governance, central aims of the indigenous movement in Ecuador. Both processes promoted grassroots organizing and created political spaces for collective decision-making. Moreover, civil society and local government actors pursued environmental and rights education to raise consciousness over environmental issues and empower the local communities to claim their rights. Additionally, several conservation initiatives, such as community forest reserves and community watershed protection projects, have been carried out, strengthening the importance of the environment in the vision of alternative local development being implemented. In this context, the opposition to mining in Intag has been framed as a struggle to build an alternative model of local development based on self-organization and promotion of economic activities that improve the well-being of communities while protecting the environment, as well as a struggle to assert the communities' right to decide on and collectively construct the future of their lives and territories.

In Kaz Dağlari, a broad-based alliance between peasants, diverse civil society actors, and local governments has been built to stop the mining projects. The basis of this alliance has been the defense of "the local," i.e., the protection of the particular qualities of the region—the existing economic activities, its environmental and cultural values, and the quality of life it offers—against mining. However, the relations between the peasants, on the one hand, and the civil society and local government actors, on the other, have remained rather distant,

71 Gavin Bridge, "Mapping the Bonanza: Geographies of Mining Investment in an Era of Neoliberal Reform," *The Professional Geographer* 56 (2004): 406-421.

hierarchical, and focused almost solely on stopping the mining projects. The solidarities established, therefore, have brought together fixed interests rather than leading to the negotiation of different collective identities and deliberations over the future of the region. As a result, the peasants' opposition to mining has mostly been confined to a particularistic defense of their own interests. To justify positions and refute the arguments of the state and the mining companies that gold mining is beneficial for the development of the country, they have argued that the value generated by the existing economic activities in the region is higher than the expected value of the gold to be extracted.

The differences between the understandings that the peasants in Intag and Kaz Dağlari articulated can in part be related to the extent of the hegemony of the idea of development in Ecuadorian and Turkish societies. In Ecuador, the state has historically lacked the power to establish such a hegemony, which provided the space for social actors opposing mining in Intag to construct an alternative vision of development that prioritized social and environmental goals over economic prosperity. In contrast, the hegemonic discourses and practices of the state in Turkey have deeply engrained the primacy of economic development over social and environmental concerns in the social imagery. As they framed their struggle mostly in terms of a cost-benefit analysis—arguing that mining would harm the agricultural and tourism activities in the region while benefiting mining companies, hence, it would not contribute to Turkey's growth—the social actors in Kaz Dağlari could not transcend this developmentalist ideology.

The Intag experience demonstrates that elaborating and implementing an alternative vision of development and the construction of political spaces where the right to participate is actually exercised are crucial for local environmental struggles to go beyond defending a specific place and develop critical understandings that can foster more egalitarian, just, and sustainable social and environmental relations. On the contrary, focusing on the restricted aim of stopping specific projects and not articulating the resistance to a broader political project, as has been the case in Kaz Dağlari, curtail transformative politics. Local political action provides possibilities to mold new subjectivities around the ideals of collective well-being, justice, democracy, and sustainability. Realizing this potential, however, is contingent on actually practicing alternative forms of living, organizing, and decision-making.

ALTERNATIVE FOOD INITIATIVES IN TURKEY[72]

Zeynep Kadirbeyoğlu and Nazlı Konya

Alternative Food Initiatives (AFIs) search for alternative systems of production and exchange such that the contemporary globalized and corporatized food governance regime can be altered in the long run. Engendering agrifood systems that are "environmentally sustainable, economically viable and socially just"[73] is their main goal. There are different types of AFIs—such as urban/community garden projects,[74] farmers' markets,[75] consumer cooperatives, and community-supported agriculture[76]—that try to "reconnect farmers and consumers,"[77] create a broad alliance based on mutual aid and trust between growers and consumers,[78] redistribute the value extracted within the food system,[79] maintain the "integrity of ecosystems,"[80] "transform the oppressive trade relations and corporate control," and replace them "with socially embedded markets and democratic governance."[81] Using concepts such as form of life,[82] democratic governance, and resistance from within, we examine whether AFIs can generate alternatives to hegemonic neoliberal policies.

In Turkey, with the entrenchment of neoliberal policies such as the cutback on agricultural subsidies and support mechanisms in the 1990s, exclusion in food systems intensified. The increasing presence of agrifood corporations placed even more pressure on small peasant/family farms in a context where agricultural policy had long been taken out of the realm of politics in line with the Washington

72 This note is based on the following forthcoming book chapter: Zeynep Kadirbeyoglu and Nazlı Konya, "Alternative Food Initiatives in Turkey," in *Neoliberal Modernization and Economic Growth in Turkey: Environment, development and conflict,* eds. Fikret Adaman, Bengi Akbulut, and Murat Arsel (London: I.B. Tauris).

73 Patricia Allen, David Goodman, Harriet Friedman, and Douglas Warner, "Shifting plates in the agrifood landscape: The tectonics of alternative agrifood initiatives in California," *Journal of Rural Studies* 19 (2003): 61-75.

74 Jules Pretty, *The Living Land: Agriculture Food and Community Regeneration in Rural Europe* (London: Routledge, 1998); William B. Lacy, "Empowering Communities through Public Work, Science, and Local Food Systems: Revisiting Democracy and Globalization," *Rural Sociology* 65, no. 1 (2000): 3-26; Kate Clancy, "Reconnecting farmers and citizens in the food system," in *Visions of American Agriculture,* ed. W. Lockeretz (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1997); Laura DeLind, "Organic farming and social context: A challenge for us all," *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture* 9 (1994): 146-147.

75 Alison Hope Alkon and Teresa Marie Mares, "Food sovereignty in US food movements: Radical visions and neoliberal constraints," *Agriculture and Human Values* 29 (2012): 347-359; Robert Gottlieb, *Environmentalism Unbound: Exploring New Pathways for Change* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001); Julie Guthman, "Bringing good food to others: investigating the subjects of alternative food practice," *Cultural Geographies* 15 (2008): 431-447.

76 Jenny Cameron and Rhyall Gordon, "Building sustainable and ethical food futures through economic diversity: Options for a mid-sized city" (Paper presented at the Policy Workshop on The Future of Australia's Mid-Sized Cities, Latrobe University, Bendigo, VIC, September 28-29, 2010).

77 Charles Z. Levkoe, "Towards a transformative food politics," *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability* 16, no. 7 (2011): 687-705.

78 David Goodman and E. Melanie DuPuis, "Knowing food and growing food: Beyond the production–consumption debate in the sociology of agriculture," *Sociologia Ruralis* 42, no. 1 (2002): 5-22.

79 Pretty, *The Living Land.*

80 David Schlosberg, "Theorising environmental justice: The expanding sphere of a discourse," *Environmental Politics* 22, no. 1 (2013): 37-55.

81 Madeleine Fairbairn, "Framing transformation: The counter-hegemonic potential of food sovereignty in the US context," *Agriculture and Human Values* 29 (2012): 217-230.

82 For related theories, see Bonnie Honig, *Emergency Politics: Paradox, Law, Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2009); Giorgio Agamben, "What is a Destituent Power?" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32 (2014): 65-74.

Consensus, which stipulated that good economic policy does not interfere with market mechanisms. Furthermore, processes such as the unregulated use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers in agriculture and growth hormones in livestock and poultry production made it harder for consumers to access healthy and affordable food. Given this situation, the search for alternative agricultural practices began in the early 1990s in Turkey, but initially it was confined to a very small group. The number of groups and the volume of food exchanged have increased significantly over time. To evaluate whether AFIs do indeed constitute an alternative modality of life, we examined 55 food initiatives through web-based research.

We found that the initial catalysts for food collectives are generally individuals with prior experience in political and/or civil society activism. Well-educated, middle-class urbanites are at the origin of such food initiatives. These returnees usually mobilize farmers in villages surrounding their sites of production. In urban areas, these groups try to be as inclusive as possible in order to attract lower-income groups. AFIs attempt to organize all processes related to food production, from its monitoring, certification, and collection to the transmission and distribution of orders and consumption. Some collectives collect and transmit orders online, others engage in consumer-supported agriculture, and yet others organize producers' markets or have a shop where products are delivered and sold. Some collectives require organic certificates, whereas others do not since certification is commercialized, very expensive, and thus a burden on small farmers. The latter group usually resorts to participatory guarantee systems (PGS) where, with the help of experts and consumers, AFI members fill out forms detailing the production process so as to ensure that the products they receive are produced according to standards such as organic, traditional, or agroecological.

Our research shows that AFIs fulfill important roles: they open up new channels of food transaction by eliminating intermediaries between long-separated urban and rural dwellers, modify urban tastes to incorporate local crop varieties into their diets, conserve and promote heirloom and local seeds, and revive old, forgotten techniques of production to show these methods are viable and efficient in contrast to conventional means of production. Generating collective subjectivities is the key to AFI functioning. If consumers are only interested in accessing healthy food or engaging in individualized ethical behavior—such as consuming fair-trade or organic produce, then it is not possible to claim that these initiatives promote a new social fabric that constitutes an alternative to the one constructed upon market imperatives. However, this is not the case. *Ormanevi Kolektifi* (a producers' collective), BUKOOP (*Boğaziçi Mensupları Tüketim Kooperatifi*, Bogazici Members Consumers Cooperative), and DBB (*Doğal Besin, Bilinçli Beslenme* consumer collective), for example, aim to transform urban consumers into semi- or co-producers by compelling them to organize, engage in more direct relationships with farmers, gain awareness about the social and economic conditions brought about by the current food regime, and share responsibility concerning the livelihoods of small-scale farmers. The new modality of life mentioned here is based on a constant questioning of all the conditions and consequences relevant to the processes in which food arrives to the table from the farm. Furthermore, AFIs can be seen as spaces for democratic enactments that attempt to bring about alternative actualized practices as long as norms, ends, means, and processes are open to contestation by all members. BUKOOP, for instance, emphasizes consensus-based decision-making with a genuine investment in participatory deliberation. For sure, not all questions find consensual answers immediately, but members do not take action until they persuade one another.

There are also many challenges that AFIs face: maintaining the levels of voluntary work required to run a collective; conflicting motivations of different AFI members; and the size of the consumer group. AFIs are criticized because they remain "alternative" rather than "oppositional," since they do not challenge the current agrifood system explicitly but prefer to work incrementally within existing market structures. Here, incrementalism refers to the choice of not striving for national policy change, governmental entitlements, or any other macro-level institutional restructuring. Moreover, critics claim that the AFIs are limited in scope in terms of economic activity and emphasize the need to "scale up" and "scale out." However, unlike the homogenizing and totalizing inclinations of mainstream economic approaches, the operational logic of AFIs relies on the needs, demands, and experiences of the local populations within their respective environments and promotes diversification in terms of principles and priorities, legal status, or organizational structure.

Based on our findings, we argue that if AFIs can diversify and multiply in order to make a more significant impact, they can provide a viable alternative modality in Turkey. These initiatives are consciously attempting to create an alternative to the all-pervasive neoliberal model by enacting solidarity-based and participatory structures that are open to change.

CONTESTED NOTIONS OF COSMOPOLITANISM IN THE CONTEXT OF GENTRIFICATION

Defne Kadıoğlu

This intervention departs from the idea that there is an urgent need to repoliticize the cosmopolitan agenda, an idea voiced passionately by the participants of the "Cosmopolitanism Revisited" conference. To form the basis of this argument, I take cues from David Harvey's *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*[83] in which Harvey has compellingly argued that without an understanding of how people are embedded in places and how geographical inequalities are produced, cosmopolitanism will remain a problematic vision from the viewpoint of social justice. Gentrification is a case in point: While gentrifiers are frequently described as a "cosmopolitan class" with an affinity for heterogeneous city environments, the global and world cities of today are certainly not characterized by social equality. As I will briefly illustrate through a case study in an inner-city neighborhood in Berlin, gentrification can be seen as a result of selective discourses of market-oriented cosmopolitanism that fail to take into account the everyday practices of locals.

According to Stephan Lanz, the dominant narrative attached to Berlin since the turn of the century has been that of the "cosmopolitan-diversitarian metropolis."[84] The articulation of Berlin as a city of immigration and cultural diversity at that point was quite remarkable given the fact that the conservative-liberal mantra "Germany is not a country of immigration" was still dominating public opinion. Immigrants and their families were largely constructed as Others that were either a problem for social cohesion or seen as culturally enriching but still alien. This idea of Berlin as a cosmopolitan metropolis then was different from a simple acknowledgement of different cultures and lifestyles as part of the cityscape, but it conceptualized diversity as constitutive of the city itself. This discursive change after 2000, in which immigrants—rather than being viewed as cultural Others—were promoted as part of what makes Berlin attractive, was accompanied by political change. The Social Democratic-Green German government fought for a relaxation of the rigid blood-based citizenship law in 2000, partially opening the way for naturalization and dual citizenship: an important step, some would argue, towards a more cosmopolitan German society.

However, the idea of equality between different lifestyles and identities, as well as progress on legal equality, was accompanied by rising economic polarization. Since the end of the 1990s, the German welfare state has been progressively dismantled, accompanied by the *de facto* end of social housing, which has put inner-city neighborhoods under rent pressure. This is also the segment in which most immigrants have to compete. So, what happens when discourses of cosmopolitan living are coupled with deindustrialization, deregulation, and the commodification of housing?

83 David Harvey, *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.)

84 Stephan Lanz, *Berlin aufgemischt: Abendländisch, multikulturell, kosmopolitisch?: Die politische Konstruktion einer Einwanderungsstadt* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2007).

My fieldwork is based on a working-class neighborhood in inner-city Berlin located in the very north of the Neukölln borough. Similar to the better-known Kreuzberg to which Neukölln neighbors, the district is historically populated with working-class inhabitants from more than 160 nationalities. While Neukölln is still relatively poor, studies have revealed that particularly in the North demographics have shifted towards higher income and status residents. From 2008 until 2014, rents for apartments that were newly let increased by a share of 80 percent, rising above the Berlin average. While gentrification traveled from other districts of Berlin, especially Kreuzberg, to North Neukölln, the local government had a pronounced role in transforming the area's social composition: backed by national and EU funds, the gentrification process was accelerated by renting out vacant spaces to artists and other creative users, so-called "urban pioneers."[85]

In my research I encountered contradictory and competing visions of cosmopolitan lifestyles and diversity. Despite Berlin's self-marketing as a cosmopolitan hub, North Neukölln was not particularly conceptualized as a "cosmopolitan" district prior to the gentrification process that began in the mid-2000s but quite the contrary: particularly after reunification the borough was constructed as Germany's prime ghetto. The fact that the local government felt the need to intervene in North Neukölln by introducing new middle-class creative entrepreneurs to the neighborhood shows that Neukölln in its pre-gentrification state did not fit the vision of Berlin's self-branding as a cosmopolitan world city. Accordingly, landlords, gentrifiers, and third parties involved in the transformation of the area frequently voiced the previous lack of the right "social mix" given the alleged[86] dominance of Turkish and Arab immigrants. Only with the inflow of first-world immigrants and other middle-class residents, as well as tourists, was the district understood to be a place of "vibrant cosmopolitan diversity."[87] The dominant language spoken on the streets is no longer Turkish or Arabic—which used to be a huge concern in German society given that Neukölln was suspected of developing into a Muslim parallel society—but rather Spanish and English, which seem to be less of a concern.

Long-term immigrant residents, on the other hand, frequently have a different conception of pre-gentrified Neukölln, a conception that contradicts the former ghetto image of the district. Despite being vocal about the shortcomings of their neighborhood (which according to residents rather stem from insufficient public services, especially in the realm of education), many underlined the use value of Neukölln as a space in which they felt secure from racial harassment and found multiple opportunities to socialize with neighbors. Particularly, immigrant women typically appreciated Neukölln's central location given their limited mobility and higher dependence on spatial proximity. Moreover, there was a clear sense among residents that Neukölln was already a cosmopolitan space prior to the gentrification process, in which encounters and exchange between the 160 nationalities was part of daily life.

I would maintain that these competing notions of the past and current state of North Neukölln are also a result of different notions of what lived cosmopolitanism is. The cosmopolitanism envisioned by the city of Berlin, many newcomers, and part of civil society is one that should increase the neighborhoods' exchange value—it is a "market-oriented

85 The term "urban pioneers" in gentrification research is generally used to describe the first middle-class cohort that starts moving into an inner-city neighborhood and thereby signals to other members of the middle and upper class that the neighborhood is a viable place to live.

86 About half of North Neukölln residents are of immigrant descent.

87 Susanne Schreiber, "Neukölln: Vibrant cosmopolitan diversity," *Visit Berlin,* September 17, 2014, accessed September 2, 2016, http://blog.visitberlin.de/en/2419-neukoelln-vibrant-cosmopolitan-diversity.html.

cosmopolitanism."[88] In this case the idea of cosmopolitanism remains, as Harvey argues, relatively vague and detached from the material inequalities on the ground. Encounters with different cultures and realities are hence reduced to consumerism, while the actual use value created through everyday practices between diverse social groups in Berlin remains outside the cosmopolitan narrative attached to the city. Long-term residents in their accounts refer to these actual everyday practices in Neukölln that have been present long before the gentrification process. In that sense even when labeled as a ghetto, Neukölln, for its residents, had already been the site of "actually existing cosmopolitanism,"[89] as the late Ulrich Beck had argued. Unfortunately, market-oriented cosmopolitanism ignores these locally produced cosmopolitan practices and renders them invalid.

What would be a way forward? As Gary Bridge has argued, we need to divorce our understanding of cosmopolitanism from the idea of mobility and instead look for a cosmopolitan knowledge that does not defy social justice by learning from local practices of living with difference.[90] Berlin is an interesting example: on the one hand, the cosmopolitan city branding shows how discourses that have the potential to be empowering are depoliticized and instrumentalized for neoliberal urban policies such as gentrification. On the other, however, the German capital has always been and still is an extraordinary site for urban struggles. One could argue that these struggles are also fueled by the contradictions that market cosmopolitanism generates.

88 Mirjam Lewek, "Spaces of fear and their exclusionary consequences: narratives and everyday routines of sub-saharan immigrants in Berlin," in *Creating the unequal. The exclusionary consequences of everyday routines in Berlin,* ed. Talja Blokland et al. (London/New York: Routledge, 2016), 32.

89 Ulrich Beck, "Toward a new critical theory with a cosmopolitan intent," *Constellations* 10, no. 4 (2003): 453-468.

90 Gary Bridge, "The paradox of cosmopolitan urbanism: rationality, difference and the circuits of cultural capital," in *Cosmopolitan Urbanism,* ed. Jon Binnier et al. (London/New York: Routledge, 2006), 68.

IPC | ISTANBUL POLICY CENTER
SABANCI UNIVERSITY
STIFTUNG MERCATOR INITIATIVE

ISBN: 978-605-9178-97-6

Istanbul Policy Center
Bankalar Caddesi No: 2 Minerva Han
34420 Karaköy, İstanbul TURKEY

+90 212 292 49 39
+90 212 292 49 57
@ ipc@sabanciuniv.edu
w ipc.sabanciuniv.edu