"Negotiating the Borders of Humanity: Street Animals in Turkey and the Biopolitics of Community and Immunity"

By Bengisu Gülşen Koşarhan

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Gender Studies

Supervisor: Dr. Hyaesin Yoon

Second Reader: Dr. Julia Sachseder

Vienna, Austria

2024

Abstract

This thesis explores the biopolitics of street animals within both Western and Turkish contexts, focusing on how these animals have been historically and contemporarily governed, and how they reflect broader socio-political dynamics. Through the lens of Roberto Esposito's theoretical framework, particularly his concepts of community, immunity, and biopolitics, the study investigates the transformation of communal relationships between humans and street animals. It delves into the emergence of biopolitical control during the modernization of the Ottoman Empire and its continuation in the Turkish Republic, analyzing the historical shifts from a culture of mutual coexistence to one dominated by exclusion, control, and violence.

The thesis traces the genealogy of these transformations, examining the pivotal role of legal frameworks such as the Ottoman Tanzimat reforms, the 1910 mass exile of street dogs in Istanbul, and the 2004 Animal Protection Law in Turkey. The analysis highlights how these legal and political changes have shaped the status of street animals, leading to their politicization and the complex interplay between affection, violence, and governance. In doing so, the study sheds light on the ongoing tension between the protective intentions of laws and their often exclusionary, violent implementations, revealing the underlying biopolitical dynamics that continue to influence the lives of street animals in Turkey.

Through a detailed discourse analysis of the last 20 years, the thesis also addresses the contemporary politicization of street animals, exploring how recent legal amendments and public perceptions have further complicated their status within urban communities. The findings underscore the need to re-evaluate the legal and political frameworks governing street animals, advocating for a more compassionate and inclusive approach that recognizes their integral role in the social fabric of Turkish cities.

Declaration

I, Bengisu Koşarhan, declare this thesis contains only original, previously unpublished work, except where acknowledged by bibliographical references.

I further declare the following word counts to be accurate: 19.070

Word Count (Thesis text, excluding notes and references):17.710

Entire thesis manuscript word count:

Signed, Bengisu Gülşen Koşarhan

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my family, friends and all the animals have inspired me with their existence.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

In the fall of 2022, what started as a boring day ended with me visiting a friend whose house was very close to mine. We had dinner together and then spent a couple of hours talking and having a good time. Around 3 am, it was time for me to go back home. Since the distance between our homes was very close—a couple of hundred meters—I had to walk. My friend anxiously asked me to stay the night since it was not very safe for me to walk a couple of hundred meters at 3 am in Turkey as a young woman. I did not want to accept that; I did not want to give into the fear that I experienced only because of my gender. I assured my friend it was okay and that I would call her as soon as I reached home. Even though I put on a courageous face, I was nervous. I put my earphones on in the elevator but could not bring myself to play the music. My senses were hyper-aware, and I did not want to miss any sound coming my way. I started to walk anxiously, my heart pounding, my hands in my pockets—one holding my phone and the other gripping my house key positioned as a self-defense weapon. I was ready for my journey, a journey that connects me to millions of women in various places who were going through it at the same time, a journey that I had gone through time and time again. Then, I started to hear a noise coming from behind me. At first, I tried to figure out what it was. The noise stopped when I stopped walking, then resumed when I started again. My heartbeat increased to an unprecedented level for that night. With courage, I looked behind and saw a dog who had been following me since I left my friend's apartment. I remembered it since I had petted it when I entered her apartment complex earlier. It was what we called a "street dog" in Turkey. It was big and seemingly very scary to the eye, and it belonged to the streets of Istanbul. I was relieved that it was a dog and not a man. I called it to come near me; it approached. I extended my hand for it to smell and understand that I was not a threat, I was a friend. We got to know each other for a couple of seconds and started to walk together. Whenever a car passed, he immediately came to my side and posed as if he was protecting me from it. I assured him when everything was all right and then he would start to walk again. He accompanied me to my home, waited until I walked

through my doors, and then left as if nothing had happened. As if he had not just erased my concerns about walking alone and kept me company. It was as though he sensed my nervousness, came, did everything he could to make me relaxed, and then left. At that moment, I had a friend in the scary night, much more intelligent and capable of emotions and empathy than the humans I was very scared of. At that moment, accompanied by the quiet presence of a street dog, I realized the profound role that animals can play in shaping urban communities. It was not just a moment of personal relief but a clear demonstration of how non-human inhabitants of the city contribute to a sense of security and belonging. This encounter underscored the potential for a mutual coexistence that challenges our conventional views on urban safety and community dynamics, revealing the intricate biopolitical relationships that weave through the streets of Istanbul.[1]

The aftermath of that night brought many unanswered questions to my mind, deeply influencing my research on the topic of street animals and their governance in Turkey. In the bustling streets of Turkey, the presence of street animals is not just a common sight but a vital part of the urban tapestry. These animals are far from passive urban fixtures; they are active participants in the social and biopolitical arenas that shape their lives. Michel Foucault's concept of biopolitics—referring to the strategies and mechanisms that manage life processes under authoritative regimes—provides a framework for understanding these dynamics (Foucault, 1976). In Turkey, biopolitical frameworks manifest in policies and public attitudes that govern the visibility, movements, and existence of street animals.

The history of street animals in Turkey is steeped in a mix of affection, violence, and governance, stretching from the Ottoman Era to the modern Turkish Republic. Contemporary policies towards these animals reflect profound contradictions and fluctuations, mirroring broader societal tensions around animal rights, urban safety, and public health. Legislative efforts, including the Animal Protection Law No. 5199, aim to safeguard these animals, yet enforcement is sporadic and recent amendments have regressed on animal rights. Public perceptions are sharply divided: some view street animals as integral members of their communities, while others regard them as nuisances or

[1] This anecdote was retrieved from my personal journal dated, 21.10.2022.

even threats. This dichotomy poses a significant biopolitical challenge: how can the coexistence of human and non-human animals be reconciled in Turkey's shared communal spaces?

1.2 Research Objectives and Questions

This thesis aims to explore the biopolitical management of street animals in Istanbul, focusing on the intersection of laws, community actions, and public perceptions that shape the lives of these animals and the pervasive issue of violence against them. The analysis will cover the last 20 years, starting with the adoption of Animal Protection Law No. 5199, with a particular emphasis on the significant amendments made in July 2021 and July 2024. These amendments have substantially increased the politicization of street animal presence and associated violence.

The guiding research questions are:

1. How do legislative frameworks in Turkey address the presence and welfare of street animals?
    - This question seeks to understand the specific provisions and the effectiveness of laws intended to protect street animals, examining changes over time and their impact.
2. Historically in what ways do community interactions and public perceptions influence the treatment of street animals?
    - This inquiry focuses on the role of community behaviors and societal attitudes in shaping the daily realities of street animals in urban settings.
3. What are the implications of current biopolitical practices for the concept of community and coexistence in urban environments?
    - This question explores the broader theoretical implications of how street animals are managed, highlighting the tensions and dynamics within urban communities.

The theoretical framework will draw upon the work of Italian political philosopher Roberto Esposito, particularly his concepts of community, immunity, and biopolitics (Esposito & Hanafi,

2013). Through this lens, I will argue that in the context of Turkey, the management of street animals and the violence directed towards them are deeply intertwined with broader biopolitical processes and political discourse. This is evidenced by the framing of street animals as objects of governance, the establishment of boundaries of immunity, and the contestation of community formations.

1.3 Methodology

The study employs a qualitative research design, utilizing discourse analysis to examine the complex interplay between media representations, civil society advocacy, governmental policies, and political propaganda. This approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of the social and political contexts that shape the management and perception of street animals.

1.3.1 Data Collection

Data for this study will be collected from four main sources:

1. **Media Representations**: A systematic review of both print and digital media sources will be conducted to gather articles, news reports, editorials, and features that discuss street animals. The focus will be on how street animals are portrayed and the narratives that are constructed around their presence and management.
2. **Civil Society Advocacy**: Publications, press releases, and campaign materials from NGOs and other civil society organizations dedicated to animal rights and welfare will be analyzed. Special attention will be given to advocacy strategies and the framing of street animals within these materials.
3. **Governmental Policies and Laws**: Official government documents, legislative texts, and policy papers relating to the management of street animals will be scrutinized. This will include a detailed analysis of the Animal Protection Law No. 5199 and its amendments.
4. **Political Propaganda/Election Propaganda**: Materials produced during election periods with an emphasis on the latest nationwide municipal election that was held in March 2024; including speeches, manifestos, and campaign materials from political representatives, will

be examined. This analysis will help understand how street animals are used in political discourse and whether their presence is politicized.

1.3.2 Data Analysis

Discourse analysis will be utilized to interpret the data collected from the aforementioned sources. This method will help in identifying:

- How different discourses construct the identities and 'worth' of street animals. How the concept of ferality (Yoon, 2021) is at work through these discourses?
- The power dynamics embedded within the language and imagery used by media, politicians, and civil society.
- Contradictions and consistencies in the narratives across different sources.

Triangulation:

To ensure the reliability and depth of analysis, triangulation will be used. By comparing and contrasting findings from media, governmental, and civil advocacy sources, the study aims to present a nuanced view of the biopolitical management of street animals.

1.3.3 Ethical Considerations

The study will adhere to ethical research standards, ensuring that all data used, especially content from civil society organizations and political campaigns, is publicly available and cited appropriately. Care will be taken to anonymize sensitive information and to present a balanced view in the analysis.

1.3.4 Limitations

The study acknowledges potential limitations, including media bias and the availability of official documents. Additionally, the interpretation of discourse might be influenced by the researcher's own biases and cultural understanding.

This methodology aims to provide a robust framework for exploring the complex dynamics of street animal management in Turkey, offering insights into how street animal presence reflects and shapes power dynamics, social attitudes, and ethical considerations within urban spaces/communities; highlighting the complexities of governance, violence and community solidarity.

1.4 Conclusion

The following chapters will be organized as follows: Chapter 2 presents the theoretical framework, offering a detailed analysis of Roberto Esposito's theories. This chapter traces the genealogy of key terms and elucidates their complex interrelationships. Chapter 3 examines the biopolitics of street animals in the Western World, focusing on how the negative mode of biopolitics has led to the auto-immunization of the community shared between humans and street animals. Chapter 4 explores the inception of biopolitics in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, detailing the impact of modernization efforts up to the enactment of the Animal Protection Law. Chapter 5 engages in a discourse analysis of the last 20 years, highlighting how the politicization of street animals has evolved alongside changes in the legal framework. The thesis concludes with Chapter 6, which synthesizes the findings and implications of the preceding chapters.

Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Communitas and the Munus of Being-Together

Roberto Esposito's reconceptualization of community centers on the Latin root of "communitas," particularly the terms "cum" (with) "munus," which signifies a gift given without expectation of reciprocity. He argues that this gift leads individuals beyond their own subjectivity, exposing them to alterity and the inherent risks involved (Esposito, 2013). This notion of "munus" parallels Christian theology, where community, or koinonia, is understood as a divine obligation that binds believers together through God's covenant, symbolized by Christ's sacrifice. This relationship emphasizes a duality of suffering and glory, reflecting the complexities of communal life in Christianity, where the divine gift creates a permanent yet inadequate response from humanity, highlighting a fundamental separation and unity between God and humankind (Langford, 2015).

According to Esposito in the late 1980's the concept of community has been deconstructed with the understanding from proper to relational. Community was traditionally perceived as a cohesive entity that united specific individuals by virtue of a shared identity. Within this framework, community was intricately tied to the notion of the "proper": whether it involved asserting ownership over communal resources or expressing individual attributes, community membership was defined by a sense of mutual belonging. The commonalities shared by its members constituted what was considered appropriate or rightful to them, emphasizing their collective ownership of shared identity and resources (Esposito, 2013). The idea of ownership and identity, when we think about community, stems from this traditional understanding of the concept. However, with the works of Nancy, Blanchot, and Esposito himself this belonging through sharing transformed by

instead of characterizing community as a possession or attribute of its members, it was conceptualized as an inherent alterity that distinguished it from itself, stripping it of any fixed identity. Rather than being bound together by a tangible substance or entity, individuals within this conceptualization of community were interconnected by a fault line that traversed through them, mutually contaminating each other (Esposito, 2013).

It is the fault line that brings us together but what makes community for Esposito is the obligatory nature of the gift-giving. This act is not reciprocal and forces the subject outside of its boundaries. In a way, Gift is grounded in duty and law in the Kantian sense which brings a state of shared vulnerability and openness among the members of the community. Members of the community are no longer their identical selves once they enter into these relationships (Hole, 2013). It is the unattainable nature of law that brings imminence and transcendence into the subjective existence of the community. Rather than seeing Otherness as something from the external realm and being distinct; individuals within the community continuously negotiate and navigate diverse perspectives, which in return enrich their communal experience. The internal dynamics of the community through "difference" perpetuates a continual state of alteration and transformation for Esposito's conceptualization of the term (Hole, 2013). Community then becomes a non-belonging that challenges the boundaries of self and other, suggesting that community is fundamentally about being exposed to and affected by what is outside or beyond us (Hole, 2013).

Esposito critiques modern political philosophy, particularly Hobbes, which transforms this theological understanding of communitas and non-belonging into a secular framework. Hobbes reinterprets the communal bond through the lens of fear and self-preservation, asserting that the state of nature is characterized by universal fear, leading to the establishment of a social contract. In this view, community is no longer defined by divine gifts but by the necessity of survival, marking a significant shift in the understanding of community from a theological to a political construct. Esposito views this transformation as a form of nihilism, where political order attempts to suppress the existential void left by the divine withdrawal (Langford, 2015).

In Hobbes' perspective, the community becomes an "immunitas," where individuals are isolated from one another, united only by their fear of death. This shift represents a departure from the original communal gift, reducing the concept of community to a pragmatic response to existential

threats (Langford, 2015). Esposito's analysis reveals how modern political thought constructs community as a means to mitigate the moral ambiguities of human existence, ultimately failing to address the deeper theological implications of communal bonds.

Heidegger's ontological approach transcends Kant's notion of law as a boundary of the self, which defines community within these limits, as well as Hobbes' concept of the social contract. Instead, Heidegger shifts the focus from juridical and normative dimensions to explore the fundamental nature of being, emphasizing concepts like "Dasein" (being-there) and "Mitsein" (being-with) (Esposito, 2013). He argues that "Mitsein" is foundational to our "Dasein," suggesting that human existence is inherently finite and social, shaping our communal interactions. This perspective views community not as an ideal or static structure but as a dynamic interplay of individual existences that are deeply interconnected and defined by their temporal, existential conditions (Langford, 2015).

Heidegger introduces the concept of the "abyss" to describe an intrinsic absence or lack within our existence, indicating that our understanding of being is not complete or self-contained. This "ruptured" nature of being compels individuals to seek grounding in the world, underscoring that community and individuality emerge simultaneously from this profound existential ground. The "abyss" challenges the definitive boundaries established by Kantian law, advocating for a more fluid and indefinable space where communal bonds are continuously formed and reformed (Langford, 2015).

Esposito aligns with Heidegger in portraying community not as completeness or perfection but as an engagement with our limitations and those of others. Community relationships and behaviors, he suggests, are not contingent upon existential threats or moral laws but are derived and shaped from the co-existence and experience of our being (Langford, 2015). However, both Heidegger and Esposito's frameworks predominantly focus on human coexistence, leaving the interactions with the non-human world less explored. This oversight presents an opportunity to extend their conceptions of community to include broader ecological and interspecies relationships, thus deepening our understanding of communal existence.

Building on Heidegger's ontological exploration of community, Bataille introduces the concept of "non-knowledge," which diverges sharply from traditional philosophical discourses centered on knowledge, identity, and subjectivity. Non-knowledge challenges the conventional role of the subject as an external observer or comprehender of experience. Instead, Bataille posits that the subject is deeply embedded within experience itself, which is fundamentally characterized by a lack of fixed subjectivity. This perspective foregrounds experience as primary, defined by the absence or negation of traditional subjectivity and exposing individuals to the inherent incompleteness and contingency of their existence (Langford, 2015).

This existential exposure lays the groundwork for a new conception of community. Contrary to traditional communities built around shared identities or common goals, Bataille's vision of community is rooted in the shared recognition of non-identity and existential vulnerability—a theme also present in Heidegger's analysis. Bataille's focus on non-knowledge fosters ethics that are not anchored in fixed moral laws but in the continuous negotiation of our limitations and openness to the existential conditions of others. This ethical stance emphasizes the inherent uncertainty and unknowability of others' experiences and situations, advocating for a respect for this alterity. According to Esposito, this perspective radically rethinks community as a dynamic, ever-evolving space of ethical and existential encounters, rather than a static entity defined by commonalities. It decentralizes the subject which positions individuals as the primary agents within social and political life (Langford, 2015).

In this framework of looking at the genealogy of the term, Esposito shows us what this term means in different philosophical contexts and how it evolved into his way of understanding what community means and entails. Community is not a fixed or a static entity, it is not a site of unity or harmony but a venue for engaging with and embracing the transformative potential of encountering difference. This transformative potential enables community to be a space of continuous growth, change, and alterity.

2.2 Immunity and The Double Bind of Protection

According to Esposito, one cannot think about community without in relation to the paradigm of immunity. He claims that “If communitas is what binds its members in a commitment of giving from one to the other, immunitas, by contrast, is what unburdens from this burden, what exonerates from this responsibility. (Esposito, 2013)” Immunity then becomes a necessity for the community to prevail. It protects the life from external threats. However, Esposito expands this concept beyond its conventional understanding, viewing immunity not merely as a shield against harm, but also as a form of exclusionary inclusion. In other words, immunity paradoxically involves both safeguarding life within a protective barrier and delineating boundaries that determine who belongs and who is excluded from the protected community. This dual nature of immunity fosters a dynamic tension between inclusion and exclusion, where the very act of preserving life necessitates the demarcation of 'others' who are perceived as threats to the integrity of the protected community (Esposito, 2013).

The concept of law is important for the immunity paradigm. Through the lens of "exclusionary inclusion," a concept where law both protects and excludes, pivotal to understanding modern legal dynamics. This paradoxical nature of law, rooted in the Hobbesian social contract, posits that while designed to safeguard life, law simultaneously restricts freedoms, revealing its immunitary function—protecting against social conflicts at the cost of communal ties. Law transforms communal munus into individual rights, redefining community bonds into legal relations that prioritize individual entitlements over collective integrity, thus reappropriating what is communal into distinct legal identities (Langford, 2015).

Moreover, to show how law and violence go hand in hand Esposito looks at the work of "The Critique of Violence" by Walter Benjamin. This work dentifies a cyclical, repetitive pattern where law and violence emerge not as opposites, but as intertwined manifestations of the same essence, termed "Gewalt." This concept reveals that law perpetuates itself through foundational violence, continually retracing its steps to a mythical origin and reinforcing its principles through acts justified as preserving law (Langford, 2015). This cyclical nature suggests that law is trapped in a loop of creating and resolving violence without ever truly eliminating it, operating under a "mythical core" that seeks to reset historical progress and maintain the status quo through violent re-enactments. Such a structure of law intensifies the "exclusionary inclusion" process, where law

both protects and excludes by internalizing external threats, thus blurring the lines between legal and illegal actions. Esposito argues that this intrinsic violence within law not only fails to eradicate societal violence but potentially exacerbates it, posing a significant challenge to the foundational immunitary logic of modern legal systems (Langford, 2015).

Esposito argues that the generalization of mechanisms for social immunization fundamentally alters the role of law. Rather than being an external force applied to the community, the law becomes synonymous with the immune system. As a result, the relationship between law and community undergoes a profound articulation. The concept of community is dissolved into the difference between the legal system and its environment, signaling the disappearance of community as a distinct entity (Langford, 2015).

Drawing parallels to the body's immune system, where the body combats external threats only through recognizing them, implies that the body must expose itself to what endangers it. Consequently, if the body is over-immunized, it may lead to its own demise. Hence double-bind implicit of the immunitary dynamics. Esposito argues that this double bind is what characterizes the modernity in all its individual and collective experience. Excessive immunization can confine existence, stripping away both freedom and the deeper meaning inherent in the concept of communitas. He argues that the mechanisms designed to protect us—whether at the level of the individual, society, or state—can also inhibit growth and, at extreme levels, potentially destroy life by reducing it to mere biological existence. Esposito suggests that high levels of immunization sacrifice the quality of life for mere survival. This perspective illuminates the possibility for the concept of community to reclaim political relevance, not by embodying a broader inclusive circle, but rather by serving as a conduit that disrupts these non-communicative boundaries, blending human experiences and liberating them from an overemphasis on security. In this framework, community emerges as a vital resistance to the pervasive syndrome of excessive immunization, which acts both defensively and offensively in contemporary society (Esposito, 2013).

2.3 Politics That Comes From Life Itself: Biopolitics

The history of the biopolitical paradigm, originating from Michel Foucault's lectures in the 1970s and further developed by Italian scholars like Giorgio Agamben and Antonio Negri, demonstrates

a tension between two divergent interpretations of biopolitics. On one hand, there is a negative interpretation that views biopolitics as a force that seeks to reduce life to mere organic matter, exerting power over it and potentially leading to apocalyptic consequences. On the other hand, there is a more optimistic interpretation that sees biopolitics as a means for life to perpetuate itself beyond historical contradictions, with politics being dissolved into the rhythm of life's reproduction. The author contends that this tension arises from a semantic breach within the concept of biopolitics itself. The terms "bios" and "politics," which compose the term "biopolitics," seem to be designed separately and only later related to each other. This disjointedness results in two distinct layers of meaning within the concept, which were never fully integrated (Esposito, 2013). Consequently, biopolitics becomes fractured into two parts that are mutually incompatible, or only reconcilable through the forceful domination of one over the other. This fundamental contradiction within the concept of biopolitics underscores the challenge of reconciling the diverse interpretations and implications of this complex phenomenon (Esposito, 2013).

The possibility of finding an opening and connection between these two opposing strands of biopolitics arises for Esposito yet again with the immunization paradigm. The establishment of the dual character of the immunization process as both the protection and negation of life helps us to create a more nuanced understanding of biopolitics and biopower. Since the predominant negative aspect of the biopolitical paradigm does not stem from external forces violently subjugating life, but rather from the inherent contradiction within life itself as it seeks to defend against threats while simultaneously thwarting its own needs (Esposito, 2013). Immunity, crucial for safeguarding both individual and collective life – as evidenced by the indispensable role of the immune system in our bodies – can inadvertently hinder its own progress when adopted in a manner that excludes and isolates all other human and environmental variations. Esposito argues that this articulation of two paradigms together creates the possibility of affirmative politics prevailing in the future even though it was not necessarily the case in the past (Esposito, 2013).

To realize Affirmative Biopolitics, it's imperative to rebalance the dynamic between the common and the immune, allowing life itself to become the focal point of political discourse. Within communities, life generates excess, reshaping our subjectivity and transforming our relational dynamics. Esposito contends that achieving this requires unraveling the bonds of immunity while

concurrently fostering the creation of shared spaces and dimensions, increasingly endangered by opposing forces such as the "proper," the "private," and the "immune" (Esposito, 2013). These opposing elements erode social bonds and diminish the concept of the "common good." Consequently, recognizing the constant threat to the common underscores the importance of acknowledging non-human animals and their lives, which also fall under the purview of biopolitical control.

Chapter 3 Urban Outcasts: The Biopolitical Control of Stray Animals and the Dynamics of Exclusion and Inclusion in the West

3.1 Introduction

"…one could say that immunization at high doses is the sacrifice of the living – of every qualified life, that is – for the sake of mere survival. It is the reduction of life to its bare biological matter. (Esposito,2013)"[2]

[2] Walter Benjamin's argument as quoted by Esposito in his work "Community, Immunity, Biopolitics (2013)"

At the core of modern biopolitics, according to Esposito, is the immunization paradigm, which intersects the biological and political realms to simultaneously offer protection and impose negation on life. This paradigm encapsulates the dual nature of the immune dispositif, capable of both safeguarding and harming. Esposito analogizes societal protective mechanisms to an overactive immune system, which, while intended to defend, can turn destructively against the body it serves. Such dynamics in political regimes can suffocate or fragment the very communities they intend to protect, leading to a biopolitical regime that may become oppressively invasive or lose touch with its foundational principles. This concept of autoimmunization is evident in the extremes of modernity, where biopolitics, synonymous with the thanatopolitics of the Nazi regime or Soviet communism, ultimately catalyzes not just the elimination of perceived external threats but also the self-destruction of the community itself (Esposito 2013). Continuing this legacy "the only source of political legitimacy today seems to be the preservation and implementation of life (Esposito, 2013).".

3.2 What Happened to the Stray Animals of the West?

Safety, utility, predictability, controllability… These principles were defining urban life in 19th and 20th century of Europe Under these principles Western cities were seen the epitome of safety, order, cleanliness, and health. The cost of living this way was insignificant since it was paid by the animals, poor, gendered and ethnic minorities. In other words the burden of paying the price was cast on the outcasts and waste of modernity (Bauman, 2004). [3] Modernity is essentially a meta-language that enables responses in immunitary terms to a series of preventive security needs that emerged deeply from life and uses biopolitical dispositifs to achieve these needs (Esposito, 2013). Modernity according to Bauman is the result of "compulsive and addictive designing" and inherent to the design and change must produce waste. Non-human animals were part of this waste and considered redundant, controllable, and sacrificial in the name of achieving the future; a future of safety, utility, predictability, and progress (2004).

[3] Bauman's Notion of waste was constructed on the notion of homo sacer and did not considered non-human animals however it is a speciest analysis which in my text includes non-human animals as well.

Modern urban spaces of the Western World[4] have been cleaned from the unwelcome population of non-human animals[5] since the middle of the 19th century. [6] Until the 1850's animals were abundant in the streets of the Western World. They belonged to the community as part of the social fabric. What characterized the time up until that point was the urban explosion which happened due to the heavy Industrialization of Europe. Existing state institutions had a hard time dealing with industrial capitalism and what it brought; chaos, pollution, fog and an unprecedented amount of waste. Beginning of the 18th century animals were an integral part of recycling of the waste as sources of manure. The presence of animals maintained a connection between rural and urban areas, creating a blend of city and countryside within urban environments (Atkins et al. 2012). However, there was a fundamental shift during the Victorian era called "The Great Separation".

3.2.1 The Great Separation and the violence it brought

The Great Separation was a transformative historical process that physically and conceptually divided urban spaces from the natural world, focusing particularly on sanitation. Consequently mid-19th century saw the rise of the Public Health movement which aimed to not only physically transform urban spaces by introducing systems like sewers but also generate widespread intellectual excitement. The shift to sanitary-focused urban design marked a fundamental change in how society viewed and managed the environment, pushing for a strict separation between 'clean' urban life and 'dirty' natural processes. This shift was not merely physical but also cultural and ideological, influencing literature, art, and public consciousness (Atkins et al. 2012; Pearson, 2017). By the early 20th century, the idea of a city had evolved to exclude the organic, chaotic elements of nature, establishing a precedent for modern urban planning that continues to shape cities today. Thereby, animals became nuisances that were a threat to public health and safety.

[4] In this text "Western World" will mainly with regards to Western Europe and North America.
[5] This category consists of species which have transgressed, such as rats, cockroaches and pigeons, and are judged to be vermin because they are 'out of place' in the city. As well as canines/cats who does not belong to any individual or institution as companion species. Useful animals such as cows, sheep, chickens and pigs are also cleaned from the urban spaces and went to either borders of the city or into meat industrial complex.
[6] In the context of this article I will specifically look at stray dogs and cats in these cities. The other species and their erasure from the urban landscape is beyond the topic of this thesis.

Particularly with the discourse of rabies. They needed to be confined to their appropriate spaces. For dogs and cats, these places meant utter domestication and belonging to either individuals or institutions as pets. Being a stray animal that belonged to the streets and to the community as a free beings like before was out of the question. To achieve this removal there were multiple initiatives from the governments in the form of legislation and policing (Atkins et al. 2012).

Esposito's biopolitics involves the governance of life itself, where the state intervenes in the biological existence of individuals to regulate health, hygiene, and the body. The Great Separation is a clear example of biopolitical governance: it was a state-led initiative to control urban populations' health by transforming the environment and regulating the presence of animals in attempts to immunize the urban population against the dangers of disease and disorder. In this case, the biopolitics of stray animal life succumbed to the negative immunization paradigm in which existing community relations were nearly destroyed and fundamentally changed in the name of protection.

This could happen through what Esposito calls the mechanisms of exclusionary inclusion or what Hyaesin Yoon calls with "machine of feralization". [7] In her influential work Yoon, looks at the notion of feral as a way to understand bodies and entities that cross borders and disrupt established categories. "The feral" is a biopolitical symbol that crosses species boundaries. It draws on Trinh T. Minh-ha's idea of the "inappropriate/d other" to highlight those on society's margins—those who could disrupt the usual management and movement of populations within international and capitalist frameworks. Building on Esposito's understanding of the immunization paradigm, Yoon argues that the immune system also functions as a continual mechanism of feralization—a system that deals with what exceeds Agamben's "anthropological machine," which repeatedly defines and redefines the boundary between humans and animals in a realm where these distinctions are not clear. "By referring to the machine of feralization, I point to the technics and technologies entailed in the production of feral bodies (Yoon, 2021)." These dispositifs, range from law to cultural practices to technologies of regulatory and disciplinary interventions. Lastly, the author contends that feral is a performative institution and technology through its practice. It is produced, intervened and disposed time and time again in different contexts and relations (Yoon, 2021).

[7]Yoon, H. (2021). Feral Biopolitics. In E. Steinbock, M. Szczygielska, & A. C. Wagner (Eds.), Tranimacies (1st ed., pp. 131–146). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003099130-15

3.2.2 Can we still save the community?

"In 1883 the pharmacist Emile Capron called for stray dogs to be removed from the streets of Paris as 'the infinite number of these awful mutts' spread rabies, caused numerous traffic accidents by scaring horses, and alarmed pedestrians. As Capron's remarks suggest, many commentators treated strays as dangerously mobile nuisances that hindered the free movement and threatened the health of the city's productive human and nonhuman inhabitants." (Pearson, 2017)

Capron's view was only one of the many that called for the eradication on the basis of the protection of the human members of the community. While rabies and public health were a significant concern, the fear of stray animals was not solely due to the disease. It was also influenced by wider cultural attitudes and tensions, along with a general disgust at seeing strays in public spaces. Research in the growing field of animal history indicates that as animals of a domestic species who appear to reject human company, strays blur the lines between 'wild' and 'domestic.' They become focal points and symbols of urban conflict, often portrayed by advocates of modernization as signs of outdated urban practices (Pearson, 2017). Stray animals of the Western World at this time became a product of the machine of feralization. *Figures A.1, A.2,* and *A.3* show a detailed timeline of the laws, regulations, and policing that occurred in two important urban cities of their time; Paris and London (Atkins et al. 2012; Pearson, 2017). These technologies resulted in an amount of violence against these bodies in unprecedented ways. What started as leashing and muzzling of the animals that were seen as rabid in municipal ponds swiftly turned into an aim of eradicating all stray lives sighted on streets. Multiple methods of killing were justified in forms that ranged from hanging to shooting (with drugs or other materials) or others poisoning the food put on the streets. If they weren't killed by public officials these bodies were left to the mercy of the vivisectionists with no supervision or their dead bodies were monetized to the general public. Come the end of the 20th century, the Western World solved the problem of strays by changing their communal status to pets only (Atkins et al. 2012; Pearson, 2017).

This transformation did not occur without any resistance. The Animal Protectionist movement was dependent heavily on people who were from bourgeoisie backgrounds, who were women, and who belonged to the feminist movement. Société Protectrice des Animaux (SPA)[8] was a product of this movement in Paris. They fought for the end of the pond which they deemed "a merciless site of incarceration and cruelty" (Pearson, 2017). The ones who had the economic means such as Fanny Bernard[9] opened private refuges and the others[10] opened their homes to their fellow community members. More moderate members advocated to find less painful and merciful ways for killing which led to the borrowing of the gas chambers from the British. Which in retrospect weren't as merciful as intended since it would take up to 10 minutes for these animals to die and some even lived after experiencing this traumatic event, only to be finished off with another method (Pearson, 2017).

Laws and regulations were the most important dispositifs that were used in the biopolitical governance of stray animals at the time. To fight against this legal framework and level the playing field, the efforts of Animal Protectionists started the concept of the "Animal Rights Framework" whose effects can be seen to this day. In his significant work Carry Wolfe[11] states that "…animal rights philosophy[12], in spite of itself, continues to rely on a speciesist (or better, perhaps, anthropocentric) model of subjectivity in its criteria for determining which beings deserve rights." (Wolfe, 2013). He posits that Legal Rights discourse formed around either "will-based"[13] or

[8] Animal Protection Society, SPA, founded in 1845 in Paris.

[9] She was the daughter of Claude Bernard, who was one of the noted vivisectionist of the time. Known for his cruelty and lack of mercy towards these animals in his operations.

[10] Such as the offal selle Mme Graye.

[11] For more information on Wolfe's arguments please look at the book "Carry Wolfe (2013), *Before the Law*: *Humans and other Animal in Biopolitical Frame"*.

[12] For more information of the past and current debates on the debates fort he animal rights philosophy of the modern western World plase look at the book *"Sunstein, C. R. (Ed.), & Nussbaum, M. C. (Ed.). (2004). Animal rights: Current debates and new directions. Oxford University Press."*

[13] Represented by the likes of Posner which places the consideration of rights entirely under the influence of economic utility and political practicality. It argues that legal rights serve as tools to ensure freedoms essential for maintaining a functioning democratic government that supports social order and prosperity. Typically, those who possess these rights are, with few exceptions, individuals who can vote and participate in economic activities. According to this perspective, animals do not meet these criteria. Or with the likes of Epstein who takes a stark stance that aligns with what Regan terms the "might makes right" position. He argues that if the only method to create an AIDS vaccine that could save thousands of lives involves conducting painful or lethal experiments on chimpanzees, then the notion of an animal's right to bodily integrity would halt such research. According to Epstein, this research halt is inevitable and justified (Wolfe, 2013, p.14).

"interest-based"[14] and does not capture the inherent co-existence of our being-with each other and tries to confirm a certain interpretation of the human subject. "…An interpretation…. that has been and will have been the lever of the worst violence carried out against nonhuman living beings" (Wolfe, 2013). Therefore the efforts that started initially to protect these animals from the violence that they endured during the biopolitical governance of the 19th-20th century still prevail. I argue that cyclical violence within the law as a mechanism of immunization; first used as the basis for eradication of these bodies from the streets now helps them stay out of the streets making it impossible to form the community of stray dogs and humans living in harmony in Western World till this day.

3.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I wanted to map a historical account of the biopolitical control of stray animals in the Western World using the theoretical framework of Esposito and the notion of ferality. Through this analysis, I aimed to uncover how mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion have shaped the lived experiences of non-human animals in urban environments. By tracing the development and implementation of policies from the Victorian era to modern times, this chapter illustrates the transformation of public and legal attitudes towards animals. The narrative reveals a shift from overt violence and exclusion to more subtle forms of control through legal frameworks and cultural practices. Drawing on Esposito's concepts of community, immunization, and biopolitics, as well as Yoon's insights into ferality, the chapter proposes that when the immunization paradigm is taken to extremes to protect the community from perceived threats, a destructive form of biopolitics can emerge, potentially leading to the dissolution of the very community it aims to protect. Without interventions to redirect this negative biopolitical mode, the same cycles of violence may

[14] Represented by the likes of Regan and Singer. Tom Regan and Peter Singer offer distinct perspectives in the animal rights debate, grounded in their views on animal interests. Peter Singer, a utilitarian, argues that ethical actions should consider the interests of all beings equally, focusing on the capacity to experience suffering to guide decisions aimed at reducing harm, such as advocating for vegetarianism. In contrast, Tom Regan adopts a rights-based approach, asserting that animals have intrinsic value and inherent rights, including the right to life and a right not to be harmed, leading him to advocate for the abolition of practices that treat animals as commodities. While Singer's views lead to a flexible, outcome-focused ethical stance that seeks to minimize overall suffering, Regan's stance is more rigid, emphasizing moral absolutes that protect animal rights regardless of the consequences (Wolfe, 2013, pp.14-16).

perpetuate in the newly formed relationships between excluded and included groups. This exploration is crucial for understanding and potentially reconfiguring our approach to community, ensuring that both human and non-human inhabitants are considered and respected.

Chapter 4

4.1 Introduction

The situation regarding street animals in Turkey is complex and has a long history predating the current republic. In this paper, the term "street animals"[15] refers specifically to dogs and cats, with dogs typically being the primary targets of biopolitical control, which is later extended to cats. Both archival and contemporary discourse analyses reveal that dogs were the ones initially depicted as unwanted and dangerous entities that the government must control and eliminate in Turkey during the modernization era of the Ottoman Empire (which predates the Republic). Subsequently, policies targeting dogs are almost invariably applied to cats, leading to violence against them and control over their bodies. In contrast to this culture of domination, a culture of affection has always persisted, with advocates for street animals striving to protect these beings against governmental control and maintain communal relationships with them. Ultimately, the efforts of these advocates led to the establishment of the Animal Protection Law (Law No. 5199) in 2024. However, the framework of rights provided by this law has fallen short in the face of ongoing domination and violence and led to its multiple amendments making the legal framework more ambiguous and open to interpretation which leads to violence against these bodies.

In this chapter, I will explore previous literature and archival materials on the opposing cultures of persistent affection and domination, including biopolitical control and violence on the topic. This analysis traces the origins of these dynamics to the early twentieth century in the Ottoman Empire and examines their continuation in the present-day Turkish Republic.

[15] The term “street animals” were used here instead of “stray animals” since

4.2 Culture of Affection and Belonging: Street Animals as Part of the Neighborhood

"The Turks live in peace with all creatures, whether living or non-living; be they trees, birds, or dogs, they respect everything created by God. Their charity extends to these unfortunate beings, who are often abandoned or persecuted in our own lands. In every street, there are bowls of water placed here and there for the neighborhood dogs." (Alphonse de Lamartine, 1833)[16]

From Julia Pardoe to Mark Twain to Pierre Loti, and many others, the presence and cultural significance of street animals in Turkey have long been subjects of fascination and bewilderment. Edmondo de Amicis notably described Istanbul as a "massive dog sanctuary, a very big kennel" (1874), highlighting the extensive presence of street animals and their integration into communal life. These animals were integral and organic parts of cities, neighborhoods, and communities, visible in various public spaces such as narrow streets, marketplaces, mosque courtyards, parks, and waterfronts (Spataris, 2004). They received care, food, water, shelter, and medical treatment from human inhabitants, which enabled them to form packs, socialize with humans, and deeply integrate into the city's neighborhoods (Ibanez, 2016). Under the collective care of neighborhood residents, they contributed to the formation of communal identities and public life within Istanbul's neighborhoods through their territorial behaviors and interactions with humans (Ibanez, 1907, 2009; Işın, 1993).

Unlike their European counterparts, dogs in Istanbul were not considered stray or wild but rather semi-domesticated. They were mixed breeds, born on the streets, and not subjected to biopolitical control or property regulations, allowing them to reproduce freely and develop territorial behaviors (Ibanez, 2016). They were neither sacred animals nor traditional pets but were significant communal beings (Ibanez, 2016). The Turkish term for street dogs, "sokak köpeği," emphasizes their collective belonging to the streets and their role as commoners within the urban community since they were not labeled as strays. They belong to these streets, they born there, mate there, and they die there. These dogs were "liminal animals," interacting with humans and sharing urban

[16] İstanbul Research Institute https://artsandculture.google.com/story/uQUBF6Zy7KPVLQ

spaces without being confined to domestic life (Kymlicka & Donaldson, 2014). Each neighborhood had its own dogs, named by locals, who guarded their territories and interacted closely with residents (Ibanez, 1907, 2009). Just like their human inhabitants, street animals contributed to their living spaces. They were guardians against outsiders, both human and animal, often resulting in fights. Furthermore, they cleaned the streets by consuming garbage (Twain, 1862). In an empire without a central municipal system, street animals played a crucial role in maintaining cleanliness and safety in the streets, which made them vital participants in their communities (Yıldırım, 2021). Human inhabitants of the city were also helping them in a mutual relationship where they left them food, and water and tended when they were sick or hurt. Consequently, the concept of "street dogs" highlights a strong cultural tradition encompassing dogs' lives in Istanbul, where they were fed, sheltered, and cared for by the local population and responsible for their duties, marking a distinct urban and communal identity (Ibanez, 2016; Tuan, 1984).

Cats, in addition to their extensive presence in public spaces, were also permitted by human inhabitants to enter private spaces. Due to the religious distinction of cleanliness between dogs and cats[17], the latter were allowed to spend time in people's homes, shops, and mosques, alongside their freedom in the streets. This access allowed cats to enjoy a dual identity, both as communal animals and as members of households. This integration into both public and private spheres highlights their unique status and the cultural acceptance they received within the community (Hart, 2019).

In Imperial Istanbul -which was considered only urban city that fit the standards of the West-, the well-being and freedom of street animals were sustained by a collective ethos of cohabitation, which emerged from daily interactions with the city's human inhabitants (Tuan, 1984). While human-animal relationships sometimes involved dominance and abuse, they more often generated compassion and care. This ensured that the animals were fed, sheltered, and protected from harsh

[17] Guided by Sunni Islam, which considers dogs as makruh (detestable but not forbidden), Istanbulites traditionally did not allow dogs indoors. Unlike cats, dogs did not participate in the household's domestic life. If a home had a courtyard, patio, or garden, it likely provided a basket, blanket, or hay for dogs to sleep on during cold weather. Otherwise, dogs were fed outside in public spaces whilst cats enjoyed both (Yıldırım, 2021; Hart, 2019)

weather and disasters (Amicis, 1896; Sungurbey, 1993; Işın, 1995; Felix, 2015). Among these caring acts, feeding and providing water for the animals were of primary importance.

Istanbulites developed unique practices for feeding animals long before the global spread of commercial animal food. One such practice involved preparing a mix called "papara," which consisted of leftover food such as chicken, meat, or bone broth mixed with bread. This food was left on roadsides alongside water bowls for the animals to consume (Sungurbey, 1993; Zarifi, 2006; Ibanez, 2016). Another practice involved "mancacılar" (dog meat vendors), who sold meat, bones, and offal to people feeding street dogs and cats (Reyhanlı, 1983; Yıldırım, 2021). These feeding practices continue today in every major city in Turkey, where food and water cups are left for street animals by animal lovers.

According to Yıldırım (2021), socially organized acts of compassion were institutionalized under a quasi-legal framework, particularly in predominantly Muslim-populated neighborhoods. Local charity organizations, pious foundations, nursing homes (darruşşifa), and medical centers offered medical treatment and shelter for sick, injured, and elderly dogs (Haşim, 1928; Sungurbey, 1993). These institutions relied financially on donations and bequests from caring locals, who sometimes left wealth or property specifically for the care of street animals (Olivier, 1793). These foundations exemplified collective compassion and mercy, shaping the legal framework for multispecies cohabitation in Istanbul.

Up until the early 20th century, the primary ethical framework guiding behavior towards street animals in Istanbul was grounded in a recognition of the shared vulnerability and finitude of both humans and animals as embodied beings interconnected through communal bonds. There were no centralized laws or legal systems specifically protecting these animals; instead, customary laws emerged from the shared interconnectedness among community members. These animals belonged to the streets, coexisting with their human counterparts, and if they were seen as destitute and in need of help, they received it. This support was not provided as a state duty but as a communal responsibility, acknowledging the animals as integral parts of the neighborhood.

In Roberto Esposito's framework, the concept of community is intricately linked with notions of mutual vulnerability and the necessity of protective systems that do not override the essential interconnections within a community. This understanding aligns closely with the historical and cultural dynamics of street animals in Istanbul and the rest of the cities of the country, where

animals are not merely co-inhabitants but active participants in the communal life. Similar to Esposito's discussion of immunity, the relationship between Istanbul's residents and street animals illustrates a form of communal immunity where protection and care are reciprocated, enhancing the collective well-being without suppressing individual or species-specific needs. The ethos of cohabitation in Istanbul embodies his ideal of a community that thrives on openness and mutual support, rather than exclusion and control, highlighting a model where biopolitical practices are imbued with compassion rather than domination. This inter-species community, upheld by shared care and responsibility, exemplifies a living, breathing manifestation of Esposito's theoretical community, marked not by the boundaries it creates but by the connections it fosters.

4.3 Under the Influence of Modernity: Rise of Dominance and Violence

4.3.1 Under the Influence of Europe: Tanzimat Era and the Modernization of Ottoman Empire (1839-1909)

During the Tanzimat era (1839-1876), a wave of Western-inspired urban renewal and planning reforms aimed to transform Istanbul by addressing issues like overcrowding, disease, and crime. Influenced by urban developments in cities like Paris, Vienna, and London, the Ottoman government enlisted European elites to devise reconstruction plans. These plans, inspired by Haussmann's renovation of Paris, proposed the creation of broad boulevards and open spaces following geometric principles. However, due to Istanbul's challenging topography of hills and valleys, these grand designs remained largely unimplemented and theoretical. Nevertheless, they shifted the governance discourse towards heightened security and order within the urban space.

This era also saw significant political-legal changes aimed at increasing state control over public spaces, including the establishment of a police force with codified regulations, a city-wide municipal regime, and anti-vagrancy laws. These measures allowed the state to regulate the presence of street dogs, whose bodies and movements through the city were closely monitored and controlled. This regulatory approach to managing urban space and its inhabitants, including

animals, led to significant interventions such as the mass exile of street dogs in 1910, illustrating a shift towards a more controlled and regulated urban environment.

The establishment of the police force in 1845 marked a transformative moment in the policing of public spaces in Istanbul. his era focused on Western-inspired reforms and modernization efforts, including the urban planning and public security sectors. The police force was created to replace earlier, more localized security arrangements like the bekçi (watchmen) and asesbaşı (head of the watchmen), centralizing control over surveillance, inspection, and social control throughout the city. The Police Regulation, codified in the same year, laid the legal and administrative groundwork for the newly established force. Later on regulations of public spaces were codified under the name of Regulation of Streets in 1858. These were instrumental in articulating the political paradigm of policing by specifying acceptable behaviors and interactions in public spaces. The regulations aimed to discredit and criminalize certain bodies, marking them as potentially dangerous and designating them as threats to public order and security as well as involved plans for street widening, lighting, and the construction of open spaces, although many of these plans were impractical due to Istanbul's challenging topography and were never fully realized. This reconfiguration established clear distinctions between what was considered safe and dangerous, proper and improper. Through this, the police were able to execute their duties by focusing on those labeled as undesirable, thereby exercising the state's power to shape the social landscape of the city.

Another move that was made under the influence of modernity was the establishment of Municipal Governance (1855). The Şehremaneti (Istanbul Prefecture) was established, later followed by the Commission for the Order of the City and then the Sixth District Municipality. These bodies were tasked with the overhaul of the city's infrastructure and public services to meet the demands of the increasing population, especially in cosmopolitan areas like Beyoğlu. The initial aim was to improve basic services such as food supply, tax collection, road repair, city cleaning, and market control.

Up until this point these infrastructural regulatory changes set the tone for the biopolitcal governance within the Empire. However, The Vagabond Law [Serseriname] enacted in 1909 significantly intensified the state’s control over public spaces and marginalized populations in Istanbul, including street animals, which became targets of state policing alongside vulnerable

human populations. This law was a legal instrument that criminalized the existence of the homeless, unemployed, and other marginalized groups, treating their presence in public spaces as a sign of social disorder. The law was part of a suite of reforms aimed at modernizing Istanbul by regulating public spaces and controlling the behaviors and movements of its inhabitants. This law specifically targeted non-productive members of society (Vagabonds/Sereseriler)—such as vagrants, the homeless, and street dogs—branding them as threats to public health and safety. These groups were depicted as sources of disease, disorder, and instability, needing strict control and regulation. Street animals, in particular, came to symbolize disorder and were consequently subjected to harsh measures intended to cleanse the urban environment. They were often rounded up and removed, sometimes violently, from the streets. The law transformed these bodies from being part of the urban community to being viewed as nuisances and vectors of disease, thus stripping them of any protective communal relations they once enjoyed. The implementation of the Vagabond Law also signaled a shift in the Ottoman state's approach to governance—from a welfare-oriented to a more punitive, surveillance-based system. It expanded the scope and intensity of policing, allowing for the discretionary use of force to manage and remove undesired populations. This legal framework supported the state's broader goals of modernization and control, facilitating the transformation of Istanbul into a more regulated, orderly, and "sanitized" city. The police were given broad powers to detain, deport, or restrict the movements of those deemed unproductive or disruptive.

The enactment of the Vagabond Law had significant symbolic implications; it redefined the social contract between the state and its subjects. Those living on the margins of society were no longer seen as subjects deserving of state protection but as problems to be managed and excluded. This redefinition was not only a matter of public policy but also a reflection of changing societal values regarding who belonged in the urban space and who did not. Consequently, the Vagabond Law not only transformed the physical and social landscape of the urban cities of the Empire but also redefined the social contract between the state and its subjects, prioritizing order and control over inclusivity and protection, and marking a drastic shift in the treatment and status of animals.

4.3.2 Epitome of Modernity: Dr. Remlinger's Report

In 1910, Dr. Paul Remlinger [18]authored an article titled "La Decanisation a Constantinople" in the journal L'hygiene generale et appliquee. This article introduced the term "decanisation," which not only referred to the systematic extermination of street dogs in Istanbul but also reflected a shift in the medical perspective regarding the state's approach to these animals and their interactions within urban spaces. Remlinger's work outlined a new array of discussions, methodologies, and spatial dynamics that reshaped how canine populations were managed and perceived, impacting their movements and social dynamics in public areas.

Remlinger's article titled "La Decanisation a Constantinople" outlines a systematic plan not only for the eradication of street dogs but also frames these actions within a broader context of urban hygiene and public health. As well as deeply tying it to broader economic incentives. Politics of decanisation according to Remlinger was supposed to occur in a dual phase. By positioning dogs as vectors of disease—such as hydatid cysts, tuberculosis, and mange—Remlinger casts the presence of street animals as a public health issue, with their eradication necessary for disease control and hygiene improvement. After this construction decanisation was to be a discreet operation, removed from public eyes, which reflects the tensions between municipal authorities and the city's residents—many of whom might resist such violent measures against animals they coexisted with. The proposed methods of dealing with the dogs were clinical and removed from public sensitivity. Remlinger's plan involved capturing dogs at night and transporting them to facilities equipped with gas chambers, where they would be exterminated quietly and efficiently. Afterward, bodies of these animals could be commodified—sold as raw materials in European and North American markets where there was a demand for products derived from animal parts such as leather, fur, and biochemicals.

The decanisation proposal fundamentally changed the societal and symbolic roles of street dogs in Istanbul. Previously viewed as members of the community worthy of protection and care, dogs were recast as hazardous and expendable. This transformation underscores a larger thanatopolitical strategy where the state determines life and death, asserting control over urban environments

[18] After Pasteur developed the rabies vaccine in 1885, the Ottoman Empire sent a health mission to learn the anti-immunization techniques. In Rabies Vaccine Laboratory/Ottoman Institute of Bacteriology was founded in Istanbul in 1887. Dr. Remlinger become the director of the establishment between the years of 1900 and 1910.

through the biopolitical regulation of animal populations. While Remlinger's proposal was never fully realized, it laid the groundwork for subsequent animal control initiatives and demonstrated a disturbing readiness to commodify and eliminate life for economic and aesthetic purposes. This shift also transformed the traditional human-animal relationship in Istanbul from one of mutual coexistence to one dominated by control, exclusion, and exploitation.

4.3.3 State is on the Move: Biopolitics of Decanization

On April 10, 1910 the first act of mass dog eradication of the city occurred. In the early hours of the day, Istanbul was awakened by a disturbing symphony of gunshots, metallic clangs, and canine barks. Under a new decree from the Constitutional government, police squads conducted city-wide raids to apprehend street dogs. The operation began with the swift capture and suffocation of puppies, followed by the slower, elderly dogs. Younger, more agile dogs initially evaded capture but were eventually overpowered by police using increasingly violent methods. The sounds of shouting, whipping, and gunshots filled the air, accompanying the distressed cries of dogs. By morning, the mass roundup had effectively cleared the city's streets of thousands of dogs, setting the stage for further brutal actions. The following weeks as the captures become bloodier, the public started to intervened to the actions of the police. Thus, forcing the government offering the the most marginalized, excluded, already criminalized and poor segments of the poor monetary incentive for the each dog they capture and bring it to the authorities. In just a couple of weeks there were thousand animals who have been captured, killed and kept in carcaration for weeks in wooden cages on the Topkapı Shore (Işın, 1993; Pinguet, 2009; Yıldırım 2021).

The Shore quickly became a nightmarish place for the detained dogs, who waited in fear and uncertainty. Crammed together in confined spaces, deprived of food and water, the dogs grew ill and aggressive, eventually turning on one another in desperation. Outraged by the dreadful conditions, locals clashed with police, attempting to free the suffering animals by breaking open their cages. As public outrage continued without abatement, the government decided to implement a drastic measure that would permanently alter the fate of both the dogs and the city. Dogs that had been confined for weeks were loaded onto boats bound for Sivriada (Oxia) -later called Hayırsızada (Wicked Island), a desolate and barren island far from Istanbul's shores, effectively turning it into a grim penal colony for the city's once cherished canine inhabitants (Yıldırım, 2021).

The incident of Wicked Island resulted in the exiling and killing approximately 80.000 street animals. It is a clear example on how excessive immunization turns into thanatopolitics thereby altering community relationships dramatically since after this incident mutually affectionate relationship of care between humans and street animals have been altered and almost eradicated. From this point on, biopolitical governance of street animals in Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic emerged and followed the same trajectory with a final point of erasure.

Aftermath of Wicked Island until 1990's thanatpolitics of street animals continued. However, due to public outcry of the first method of mass exile it changed into more subtle and careful way of doing the job. The municipal governance of Istanbul took over the management of street dogs, relegating them outside the political economy—since they neither generated profit nor were useful for labor—and placed them under strict municipal control. This was evident in policies and actions like the city-wide dog culls commanded by Mayor Cemil Topuzlu, who openly admitted to exterminating tens of thousands of dogs during his tenure, viewing this as a necessary act to cleanse the city (Yıldırım, 2021). "Dr. Cemil Topuzlu, who was the mayor of İstanbul between 1912-1914, in 1918, and between 1919-1920, would write in his memoirs that he ordered the extermination of dogs to be carried out "little by little" (Alkan, 2016, p.618)." As municipal governance in Istanbul grew more powerful and assertive, the methods of decanisation—specifically shootings and poisonings—escalated in cruelty and violence. Despite these harsh measures, traditional communal norms of care and protection for street dogs proved resilient, maintaining a presence in the face of increasing brutality. However, the visible and systematic violence perpetrated by the state did not eradicate the ingrained culture of caring for street dogs within the community. Rather, it shifted the practice of animal care from a politically engaged activity to a more private, everyday urban experience. Over time, this enduring violence reshaped the political landscape around animal protection in Istanbul, catalyzing the development of a nascent movement dedicated to safeguarding animal welfare, distinct from prior informal care practices (Yıldırım, 2021).

The first animal rights organization in Istanbul, The Society for the Protection of Animals (İstanbul Himaye-i Hayvanat Cemiyeti) was founded in 1912 against the rising visible violence against street animals once again. However, for the Society, the main concern was not to stop the decanization process rather it was to change how it was conducted (Yıldırım, 2021). This could be due to the fact that The Istanbul Society for the Protection of Animals was established by the city's

political and bureaucratic elites following the 1910 Wicked Island dog exiles. Comprised of upper-class members such as former bureaucrats, physicians, vets, political figures from the Constitutional Revolution, expatriate journalists, businessmen, their philanthropic female relatives, and a few local intellectuals, it was a top-down initiative rather than a grassroots movement (Yıldırım, 2021; Melikoglu 2009; Pinguet 2010; Gündoğdu 2010, 2018 in Faroqhi 2010). Making the movement a political statement to the oriental gaze especially to Europe which has been influencing them on how to conduct modernity and been shocked with the news of Wicked Island.

The Istanbul Society for the Protection of Animals, holding a welfarist view, promoted humane treatment in the city's dog population management. They argued that the Istanbul Municipality should refine the decanisation process to avoid cruel extermination practices. Nonetheless, the methods employed by the Municipality were harsh, transforming the cityscape into a vast slaughterhouse. Many society members who supported Western ideals believed that adopting more sterile, less painful, and less visible killing methods would be more humane and civilized. The Society firmly maintained that dogs should be euthanized discreetly, in a manner that minimized their suffering and did not visibly cause pain or fear (Yıldırım, 2021). This opened up a shift from thanatopolitics to biopolitics of governing these bodies still with the aim of killing.

After the World War 1, the workings of the Society intensified and filled the void left by the state. They provided healthcare and vaccinations to the street animals while continuing the agenda for "humane killings". When the 1950's came, the state was equipped with drugs that were used in the Western World. The decanisation was still happening under these new methods now with a chemical biocide. However, there were rising concerns from the public yet again and the state needed a new agenda to pursue them into compliance (Yıldırım, 2021).

To this end, the threat of rabies was used for the legitimacy of killing street animals. The government launched a program called "State, Citizen, Hand in Hand to Combat Rabies". They distributed bullets and guns to citizens and created a monetary incentive for each dead body following in their ancestors' footsteps in orchestrating violence on the public level. Government-organized biocide against these animals was everywhere with the state using every possible dispositifs on their hands to reach a total decanisation for the urban spaces.

4.3.4 Affection or Violence? Where does the Legal Framework of Rights Fit into Biopolitics?

During the 1970s, the extreme and random violence inflicted on street dogs by the government, including frequent poisonings and shootings, led to widespread public outrage. The Universal Declaration of Animal Welfare, issued on October 15, 1978, though not legally binding or adopted by Turkey, significantly influenced public sentiment and the discourse around animal rights. This shift in public awareness prompted calls for more humane treatment of animals and pressured the municipality to adopt less visible methods of animal population control. Following the military coup of September 12, 1980, the municipality ceased publicizing its extermination statistics, reflecting a move toward more covert operations. This period also saw a strengthening in animal welfare advocacy, pushing for designated safe spaces for street animals, fundamentally altering the urban experience and management these animals in (Yıldırım, 2021).

The transformation of government's approach to handling its street dog population in the late 20th century marked a significant shift towards what is termed as "carceral decanisation" (Yıldırım, 2021). This approach involved a nuanced blend of visibility and spatial management strategies, aimed at addressing public backlash against the overt cruelty previously exhibited towards street dogs. Instead of perpetuating visible acts of violence against dogs, the state developed secluded spaces—specifically, animal shelters. These shelters, while ostensibly serving as refuges for the dogs, actually functioned as sites of confinement, control, and violence aligning with broader carceral practices observed in other forms of institutional containment like prisons or detention centers. The shelters themselves were often situated on the city's peripheries, embodying a form of spatial marginalization that mirrored the treatment of the dogs within. Here, the dogs were subjected to intense surveillance and control, with their movements, behaviors, and reproductive capacities tightly regulated (Sungurbey, 2003). This form of management reveals a deep intertwining of care and control, where the welfare of the dogs was managed in a way that also facilitated their segregation and, in many cases, their eventual culling (Yıldırım, 2021). Moreover, the existence of these shelters did not merely alter the landscape for the dogs but also transformed the human-animal dynamics in the city. They shifted the locus of care from the community and public spaces to isolated, controlled environments, thereby depersonalizing and institutionalizing animal care (Yıldırım, 2021).

First of all, building on what they have learned animal shelters served as environments where municipalities developed the necessary skills, medical practices, and administrative abilities to efficiently carry out large-scale dog exterminations. The first forms of the shelters were built on with barrack-style spatial design where animals weren't chained but locked in large cages with 5 to 10 animals sharing the space. Later on, the cages were individualized with the animals being chained inside. They were not allowed to be socialized or interact with other animals or humans except shelter officials (Yıldırım, 2021). The behavior of shelter officials wasn't regulated or checked thus making way for abuse of power where violence against these bodies could occur even before they were killed by a veterinarian. This type of environment was far from what these animals were used to. The restrictions of their past life of unrestrained mobility and limitless socialization were alone enough for some of them to fall into heavy depression and die without them being killed. This is still the case for some of these street animals today after they are put into shelters. The strict control within animal shelters enabled more systematic and organized medical interventions, particularly in managing the reproductive health of street animals. As a result, spaying and neutering of cats and dogs became routine procedures following the establishment of these shelters (Yıldırım, 2021).

The second consequence of the establishment of these shelters was the fact that it changed the status of these animals within the community from "street animals" to "strays" by establishing designated living spaces for them, making the streets inappropriate for their bodies. Following the establishment of animal shelters, detailed records and statistics about captures, shelter admissions, and spay/neuter procedures began to vanish from public archives. This lack of data highlights the pervasive, unofficial nature of the violence inflicted, as well as the ambiguous and often untracked interactions between humans and non-human animals (Yıldırım, 2021; Massumi, 1992). Moreover, the attitude of doing everything behind closed doors and only allowing which information they wanted to reach the ordinary citizen, resulted the state to avoid public scrutiny which was for a long time the only mechanism of checks and balances that they had in the absence of other regulatory forms.

For nearly a century street animals, who were undeniable parts of the community, who belonged to the streets, protected and able to protect themselves against any kind of threats suffered unimaginable violence, pain, and eventual death under negative forms of biopolitics from two

different countries with the help of extreme immunization paradigm. Both of these countries used every possible dispositifs available to them to conduct their violence, while the old modes of their protection were either abolished or wasn't enough in the face of such a coordinated and systemic assault. This brutal application of power not only stripped these animals of their autonomy and safety but also eroded the communal bonds and relationships that had integrated them into the urban fabric.

During mid-90s, two important incidents ignited the public against the century-old impunity and violence. In 1996, under the leadership of Mayor Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality orchestrated a vast extermination of street dogs and cats, coinciding with the preparations for the UN Habitat II Convention, Istanbul's largest international event to date. During this period, municipal workers indiscriminately killed over 200,000 street animals. The previously debated humane methods of animal euthanasia were completely abandoned in favor of abrupt and chaotic killings. In marginalized areas, municipal workers frequently engaged in open gunfire against dogs, attacking them in parks or while they slept on the streets. In central districts, the killings were more covert, involving poisoned meat and nighttime shootings. By the summer's end, Istanbul's streets were littered with dying animals in distress. To minimize media scrutiny and public outcry, the municipality removed the dead only from central areas. In less visible parts of the city, the carcasses were left in the open. As the UN event continued, the gruesome sight of dead animals in Istanbul's back alleys and streets drew significant media attention, sparking widespread public outrage. This led to an increase in police reports and criminal charges, bolstered by strong visual evidence and eyewitness accounts. By the late 1990s, the public visibility of poisoned and decaying dogs had become a common feature in evening news broadcasts, with print media providing detailed reports, citizen interviews, and comments from remorseful shelter workers (Yıldırım, 2021).[19]

[19] This information was taken from Mine Yıldırım's dissertation "Between Care and Violence Street Dogs of Istanbul" for her Doctor of Philosophy degree which was submitted and accepted by The New School for Social Research of The New School, in April 2021. When I wanted to corroborate the claims from her cited sources, which were national news agencies I was not able to access them digitally. They were either erased from the internet or access has been denied. However, since the information was accepted at the time with a Turkish professor who could have fact-checked its authenticity. Under these, I have accepted its factuality and used in my own work.

The second shift point was the reports of sexual assaults on dogs within municipally run shelters in Istanbul became distressingly common throughout the 1990s. These assaults, involving a range of abusive behaviors from penetration to torture for sexual gratification, were extensively reported by the media, sparking significant public outrage and protests. By the mid-1990s, incidents of sexual abuse against dogs in shelters had escalated from sporadic occurrences to a disturbing norm within the system. Such acts of abuse became embedded in the routines of institutional care, often concealed within the confines of shelter operations. As a result, activists frequently broke into shelters to rescue dogs and confront the abuse. Initially, these incidents were treated by the media as shocking deviations, but over time, they came to be seen as symptomatic of a systemic failure in institutional animal care (Yıldırım, 2021). The widespread dissemination of these horrifying images eventually undermined the public's acceptance of animal shelters, marking a critical turning point. This shift was not driven by the visual documentation of the killings, which were supposed to occur in a space of protection, but rather by the public exposure of the sexual exploitation of shelter dogs, challenging fundamental ethical and moral standards across secular and Islamic communities (Massumi, 2010).

Aftermath of these events started country-wide protests emerged around shelters, including sit-ins, press statements, and direct confrontations with municipal workers during animal displacements. Activists employed tactics like blocking trucks, breaking into shelters to release animals, and vandalizing with graffiti. Other methods included street blockades, destroying shelter infrastructure, hunger strikes, and vocal protests at public appearances of municipal leaders. Meetings and press conferences outside courthouses and the National Assembly also became common forms of advocacy. People started to organize and demand rights against the impunity of such violence. The need and demand for the protection of these bodies occurred under a legal framework within biopolitical governance and resulted in the legalization of animal rights in Turkey (Yıldırım, 2021).

Turkey's first act on animal protection was enacted on June 24, 2004, called "Animal Protection Law (Law no.5199)". It was part of the ratification process[20] for the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals (CoE, 1987) which was signed by Turkey in 1999 (Alkan, 2016). The

[20] Turkish legal framework requires for any signed international convention to be written into Turkish Law as part of its ratification process. In this case Convention fort he Protection of Pet Animals (CoE) ratified as Law.5199.

European Convention primarily addresses the role of domestic animals within private properties, focusing on their contributions to human quality of life and the potential health and safety risks they pose. It sets stringent regulations for pet owners, prioritizing the concerns of those who may be uncomfortable with animals near their living spaces. This aspect of the Convention emphasizes public health concerns over a broader animal welfare agenda. While it imposes strict prohibitions against harmful practices like tail docking, tooth cutting, declawing, and vocal cord removal, its protective measures are mainly limited to owned animals. Conversely, the Convention permits the euthanasia of stray animals but places restrictions on the methods used (Alkan, 2016). It is strictly animal welfare centered on the protection of the animals whilst creating a hierarchical position between animals that are deemed as property (pets, institutionalized animals, or animals that are used for human consumption) and strays.

The Law was a key component of the initial term of the Justice and Development Party-led government (JDP) (Ak Parti (AKP) in Turkish)[21], which was marked by significant constitutional amendments and legal reforms. Paradoxically, Prime Minister of the AKP government was Recep Tayyip Erdoğan who was the Mayor of Istanbul in 1996. The same Mayor allowed 200.000 street animals to be killed in preparation for the UN Convention (Yıldırım, 2021). Law No.5199 in some aspects was ahead of its Western counterparts regarding the writing of its animal-welfare legislation. The Animal Protection Law in Turkey introduces a broad and somewhat philosophical stance on animals by declaring that "all animals are born equal" without providing a specific definition for "animal." This approach diverges from what many animal rights activists might have expected, which would typically include a clear definition that could guide precise legal interpretations and enforcement. The phrase "all animals are born equal" reflects an extension of the principle of equality before the law, traditionally applied to humans, to include animals. This inclusion is underpinned by anthropological views that emphasize a shared sense of care, compassion, and protection for animals, integral to human societies. Essentially, this framework situates the law within an affective regime of animal welfarism, where emotional and ethical considerations towards animals play a central role in shaping the law's spirit and intentions

[21] JDP/AKP abbreviations will be used in this paper rather than using the full name of the political party. From its election in 2002 AKP government and its founder Recep Tayyip Erdoğan have been governing the country in one shape or another. AKP government has been the majority government whilst Erdoğan for his first three term was Prime Minister then with the constitutional change that happened in 2017 (which turned the country from Parliamentary system into a Presidential system) served as the President of the country.

(Yıldırım, 2021). The law thus embodies a commitment to treat animals with a baseline of respect and dignity, recognizing their intrinsic value and the emotional bonds that can exist between humans and animals. On the other hand, the lack of a specific definition of "animal" could lead to varied interpretations, potentially undermining the law's effectiveness. Clear definitions and detailed regulations are crucial for consistent enforcement.

Article 1 argues that "The purpose of this Law is to ensure that animals live comfortably and are treated well and appropriately, with consideration for human, animal, and environmental health, to protect animals from pain, suffering, and torture in the best possible way, and to prevent all kinds of distress" (My own translation from (Law.5199, 2004)). Additionally, Article 13 explicitly prohibits the killing of animals, except under specific legal circumstances such as for medical or scientific reasons, and when not intended for food or due to a threat to humans or the environment. Moreover, it forbids the killing of pregnant, nursing, or birthing animals under any circumstances (Law.5199, 2004). Under the new law, municipalities are tasked with establishing shelters and hospitals for incapacitated and ownerless animals, managing their care, and running educational programs about animal welfare. They are also responsible for the registration and training related to domestic and ownerless animals, managing zoos to mirror natural habitats, and utilizing fines collected for animal welfare purposes (Law.5199, 2004, Article(s) 4/j; 5; 17; 22; 27). Article 6 emphasizes the prohibition of killing stray and incapacitated animals, mandating their prompt transfer to animal shelters for necessary medical care and rehabilitation. The animals, once rehabilitated, are to be released back into their original environments if rehoming is not possible.

Enacted in response to increasing public outcry over abuses in animal shelters and local government practices, the law notably placed street animals under state protection for the first time in Turkey's history. This landmark legislation marked a significant victory for the collective movement dedicated to the welfare of street animals. With its content even though on paper seemed like it was ahead of its counterparts around the world the law had important limitations regarding the community status of street animals. The law established a crucial differentiation between pets and stray animals. It outlined the rights of owned animals in terms of property rights, treating them as the possessions of their owners while categorizing street animals simply as strays. Additionally, the law formally disregards the historical relationships and natural behaviors that these street animals have developed as city dwellers and community members. While the law acknowledges

the physical and psychological suffering of animals, it does not formally recognize animal sentience or rights. It differentiates between necessary and unnecessary suffering, a distinction that Gary Francione criticizes for potentially justifying cruel actions for purported higher purposes. The law's failure to address systematic cruelty (1991), as seen in shelters, animal farming, scientific experimentation, and hunting, is compounded by its classification of violations as misdemeanors rather than criminal offenses, resulting in weak enforcement (Yıldırım, 2021).

Consequently, the initial Animal Protection Law in Turkey did not effectively combat the culture of impunity towards street animals. Firstly, due to its separation between animals as "owned animals" and "ownerless/stray" animals, it denies them their legal persona. With this denial comes ambiguity on which bodies violence can occur? However, the most important factor that helped the culture of impunity was the fact that acts of violence were classified under the Misdemeanors Law, which resulted in virtually no punishment whatsoever to those who have been unfortunate enough to get caught and went through investigation and prosecution process (Law.51199, 2004. Despite these shortcomings, the law still offers significance as the first type of legal framework for the welfare of animals in the country.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter explores the evolution of communal relations between humans and non-human street animals in the Turkish Republic and its predecessor, the Ottoman Empire, from the 19th century through 2004. It specifically examines the Tanzimat (Modernization) Era of the Empire through development leading up to the enactment of Turkey's first legal framework dedicated to the protection and welfare of non-human animals, including street animals. I argue that Esposito's framework of Community, Immunity and Biopolitics represents the transformation of communal relations best.

Esposito's notion of community involves a common bond that also entails a mutual obligation or debt—members of a community are bound by what they share, be it risk, responsibility, or care. In the context of the Tanzimat reforms and the Animal Protection Law, the community of Istanbul undergoes transformation. Originally, street dogs are integrated into the fabric of urban life, sharing space with human inhabitants and forming a part of daily interactions. The community

bond extends to these animals, evidenced by traditional practices of care and coexistence. However, as modernization efforts intensify under the influence of European urban models and the push for a sanitized, orderly city, these communal bonds are disrupted. Street Animals, once considered part of the urban community, are recast as threats to public health and safety, aligning with Esposito's idea that the community often defines itself through exclusion—what it is not. This shift is a clear manifestation of an immunizing logic: by excluding and eventually eradicating street dogs, the community seeks to protect itself from perceived threats of disease and disorder. This mechanism, while protective, can also lead to autoimmunity, where the protective measures harm the very body they aim to defend.

The introduction of the Vagabond Law, Animal Protection Law and the systematic efforts to control, displace, and exterminate street dogs illustrate this immunizing process. The state's actions, driven by desires to modernize and regulate public space, effectively "immunize" the urban community from the "disorder" street dogs purportedly represent. Yet, this process can be seen as an autoimmune response: in seeking to purify and control the urban environment, the state disrupts existing social bonds and community practices of care, erasing a part of the city's own historical and cultural identity.

The biopolitics that emerged from this lexicon of this balance of community and immunity in this case was the negative mode persisted. Extreme immunization led unprecedented violence against these bodies with the aim of eradicating their lives from the streets and altering the communal relationship between humans and street animals altogether.

Chapter 5

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the methods of critical discourse analysis and content analysis will be employed to examine media representations, civil society advocacy efforts, and governmental policies pertaining to street animal management and violence against them in Turkey. Data for this analysis was collected from diverse sources, including print and online news outlets, reports authored by various non-governmental organizations, materials utilized in election propaganda, official government channels, and social media platforms. These sources were selected to provide a comprehensive understanding of the discursive construction and portrayal of street animal-related issues across multiple societal domains. The data collection process involved systematic retrieval and compilation of relevant materials from the aforementioned sources, spanning a period of the last 20 years with a particular emphasis on the three years following the 2021 amendments to the Animal Protection Law. This temporal scope was chosen to capture longitudinal trends and recent developments in street animal management practices and discourses. The inclusion of diverse media sources (both pro-government and independent news outlets), NGO reports, political campaign materials, government communications, and social media content ensures a multi-faceted analysis of street animal-related narratives and discourses within Turkish society. By drawing upon this diverse array of data sources, this study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between political, social, and cultural factors influencing street animal management dynamics and the perpetuation of violence against street animals.

5.2 Amendment to the Animal Protection Law (Law.5199)

As part of a series of posts to demonstrate what he and his party have achieved during 2021, President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan shared this on his official social media platform:

"We made a significant amendment to Law No. 5199 on the Protection of Animals, fulfilling our responsibility towards our beloved animal companions." [22]

There are several important points in this statement worth mentioning. First, it comes directly from the president itself which has great influence over public opinion since Erdoğan has been the charismatic leader of the country for over twenty years. The use of the word "significant" to describe the revisions is also important since it conveys the meaning of success regarding the changes to the general public. Lastly, he chooses the phrase "our beloved animal companions (in Turkish *can dostlarımız*)" referring to animals which has been the key phrase in animal rights advocacy in Turkey for a very long time aligning his message with widespread sentiments of care and protection for animals. His deliberate use of language and strategic placement of the post as part of the long list of accomplishments that serve the interest of the country, and its citizens shows the importance of the issue of street animals and their protection for the political agenda.

The revised version of the law was indeed significant for the public, especially for the people who had been waiting and advocating for a version of the law that was more just to their four-legged companions for over a decade. However, not in the way that the president was intended. The amendment immediately garnered attention and heavy criticism from civil society because of the way it was written and approved. In February 2019, through a proposal by the five political parties represented in the parliament, the Parliamentary Investigation Commission was set up with the aim of determining the necessary measures for the protection of animal rights and the prevention of cruelty and ill-treatment towards animals (Yasamicinyasa, 2021). This commission was the product of the ever-lasting efforts and pressures of the vibrant grass-root organizations that seek to end violence and violations of rights against non-human animals in Turkey. These organizations were a crucial part of the work of the Commission and the subsequent report that they proposed for the changes to the law. Despite collaborative efforts with civil society organizations, the Commission report was entirely disregarded, and a legislative proposal for amendments to Law No.5199 and the Turkish Penal Code, prepared by the ruling AKP party, was rushed through parliamentary approval overnight. Subsequently, the amendments came into effect on July 14, 2021, despite objections from animal rights advocates who contend that the changes fail to protect animals and instead serve the interests of those seeking financial gain through animal exploitation

[22] https://twitter.com/RTErdogan/status/1476825457739763713

(Yasamicinyasa, 2021). The amendments purportedly heralded reforms in animal protection legislation; however, critical analysis reveals glaring inconsistencies and loopholes within the law. Notably, while the amendments recognize animals as sentient beings rather than mere property, no explicit provision abolishing their status as property is articulated. Moreover, although the amendments ostensibly regulate the sale of animals in pet shops, they fail to prohibit the commercial trade of animals, perpetuating conditions conducive to animal exploitation and suffering.

Additionally, while the amendments introduce provisions for criminalizing acts of cruelty towards animals (including killing, torturing, and sexual abuse) under the Turkish Penal Code rather than solely under the Misdemeanors Law, the prescribed penalties still fall short of ensuring meaningful accountability for offenders. They are either postponed or cnverted into insignificant amount of cash. This is because the maximum punitive sentence is set at three years, which typically does not result in jail time or criminal incarceration unless the perpetrator commits another crime within five years. Given the often-lengthy judicial processes, even if another crime is committed, it would likely surpass this timeframe, resulting in virtually no punishment for these crimes.

Furthermore, the authority to report animal cruelty is exclusively granted to the administration of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, with the stated goal of reducing the workload on courthouses. This restriction prevents citizens, political parties, and NGOs from initiating legal action against perpetrators of violence, unless they directly witness the act and involve police and prosecutors at the crime scene. Given the state's history of institutional violence against these animals, allowing only the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry to file complaints helps perpetuate violence against street animals, often without consequence (Law.5199, 2004). Moreover, the amendments do little to tackle systemic issues such as the designation of certain dog breeds as "dangerous" or the operation of municipal shelters that function effectively as euthanasia centers. These factors contribute to the precarious situation of non-human, especially street, animals within society (Yasamicinyasa, 2021).

Despite the concerted efforts of various stakeholders, including NGOs, the public, and political parties, to safeguard the lives of non-human animals in Turkey, the revised version of the law ultimately fell significantly short of expectations. Rather than addressing the root causes of cruelty against these animals, it served to further politicize the issue of street animals in the country,

perpetuating their vulnerability to abuse and neglect and continuation of impunity which has a long history.

5.3 Where Does Street Animals Belong?: The debate sparked by Erdoğan; Shelters or streets?

Not long after the amendment of Law No: 5199 amid all of its controversy, the country was confronted with news of "street dogs attacking young children" across the nation. On 22 December, 2021, a 4-year-old child called Asiye in one of Turkey's major cities was attacked by two dogs belonging to what is now considered a "dangerous" species. Her severe injuries coupled with the fact that these two dogs were not supposed to be even out of the shelters in the first place by the newly accepted Animal Protection Law presented a good opportunity for another set of biopolitical *dispositifs* to emerge. During the same day, Erdoğan participated in his political parties' three-day Municipal Mayors Consultation and Evaluation Meeting to think about the upcoming national municipal election in 2023. [23]

"I would like to draw your attention to a matter of sensitivity here. It's about the issue of street animals. Unfortunately, we often come across distressing news in the media about incidents caused by stray dogs attacking children. First and foremost, we must not forget that the place for stray animals is shelters, not the streets. (…) Mayors, (…) Please take proactive steps for stray animals, by establishing warm and safe shelters and promoting the production of animal food from food waste, we can win over many hearts, we can win hearts. In this way, we can ensure not only the safety of our citizens from the threats posed by stray animals but also fulfill our responsibility towards animals, who are also living beings." (President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, 2021)[24]

[23] https://www.sabah.com.tr/gundem/2021/12/22/ak-partide-kamp-mesaisi-basliyor-baskan-erdogan-belediye-baskanlari-ile-bulusacak?paging=4

[24] https://www.ntv.com.tr/turkiye/cumhurbaskani-erdogan-sahipsiz-hayvanlarin-yeri-sokaklar-degil-barinaklardir,2z39KmcdL0-oTnx0tPixxw Translated by the author.

The President's remarks, coinciding with Asiye's attack, immediately provoked a public backlash against street animals. His words legitimized the machine of ferality with the discourse of protection and threat once again.

Erdoğan begins his speech by referencing attacks similar to Asiye's case, highlighting street dogs as a pressing issue requiring government intervention. He asserts the duty of the government to gather all stray dogs and place them in shelters to prevent harm to citizens. While cautioning mayors to execute their duty without causing harm to animals, he appears to advocate for animal welfare (Erdoğan, 2021). However in reality he sanctions a threshold of suffering for animals, deeming violence as necessary for ensuring citizen safety.

At the governmental level, the perpetuation of violence against street animals in Turkey is intertwined with the operation of the shelter system. Emerging in the 1980s, these shelters initially served as spaces for out-of-sight dog culling and mass eradication, thereby legitimizing the violence inflicted upon these animals (Yıldırım, 2021). However, as stated clearly by the Law No. 5199 Article 6[25], the approach to managing street animal populations is based on the principle of "Catch, Neuter, Release." Despite this legal framework, the public opposition from the President has created an environment where municipalities feel empowered to exceed the limits of the law with impunity yet again which in retrospect was escalating already. Consequently, this caused a chain of events, wherein street animals were rounded up by municipalities and subjected to various forms of cruelty and abuse got away with it without legal sanction imposed upon them on various occasions up until the municipal election happened on March 31, 2024 and the subsequent amendment to the Law.5199 on August 2024.

President Erdoğan's sentiment reminded the one Istanbul's Mayor Kadir Topbaş made in 2014 on live TV. He declared their intent to address what they termed a longstanding issue in the city by establishing two large stray animal detention centers on both sides of Istanbul. Each facility will have the capacity to house at least 20,000 dogs, removing them from the streets to prevent them from roaming freely. The municipality stated this plan as the ultimate solution to eliminate the presence of stray dogs in Istanbul, aiming to definitively resolve the city's chronic issue by creating

[25] https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=5199&MevzuatTur=1&MevzuatTertip=5,

the world's largest animal shelters (Yıldırım, 2021). [26] Big animal detention centers usually called rehabilitation centers or natural living areas were already under construction or constructed after the Mayor's speech in Istanbul. They all had similar characteristics. They are built on large grounds usually at the edges of the city where public transportation is limited or non-existent which restricts the volunteers and ordinary citizens from visiting it regularly. The animals that are not sick or dangerous live in all access spaces (open to the public). However, they each stay in their own individual kennels, they are chained and aren't allowed to socialize with each other. The ones that are sick stay in the medical wing of the center until they are healed or they die. The last wing is allocated for the "dangerous ones". They can be either illegal species such as pit bulls or the animals that are perceived as uncontrollable, violent and dangerous. These animals also stay in small, individualized spaces but inside buildings with no windows and chained to the walls (Yıldırım, 2021). The type of animal shelter that the Mayor was referring to again shows us just how far the government's immunization against street dogs can go. No communal relationships were allowed between humans and animals as well as with each other and total control over their bodies. Mine Yıldırım argues that these animals endure great violence within these shelters and the violence against them occurs extra-legally with methods that are not allowed in the Law.5199 They are beaten to the point of torture, shot with guns, or died with unknown methods besides the use of permitted drugs (2021).

One of these extreme violence within the shelters was reported by veterinarian Ege Kabataş, formerly employed at the Beykoz Municipality Animal Shelter He paints a disturbing picture of the conditions within the facility. According to Kabataş, his tenure revealed widespread neglect and malpractice, including instances where 48 cats died for unknown reasons in a single day when he wasn't working. He claims that the said animals were fine and were in a state where their deaths in a single day were impossible. He also states that there was not enough euthanasia drugs within the facility during the time and he did not know which methods were used to slaughter these animals. This incident and others prompted Kabataş to speak out about the systemic issues plaguing the shelter. Kabataş's claims gained traction when he attempted to address these concerns internally but faced resistance and eventual dismissal when his efforts to reform the shelter's practices were met with bureaucratic indifference and hostility. His whistleblowing actions,

[26] CNN Turk, Beki. Akif. (Producer). (2014, March 14). Baştan Sona [Television broadcast]

including capturing images of the conditions inside the shelter, were intended to spur change but instead led to his exclusion from the facility and accusations of misconduct. The shelter, endorsed by President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan as a model institution[27], became a focal point for animal rights activism after disturbing practices came to light, including the use of bleach to euthanize animals and the mysterious disappearance of numerous shelter animals. Despite Kabataş's efforts to bring these issues to the attention of higher authorities and the public, little has changed. The shelter continues to operate under questionable management, with high-end cars and private drivers for staff members raising further suspicions about financial mismanagement where the allocated money for the welfare of these animals from the Ministery comes lacking in the official books.[28]

The other shelter that was praised by Erdoğan was Konya Rehabilitation Center which again came into scrutiny in 2022 with two shelter officials were recorded in a video where they were killing a dog using their shovels. [29] The two perpetrators after a judicial process were left with no charges. [30] Another tragedy came from Elazığ Rehabilitation Center. After a complaint, Elazığ Center was investigated by a public prosecutor. He revealed in his report that in 4 months there was 1062 animal deaths occurred for mainly unknown reasons including beheading and beating. He asked for a maximum prison sentence for the officials who were responsible for this grave violence. However, like its Konya counterpart the perpetuators were left with impunity yet again. [31]

President Erdoğan claiming that street animals belonged to the shelters not to the streets is the reminiscence of multiple incidents over a century that was aimed at breaking communal bonds and status of these animals in the name of public safety which leads to politics of violence at an institutional level to be perpetuated over and over again.

[27] https://yesilgazete.org/erdogandan-nice-vahsete-sahne-olan-beykoz-ve-konya-barinaklarina-ovgu-takdir-ettim/

[28] https://t24.com.tr/yazarlar/tugce-tatari/o-veteriner-hekim-anlatiyor-kopek-bolumunden-sonra-atandigim-kedi-bolumunde-de-kiyim-vardi,38297

[29] https://www.milliyet.com.tr/gundem/turkiyeyi-sarsan-goruntu-konyadaki-vahsette-2-kisi-tutuklandi-6862762

[30] file:///Users/aysimaahsen/Zotero/storage/EFJRL3MY/konyadaki-barinak-vahsetinin-saniklarina-tahliye-karari,pF2ZnY-1qkOrHYqOkIheQg.html

[31] file:///Users/aysimaahsen/Zotero/storage/AZH32D55/elazig-gecici-bakimevindeki-dehset-icin-beraat-karari-insanlik-sucu.html

5.4 Street Animals as Election Propaganda and Last Amendment to the Animal Protection Law

The discourses surrounding the presence of street animals from the state officials and the President Erdoğan were once again on the rise just before the nationwide municipal election on March 2023. On January 2024, Yeniden Refah Partisi (one of AKP's coalition partners in the election) published a video as part of their election propaganda called "Municipal Governance with Morals". In the video a woman first tells to the camera "If there is no morals" which a little girl finishes saying "there are stray animals". After their lines, the voice of a man says "We will protect our streets, we will make our children live!" with the exact words appearing on the screen. [32] This propaganda video was the representation of the election process that Turkey went through in March 2024. Murat Kurum (AKP's candidate for Istanbul Municipality) stated that his vision for the future of the city contained the eradication of Istanbul's "stray dog" problem which affected women and children's safety on the street. [33] His words were also reflected from the Governor of Istanbul, Ahmet Gül on live TV who claimed that there were two choices regarding the fate of the street animals. One of them was putting all of them in shelters until the rehoming occurs or putting them to sleep if the adoption process is not complete. The basis of his argument was the fact that there are not any ownerless animals an animal should be the property of someone. [34]

All of these had important cultural and material significance throughout this time. The election video was the continuation of the ferality process that has been happening against these animals for such a long time. It framed these bodies as threats to women and children (the most fragile segment of the population) of the Turkish Republic which was the duty of the state to protect at all costs. Additionally, it framed the issue with the theme of morality which is yet again considered as one of the most important notion that needs to be upholded and protected under Turkish culture and Islam. Kurum's speech signaled what would happen after the election, a purpose that hasn't been achieved by the Republic for a century and Gül provided the method of how it would be achieved. It would be with a method that was not allowed either legally or culturally; euthanasia

[32] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pBsdAiYwYHc

[33] https://bianet.org/yazi/yerel-secimler-ve-beseriyetin-banileri-291143
[34] https://bianet.org/yazi/yerel-secimler-ve-beseriyetin-banileri-291143

for the Republic. To this end immediate aftermath of the election there was another proposed amendment to the Animal Protection Law.

On August 2, 2024 this proposal was accepted by the Turkish National Assembly with a huge amount of public backlash and protests which continues to this day. With this last amendment, Municipalities were now allowed to kill healthy street animals legally if they weren't owned as pets (Law.5199, 2004). The state has finally achieved full biopolitical control over street animals and destroyed the one form of communal relationship humans had with them probably once and for all.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I wanted to map out the developments of the biopolitics of street animal control in Turkey after the enactment of its animal protection law. It was evident that what was seen as a significant development against the systematic violence and negative mode of biopolitics that occurred against street animals in Turkey and its predecessor the Ottoman Empire, only perpetuated of the same violence to continue but this time not extra-legally. Feralization and exclusion of these bodies continued as the political officials constructed them as a threat to public safety and the modern urban order as a mechanism of auto-immunization against the community of humans and their non-human friends.

The legal framework in this content was not able to protect these communal bonds where these animals once felt safe roaming the streets and the companionship they enjoyed from humans, as the two amendments to the Animal Protection Law achieved total biopolitical governance over these bodies with the ultimate aim of eradication after nearly a century. As Esposito argues, the law which was supposed to protect them against violence only allowed its perpetual cycle.

Chapter 6 Concluding Reflections: Reimagining Community and Biopolitics

As a country we are used to see cats and dogs roaming the streets in a manner of carelessness. They are our companions at nights when we walk empty streets, providing us with a sense of ultimate companionship and protection. When we see them lying under the sun enjoying its warmth and being lazy while we run to our busy days it puts a smile onto our faces. In cold weather or rain we all take a refuge in the cozy cafés, libraries, restaurants… Any place that has walls and radiators really. They have their share in what we eat and drink, so we leave what belongs to them in the same place, day after day. They protect what we can't, when we can't. When they need a belly rub or a scratch they come to us in the hopes of receiving them. They come to us when we are sad, anxious or full of love wanting to share our emotions. In the streets we are never alone, sad or under threat.

I thought these sentiments were reflected by the every citizen of my country until I was bombarded with the news of utter violence and misery against my friends every day for a while now. Anytime I see poisonings, torture, beatings and death of my friends, my companions; same questions come to my mind. How can anyone inflict violence upon these bodies? How can sight of cats and dogs on the streets bother people to the point of them wanting them all gone? Who decides they don't belong to these streets that we share together? These questions was the starting point of this thesis. I wanted to know what broke the community we share and what ignited these act of violences.

Esposito's framework of Community, Immunity and Biopolitics provided me the lens for my analysis. He argues that Community, Immunity and Biopolitics can't be separated and think of separately. They all link in a complex way to govern the life itself (Esposito, 2013). In modernity biopolitics emerges to regulate and protect life at the point of extreme immunization. The political legitimacy comes from this exact intersection. Excluding some in the hopes to save the excluded, utterly disregarding our co-existence as living beings. Falling to the traps of the negative mode of biopolitics that eventually leads the auto-destruction of the same community we want to protect. The law in this paradigm of immunization leads to the perpetuating the same violence it wants to protect contributing to the destruction of our alterity with the others.

The fate of the street animals in Turkish context seems to be heading to the same exact direction. Before the Tanzimat Era which started the modernization period of the Turks, street animals were essential part of the community. There was mutual affection and ethos of care between these animals and humans. They benefited and protected each other; they allowed their alterity to shape their existence and experiences in this world. They were part of the same community, belonging to the same place the streets of their neighbourhood.

With the ideas of modernity, Ottoman Empire went through a profound transformation which affected the relations of this community eventually leading to its perceived death. The ideology of sanitation and order came first. Constructing these bodies as dirty, sick and unwanted. They become feralized by the intellectuals and state officials who wanted their country to comply with the modernity of Europe. This feralization resulted into an unprecedented violence to ever be experienced in the forms of control of their movement, exile, mass killings. These acts of violence from the state continued in one shape or another, mainly extra legally and without any form of official mechanism to prevent it (Yıldırım, 2021).

With the two events of mid-90's the animal rights movement gained momentum in Turkey becoming politically organized against this negative mode of biopolitics over the lives of the street animals in an attempt to fix the community. This movement resulted in Turkey to enact its first Animal Protection Law (Law. 5199). The law at first started with the aim of reintegrating street animals into the social and legal fabric of the community by offering them protections that were previously absent. However, over time, the law's limitations became evident as it failed to address the systemic issues and deep-seated prejudices that had led to the marginalization and mistreatment of these animals. Despite the law's initial promise, the persistent acts of violence and the cultural narratives that feralized street animals persisted.

The situation took a drastic turn with the two amendments to the Animal Protection Law in 2021 and in 2024. These changes, ostensibly designed to further protect animals, in fact, deepened the biopolitical control over their lives, marking a regression to practices reminiscent of the Tanzimat modernization efforts that first disrupted the human-animal community. By legally sanctioning the removal of street animals to isolated shelters and enabling their euthanasia under certain conditions, the amendments undermined the very ethos of communal living and co-existence that the original

law sought to restore. This reversion to a negative mode of biopolitics, where the life and death of street animals are managed and controlled to an even greater extent, highlights a profound failure of the Turkish legal and political system to embrace a true community ethos that includes all forms of life. Instead of protecting life, the amended law now contributes to the biopolitical governance that justifies exclusion and eradication under the guise of public safety and health. This shift not only endangers the lives of street animals but also erodes the social fabric of the community by fostering environments of fear and intolerance rather than care and mutual respect.

The culmination of this thesis shows that unless there is a fundamental shift in the biopolitical approach taken by the state—away from a framework of excessive immunity that results in auto-immunization- and toward a framework of affective biopolitics that embraces inclusivity and recognizes the intrinsic value of all community members, human and non-human alike—the cycle of violence and marginalization is likely to continue. Esposito's concept of affective biopolitics highlights the need for policies that not only protect but also promote positive relationships and mutual care among all forms of life. For Turkey to move forward and truly address the plight of its street animals, it must reconsider the roots of its communal bonds and the ethical obligations that arise from shared cohabitation in urban spaces. This involves transforming the legal and cultural narratives that have historically marginalized street animals, fostering an environment where they are seen not as threats or nuisances, but as integral members of the community. As we look towards the future, it is imperative that we strive to reconstruct not just the laws that govern our treatment of street animals, but also the underlying attitudes and beliefs that shape these policies. Only by incorporating the principles of affective biopolitics—focusing on empathy, care, and the common good—can we hope to restore the community we have lost and protect the vulnerable lives that depend on our advocacy and action.

Timeline of Key Developments in the Great Separation

1830s - 1840s: Early Sanitary Concerns and Cultural Reflections	**Emergence of Sanitary Ideas**	Public awareness about urban sanitation issues rose. Edwin Chadwick advocated for reforms. Concept of the "bacteriological city" emerged.
	Literary and Artistic Responses	Authors like Charles Dickens highlighted urban filth in novels such as *Oliver Twist* and *Bleak House*. Cultural reflections on city conditions increased.
	Establishment of the Metropolitan Sewers Commission (1847)	Aimed to improve sanitation in London with systematic waste management efforts.
1850s: Crisis and Initial Reforms	**Political Challenges and the Great Stink (1858)**	The "Great Stink" from the polluted River Thames led to increased public and political support for sewer systems.
	Technological Debates and Advancements	Debates on sewer construction methods; 2,600 miles of piped sewers by 1854 reflecting rapid technological adoption.
1860s - 1870s: Consolidation of Sanitary Reforms	**Joseph Bazalgette and the Integrated Sewer System (Completed in 1875)**	Bazalgette's comprehensive sewer system became a model for urban sanitation, introducing an effective waste management network.
	Cultural and Ideological Shifts	Modernized urban environments shifted perceptions, emphasizing cleanliness and order in city design.
1880s - Early 20th Century: Completion of the Great Separation	**Decline of Animal Presence in Cities**	Reduction of animals due to increased sanitation and infrastructure; motorized vehicles replaced horses.
	Impact on Public Health and Urban Planning	Development of the "sanitary city" concept, influencing modern urban planning and public health regulations.
Mid-20th Century Onwards: Legacy of the Great Separation	**Permanent Changes in Urban Environments**	Deep integration of sanitary reforms into urban planning; mechanization and decline of animal-powered transport completed the Great Separation.

Figure 1 Timeline of Key Developments in the Great Seperation

Timeline of Key Legislative Acts and Developments for Animal Nuisances and Public Health in 19th Century London

1817	**Act for Better Paving, Improving, and Regulating the Streets of the Metropolis**	Initiated parliamentary interest in animal nuisances. Required abatement of nuisances from pigs, slaughterhouses, etc. Prohibited swine within 40 yards of streets/public places.
1844	**Metropolis Buildings Act**	Defined offensive trades by their smells (e.g., blood boilers, bone boilers, slaughterers). Delayed restriction of such trades near homes/public highways by 30 years.
1846	**Removal of Nuisances and Prevention of Epidemic Diseases Act**	Allowed intervention if a nuisance was certified by two doctors as injurious to health. Addressed public health risks like cholera.
1847	**Towns Improvement Clauses Act**	Gave local authorities power to prevent unlicensed new slaughterhouses. Allowed local regulation of offensive trades and animal-related nuisances.
1847	**Town Police Clauses Act**	Prohibited throwing offensive waste into streets. Forbade keeping swine near streets if it constituted a common nuisance.
1848	**Public Health Act**	Established local Boards of Health in areas with high mortality rates. Enabled regulation of slaughterhouses and offensive trades. Allowed compilation of slaughter-house register.
1855	**Metropolis Management Act**	Allowed London districts to appoint Medical Officers of Health and Inspectors of Nuisances. Aimed to regulate urban cleanliness and manage public health risks.
1855	**Nuisances Removal and Diseases Prevention Act**	Consolidated earlier acts (1846, 1848) for easier enforcement. Mandated each local authority to appoint at least one Sanitary Inspector.
1866	**Sanitary Act**	Required enforcement of sanitary regulations by local authorities. Empowered authorities to abate nuisances and mandated regular manure removal.
1874	**Slaughter-houses Metropolis Act**	Enabled Metropolitan Board of Works to establish by-laws for slaughter-house operations. Resulted in closure of many slaughterhouses in London.
1875	**Public Health Act**	Comprehensive regulation of urban sanitation and public health. Included specific provisions on nuisances, offensive trades, and slaughter-house licensing.
1877	**Model By-laws Issued by the Local Government Board**	Encouraged standardized regulations for offensive trades and slaughterhouses. Added more trades to the list of those considered offensive.
1890	**Public Health Acts Amendment Act**	Allowed local authorities to determine the length of licenses for offensive trades. Refined and enforced public health and sanitation measures.
1891	**Public Health (London) Act**	Prohibited new offensive trades in London. Allowed flexibility in licensing period for existing slaughterhouses.
1893	**London County Council's Consolidated By-laws on Offensive Trades**	Further clarified and enforced regulations on offensive trades to protect public health.

Figure 2 Timeline of Key Legislative Acts and Devolopments for Animal Nuisances and Public Health in 19th Century London

Timeline of Stray Dog Management in Paris		
18th Century	**1725: Early Ordinance on Stray Dogs**	Order from the Châtelet de Paris prohibits merchants and artisans from allowing their dogs to roam, addressing public safety concerns.
	1791: Establishment of Municipal Pound (Fourrière)	Official identification of the pound as the place for impounding stray animals, setting a precedent for confinement and culling.
19th Century	**1813: Police Ordinance under Napoleon**	Reinforced requirement for dogs to be tied, muzzled, or confined; non-compliance led to destruction. Aligns with public order and hygiene efforts.
	1845: Extended Measures Against Stray Dogs	Ordinance requires all street dogs to be muzzled and collared, linking stray dogs to danger and criminality.
	1850: Grammont Law Enacted	Law focuses on preventing violence in public, including control and slaughter of stray dogs.
	1852: Minister for General Police Advocates for Stray Dog Removal	Emphasis on removing strays for public safety, reflecting state concern with managing urban populations.
	1855: Implementation of Dog Tax	Tax aimed to reduce the dog population, particularly targeting the lower classes.
	858: Rabies Scare Heightens Concerns	Increased focus on stray dogs as disease vectors, leading to stricter control measures.
	1860s: Rise of Public Hygiene Movements	Stray dogs seen as threats to social order, prompting increased efforts to manage their presence.
	1878: Spike in Rabies Cases	Ordinance mandates immediate seizure and killing of uncollared dogs. Significant increase in impoundment and slaughter.
	1881-1882: Nationwide Rabies Regulations	Regulations permit immediate killing of dogs and cats suspected of rabies; uncollared dogs are impounded and destroyed.
	1883: Emile Capron's Call for Stray Dog Removal	Highlights issues like rabies spread and traffic accidents caused by strays, reflecting growing public alarm.
	1892: High Number of Stray Dogs Impounded	Over 26,500 dogs impounded due to rabies spike; a particularly lethal year for strays.
	Late 19th Century: Continued Stray Dog Control Efforts	Despite advances in rabies understanding, strays remain associated with danger and disorder.
Early 20th Century	**1902: Introduction of "Cynoctone"**	Device for humane asphyxiation of dogs introduced, aligning with public hygiene and animal protectionist concerns.
	1910: Seine Flood and Continued Anti-Stray Campaigns	Persistent anti-stray campaigns amid ongoing urban vulnerabilities and public health concerns.
	1912: Motorized Vehicles for Stray Collection	Introduction of motorized vehicles improves efficiency of stray dog impoundment and culling.
	1918-1919: Influenza Epidemic Parallels	Demonstrates the limits of controlling stray dog populations amidst broader public health crises.
Post-World War I	**Ongoing Anti-Stray Campaigns**	Continued focus on stray dog management, evolving towards issues like excrement control and public health concerns.

Figure 3Timeline of Stray Dog Management in Paris

Bibliography

Anilan, E. (2021, December 22). Ak Parti'de kamp mesaisi başlıyor! Başkan Erdoğan, belediye başkanları ile buluşacak. *Sabah*. https://www.sabah.com.tr/gundem/2021/12/22/ak-partide-kamp-mesaisi-basliyor-baskan-erdogan-belediye-baskanlari-ile-bulusacak

Başkan Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Paylaştı! "2021 Yılında Neler Mi Yaptık?" (2024, May 1). *Aksam*. https://www.aksam.com.tr/foto-galeri/guncel/baskan-recep-tayyip-erdogan-paylasti-2021-yilinda-neler-mi-yaptik/66588

Bianet. (2022, November 21). "Cumhurbaşkanının talimatı yasaya aykırı, bağlayıcı değil, uygulanamaz." *Bianet*. https://bianet.org/haber/cumhurbaskaninin-talimati-yasaya-aykiri-baglayici-degil-uygulanamaz-270270

Bianet. (2024a, January 30). Yerel seçimler ve beşeriyetin "banileri." *Bianet*. https://bianet.org/yazi/yerel-secimler-ve-beseriyetin-banileri-291143

Bianet. (2024b, January 30). Yerel seçimler ve beşeriyetin "banileri." *Bianet*. https://bianet.org/yazi/yerel-secimler-ve-beseriyetin-banileri-291143

Cary Wolfe. (2010). Before the law: Animals in a biopolitical context. *Law, Culture, and the Humanities, 6*(1).

Cumhurbaşkanı Erdoğan: Sahipsiz hayvanların yeri sokaklar değil barınaklardır. (n.d.). *NTV*. https://www.ntv.com.tr/turkiye/cumhurbaskani-erdogan-sahipsiz-hayvanlarin-yeri-sokaklar-degil-barinaklardir,2z39KmcdL0-oTnx0tPixxw

Donaldson, S., & Kymlicka, W. (2014). *Zoopolis: A political theory of animal rights*. Oxford University Press.

Dha. (n.d.). Pitbull saldırısına ilişkin görüntülerin bir kısmı silinmiş! Asiye Ateş'ten ilk kare. *Hürriyet Ana sayfa*. https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/pitbull-saldirisina-iliskin-goruntulerin-bir-kismi-silinmis-asiye-atesten-ilk-kare-41970989

Elazığ Geçici Bakımevi'ndeki dehşet için beraat kararı: İnsanlık suçu. (n.d.). *Yeşil Gazete*. https://yesilgazete.org/elazig-gecici-bakimevindeki-dehset-icin-beraat-karari-insanlik-sucu/

Faroqhi, S. (2005). *Subjects of the Sultan*. I.B. Tauris.

Faroqhi, S. (Ed.). (2010). *Animals and people in the Ottoman Empire*. Eren Yayıncılık.

Google Arts & Culture. (n.d.). https://artsandculture.google.com/

Hart, K. (2019). Istanbul's intangible cultural heritage as embodied by street animals. *History and Anthropology, 30*(4), 448–459. https://doi.org/10.1080/02757206.2019.1610404

Hole, K. (2013). The ethics of communitynancy, Blanchot, esposito. *Angelaki, 18*(3), 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969725x.2013.834668

Işın, E. (1985). 19. yy'da modernleşme ve gündelik hayat. In M. Belge (Ed.), *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 2, pp. 63-68). İletişim Yayınları.

Işın, E. (1987). Dört ayaklı belediye, ya da İstanbul köpekleri. *Çağdaş Şehir, 5*, 61-64.

Işın, E. (1999). *İstanbul'da gündelik hayat: İnsan, kültür ve mekân ilişkileri üzerine toplumsal tarih denemeleri*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Işın, E. (2008). *Everyday life in Istanbul: Social historical essays on people, culture and spatial relations*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Kete, K. (1994). The beast in the boudoir: Petkeeping in Nineteenth-Century Paris. University of California Press.

Langford, P. (2015). *Roberto Esposito: Law, community and the political*. Routledge.

Massumi, B. (1993). *The politics of everyday fear*. University of Minneapolis Press.

Massumi, B. (2014). *What animals teach us about politics*. Duke University Press.

Melikoğlu, B. (2009). Türkiye'de kurulan ilk hayvanları koruma derneğinin tarihsel gelişimi. *Veteriner Hekimler Derneği Dergisi, 80*(1), 37-44.

Melikoğlu, B., GüI, R. T. B., & Özkul, T. (2009). Paul Ambroise Remlinger: A Pasteurien in Turkey and his studies on rabies. *Revue de Médecine Vétérinaire, 160*(7), 374-377.

Mevzuat Bilgi Sistemi. (n.d.). Cumhurbaşkanlığı forsu. https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/

Ntv. (2023, January 2). Konya'daki barınak vahşetinin sanıklarına tahliye kararı. *NTV*. https://www.ntv.com.tr/turkiye/konyadaki-barinak-vahsetinin-saniklarina-tahliye-karari,pF2ZnY-1qkOrHYqOkIheQg

Olivier, G. A. (1977). *Türkiye seyahatnamesi: 1790 yıllarında Türkiye ve İstanbul* (O. Gökmen, Trans.). Ayyıldız Press.

O veteriner hekim anlatıyor: "Köpek" bölümünden sonra atandığım "kedi" bölümünde de kıyım vardı, izinli olduğum gün 48 kedi birden ölmüş ve benim nöbetime yazmışlar; kutuda

unutulup açlıktan ölen hayvanlar var!(n.d.). *T24*. https://t24.com.tr/yazarlar/tugce-tatari/o-veteriner-hekim-anlatiyor-kopek-bolumunden-sonra-atandigim-kedi-bolumunde-de-kiyim-vardi,38297

Pearson, C. (2017). Stray Dogs and the Making of Modern Paris*. Past & Present, 234(1), 137–172. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtw050

Pinguet, C. (2009). *İstanbul'un köpekleri* (S. Özen, Trans.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Pinguet, C. (2010). Istanbul's street dogs at the end of the Ottoman Empire: Protection or extermination. In S. Faroqhi (Ed.), *Animals and people in the Ottoman Empire* (pp. 353-372). Eren Yayıncılık.

Reyhanlı, T. (1983). *İngiliz gezginlere göre XVI. yüzyılda İstanbul'da hayat (1582-1599)*. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayını.

Roberto Esposito. (2013). Community, immunity, biopolitics. *Angelaki, 18*(3).

Spataris, H. (2004). *Biz İstanbullular böyleyiz! - Fener'den anılar (1906-1922)*. Kitap Yayınevi.

Sungurbey, I. (1993). *Hayvan hakları: Bir insanlık kitabı*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi.

Türkiye'yi sarsan görüntü! Konya'daki vahşette 2 kişi tutuklandı. (n.d.). *Milliyet*. https://www.milliyet.com.tr/gundem/turkiyeyi-sarsan-goruntu-konyadaki-vahsette-2-kisi-tutuklandi-6862762

Twitter. (n.d.). X.com. https://twitter.com/rterdogan

YouTube. (n.d.). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pBsdAiYwYHc

Yıldırım, M. (2021). *Between Care and Violence Street Dogs of Istanbul* (dissertation).

Zarifi, Y. L., & Skotiniyadis, K. (2006). *Hatıralarım: Kaybolan bir dünya: İstanbul 1800-1920*.

Yasamicinyasa. (n.d.). Eylül 2021. Eşit, adil, yaşan