

UrbanStudies

FRANK ECKARDT,
KATHRIN WILDNER (EDS.)

Public Istanbul

Spaces and Spheres
of the Urban



[transcript]

Frank Eckardt, Kathrin Wildner (eds.)
Public Istanbul

FRANK ECKARDT, KATHRIN WILDNER (EDS.)

Public Istanbul

Spaces and Spheres of the Urban

[transcript]

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

© 2008 transcript Verlag, Bielefeld



**This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 License.**

Cover layout: Kordula Röckenhaus, Bielefeld

Cover illustration: Kathrin Wildner, Istanbul, 2005

Proofread by: Esther Blodau-Konick, Kathryn Davis, Kerstin Kempf

Typeset by: Gonzalo Oroz

Printed by: Majuskel Medienproduktion GmbH, Wetzlar

ISBN 978-3-89942-865-0

CONTENT

Preface	7
PART 1 CONTESTED SPACES	
Introduction: Public Space as a Critical Concept. Adequate for Understanding Istanbul Today?	13
FRANK ECKARDT	
Mapping Social Istanbul. Extracts of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area Atlas	21
MURAT GÜVENÇ	
Contested Public Spaces vs. Conquered Public Spaces. Gentrification and its Reflections on Urban Public Space in Istanbul	29
EDA ÜNLÜ YÜCESOY	
Globalization, Locality and the Struggle over a Living Space. The Case of Karanfilköy	49
SEVİL ALKAN	
Fortress Istanbul. Gated Communities and the Socio-Urban Transformation	83
ORHAN ESEN/TİM RİENİETS	
Peripheral Public Space. Types in Progress	113
ELA ALANYALI ARAL	
Old City Walls as Public Spaces in Istanbul	141
FUNDA BAŞ BÜTÜNER	
Regenerating »Public Istanbul«. Two Projects on the Golden Horn	163
SENEM ZEYBEKOĞLU	

Public Transformation of the Bosphorus. Facts and Opportunities	187
<hr/>	
EBRU ERDÖNMEZ/SELİM ÖKEM	

PART 2 EXPERIENCING ISTANBUL

Introduction: Spaces of Everyday Life	209
<hr/>	
KATHRIN WILDNER	

Istanbul's Worldliness	215
<hr/>	
ASU AKSOY	

Public People. Temporary Labor Migrants in Nineteenth Century Istanbul	233
<hr/>	
FLORIAN RIEDLER	

The Public and the Private. Discourses and Identifications among Vanlı Women in Istanbul	255
<hr/>	
ANNA GRABOLLE-ÇELIKER	

Creating New Spaces, Claiming Rights. West African Immigrants in Istanbul	279
<hr/>	
KORAY ÖZDİL	

Whose Space, Whose Culture? Struggle for Cultural Representation in »French Street« of Istanbul	299
<hr/>	
SUSANNE PREHL	

Sabiha in »Public Istanbul«	319
<hr/>	
FERIDE ÇIÇEKOĞLU	

Subjects that don't count. Places that are not important. 5 Artistic Approaches	333
<hr/>	
SUSANNE BOSCH	

Notes on Contributors	349
------------------------------	-----

Preface

Since ancient times, Istanbul has been one of the most important cities on the European continent. In the 20th century, urban transformation processes marked the metropolis. As a result of intense internal migration from the 1950's to the end of the 20th century, the city grew to an official population of 12 million, with inhabitants on both sides of the Bosphorus. In spite of master plans to control the city's development, the growth is spontaneous and informal. At the same time, as an industrial and service city, the metropolis is a subject of national politics and global competition. The simultaneous coexistence of these disparities has affected the development of urban space in Istanbul. Therefore, in urban space, cultural conflicts about the definition of locality and identity are manifested and materialized.

In contemporary social and cultural science, urban space is no longer conceived as an objective or static container for social practices, but as a complex analytic category. Cities as complex structures are combinations of localized places, institutions and actors, activities, imaginaries and narratives. Urban space is analyzed as a social process that is based on spatial structures and space constructing activities. Urban spaces are continuously (re)constructed in planning processes, as well as in everyday practices. In this sense, the existence of public space – where spatial structures are materialized and social interactions take place – is a central characteristic of »urbanity«. It is temporarily used for different utilizations and has differing attributions of meaning. It is thus a heterogeneous space of negotiation, materially and discursively disputed.

In the first decade of the 21st century, on the brink of entering the European Union, Istanbul is a place of exemplified urban transforma-

tion. The significance of public spaces is becoming a popular topic in research and discussion about Istanbul's development and modernization. In research projects public space is analyzed not only concerning its shape as architectural design projects but as a social and political space. The discussions reflect the effort to overcome polarizations and dichotomist attributions like the »historic« and the »contemporary« city, »tradition« and »modernity«, »periphery« and »center«, the »local« and the »global«. The outcome of new discourses arising on migration, social exclusion, or the definition of the Other, are propositions for built environments that would create the physical conditions necessary for »new public spaces« as well as »public spheres«, where different cultural groups would have access and representation.

With its layers of the past, present, and future, Istanbul is an appropriate city to study the contemporary urban condition: the constitution of public spaces and spheres. Nevertheless, while more attention has been drawn to Istanbul's metropolitan life, profound studies on the complex cultural and urban situation are still rare.

In 2006 – succeeding research projects about other metropolis and the production, perception and appropriation of urban space – our intention was to initiate an interdisciplinary discussion with theoretical approaches and case studies on Istanbul. As urban scholars – with so far limited knowledge on Istanbul – we organized the conference »Public Istanbul – Spaces and Spheres of the City« at Bauhaus University, Weimar (19th and 20th January 2007). The conference had an interdisciplinary focus, with contributors from fields of geography, ethnography, history, cultural studies, architecture, and urban planning. We invited young urban scholars and well-known experts from Turkey and Germany, encouraging a dialog between different approaches and disciplines. Finally the conference was organized along four main axes of research: »Divided Istanbul« – dealing with socio-demographic aspects in a fragmented urban space, »Experiencing Istanbul« – an ethnographic and artistic look at everyday practices, »Planning Istanbul« – concentrating on the typology of public spaces, larger city planning projects, and new forms of urbanism, and finally »Representing Istanbul« – (historical) investigations about the image of the city and its reflection in cinema and art.

This book is an outcome of the conference, a selection of the perspectives and papers, which represent interdisciplinary approaches to urban transformation and everyday life in Istanbul as a globalizing metropolis. The collection of articles includes different levels and degrees of research experience, a combination of scientific and subjective ap-

proaches, various means of data collection, methodology and analysis, and different writing genres.

The volume is divided into two parts. The first part concentrates on geographical and sociological perspectives. Aspects of urban planning are also presented, and public space is analyzed in a spatial and political sense. Istanbul's urban organization of what we call the »public sphere«, has undergone substantial change, like many other cities. Unlike other cities in Europe, however, fast growth has challenged urban planning and local politics in a yet-unknown way. The question then is what the term »public« still means in Istanbul under contemporary conditions.

The second part takes a closer look at everyday life, investigating specific sites, social interaction, and individual biographies. Focusing on the micro level of local places and everyday practices, the historic and ethnographic case studies in this part give insight to possible interpretations of public spaces as arenas for production and reproduction of the urban.

The book represents fragments of contemporary discourses on Istanbul. It is not meant to be complete; there are many topics which could not be mentioned in the span of this work as well as many more scholars, planners, and scientists working on Istanbul and public space. We understand this compilation as a first step towards further discussions and exchanges between disciplines, knowledge, and local perspectives on the multi-dimensionality of urban public spaces in Istanbul.

Kathrin Wildner and Frank Eckardt, Mai 2008

PART 1 CONTESTED SPACES

Introduction: Public Space as a Critical Concept. Adequate for Understanding Istanbul Today?

FRANK ECKARDT

Bridges have tremendous impacts on cities. They are defining geographic markers lending its inhabitants a sense of orientation. In Istanbul, especially the famous Galata Bridge has shaped our perception of the city. The bridges crossing the Bosphorus are not only vital conductors of traffic between the European and Asian side of the city, moreover, they offer a perspective, which defines the city. To understand the city without these symbolic elements would leave Istanbul's sense of urbanity devoid of its essence.

Imagination is one of the most powerful aspects of urban life (Pile 2000). As the American sociologist Robert E. Park once said, cities are »state of mind«. In the same way we can understand Istanbul as being lived by its metaphorical landscape which is? Most visible in the built environment, but is also expressed in less visible arteries of the sciences and arts. Istanbul offers a rich variety of symbolic spaces, which are perceived as emotional, abstract and concrete places. In daily life, this complexity often remains unrecognized, as human beings respond to encounters and various situations, according to their definition of them.

In this way, Istanbul as one city falls apart as it delivers different spaces for tourists, rural migrants, global entrepreneurs, and socially stratified inhabitants. The function of public places in the different phases of city development seemed always to be that they offer some kind of interference between separated parts of Istanbul. In the past, the Galata Bridge captured a special quality, as the bridge was not only a

place for traffic but also a place for markets. People went to the bridge to buy and sell, to meet, to perceive the city and the others; they went there to be there. Nowadays, people still want to have a view to the Bosphorus bridges, although the bridge is no place to stay.

The example of the bridges shows that places can offer important and often unexpected meanings for our understanding of the city. Perhaps in contradiction with their intended functions, bridges are places in which perspectives are gathered: perspectives of different people, strangers and natives alike, creating a common understanding of what is worth looking at. It creates positive icons in a diverse, complex, and often difficult city life. In this way, a subtle manner of exchange between individuals from various backgrounds shapes a »sphere« of Istanbul with different aspects. In the first place, this creates an »atmosphere« which might not be sensed by all, but it can be an important factor to many people in their perception and experience of the city (Böhme 2006). Its social significance, however, lies in the structure that it gives to our perception and which is as a point of reference in the urban discourse with others about it. The planned reality of Istanbul and the constantly changing urban geography of this metropolitan area, however, makes it necessary to distinguish between places of private and public meaning. This is a process in which places become public by making them a symbolical space (Watson 2002).

From an analytical point of view, examining public spaces in Istanbul remains a confusing task. In our observations, we are frequently guided both by different perceptions and the need for a concept that captures the particularity of Istanbul. There are different ways to understand, observe and produce public spaces, but the meaning society gives to the spaces and the relationships society establishes with these spaces are crucial. Istanbul's position at the border of Europe and Asia, not only render it difficult to apply complex terminologies such as »European city« or »Middle Eastern city«, as »global city« or »mega-city«, but also overshadow general understandings of the relationships between space and society.

Max Weber's theoretical distinction between European and Asian cities, in which he characterized the »European city«, by its ability to bridge differences among social groups through public encounters, has guided our concept of European cities (Weber 2000). If we understand the »public space« as a composition of concrete place and a specific form of social life, that what might be called the »sphere« of the public, than the empirical difference often connected to its categorization are questionable. As historians have made clear, the European city never fully embodied this ideal concept, nor is the Asian city free of a public

sphere (Bruhns/Nippel 2000). Many of Habermas' observations regarding the emergence of the public sphere in British, French, and German modern society since the 19th century is also true for Middle Eastern societies. As Jakob Skovgard-Peterson states: »As in Europe, the public sphere in the Middle East ideally comprised everyone. In practice it was quite exclusivist« (2001: 13).

If these ideal concepts are taken for granted, however, the debate regarding the significance of public space in Istanbul is in danger of being misleading and fruitless. Perspectives on Istanbul as perceived through a »European« or »Middle East/Asian« lens may stand in the way of an analysis that considers recent developments in Istanbul. Questions such as to what extent the city is still »European« and how the city is incorporated into the Middle East are focal points of many discussions and debates concerning Istanbul today. Nonetheless, the term »European City« may be helpful if it is applied to the discourse in a sociological way, excluding political, cultural, historical, and economical contexts. This narrowed view which neglects the nexus between spaces and of society – as described by Weber, Arendt, and Habermas – has become prominent in many planning discourses:

»Allee, boulevard, campo, and piazza – nothing defines the picture of the European city and its public space like these spaces. To walk as a flaneur, to communicate, to meander like a cosmopolitan through the city, to be relaxed in the rushing city life – nothing characterizes the image of the urbanites more than their behaviour in the public spaces.« (Selle 2004: 131)

Taking a closer look on Istanbul and its spaces requires a selective perspective on what might be qualified as »public«, being both place and sphere. There are particular subjects to be found in Istanbul which are beyond the overstressed concepts discussed so far. Similarly, as a consequence of globalization, the profound reshaping of Istanbul's cultural dimensions has resulted in the establishment of new patterns in cross boarder public encounters (Öncü 1997).

New conceptual approaches that have the ability to contend with Istanbul's sensitivities are called for. Contributors to this book grapple with such approaches in an effort to understand and analyze the changing character of Istanbul. Implicit questions are present in the attempt to understand as much as possible of what recently becomes important in the development of Istanbul and what still is significant from its divers history as city between East and West, Christianity and Islam, modernity and tradition. While Istanbul is a city, which for decades has attracted people from rural areas in pursuit of a better life, the city has more re-

cently been following a pattern of growth incomparable to any other city in Europe. Here, the mechanisms of the social construction of space by public spheres can be traced clearly. By changing the social labeling of those places occupied by the new settlers (Özbakay 2006) and the conflicted pattern of »insiders« and »outsiders«, well known in modern cities since Elias and Scotson's famous study (1990) – has become the main logic for Istanbul's new social geography.

The significance of the public is then altered, challenged, and maybe even lost. This is true, at least if we continue to think of Istanbul's public spaces in a way that relates it to particular places. Again, the shift in the former construction of public places to Istanbul's current less tangible contemporary meaning and generation of »public« might become easier to understand if we return to examples of the bridges. In the past, the Galata Bridge was a locally well-known and an often frequented place where the relationship between presence and perception was highly interrelated with one another. Today, in the global era, the Bosphorus bridges are common public sphere for everybody. They are symbolic spaces which must be perceived against the background of Istanbul's fragmented metropolitan area which lacks places that give expression to the new (automobile) mobility of the city, its fast growth, and new spatial orders.

This might lead to the conclusion that »abstract«, »far«, »social«, and »political« elements in public spaces are increasingly important in what is captured by the ambivalence of the term »public«. In the same vein, the re-consideration of space has been the main debate in the urban studies discipline during the 90s. With the emergence of a post-modern geography (which is no longer making difference between description, empirical evidence and analysis) stated in its most radical positions that the dimension of the particular »urban« seems to be disappearing. As a result, urban concepts now need to be regarded against the city's regionalization (Eckardt 2005). Istanbul with its past period of hyper-growth appeared to support this line of argument. Already, the recognition of the fact that Kemalist state architecture supported a decline in the significance of the local public (Bozdoğan 1994) questions to what extent the term »public« is related to the spatiality of Istanbul.

It is imperative that the conceptualization of public space in Istanbul takes discourses, political and planning regulations and prerogatives, imagined and perceived dimensions of the public, into sincere consideration. In other words, the »sphere« of public Istanbul is no longer only a matter of »atmo«-sphere; it has instead become the crucial point of analysis.

In this regard, the problem is that the concept of »public space« derives from theoretical and empirical considerations which neglect the multifaceted dimensions of cities like Istanbul: complex, diverse, multi-layered, antagonistic and overlapping, homogeneous and heterogeneous and everything at the same time, the same place. Is then the term »public« still adequate? If the argumentation presented above remains, abstract conceptualization will not suffice to answer this question. Instead we must turn to the debate of the city's publicness in the context of its diverse settings of meanings, expectations, patterns of behavior, and visualizations in terms of place and aesthetics. No single theory will be presented in this book – whether we examine Hannah Arendt's »public« concept, elaborated on the experience of the Greek polis, or analyze Jürgen Habermas's works, referring to the public realm understood against the background of the emergence of a Western European democracy, all of these theories and conceptualizations can be used as a theoretical framework to understand Istanbul's public realm.

Through their examination of Istanbul's places of periphery, city walls, gated communities, new urban planning processes, and gentrified neighborhoods, the contributors to this book trace the city's representation and therefore its »publicness«. Collectively these spatial formations intrinsically testify to the overall hypothesis of post-modern discourses on the city. The questions posed by Habermas and Arendt, however, are not overcome, obsolete or even solved. If the project of modernity is not complete, as Habermas (2004) argues, then modern science and the modern city are more than just simply components of a postmodern pot-pourri. In contrast, re-reading the classical works of both Habermas and Arendt lead scholars to reformulate their questions in an effort to understand the problem of the public sphere. Habermas' work shows that public opinion and the public sphere are closely related and should be regarded in its embeddedness of democracy (Habermas 1990). By showing how the definition of the private depends on the emergence of a public, he points out that only the separation of both spheres has enabled the process of political representation and the establishment of a liberal state. In his analysis, Habermas however expresses his deep concern that these achievements are threatened by mass society, as the individual is no longer able to influence the process of creating public opinion or be part of the public sphere. Power relationships are re-established where few decide in the name of many. In this process, the public is »re-feudalized«. Read in the context of urban research, Habermas' analysis extends the debate concerning the relationships between private and public state, the role of the state, and the requirements of public sphere to fulfill its democratic function.

The principal distinction between the »public« and the »private«, as Hannah Arendt (2002) argues is profoundly incorporated in all forms of democracy as it is based on a lifestyle where the public is a distinct place to realize the noble ideas of individual sense seeking. The public is a place of virtue and not intended for private activities. It is the arena in which decisions are made in favor of the common good. Far from being idealistic, Arendt points out that public place can only fulfill its function, which is to defend the city as a collective space, by allowing the individual to have a sense for the »*bonum commune*«, the pursuit of the shared happiness. As a precondition, private matters and concerns must be conducted outside the public sphere. While many observers of the privatization of public places are frightened by the fact that these places lose their accessibility, Arendt's analysis questions the common contemporary argumentation in Istanbul and elsewhere, that private property is favorable to the whole society.

However, while Istanbul might be viewed as leaving behind closed narratives of the »European city«, the »mega-city«, or the »global city« these narratives remain open, and in the case of Istanbul are reformulated in a double sense. The public realm and the function of public opinion are the most important pillars of modern society; the encounter of citizens on a plaza is therefore still an emblematic vision (cp. Watson 2005), but questions concerning the free sociability of a city under the impacts of flows of urbanism, globalization, cumulating social exclusion, and civic and cultural fragmentation arise. Then, attempts to answer these questions seems to be an illusionary project. Nevertheless, a critical lackmuss proof how much it is still possible to narrate about Istanbul has to be taken. Secondly, the space of public in Istanbul arrives at a moment where attention for places beyond the existing and still powerful narratives such as the limited city, center-periphery, Istanbul as administrative, cultural, political, social and economic entity, is increasingly creating confusion. There is a common sense among the authors of this book that the abolition of the modern city's master-narrative has little explanatory power for the understanding of contradictory public spheres that the new spaces of Istanbul embody. More has to be taken into account, more places have to be analyzed in their relation to the public space of the city, more encounters with the intermediate function of institutions and actors have to follow, before a new orientation on Istanbul might appear in its contours.

Approaching the city in this way means foremost to search for a more adequate, inspiring, promising, and inclusive strategy to create a better understanding of the world of Istanbul. The contributions in this part of the book are showing the struggle encountered by the authors. On

one hand, they write about a particular place and on the other hand, they endeavor to link specific experiences to a general mode of analysis and use theoretical concepts to explain urban developments. The confrontation of local examples with urban theories remains a major motive for urban scholars and is a good reason to have a closer look at the public space in Istanbul.

References

- Arendt, H. (2002) [1967]: *Vita activa oder vom tätigen Leben*, München: Piper.
- Böhme, G. (2006): *Atmosphäre: Essays zur neuen Ästhetik*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Bozdogan, S. (1994): »Architecture, Modernism and Nation-Building in the Kemalist Turkey«. In: *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 10, pp. 37-55.
- Bruhns, H./Nippel, W. (eds.) (2000): *Max Weber und die Stadt im Kulturvergleich*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Eckardt, F. (2005): »Introduction«. In: F. Eckardt (ed.), *The City and the Region*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 5-25.
- Elias, N./Scotson, J. (1990): *Etablierte und Außenseiter*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, J. (1990) [1962]: *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, J. (2004): *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Moulines, C. U. (2002): »Einheit des Seins – Einheit der Wissenschaft«. In: D. Rippl/E. Ruhlau (eds.), *Wissen im 21. Jahrhundert. Komplexität und Reduktion*, München: fink, pp. 123-167.
- Öncü, A. (1997): »The myth of the »ideal home«: travels across cultural borders«. In: A. Öncü/P. Weyland (eds.), *Space, Culture and Power: New identities in globalizing cities*. London/New Jersey: Zed Books, 56-72.
- Pile, S. (2000): »Sleepwalking in the modern city: Walter Benjamin and Sigmund Freud in the world of dreams«. In: G. Bridge/S. Watson (eds.), *A Companion to the City*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 75-86.
- Selle, K. (2004) : »Öffentliche Räume in der europäischen Stadt – Verfall und Ende oder Wände und Belebung? « In: W. Siebel (ed.), *Die europäische Stadt*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, pp. 131-145.
- Skovgaard-Peterson, J. (2001): »Introduction«. In: H. C. Korsholm Nielsen/J. Skovgaard-Petersen (eds.) *Middle Eastern Cities 1900-1950*.

- Public Places and Public Spheres in transformation. Proceedings of the Danish Institute in Damascus, pp. 9-19.
- Slife, B.D./Williams, R. N. (1995): What's Behind the Research? Discovering Hidden Assumptions in the Behavioral Science, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Soja, E. (1989): Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory, London: Blackwell.
- Özbekay, S. (2006): Zur Konstruktion von Gecekondu im Bewusstsein der türkischen Öffentlichkeit: eine Diskussion zur »emischen« versus »etischen« Darstellungsweise, Göttingen : MA.
- Watson, S. (2002): »The Public City«. In: J. Eade/C. Mele (eds.) Understanding the City. Contemporary and Future Perspectives, Oxford/Malden: Blackwell, pp. 49-65.
- Watson, S. (2005): City Publics. The (dis)enchantments of urban encounters, London/New York: Routledge.
- Weber, Max (2000): Die Stadt, MWS I/22-5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Mapping Social Istanbul. Extracts of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area Atlas

MURAT GÜVENÇ


In his recent research project Murat Güvenc is working on the Atlas of »Socio-spatial differentiation in Greater Istanbul 1990-2000« (*Istanbul'da Toplumsal-Mekansal farklılaşma 1990-2000*, unpublished Urban Atlas for Istanbul).

Using Correspondence Analysis he interprets census data of the Turkey Statistical Institute (TurkStat) on neighborhood level from 1990 and 2000 to map the social-spatial configurations in the metropolitan area of Istanbul. Out of a variety of parameters as place of origin, education, occupation, household income etc. for »Public Istanbul« three maps about employment and schooling profiles from the Analyses on the Istanbul Metropolitan Area (*Istanbul Metropoliten Alan Analiz Çalışmaları*) are selected to indicate urban transformation processes in specific areas in Istanbul at the beginning of 21st century.

References


Güvenç, M./Isik, O. (2002): »A Metropolis at the Crossroads: The Changing Social Geography of Istanbul under the Impact of Globalization«, In: Marcuse, P./van Kempen, R. (eds.): *Of States and Cities: The partitioning of Urban Space*, Oxford: University, Press pp. 200-17.



İSTANBUL Metropolitan Alanı



Mahalle Eğitim Profilleri
(6 yaş ve üzeri Kadınlar)
Neighborhood Schooling Profiles
(Women over 6 years of age)

- En Yüksek Okul Profili**
Highest Schooling Profile
- Orta-üst okul profili**
Upper Middle Schooling Profile
- Orta-alt okul profili**
Lower-Middle Schooling level
- En alt okul profili**
Lowest Schooling Profile




-  **Trans-Avrupa Kuzey-Güney Otoyolu**
Trans-European North-South Motorway
-  **Otoyol**
Motorway
-  **E-5 Karayolu**
E-5 Main Road
-  **Anayollar**
Main Roads
-  **Demiryolu**
Railway

0 2 4 8 km



İSTANBUL Metropolitan Alan



Mahalle İstihdam Profilleri**
(12 yaş ve üzeri erkek-kadın aktif nüfus)
Neighborhood Employment Profiles
(Economically active Men and Women
over 12 years of age)

Kadının iş gücüne ağırlıklı katılmadığı Mavi Yaka yoğun mahalleler*
*Blue Collar Neighborhoods distinctively low participation of women
in the labor force**

- İmalat [Erkek-Kadın]
Manufacturing [Men Women]
- İmalat [Erkek-Kadın] ve Toplum Hizmetleri [Erkek]
Manufacturing [Men Women] Social Services [Men]
- İmalat [Erkek-Kadın], İnşaat/Yerel Hizmetler**
Ulaştırma -Haberleşme [Erkek]
*Manufacturing [Men Women], Construction, Utilities**,
Transport & Communications [Men]*
- İmalat [Erkek-Kadın], İnşaat/Yerel Hizmetler/
Ulaştırma -Haberleşme [Erkek]
Manufacturing [Men Women], Construction, Utilities,
Transport & Communications [Men]*

Tek bir sektördeki iş gücünün yoğunlaştığı bölgeler
Neighborhoods depicting high participation of labor force in a single sector

- Ulaştırma -Haberleşme [Erkek]
Transport & Communications [Men]
- Toptan ve Perakende Ticaret (T/P Tic.) [Erkek]
Retail and Wholesale [Men]
- Toplum Hizmetleri [Erkek]
Social Services [Men]

Kadının iş gücüne ağırlıklı katıldığı Beyaz Yakalı Yoğun Mahalleler
*White Collar Neighborhoods distinctively high participation of Women
in labor force*


- Yerel Hz., Ulaştırma - (T/P Tic.) [Erkek], Yerel/İnşaat/
Ulaştırma/T/P tic [Kadın] Mali-Kurum Hz [Erkek-Kadın],
Toplum Hizmetleri [Kadın]
*Utilities, Transport & Communications,
Retail-Wholesale [Men], (Utilities/Construction R-W'sale/
Transport) [Women] Finance-Producer services [Men-Women]
Social Services [women]*
- T/P Tic., Toplum Hizmetleri [Erkek], Yerel/İnşaat/Ulaştırma/
T/P tic [Kadın] Mali-Kurum Hz [Erkek-Kadın],
Toplum Hizmetleri [Kadın]
*Retail-Wholesale, Social Services [Men], (Utilities/
Construction/R-W'sale/Transport) [Women] Finance-
Producer services [Men-Women] Social Services [women]*

* İmalat Sanayi Hariç

Except for Manufacturing industry

** Elektrik Gaz Su hizmetlerini kapsar

Covers Municipal Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity




- Trans-Avrupa Kuzey-Güney Otoyolu
Trans-European North-South Motorway
- Otoyol
Motorway
- E-5 Karayolu
E-5 Main Road
- Anayollar
Main Roads
- Demiryolu
Railway

0 2 4 8 km




İSTANBUL Metropolitan Alan



Mahalle Eğitim Profilleri
(6 yaş ve üzeri toplam nüfus)
Neighborhood Schooling Profiles
(Total Population over 6 years of age)

- **En Alt Eğitim Profili: Okur-Yazar Değil, Diplomasız okur-yazar, İlk Okul**
Lowest Schooling Profile: Illiterate/ Drop-outs Primary School
- **Alt Düzey Okur-Yazar Değil, Diplomasız okur-yazar, İlk Okul, İlk derece**
Low Schooling Profile: Illiterate/ Drop-outs Primary School & Equivalent
- **Orta Düzey Diplomasız, İlk Orta Lise ve Dengi programlar**
Intermediate Schooling Profile: Drop outs, Primary, Junior High School High School and equivalent programs
- **En Yüksek Eğitim Profili Orta, Lise ve Denk programlar, Yüksek Okul, Fakülte, Master, Doktora**
Highest Schooling Profile: Junior High School, High School and equivalent programs, College Faculty, & Post Graduate Degrees



-  **Trans-Avrupa Kuzey-Güney Otoyolu**
Trans-European North-South Motorway
-  **Otoyol**
Motorway
-  **E-5 Karayolu**
E-5 Main Road
-  **Anayollar**
Main Roads
-  **Demiryolu**
Railway

0 2 4 8 km



Contested Public Spaces vs. Conquered Public Spaces. Gentrification and its Reflections on Urban Public Space in Istanbul*

EDA ÜNLÜ YÜCESOY

Like its global counterparts, Istanbul has experienced gentrification processes in the last three decades. Observed to be scattered in particular areas of late-nineteenth century foreigners' neighborhoods, gentrification in Istanbul can be seen as a process whereby global shifts interact with local characteristics to produce a new spatial structure (Uzun 2001). As its process and outcomes vary from one city to another, gentrification marks important social and spatial changes in inner city neighborhoods, whereby not only the demographic, residential, and tenure characteristics, but also the social life in public spaces transform significantly. The role and place of public spaces in the process of gentrification are not a typical subject of analysis, yet public spaces – a residual and silent category – are victimized by stringent control and privatization, so that openness and accessibility, as main qualities of the public space, can be lost forever. This article takes a unique view of gentrification by conceiving public spaces as social constructs, i.e. describing the phenomenological and symbolic experience of space as mediated by social processes such as exchange, conflict, and control. Additionally, the article will explore the everyday uses of public space in two of Istanbul's gentrified neighborhoods, Cihangir and Galata. By analyzing the everyday activities and spatial practices of old and new residents, public and private actors and institutions, this article advocates an alternative

perspective on gentrification process and a new understanding of the intersections between a city and its citizens.

Affecting mainly the historic/inner city districts, which are either abandoned industrial sites or deteriorated housing units, the term »gentrification« originally referred to the process of invasion of London's working class neighborhoods by the middle class; the transformation of the »modest mews and cottages« to »eloquent, expensive residences« initiated a process of displacement and a complete change of social character within some districts (Glass 1964 cited in Engels 1999: 1473). Most gentrification literature deals with understanding the origins and motives of this radical transformation of urban space. On the one hand, Smith (1979, 1996) characterizes gentrification by the concept of rent gap, which represents the difference between ground rent under present land use and potential rent under a more profitable use. Thus, gentrification is more a movement of capital than of people (Smith 1979). On the other hand, Ley (1996) puts more emphasis on the economic, demographic and cultural preferences of the gentrifiers and advocates the significance of cultural and lifestyle values of a new urban middle class, namely the gentrifiers, who admire historic conservation, urbanity, and cosmopolitanism. Likewise, Zukin (1995) claims that gentrification creates social space or habitus on the basis of cultural capital, as gentrifiers are motivated by an appreciation for aesthetics and history. In addition to economic preferences, which are based on a comparison of inner city and suburban housing in reference to the costs of commuting to work places and services, changes in the demographic structure of Western societies, i.e. increasing number of single or unmarried, childless, small family units among professional and managerial groups have accelerated the process, coupled with increasing number of professional and managerial jobs in the inner city. Rather recently, class analysis has incorporated an understanding of gentrification processes (Bridge 2001, Podmore 1998). Approached as a class strategy, gentrification is considered a new form of distinction, whereby a new middle class habitus is manifested spatially in the gentrified neighborhoods. In other words, gentrification is regarded as a strategy of distinction for an emerging middle class.

In urban studies literature, the displacement of economically marginal and working class by households of a high economic status as well as the refurbishment and revaluation of previously devalued housing, and change of tenure types signify a process which drastically transforms the face, composition and ambiance of inner city neighborhoods. Due to the boutique retailing, elite consumption, and high accessibility, attraction and allure have turned the public space in gentrified neighbor-

hoods into a rewarding economic asset. Intense emplacement of leisure-oriented developments in the gentrified urban areas, with an emphasis on high levels of protection and privatization, accelerates the loosening of public space from its original roots as well as alienation from public life and public experience in the city. In that sense, gentrification contributes largely to »the narrative of loss« or »the end of public space« (Sennett 1977, Sorkin 1992). Moreover, as Bickford (2000) states, racial and class segregation caused by gentrification significantly affects the public space. Displacement of marginal and working class citizens raises concerns over a »degraded right to the city« (Mitchell 2003).

In contrast to the vast literature on the emergence of gentrification, very little work has addressed the place of public spaces in this process. While some public spaces are redeveloped and privatized as part of renovation and upgrading of inner-city districts (Zukin 1995), they also become the object of a branding strategy for ever-expanding leisure and commerce development in central urban areas. The French Street in Istanbul is the foremost example of this intervention not only in terms of privatization and thematic marketing of public space, but also with regard to so-called »place-making« with public space refurbishment and name changes. Coupled with architectural and urban qualities, these new leisure and commerce infrastructures are subsumed to be the catalysts in attracting potential gentrifiers. By and large, as a process of spatial and social transformation which generally occurs in the historic city centers, gentrification brings a series of dualities in urban structure. On the one hand, a manifold struggle in the claiming of public space is observed in articulations of different actors and corporate agents' practices. On the other hand, with the arrival of new residents, the patterns of use, appropriation, and experience of public spaces – as an important part of residential atmosphere – change. Whether the public space becomes exclusive or embraces the different practices of public and private actors, institutions, and urban residents, it inevitably becomes a significant constituent in the gentrification process.

Gentrified public space

In order to depict the role and place of public spaces in gentrification processes, this article employs a socially grounded approach to public space. In this perspective, the public space is considered a social construct which embodies a variety of social and spatial practices, contesting and conflicting interests and actions, identity displays and struggles. This view enables a multivalent representation of space, as Lefebvre

(1991) conceptualizes it; being active, porous, and inseparable from experience. In that sense, he connects the formation of subjects to space by gestures of occupation that are constitutive of both self and space (Liggett 2003). To Lefebvre (1991), the social construction of space involves constructing the rhythms of everyday life and (re)producing the social relations that frame it. Moreover, the social construction of space acts as a key process in conjunction with the concept of the »right to the city«. According to Lefebvre (2002), the right to the city is the right to urban life, »place of encounter, priority if use value, inscription in space of a time promoted to the rank of supreme resource among all resources« (p. 374). Accommodation of the right to the city in gentrification processes is particularly important. As Harvey (2003) points out, Lefebvre's concept is »not merely a right to access what already exists [in the city], but a right to change it after our heart's desire«. This view provides a significant framework in analyzing public space in gentrification processes. This way, different, conflicting, contesting hegemonic and hidden social constructions of public spaces by the old and new residents (as well as public and private actors and agencies) can be explored.

To start with, »representations of space« refer to the conceived space, i.e. the manner in which space is conceived of in a society by those who participate in the creation of the dominant discourses via control over symbolic characteristics, such as signs and codes, as well as spatial knowledge. As a strident critic of the domination of urban development by representations of space, Lefebvre warns that planning and the related design professions formulate and implement decisions about space without maintaining contact with existing spatial practices (Liggett 2003). Representations of space are not based on the everyday life in the city; instead, they operate on an abstract plane of professional codes. Secondly, »spatial practices« are both the medium and the outcome of individuals' activities, behavior, and experience in everyday life on a routine daily basis. Spatial practices involve activities, interactions, and perceptions, as well as changes in the everyday relationships with the built environment. »Actions are evaluated based (in part) on where they occur, and places are evaluated in part through the actions which are carried out there.« (Creswell 1999 cited in Modan 2007) Spatial practices can be congruent with or challenge representations of space, yet they persist. The overall spatial practices that people perform and evaluate in and about a particular space also sets the norm for societal assumptions about that place (Modan 2007), so that appropriateness can be defined and established with the mediation of cultural and social meanings, codes, and symbols. Lastly, »representational spaces« or »spaces of representation« function as a symbolic link to the participa-

tion in the production of meaning. In other words, it calls for the shared experience and interpretation of peoples' everyday spatial practices, where making space is very much a way of making meaning. »People not only live their space through its associated images and symbols, they actively construct its meaning through cognitive and hermeneutical processes« (Lefebvre 1991: 39). Elucidating not only the ways in which space shapes social life and vice versa, but also, and more importantly, the ways in which power operates through spatial structures, Lefebvre's framework provides a valuable insight to analyze the relations between space in use and identity in process. For the purposes of this article, the analysis of spatial practices has a revelatory importance. This analysis shows that different spatial practices, i.e. different patterns of use or appropriation of public spaces reflect different, sometimes contested and conflicted, constructions and possibilities/restrictions of further appropriation of public spaces.

Spatial practices in gentrified public spaces

Spatial practices in public spaces are closely related to users' own definitions, conceptions, and meanings, the contextual nature of one's sense of one's place and others' place. This proposition is akin to Bourdieu's relational view of the practice;

»I act because of who I am«, not because of a rational interest or set of learned values. As a body and a biological individual, I am in the way that things are, situated in a place; I occupy a position in physical space and social space. I am not *atopos*, placeless.« (Bourdieu 2000: 131)

He defines *topos*, or place, as the site an agent »takes« place or exists, briefly, as a localization, or relationally as a position. In exploring the interdependence of human agency and social structure, Bourdieu defines a sense of one's place, an embodied sense of place, as the *habitus*, a system of dispositions to a certain practice. It refers to the »embodiment of individual actors of systems of social norms, understandings and patterns of behavior« (Painter 2000 cited in Hillier and Rooksby 2005: 21). Bourdieu (2000) introduces *habitus* as the mediating link between objective social structures and individual action. In this perspective, the analysis of spatial practices not only exposes contested and conflicted constructions of public space, but at the same time reveals the spatiality of different *habitus*. Analyzing spatial practices enables us to detect the appropriation of everyday public space; in this case, both old and new

inhabitants' and users' use and conception of public spaces. How do old and new inhabitants use and experience public spaces? In which ways do these public spaces function in their everyday lives? While the inhabitants appropriate public spaces, how do they conceptualize them and which social processes are influential?

Throughout this article, spatial practices are discussed in relation to the deciphering of their social spaces, spaces where their everyday social relationships are formed. These practices also reflect the forms of belonging to the space, an important ingredient for claiming the right to the city. These forms of belonging, such as avoidance and participation, withdrawal and placement, are articulated in the relational construction of public spaces, in which boundaries of use and appropriation are continuously constructed, negotiated, re-constructed, and expressed. Gentrification calls consequentially for privatization of public space, yet it is not the intention of this paper to (re)argue the issue of privatization of public space with all of its actors and processes in the neighborhoods. Nonetheless, privatization is reflected both by representations of space – the hegemonic discourse of the planners, developers, etc. – and the everyday spatial practices of inhabitants.

Gentrification in Istanbul

This study was designed on the basis of diagnostic studies by Uzun (2001), Islam (2005), and Ergun (2004) on gentrification processes in Istanbul. Gentrification in Istanbul has, to a certain extent, followed a pattern similar to examples in other cities. Nevertheless, it is closely related to Turkey's experience with urban growth and change (Uzun 2001). On the one hand, the rise of new, environmentally-conscious, and community-oriented lifestyles, changing habitat preferences, and their close relationship with the urban heritage, and on the other hand economic proliferation after the 1980s have influenced the process in Istanbul. To İslam (2005), gentrification processes in Istanbul can be grouped into three successive waves in different parts of the city and successive time periods, each with different magnitudes and motives. The first and second wave have common characteristics, such as individual renovation of the housing units, whether late-nineteenth and early twentieth century two-or-three storey terrace houses along the coast of Bosphorus in Kuzguncuk, Arnavutköy, and Ortaköy or nineteenth century apartments of Cihangir and Galata with close proximity to the cultural and leisure activities in Taksim and Beyoğlu. The third wave, however, can be observed in the Fener and Balat neighborhoods of the Historical Peninsula

and is mainly led by the interventions of national and international institutions. Due to their location and activities, demographic, cultural, and architectural characteristics, this study focuses on Cihangir and Galata, second wave gentrification areas, as the prevalent cases of residential gentrification processes in Istanbul. Each neighborhood represents different spatial practices regarding both gentrification and public space. Though a residential collective action can be described in both neighborhoods, Galata also represents gentrification by capital – an intense development effort by large stakeholders taking advantage of the possibilities offered by the dilapidated central city. It should also be noted that while the gentrification processes in these neighborhoods have lost their pace in the last years, the embers are still glowing.

Cihangir and Galata are located in Beyoğlu, one of the most distinctive residential, commercial, and leisure areas of Istanbul with its unique architectural, demographic and social qualities. Up until today, Beyoğlu stands as an example of cosmopolitanism, a mixture of all culture and ethnicities, and a symbolic birth place of the social and civil codes and norms of Westernized Turkish Society. Developed mainly in the nineteenth century, Beyoğlu housed mixed population groups; in the late nineteenth century, when half of the population consisted of foreigners, only 21,8% Muslim and 32% non-Muslim Ottomans lived in the Beyoğlu-Tophane area (Shaw 1979). Coupled with the district's commercial and leisure activities, this population composition enabled extensive exchange and interaction between different cultural and ethnic groups. Nevertheless, the population composition changed drastically due to political, social, and economic processes, especially after WWII, the foundation of Israel and the events of the sixth and seventh of September in 1955. Most of the foreigners and non-Muslim inhabitants either migrated to their home countries or left the neighborhood and moved to the peripheral locations. Most of the houses changed tenants and/or became empty and – coupled with the rapid influx of migration from rural areas – squatted by the Turkish migrants from Anatolia. As a result, in the 1970s and early 1980s, Beyoğlu became a slum area.

From the beginning, the name Beyoğlu has been synonymous to the Westernization movement, as well as the first urban planning guided development in the late Ottoman period¹. The housing stock represents a

1 The Sixth District, composed of the neighborhoods of Beyoğlu; Galata, Pera and Tophane, was the first municipal organization in the late Ottoman period. The Sixth District realized many important urban projects to modernize urban living in Istanbul: preparation of the first cadastral maps, enlargement of streets, lighting and paving the streets, opening up of new directions, construction of water and sewage systems, etc. The reconstruc-

peculiar architectural style, not resembling other parts of Istanbul. To Güvenç (2006), this distinct architectural style of the neighborhood is the rationale behind the gentrification processes in Istanbul. Therefore, the presence of unique housing stock in Cihangir and Galata, where restrictions on deed title registrations for exchange played an important role for preservation even as the neighborhood was in decay, paved the way to gentrification. As the influence of the economic restructuring process of the 1980s resulting from globalization unfolded in Istanbul, gentrification processes flourished in the neighborhoods of Beyoğlu: Asmalımescit, Cihangir, and Galata all experienced gentrification in varying scales, actors, competence, performance, and strength.

Since this study aims at exploring various spatial practices related to the use and appropriation of public space in gentrified neighborhoods, a contextual and exploratory analytical perspective, qualitative research methodology, is employed. It should be noted that this chapter reflects the study in progress. The empirical data on which this chapter is based consisted of observations and participatory observations and was conducted in spring and autumn 2006, and later in late spring 2007. It should be mentioned that due to the iterative In addition, visual and written documents from neighborhood organizations and municipal institutions, digital archives of two national newspapers, »Radikal« and »Hürriyet«, and weekly and monthly magazines of »Tempo« and »İstanbul« were investigated. It should be mentioned that due to the iterative nature of the research, emerging additional questions and unfolding new connections and developments have made their way into the analytic strategy as developing case studies.

Cihangir: Public space as community area and collective place

In conjunction with the late 1980's economic and spatial transformation in the city at large and in Beyoğlu in particular, Cihangir, with its favorable topography – located on the slope of a hill with the panorama of entrance of the Bosphorus and the Historic Peninsula – and proximity to the center, came into high demand as a residential neighborhood (Uzun 2001). Because of the unique nostalgic ambiance of the historical build-

tion of neighborhoods and urban structure went hand in hand with the works of The Sixth District. Built mainly in the 19th century, the housing stock in Beyoğlu is comprised of apartments, hotels, and commercial buildings with their peculiar architecture. They were the first examples of such urban development in Turkish cities.

ings and the neighborhood, artists, academics, and writers had a specific interest in living in Cihangir. Beginning in the 1990s the area became more popular and the population started to change rapidly leading to gentrification (ibid). Beginning with the individual renovation of apartments, artists and architects pioneered the neighborhood of Cihangir. However, in the following years, young professionals and investors have also become attracted to the area. Today, as there are no more empty plots in the neighborhood for the construction of new apartment houses and since the neighborhood can not expand due to its location, the old apartment houses are gaining more importance and value. To real-estate experts, the neighborhood is very profitable for investment: owners may gain a premium of up to and over a hundred percent, which is more than the average for Istanbul (Elmas 1999 cited in Uzun 2001). There are several newly build apartment houses on Akarsu Street, which has become the most commercialized street of the neighborhood as services such as cafes, pubs, and restaurants have gone up in demand among visitors.



Figure 1 and 2: Akarsu Street and Havyar Street²

The individual gentrifiers, pioneers in Cihangir were interested not only in the physical upgrading of the buildings that they renovated, but also in the improvement of the social and cultural environment. Though the renovation activities were individual and it was not possible to observe common activities in the neighborhood regarding the transformation of the entire area, social and cultural improvement has been accelerated due to more organized communal activities since the establishment of the Cihangir Beautification Foundation in 1995. The members of the organization were mostly architects and professionals, i.e. the new residents of the neighborhood. In the beginning, as their name suggests, activities were mainly directed toward the rehabilitation and reconstruction

2 All photographs in this text are taken by the author.

of Cihangir, as well as the revival of the area's old identity and historic value. Therefore, the first activities were designed to secure the order and neatness of the streets and open areas. To realize the vision of restoration of the neighborhood's old image, a group of pioneers launched a project called »Integrating streets into the urban design and the life of the city starting at Havyar Street³«. Rebirth of the neighborhood was achieved by institutionalized beautification: maintaining order for car parking, garbage, and advertisements. The facades of the apartment houses were painted up to the first story. Additional help came from the security department, the district municipality, and the Historical Foundation (Uzun 2001: 113). In addition to the redecoration of the streets, the neighborhood park that was once demolished to create a parking lot was re-constructed as a park again. Conceived as a social space, the park has provided a setting for all Cihangir residents to come together not only during the holidays and childrens' activities, but also as an everyday hang-out and gossip place.

Creation of communal places for community participation was the main motive for Cihangir gentrifiers. Because of the amorphous, individual-driven character of the gentrification process, creation of public space as the community area and collective place was expected for the formation of a new community, whereby neighborhood social ties can only be established and traditional community/neighborhood alliances can only be achieved through a shared space. A recent activity designed for children aims at integrating the children of Cihangir from a common value of *Cihangirlilik*⁴ pride and raising awareness of their living environment⁵. This is an attempt to bring together the new and old residents of Cihangir and building common values of belonging to the neighborhood. In that sense, these activities also aim at realizing a distinction, developing a habitus based on living in a specific locale or habitat.

While the first-comers, the pioneers, have an affection for and commitment to the neighborhood and urban life, particularly after some refurbishment of the housing stock, the second wave of gentrifiers, referred to as the followers, have been attracted to Cihangir mainly for the prestige and social distinction established by the pioneers. The pioneers

3 Havyar Street is the street where gentrification process is considered to have begun, with the purchase of an apartment house in 1993 by an artist couple, who favored proximity to workplace and cultural activities in the centre (Uzun 2001).

4 Cihangirlilik means belonging and feeling attached to Cihangir.

5 Children of Cihangir Project comprises of 30 children selected from three primary schools within the neighborhood borders, plus 12 children who live in the neighborhood but attend schools in another neighborhood.

have to a certain degree collaborated with the neighborhood's marginal groups, among which the only homosexual agglomeration in Istanbul can be found. However, with the second group, safety concerns have been more pronounced and forced displacement has even taken place. Today, the neighborhood experiences a new flux of residents and visitors, to whom living in a small flat, chatting with the grocery, looking at passersby – eventually a writer, photographer, painter, or an artist would show up – while sitting in as sidewalk café, or just being around in the so-called »Republic of Cihangir« is a distinction.

Galata: Privatized public space vs. shared space

Galata, an old Genoese Quarter located on the north shore of the Golden Horn, has been the trade center of Istanbul since the thirteenth century. Due to the shift of administrative and finance affairs to the new Capital city of Ankara in 1923, Galata was affected sharply by the transformations in the inner city after this period and became a dilapidated area following the 1970's. Gentrification in Galata, like in Cihangir, began in the late 1980's. Nevertheless only a small part of the district has been gentrified while most of the building stock is still in a deteriorated condition.⁶ The gentrification processes in Galata and Cihangir are comparable, in the sense that they had started at the same time and had similar actors as individual gentrifiers. Like in Cihangir, but at a comparatively small scale, gentrification began with the arrival of the artists and architects, who bought and mostly rented architecturally distinct but dilapidated properties with high ceilings, which were very appropriate for them to use as studios. However, in the course of the following years, gentrification in Galata has gained a new momentum (Islam/Enlil 2006).

6 Gentrification in Galata was not as much of a boom as it was in Cihangir. The majority of residents are still migrants (Islam 2002). Until the mid 1990's, together with the art sector members, a few other professionals moved to the area for residential purposes, but the real influx of gentrifiers occurred only after 1995. According to Islam (2002), only 17.3 percent of the gentrifiers moved to the area before 1995 while most moved in after 1995 (60.8 percent) Architects and journalists, forming 42 percent of the gentrifiers respectively, were the key actors in the process probably because they were more aware of the neighborhood's historic value. On the other hand, people holding managerial positions were still not interested in moving to the area, one indicator showing that the process was still proceeding at the initial level after almost 15 years since the first signs of gentrification were seen.

Instead of individual gentrifiers, this new phase of gentrification is directed by private large-scale investment companies, who seek to make greater investments, such as purchasing a few buildings along one street and then renovating them primarily for commercial uses (boutique hotels, restaurants, private clubs, etc.) rather than residential purposes. Besides the change in scale of gentrification from individual units to groups of buildings, the local and central government become more involved in the process of allowing⁷ regeneration projects. These initiatives put more pressure on the already heated real estate market. In turn, many pioneers have moved out of the neighborhood.

Similar to Cihangir, Galata has its own neighborhood organization since 1994. Galata Association was also established by a group of architects and professionals to do away with dilapidation in the physical, cultural and social environment and work on the rehabilitation and redevelopment of Galata in cooperation with other public and private actors and agencies. They define »consuming the space« as the main reason for dilapidation:

»[...] those who squatted the vacant houses or found a place to live here (in Galata) had no intention to keep their living place, the neighborhood well, they destroyed it habitually. Because there is no sense of responsibility, no sense of belonging, it is just use, destroy, meanwhile raise the economic position a little and use the neighborhood as a springboard and move to another neighborhood. We recognize the fact that there should be a sense of belonging, we should live here, we sleep and wake up here.« (E. Avdel, member of Galata Association in Behar/Islam 2006: 160)



Figure 3 and 4: Gentrification in Galata

7 To this date, there are six projects with international partners declared in and around Galata.

Though the association rejects the idea that they long for the old Galata as a lost paradise, they have a sound interest in an urban renaissance in Galata, which is mainly concerned with urban design improvements. In addition, the association aims for social improvement in the neighborhood: »by improvement we mean that the existing residents would gain new skills, positive values, they also would understand being an urbanite« (ebd.). In order to raise the sense of belonging and attract attention to the salvation of Galata, the association organized an annual festival beginning in 1989, and with the year 2001, these festivals changed to have a more international focus.

Due to the rural background of immigrant residents, a special social atmosphere in Galata has been identified by İslam and Enlil (2006) as a village, comparable to Gans' (1982) description of Italian Americans in Boston's West End as »urban villagers«. The urban villager is almost a reverse position of an urbanite. An urban village is described by Lofland (1973) as a neighborhood, »a home territory writ large« (Lofland 1973: 132). As ethnicity and *hemşehrilik*⁸ act as catalyzers for the formation of urban villages, limited spatial mobility, homogenous peer groups, and confinement to the neighborhood for daily chores provide the social context. Though urban villages are supportive for the new immigrants in the urban area, this conception has significant influence upon the use and appropriation of public spaces. For those who want to keep their traditions and customs, the urban villages are the perfect places to continue the habitual-traditional social environment. The patriarchal lines continue and the newcomers or offspring are not alienated from traditional values and norms, which are represented, continued, and strengthened by the elderly. Ethnic networks, especially kin-related ones, which originally functioned as support mechanisms, prevent offspring from testing alternative life-styles in the urban context and perpetuate the traditional norms of gender interaction. In that sense, the urban village has its »own« traditions, customs and values, sometimes quite distinct from the one that immigrants brought with them.

Since the open spaces for social interaction are limited in Galata, some pioneers used their property as a place to meet with the residents of the neighborhood. »Oda Projesi« is worth mention not only because a group of artists created a multi-purpose meeting place together with other artists, children, and all people in the neighborhood, a public ground, but more importantly because »Oda Projesi« stemmed from everyday banal

8 *Hemşehrilik* is a concept that implies a tie presumed to exist between people from the same village, town, province, and in some cases, the same region. The direct English translation is »same-townsmanship«.

and routine spatial practices of Galata's residents and was based on the experience of the participants. Conceptualized as an artist collective, a place for informal and spontaneous artist meetings, it became an experiential space: a communal space for the neighbors in the apartment, stairs, corridors, and other parts of the apartment as well as an exhibition space for video installations, a performance arena for amateur music groups, and a playground for neighborhood children. Besides the apartment, the courtyard, surrounding streets, and the small square nearby were also enacted in other projects of »Oda Projesi«.

In contrast to projects developed gradually by old and new residents and based upon their spatial experiences, large-scale commercial activities have started to be injected in Galata. Galata is an attractive location for these projects largely due to its relatively central location in Beyoğlu, and proximity to İstiklal Street, the main pedestrian street with approximately 50.000 users per hour. Beginning with the French Street, the refurbishment of a highly dilapidated building in a street and adjacent alleys into a commercial area with a variety of sidewalk cafes and restaurants with a French ambiance, a persistent development of simulation and thematization of public space has begun. Thus, public space has become a contested space, torn between two gentrifying groups: pioneers vs. large stakeholders. Investors are backed by local authorities, who see the salvation of the area in terms of tourist-industry investments, and favor thematized, commercial gentrification. Thus, while pioneers and followers offer opportunities for people to explore urban activities and identities and create shared spaces, as well as grounds to flourish, commercial gentrification tends to prescribe the spatial structure, placing people solely as passive consumers, as well as social spacing and interaction patterns.



Figure 5 and 6: Non-gentrified streets of Galata

Gentrification redefines activities and places. Though the actual activities, such as a group of women sitting on the entrance of the apartment

drinking tea and gossiping, do not change, they should not seem foreign to the activity of sidewalk café visitors. Yet, the context is different, and there are reserved, prescribed zones of acceptable activities. Since the public/private relationship in the street has changed, the former may be considered an inappropriate activity. With the new activities and places defined due to the nature of the new activities, the traditions of boundaries and activities of public/private relationships, such as gathering in the entrance with neighbors, children playing in the street, watching the street for control, are abandoned. The relatively slow replacement process of residential uses and high potential for public/private enterprise with high profit expectations paved the way for Galata in terms of commercial and tourist-oriented gentrification. Because of the scattered commercial enclaves, the area resembles an archipelago of security zones. Not only the use and appropriation patterns are changing. With the abrupt injection of new activities, the long established public-private continuum of spheres and activities in the urban space perishes.

What's next?

Public spaces are important parts of the city for framing a vision of social life in the city: a vision both for those who live in the city and interact in public spaces every day, a meeting place and social staging ground. Diversity and difference are represented in the public spaces with the variety of rhythms and patterns of use, as public spaces are occupied at different times by different groups. In that sense, public spaces are the only arenas in the city where conflicting groups and even countercultures, which compete with each other in the urban environment, are co-present at the same time. This co-presence is not passive, even if it might seem so. There is a constant struggle for use and appropriation, whereby different actors and interests are at stake and boundaries of exclusion and inclusion are continuously constructed, negotiated, re-constructed, and enacted. On the other hand, gentrification is a process of socio-spatial transformation, profoundly changing patterns of use, appropriation and social life in the public space. Nevertheless, public space is hardly investigated as an important constituent of the process, yet alone as a consequence. More empirically grounded research is needed to investigate the role that public space plays in the process of gentrification as well as the potentials of public space in future transformations. Further work can explore the compelling question of how new social relations, identities, and practices emerge in the broader framework of gentrification processes. Strategies and tactics in changing practices, the

habits of use and appropriation of space, the place of habitat and social relations therein for both the potential displaced and replaced need to be examined instead of just dismissing them as the »other«.

The case studies of Galata and Cihangir as two examples of gentrified neighborhoods of Istanbul reveal how public spaces mediate between social and spatial changes and various public and private actors and institutions, and communicate between old and new land-uses and residents. In some instances, public space acts as a potential binding field, facilitating interaction and offering a ground for public activities in a way that at least visibility – seeing and being seen – and »exchange« in Hajer and Reijndorp’s (2001) sense of the word, are accommodated. Visibility on the one hand enables stereotypical categorizations: we are migrants, poor, religious, etc. and they are not: on the other hand, visibility offers citizens a chance to inform themselves about each other, i.e. various inhabitants of the city who had lived for a long time without any contact have a chance of active or passive interaction. In addition, public space articulates social and spatial fragmentation; such as marking territories of »us« and »them«; of »new, clean, tidy, neat« and »old wild, messy«, various styles of identification with space, and forms of making sense of place.

Gentrification, by definition, presumes privatization and exclusion, however, even in smaller degrees, as the case studies of Galata and Cihangir present, various community actions and activities enhance the public life and the sharing of public space. Approaching gentrification as a relational process rather than demonizing it, encompassing its multiple territories, actors, and processes, offers valuable perspectives and a new understanding of changing social and spatial practices. This way, we can learn to recognize and mobilize the potentials of public spaces where new forms of social life and identity formations are enacted. Concentration of highly privatized public spaces, as in the case of leisure developments in Galata, creates contested spaces so that competing groups, in this case gentrification pioneers and commercial enterprises strengthen and legitimize themselves by adopting new spatial practices, organizing festivals, art displays, thematic uses, etc. The problem is especially grave for marginal, vulnerable groups and alternative cultures, which have no or limited claim on or access to public space. Recognizing the role and place of public spaces in gentrification processes with all their varieties and differences of scales, actors, contexts, and competences supports policymakers and planners in assuring inclusive and equitable practices that secure the rights to the city, the right to flourish in urban space.

When approached from a relational perspective, the gentrification process and the place of public space in gentrified or gentrifying neighborhoods is worthy of study not only in terms of observing the different effects of gentrification on urban space, but also gaining an understanding of the different attitudes, conceptions, and interpretations of public space among different social, cultural, and ethnic groups. Recognizing a relational understanding of gentrification fosters the possibility of »nuanced planning practices« (Shaw 2005), which can contribute greatly to the diversity of uses and meanings in the city.

* I would like to acknowledge the contribution of C. Nil Duruöz Uzun for giving permission to utilize her research in Cihangir, Istanbul and working together for many ideas discussed in this study.

References

- Behar, D./ Islam, T. (eds.) (2006): Istanbul'da »Soylulaştırma«, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Bickford, S. (2000): »Constructing inequality: City spaces and the architecture of citizenship«. *Political Theory* 28 (3), pp. 355-76.
- Bridge, G. (2001): »Bourdieu, rational action and the time-space strategy of gentrification«. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 26 (2), pp. 205-216.
- Davis, M. (1990): *City of Quartz*, New York: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986): *Distinction; a social critique of the judgement of taste*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000): *Pascalian meditations*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Engels, B. (1999): »Property ownership, tenure, and displacement: in search of the process of gentrification«. *Environment and Planning A* 31, pp. 1473-1495.
- Ergun, N. (2004): Gentrification in Istanbul. *Cities* 21 (5), pp. 391-405.
- Fyfe, N. R. (ed.) (1998): *Images of the street: planning, identity, and control in public space*, London: Routledge.
- Gans, H. J. (1982): *The urban villagers*, New York: The Free Press.
- Güvenç, M. (2006): »Gentrification kavrami nasıl turkcelestirilmeli?«. *Mimarlık* 3, pp. 39-45.
- Harvey, D. (2003): »The Right to the City«. *International Journal of Urban Regional Research* 27 (4), pp. 939-941.
- Hajer, M./ Reijndorp, A. (2001): *In search of the new public domain: analysis and strategy*, Rotterdam: NAI Publishers.

- Hillier, J./ Rooksby, E. (eds.) (2005): *Habitus: a sense of place*, second edition, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Islam, T. (2002): »Gentrification in İstanbul: A comparison of different cases«, Paper presented at the conference of »Upward Neighborhood Trajectories: Gentrification in a New Century«, 26 and 27 September 2002, Glasgow, Scotland
- Islam, T. (2005): »Outside the Core: Gentrification in Istanbul«. In Atkinson, R./Bridge, G. (eds.) *Gentrification in a Global Context*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 121-136.
- Islam, T./Enlil, Z. M. (2006): *Evaluating the Impact of Gentrification on Renter Local Residents: The Dynamics Of Displacement In Galata, Istanbul* 42nd ISoCaRP Congress, retrieved from: www.isocarp.net/Data/case_studies/900.pdf in 20.09.2007
- Jacobs, J. (1961): »The uses of sidewalks« (reprinted). In P. Kasinitz (ed.) (1995) *Metropolis: Centre and symbol of our times*, London: McMillan, pp. 111-129.
- Kasinitz, P. (1995): *Metropolis; Center and symbol of our times*, London: McMillan.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991): *The production of space*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. (2002): »The right to the city«. In Gary Bridge / Susan Watson (eds.) *The Blackwell City Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 367-374.
- Ley, D. (1996): *The new middle class and the remaking of the central city*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Liggett, H. (2003): *Urban encounters*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lofland, L. H. (1973): *A world of strangers: order and action in urban public space*, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Mitchell, D. (2003): *The right to the city: social justice and the fight for public space*, New York: Guilford Press.
- Modan, G. G. (2007): *Turf Wars, Discourse, Diversity, and the Politics of Place*, Malden: Blackwell.
- Podmore, J. (1998): »(Re)reading the ›loft living‹ habitus in Montreal's inner city«. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 22, pp. 283-301.
- Sennett, R. (1977): *The fall of public man*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Shaw, St. J. (1979): »The population of Istanbul in the nineteenth century«. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 10 (2), pp. 265-77.
- Shaw, K. (2005): »The place of alternative culture and the politics of its protection in Berlin, Amsterdam and Melbourne«. *Planning Theory and Practice* 6 (2), pp. 151-170.

- Smith, Neil (1979): »Toward a theory of gentrification«. *Journal of American Planners Association* 45, pp. 538-548.
- Smith, N. (1996): *The new urban frontier: gentrification and the revanchist city*, London: Routledge.
- Sorkin, M. (ed.) (1992): *Variations on a theme park, the new American city and the end of public space*, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Uzun, C. N. (2001): *Gentrification in Istanbul: A diagnostic study*, Utrecht: Knag.
- Zukin, S. (1995): *The cultures of cities*, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Internet sites

<http://www.cihangir.org.tr/tuzuk.asp>

<http://www.yenisafak.com.tr/arsiv/2005/haziran/09/kultur.html>

<http://www.odaprojesi.org>

Globalization, Locality and the Struggle over a Living Space. The Case of Karanfilköy

SEVIL ALKAN

In recent years the increasing literature on globalization draws the picture of a new borderless world order; that globalization is an »unstoppable«, »inevitable« and »relentless« process, that the spread of investment production and technology will make the world a more homogenous and singular place, that globalization is inevitable and even desirable. Moreover, global competition will undoubtedly increase economic efficiency, that global society, economy and cultures become »placeless«, they show themselves everywhere in the world resulting in homogenization. From the neo-liberal perspective, globalization is shown as an inexorable process and a powerful force arising from outside which should be accepted as it is.

The same scenario also presents a new system including the patterns of losers as well as winners in the global world. This approach is also reflected in the global city discourse promoting competition between cities and the tendency to create a hierarchical world city system. In this hierarchical map of the world, attaining the global city status becomes very important. In order to reach this status, which offers enormous opportunities, cities should orient their urban politics towards the aim of becoming a global city.

Globalization shows itself differently with complex affinities and processes varied according to different economic, social and cultural contexts. This study aims to point to the multi-dimensionality and complexity of globalization, especially when »other cities in other places«

are in question (Öncü/Weyland 1997). It treats globalization as a complicated and uneven process rather than a singular and homogenous formation. In line with this approach, it aims to show the importance of localities in the formation of globalizing cities and prove that the local does not exist as only an opposition and resistance against the global but it finds its special space in the city life in the interrelation with globalization.

The example taken in this thesis is a locality in a globalizing metropolis – Istanbul. Istanbul, like other cities, wants to reach a global city status and participate in inter-city competition in order to gain economic benefits from globalization. Urban politics are formed and many strategies are developed mainly under the influence of the dominant globalization discourse to »sell Istanbul« in the global arena. With this image creation, only one side of the city is to be shown to the market, the bigger part of the urban population which does not fit to this image are excluded from the global city project. We see the conversion of the decaying/dying, non-representative areas with its physical and social characteristics within the urban regeneration projects, gentrification of these districts and finally the displacement of the people who live there. Our example, Karanfilköy is one of the squatter housing neighborhoods that occupies this position in the frame of the global city project. The Karanfilköy case can be described as the product of the »power struggles over the living space and local identity« (Öncü/Weyland 1997) under the impacts of globalization in the city.

These power struggles are also reflected to the general public, which makes the inhabitants of Karanfilköy quite successful in expressing themselves, even finding their power from tools shared to the public. They have realised the power rising from the public and used this opportunity to organize themselves and to gain power. This reflection allows them to be more capable of dealing with the problems because they learnt how to represent themselves and to develop organizational infrastructures that can be seen in the urban life of Istanbul.

In short, with the example of Karanfilköy, it is intended to show how a locality is victimized first by the globalization processes of the city that caused power struggles between different groups while at the same time the globalization process provided opportunities to overcome this problem, especially in the public arena. It is expected to be shown with the case study that a locality in a globalizing metropolis is neither a completely closed community nor victims of globalization. A locality can become an important actor in the city although it is supposed that they are not dominant enough to exercise power. With this example, it is

expected to point to the uneven process and effects of globalization as an opposition to the neo-liberal approach.

The dominant globalization discourse

Most theories about neo-liberalism treat globalization primarily as an economic phenomenon. It tends to view globalization as a rather unproblematic term and produces works that are focused empirically on same aspects of the economic (rather than the social or cultural) geographies of globalization (Roberts 1995 in Leyshon 1997). The concept is treated as a natural force based inherent in the market. Capital is completely free and mobile so that this »placeless money« can be only controlled by the very few powerful transnational corporations which are completely free in their actions, independent from the national and local forms of power. This approach proposes that the nation state is weakening in this borderless economy through the establishment of transnational networks of production, trade and finance that is connoted as »the end of the nation state«. Such statements show the globalization process as an inevitable, relentless process emanating from outside, which is much beyond the political powers, actuated by capitalist development and technological change. This approach conforms to neo-liberal politics and supports the free market on a global scale. The essence of this scenario is also accepted and displayed by diverse actors and organizations like governments, transnational corporations, non-governmental organizations and even social movements, to perform and legitimize their political and economic programs.

This scenario also presents a new system including the patterns of losers as well as winners and the polarization between them in the global world. The social results of globalization or those »who having been left behind, want not so much a chance to move forward as to hold others back as well« should be dealt by the governments (McGrew 1998). This idea presents manifestly the expected passive role of the government and the desire of creating a kind of new hierarchy in the global system.

Furthermore, it is also claimed that a global homogenization in social, economic and political fields, eliminating the differences between regions in the world, is inevitable and it will lead to a singular »global society«, replacing the diversity of cultural systems which were prominent until now. This homogenization thesis presents the globalization in a sense that there is an absolute harmonization with the standardized consumption culture and equalization of the acts and modes of human conditions. In addition, this approach does not take cultural and practical

experiences, like personal relations, political and religious tendencies, national and ethical identity patterns, local practises and their relations to different contexts into consideration.

Until now, the perspective that is drawn above reflects only one dimension of globalization, which is only based on the economic point of view. In addition, in these discussions the meaning and essence of the term is often deformed and mis-formulated, reducing the complexities of globalization into a one-sided, simple approach. Thus, globalization should be treated sceptically and one should be aware of the caricatures of globalization and the political contexts in which these are being deployed, but it does not mean that the very existence of the process should be denied (Dicken/Peck/Tickell 1997).

At this point, an alternative approach should be cultivated to understand power struggles, changing patterns of the local under the changes at the world scale, the positioning of the states and local governments to the existence of globality. It is so apparent that fundamental changes are occurring in the world, but how these changes and their powerful consequences should be treated is a very crucial question and should be answered carefully.

Undoing the dominant globalization discourse – The complexity of globalization

One of the basic arguments from the neo-liberal perspective to the globalization thesis is the »weakening role of the nation states« because of the increasing importance of transnational flows of capital, commodities, labour, images and information. Some studies have shown that the main discussion is not if there is more or less of a nation-state, it is rather that the states adopt themselves according to differing conditions under globalization.¹

It means that the states are gaining changing structure and orientation. It is obvious that the nation states do not carry the same characteristics and structure as it was before. However, it does not necessarily mean that the states lost their key positions in forming their politics in the global arena, but other forms of politics have become important. According to Jessop (1995), the nation state is »still the most significant site of struggle among competing global, triadic, supra-national, national, regional and local forces«. What is changing is that the state ca-

1 See studies like Peck and Tickell, 1994; Amin and Thrift, 1997; Dicken et al., 1997; Jessop, 2000; Yeung, 2002 and Park, 2003.

pabilities and structures are re-organized in intricate and complicated ways leading to a new economic and institutional orientation of the nation-state, which opens up new possibilities.

Additionally, globalization is not an external force that is unavoidable or inevitable, contrary to what the neo-liberal global perspective proposes. According to Dicken, Peck and Tickell (1997) globalization does not exist as a free-floating structure unrelated to the economic and institutional context in which it arises. Rather, it is the result of complex interactions through the process in which different social, political and economic actors, nation states, transnational corporations, localities etc., play important role. Globalization is built materially and discursively from the complex correlations and power struggles between these actors happening simultaneously among various geographical scales. Marcuse (1997) points out that »globalization does not move on its own. It is the result of human actions consciously undertaken by specific persons and groups, if with varying degrees of coordination«.

The neo-liberal hypothesis also proclaims the homogenization of cultures, claiming that the forces of commoditization will generate cultural homogenization and standardization in social life. The world becomes one singular place by offering the standardization of culture and institutional structures. According to Featherstone (1995), the process of globalization suggests two different kinds of culture scenarios. One is that the upper limits of the world are the determination, which is the globe. In this scenario, all heterogeneous cultures, whose existence becomes incorporated, melt into one global culture producing the big unification of the globe. On the contrary, the other scenario offers that the different cultures flow side by side and, at a certain point, they are confronted with each other. Within the overlap of their confrontation, various possibilities and complicated circumstances appear. Indeed, the global cultural condition is a matter of flows, meanings as well of people and goods, happening at the different levels of networks between different regions of the globe as Appadurai (1990) explains in his article. According to him, culture carries characteristics of definite fundamental disjuncture between economy, culture and politics. Reducing this complexity into a situation, which is believed to be the result of economic and technological improvement will limit our understanding of the complexities in the real life of citizens in cities, reflecting different characteristics and sometimes paradoxes of globalization. On one side, the global culture shows itself as an emerging entity, on the other side, there is another kind of culture arising which reflects the merging of the influence coming from the global level (cultural, political and economical) and the values existing in a place.

In the light of the points discussed above, the appropriate understanding about globalization and its effects on culture seems to be the one, which takes the multi-dimensionality and complexity of the process into the consideration. Within globalization the new forms of changes in the cultural field, such as the emergence of a new global culture, are observed. However, these changes are not only one-sided, that there is a rising complex composition of cultural forms differing according to their distinct components and that can be explained with the help of hybridization and global flows perspectives. In this respect, it is very crucial to evaluate the potential of hybrid differences emerging under the impact of globalization in order to analyze changing forms of relations in cultural, economical and political fields.

Globalization and localization

In relation to the discussion of complexity of the globalization process, the problem of the local, which is also underestimated by the dominant globalization discourse, should be open to discussion. The issue of local in the context of globalization has also ended with several approaches to that problem. In the most common sense, a local culture is frequently represented as a being opposite of the global and as the cultural space of embedded communities. The local in the general case has been treated as a static, closed and bounded place, which is outside the logic of globalization. People in these narrow social worlds make sense of their world and form their political identities in a culturally bounded micro-territory, the locality. These local cultural meanings are represented as generating identities inherently oppositional to the global restructuring of society and space (Smith 2001). In the same line, there is a tendency to claim that »globalization is a process which overrides locality« (Robertson 1994). Furthermore, locality is mostly represented as the space of resistance to the pressing influences and processes of globalization, that localization and globalization are shown completely opposing notions to each other. However, the new studies claim that there is actually a mutual influence and relation between the local and the global. In other words, the local is not a closed entity but it interacts, responds to the changes and flows on the global scale. Today, the notions of global and local become inseparable from each other in a way that »rather than being mutually exclusive, they are ›in‹ one another in ways that make their interpretation as important as their differentiation« (Öncü/Weyland 1997). In words of Long (1996): »[...] local situations are transformed by becoming part of the wider global arenas and processes, while global

dimensions are made meaningful in relation to specific local conditions and through the understandings and strategies of local actors«. In other words, there is a continuous interaction of local cultural elements and global cultural influences, which play an important role in the construction of local forms.

Then, how is this interaction possible, contrary to the very common expectation, from the local in the form of resistance to the disruptive processes of globalization? From the cultural point of view, within the distinct means of flows in the global world, the locals adapt themselves to global and transnational contexts and they contact with »external« cultural elements. Moreover, these external elements may become a part of the local cultures when they enter a local context. They become part of it after being filtered and adapted to the new context (Schuerkens 2004). In short, this cultural global flow is filtered by the existing local experiences with refusal, interpretation, combination and transformation of actions and forms in order to come up with the new cultural forms and new representations. This approach somehow shows that localities are not only the passive receivers in the case of the problem of dealing with global flows.

According to Öncü and Weyland (1997), different social groups with distinct relations to global flows and processes are mobilized to re-describe »their political and cultural boundaries vis-à-vis other relevant social actors in the metropolitan arena«. It is self-evident that images and commodities circulate and flow and find themselves in metropolises all over the world. Beside this, the localities are »engaged in active power struggles to maintain their conditions of social existence and cultural distinctiveness vis-à-vis other relevant actors, including the state elite« (ibid.) under the influence of globalization. The circumstances about locality is not pure resistance to global practices, the actors who are engaged in the globalization processes involve themselves in the struggle to change the circumstances of metropolitan life in order to redefine their existence according to each other. In this sense, even the resistances in globalizing cities do not address the pure opposition to globalization but to an attempt to redefine their local identities and positions in the changing relationships during the globalization processes. Even in the resistance case, the local and the global interact, interconnect and form complicated relations which are shaping the nowadays' metropolises of the world.

In brief, the global-local relation differs according to metropolises, their distinct cultural, social and economic structures as well as their histories and their engagement in globalization processes. It is self-evident that global-local interrelations will show themselves relatively different,

for instance, in New York and in Istanbul. In order to understand this distinction, an approach, which treats globalization as an uneven development should be developed and closer research should be initiated in the real life of the metropolises, without being fixed to the dominant globalization discourse, offering a one-dimensional approach to these problems. In short, globalization and localization are complicated and heterogeneous processes, which can not be simply reduced to opposing notions. On the contrary, they have a mutual relation and strong influences on each other.

Squatter housing *gecekondu* and changes within the globalization

The establishment in Turkish cities of *gecekondu*, as a type of dwelling responding to the shelter demands of a part of the population, dates back to post War II period, when the country was exposed to the major developments and changes within the frame of an agriculture-based development strategy. During this period, structural interventions in agriculture were implemented in order to integrate it to the market, mostly supported by the Marshall Plan that caused a large amount of peasants migrating to the cities. However, the major cities of Turkey were not capable of answering the housing demands of the newcomers. Therefore, the migrants remained at the margins of cities by building their own shanties in undesirable sites when they first arrived. These shanties are called *gecekondu*, literally meaning, »built in one night«.

While migrants took their place in the urban economy, they tried to meet their shelter needs by building their *gecekondus* on public land. Their *gecekondu* constructions were tolerated by the government and by the private sector as their cheap and flexible labor helped the industrialization process (Erman 2000). For this reason, the *gecekondu* was born as a non-market solution for the people who were excluded by formal housing market as well as the state. The *gecekondu* was home to the ones who were newcomers to the city and tried to take part in city life and who the state and market forgot and ignored (Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2002).

However, in the neo-liberal period, there were big changes in the urbanization process of cities guided by new policies. Until this period, there were considerable compromises between different groups and institutions about the structuring of cities (Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2001). However, these harmonious interrelations were exposed to the change in a way that several actors appeared in the urban scene to take part in urban annuities, that they even applied different strategies and roles in these

changing conditions. Taking part in urban annuities, especially by the urban poor became an important requirement in order to survive in the urban life of cities (ibid).

The governing party of the period – the Motherland Party – interestingly issued a series of amnesty laws in the early beginning of the eighties, which aimed at making *gecekondu* settlements gain a legal status in order to solve the property rights problem for including the *gecekondu*s into the formal housing markets (Şenyapılı 1998 in Kalaylıoğlu 2006). The law passed in 1984 especially gave opportunities to the *gecekondu* population in order to build 4 storey buildings instead of their *gecekondu*s which resulted in the »apartmentalization« of *gecekondu*s. Most of the *gecekondu*s were converted into apartments whereby the owners suddenly attained very precious property rights. In this way, *gecekondu* lost its defining characteristic as »basic shelter« and became a commercial phenomenon.

Until the 1980s, the *gecekondu* population was treated as others in the city but they were still tolerated with their economic and cultural realities in urban life. However, this situation has dramatically changed in the neo-liberal period. After the 1980s, the notion of *gecekondu* has gone beyond the idea of sheltering needs and lost its innocence in the public debates and the opinion of people. Especially after the *gecekondu* transformations, *gecekondu* was presented by the elites and media as a means of making easy money and the owners were viewed by the public as »undeserving rich«. In this new negative representation, the terms like »illegal *gecekondu*«, »*gecekondu* invasion«, »illegal construction«, »invasion or occupation of public lands«, »land mafia«, »plunder and opportunist« were often pronounced making the *gecekondu* gain a position beyond the moral legitimacy (Kalaylıoğlu, 2006).

Beside this, in the 1990s, a dramatic approach to the *gecekondu* has been formed and promoted in the public. A new term *varoş/varoşlu* was introduced to the society in very negative connotations. The term was firstly used by the media after the Gazi Events in 1995 and in the following year 1 May Demonstrations in which both the leftist groups were engaged with the vandalism and fights with police forces that ended with the death of some people. Within these two major events and their reflection to the society through media, the term *varoş* has started to imply a certain part of the class who are economically deprived (the deprivation may be relative or absolute) and impoverished lower classes who tend to engage in criminal activities and radical political actions directed against the state. In other words, *varoş* is a living place, which watches the city from the outside but can't be part of it (Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2002) and *varoşlu* is the person who exercises the violence and represents this

culturally as against the other actors in the city. The new notion of *varoş*, with its very negative connotations, refers to a culture as strangers in the context of urban life and, moreover as invaders directed to ruin the social and cultural texture of the city (Kalaylıođlu 2006). In this sense, *varoş* does not only refer to a spatial entity, but also to a space with its social and cultural dimensions. However, these social and cultural features of *varoş* are correlated with danger and fear that these spaces are »threat« to civilized and modernized urbanity. »The *varoş* is oppositional to the city and is setting itself against the city; it is hostile and antagonistic to the city. The city is besieged by the *varoşlu*« (Erman 2000). The term of *gecekondu* in this sense lost its innocent sense of the rural population who cannot integrate to the city, this time attacking its values, institutions and its social order (ibid.). While the notion of *gecekondu* implied an expectation of integration of the rural population to the city gradually, with the introduction of *varoş* this expectation should be left because *varoş* are culturally and socially completely against the city and its urban culture. They are the »others« and »losers« who already lost their chances to be part of the city and do not have any hope to be included. Since the *varoş* is a story of losing, it is unavoidable that they have a tendency towards violence.

In short, the changing image of the *gecekondu* population brought a dramatic positioning to the *gecekondu* problem and its population. This appears to be a big obstacle in regulating harmonious urban life between different social groups. It resulted in the exclusion of one segment of the city population that comes to important conflicts in urban life. From the point of the *varoşlu*, this situation also restricts their further demands about their urban life, as they already do not deserve it in the minds of the urbanites and the state. Their non-acceptance in this sense causes their attachment to their cultural and social identities more to represent a strong identity and organization as a counter presence.

Karanfilköy – A locality in the metropolis

When approaching from the 2nd Bosphorus Bridge towards the CBD of Istanbul, Karanfilköy appears on the left hand side of the road. Then, you reach a place where Istanbul is the most connected to the global network, processes and activities. The standard spatial requirement of being a finance centre has already been completed here so that the surroundings come into existence with a strong expression of global activities, its fundamental requirements such as offices, big and expensive shopping malls, gated communities close by are the typical spatial re-

flection of globalization in Istanbul in this part of the city. Finally, Karanfilköy, as a *gecekondu* settlement, appears in the middle of all these global activities. However, there is something interesting and, at the same time, strange about it. The first impression about Karanfilköy is that it is a *gecekondu* settlement. However, it is not post-*gecekondu* which has been converted into an apartment building after 1980s. It has a kind of a village structure, and it is pre-modern in the middle of Istanbul's representation to the global network. It seems that it is simultaneously incorporated and left behind. It is not a part of the global urban network although it is located in the core of this network. The place has been frozen² as it was in the 1950s. It seems that the typical development of the neo-liberal period, which has shaped the urban life of Istanbul, has not affected Karanfilköy. While many urban transformations have been realized by the municipality in order to get rid of »decaying areas« (*çöküntü alanları*) in order to become a representative global city, Karanfilköy remains as it is with its *gecekondu* identity, which can not be promoted in the minds of elites on the way to the global city. How is this situation possible? Can a place stay as it is while there is a continuous large-scale development around? Why does Karanfilköy exist there with these characteristics although there is a strong demand for the urban land, especially in this very precious part of the city? These are impressions and the questions, which arise about neighborhood at first sight. When deeper research and investigation are made in the neighborhood, it is understood that there are complicated interrelations between different actors, as well as very different dynamics shaping the condition of Karanfilköy. The situation of Karanfilköy today is a result of complex relations and different power dynamics in cultural, social and economic fields affected by the globalization process.

The effect of globalization on Karanfilköy

In the middle of these global movements, Karanfilköy retains its *gecekondu* identity, a place where local practices are grounded in the core of their everyday life. According to the findings of this research, it can be claimed that the condition of Karanfilköy can be characterized by a complex interrelation between globalization and localization. Öncü and Weyland (1997) also point out the same fact that »any attempt to make practical and political sense of contemporary metropolitan experience must therefore begin by recognizing that process of globalization and lo-

2 Orhan Esen used the term »frozen« in an informal talk to describe the specific situation of the neighborhood.

calization interconnect and intertwine to produce place-based political struggles« that reflects very well the position of Karanfılköy in a globalizing city. Karanfılköy, in this sense, points to a locality which is victimized by the globalization process of the city but, at the same, defeats this obstacle by the using the opportunities and means which globalization offers and provides. Within this time, Karanfılköy has adapted to the changing life of the metropolis under the intense impacts of globalization and satisfied the requirements in order to become a strong locality to declare its existence.

As it is discussed before, the localities tend to be shown as static and closed communities, which are completely outside the logic of globalization. However, Öncü and Weyland point out that the mixture of varied and different cultural forms, producing new diversities, requires complex reading in such dual oppositions as traditional/modern, indigenous/foreign or local/global. The position of the Karanfılköy residents »can be understood within the cultural frames of relevant social actors; that is social groups which are positioned differentially within the power constellations of a different system« changing under the impacts of globalization (Öncü/Weyland 1997). In other words, the Karanfılköy case is the product of power struggles determining the hierarchical relations under the impacts of globalization in the city. These power struggles come into being within the changing characteristics of city life, which are shaped by the different power dynamics in cultural, social and economic fields. In this research, these struggles are named as »living space – or *lebensraum* – struggles« as Öncü and Weyland (2007) have introduced in their work. Social groups in different relations to the global flows are:

»[...] mobilized to reassert or redefine their political and cultural boundaries vis-à-vis other relevant actors in the metropolitan arena. Place-based struggles entail contending social actors whose frames of reference, projects and practices have their logic and coherence within distinctive ensembles of the class and culture of the metropolis.« (Öncü/Weyland 2007)

Today, the situation of Karanfılköy is the result of strong power struggles carried out by different actors, such as the locals, state elites and big capital. Contrary to the vision supposing that national states lose their power in the new »borderless world«, the state appears as the most important actor in the urban scene of Istanbul as well as in the example of Karanfılköy. The state still has the capacity to develop and implement projects and form the physical map of the metropolis according to its vision.

However, the position of the locals in this power and »living space« struggle should not be described as the weaker part. On the contrary, the local appears in the urban scene as a very strong actor in the case of Karanfilköy. At first sight, it is seen as being against the pressure by the global activities in this part of the city. However, the local response to these activities and their consequences is the creation of local identity and holding on it strongly in order to gain the power in front of the other power holder. Furthermore, their mobilization was the result of very well prepared and supported kinds of conscious acts, which are realized by the possibilities that are again available with the global processes. They offer the solutions to the problems when the state fails to provide, they can easily react whenever the state politics do not match with their future vision. While doing so, they are also very aware of some mediums, which will help in order to reach a certain power. In other words, their resistance and mobilization are formed very strategically rather than being just a reaction. This helps prove the fact that localities are not closed communities and outside the logic of globalization. On the contrary, their localization was mostly possible because of the effects of the globalization of the neighborhood. In other words, they become separate entities being more than a *gecekondu* settlement, as the effects of globalization enabled them to stress more their locality in the changing, increasingly competitive urban life of the metropolis.

As Berner (2005) states, »the urban land in the strategic regions is always an important power source«. Because of the dominancy of global activities, urban land becomes very precious in this part of the city. Karanfilköy became a place, where everybody wants to gain a profit because of its important location. Today, Karanfilköy still holds one of the precious lands in Istanbul and they are even in the phase of initiating a project which is developed by the neighborhood itself, although it seems that they are not the real power holders in today's urban Istanbul. How the inhabitants of Karanfilköy, with their *gecekondu* identities which are treated as the others and poor, can keep the land and become quite strong in the core of all the global activities is a fact to be explained. What kind of power sources do they use against the global actors and the state elites in order to exist? What kind of struggle do they perform for their living space? The following section will try to show how powerful the locality can be for the urban life of the metropolis.

Locality – A powerful tool

As it was discussed above, Karanfilköy is connected to the globalization process through the power struggle over living space, as well as using

distinct strategies, possibilities and mediums in this process, which are possible again within globalization that can be characterized with their locality in their relation to globality. In the globalizing Istanbul, their everyday life, as well as their views and aspirations, are centred in the locality that primarily provides a long term and fairly secure access to the city and its opportunities and capacity to be part of power struggles over urban land. In this term, »everyday life« is important for locality, as well as for global interconnections, local resistances, trans-territorial flows, state politics, regional dilemmas, identity formations and so on are always already present. Everyday life is thus a transversal site of contestations rather than a fixed level of analysis« (Campell 1996 in Smith 2001). With their everyday practices, they become a strong locality occupying their own place in the globalization process. They are rather strong with their locality than any other identity attachment. Globalization process of the city stressed even more their attachment to their locality against the exercise of power by the nation state over their neighborhood.

According to Erder (2002) »locality means the inseparable mixture of spatial and social notions that is more beyond the physical space«. The construction of locality is possible when the inhabitants have a sense of belonging to the space, as well as social relations to the other participants of the locality. At first sight, Karanfılköy can be considered as a simple housing space as one of the *gecekondu* neighborhoods in Istanbul. However, it functions beyond simple sheltering needs. The housing spaces have more complicated characteristics and different attributes, which play a very important role in the lives of people who want to be in the urban scene.

First of all, there is a strong cohesion and neighborhood feeling in Karanfılköy, which is considered as one of the elements of creating the capacity to be organized and mobilized in urban life by Nelson (1979). All of the interviewees mention the fact that they are really happy to live in Karanfılköy because there are perfect neighbor relationships that they can't find anywhere else, especially in a place like Istanbul. They are proud of the fact that their cohesion in the neighborhood is not affected by the difference between the people in terms of religion and coming from different parts of Anatolia.

The social cohesion in the neighborhood also builds up a mutual support among the people who live in Karanfılköy. The mutual support was especially intensified during the demolition process in the neighbourhood. An attack from the outside accelerated the feelings of acting together against the action that endangers their existence.

At that point, it should be strongly mentioned that the land for the inhabitants of Karanfilköy has a different meaning, which is beyond only being a shelter for them. It is a step to become an urbanite in the metropolis. They strongly state that they have completed their urbanite process socially. However, since they still live in a *gecekondu* settlement, they are automatically and still seen as rural migrants. For them, holding and gaining the ownership of the land means they will melt into the urban life that they already completed their integration into the city. Their desire of becoming urban is strongly connected to the physical ownership of the place that they live on with their *varoş* identity, which is constituted in the minds of urban elites around them. What Şinasi Yalcın, the president of AKDER (Akatlar Culture and Cooperation Association), says very strikingly:

»We want to be a part of the city. We want to be urbanites. We want to be a community, which combines the values from our homeland together with the urban values here instead of only living with our traditional cultures. We want to be modern. However, we want to discuss what urban means in this respect. We are urbanites but our only deficiency is the partially physical problems of our living space. This is only because of our economical conditions, helplessness of us in the presence of problems during the period. If there was a fair income distribution in this country, people had good opportunities to make their living, they had enough money to buy a house, do you think that people would think about living a place which does not have any electricity, water, sewage system?[...]This settlement is a result of helplessness and bad circumstances. These people are not the ones who usurp the land.«³

It can be understood from this statement that they are already urbanites, but still live in a *gecekondu*, which is always labeled with being »rural«, »Anatolian«, »not civilized« people who could not adopt the lifestyles and values of modernizing-globalizing urban elites. If we look at the problem of land ownership in this concern, it can be understood how important to be recognized by, firstly, the state and, later, by the urbanites/urban elites in Istanbul, where ownership became one of the most important criteria of being an urbanite. When they become a part of the urban system, they believe that they will not have any problems in urban life because most of them have been already part of it. However, they also want to preserve the values from their homeland, which they believe are very precious, especially in the degenerated urban life of Istanbul. They try to be on the urban stage with their uniqueness about physi-

3 Interview with Şinasi Yalcın, president of AKDER, during the fieldwork in 2006.

cal and social characteristics of the neighborhood. There is a wish to become like urbanites but at the same, to be distinguished from them.

The locality in relation to their everyday life practices, the sense of belonging to the place and the social meaning of the land find their expressions through the organizations in the neighborhood. If the main characteristic of locality is related to group building, the existence of the organizations, according to the communal interest specific to the groups are self-evident (Berner 1997). Grouping around some organizations are necessary in order to be strong in the power struggles over the urban sphere. Berner (1997) also points out that since the poor are excluded from direct participation in politics and decision-making they cannot attach themselves to the existing organizations, they have to establish organizations in order to gain power in urban life.

Karanfilköy is a place where people try to exercise power and find their representation through local organizations. Aysel Zorlu who works actively in AKDER says: »Individual attempts are never taken into account seriously. However, being organized is always important and necessary for gaining power. We are so much aware of this fact«.

In this context, three local organizations whose fields of actions are different have been found in the neighborhood. These are AKDER, Mosque Organization and Akadlar Sport Association.

When these three associations are analyzed, it is self-evident that they are very specific to the neighborhood. In the interviews, it is mentioned that AKDER and Mosque Organizations have sometimes conflicting interests. However, it can be stated that they act together when it is necessary, for instance during and after demolition processes. This collective action enables them to supersede the lines of division, according to the place of origin and religion. These organizations constitute their power in response to the city. Being organized is also considered as a way to be modern and democratic in the neighborhood that is used as a very strong element to constitute their identity against/in the city.

Beside their resisting and lobbying actions, through these organizations, they also try to reject identities (of *varoş* or illegal occupants) attributed to them in the neo-liberal period. They have to produce their image again, independent from *varoş*, in order to obtain a different position between others.

»The inhabitants of Karanfilköy want to present an ideal model for Istanbul. Because of this reason, Karanfilköy founded Akadlar Sport Association, AKDER, the library open to the public, Mosque Association which manifests in

the religious field, park fields because it dreams of a city which respect to people and environment«.⁴

When we think that the local relations and association are constituted through the interaction of space, political structure, the class structure of local and ethnicity (Erder, 2002), the elements specific to Karanfilköy can be described with the interaction of space and class structure, in relation to their position in urban life. It is self evident that the inhabitants of Karanfilköy constructed their relation to the city via their locality. If they did not form this locality, they would not be capable of showing themselves as a very strong actor in the urban scene and involve themselves in metropolitan life. Their locality gives security and self-confidence to the individuals who want to have a share in urbanity both physically and socially. They are strong only when they are inside this locality.

However, this locality did not come into being by itself. There are strong push factors to accelerate such a formation. In this paper, it is claimed that their locality became strong in order to resist the pressures from outside and to struggle over their living space, which is the result of the globalization process of the metropolis, changing the positioning of the relevant social actors within the new power constellations of a changing system. Locality, which started from the fact to work out solutions to the problems on housing and basic urban services, now, has advanced itself to the gaining the power in conflicts over the use of urban space.

Struggle over a living place and local identity

Power struggles between Karanfilköy and the Municipality

Karanfilköy was described as a locality that exists in the middle of a global place whose appearance recalls a village, a *gecekondu* settlement that seems to be not affected from the aggressive city development in the neo-liberal period of Istanbul. It is self-evident that during the dense global activities in this region, the land has reached extreme high values, leading to the power struggles over land rights. This situation is undoubtedly the result of the interests of many actors namely the state elite and big capital. The third interest group in this case is Karanfilköy itself, although it seems that it is a weak part of this story at first sight.

4 »Karanfilköy Explains Itself« – the declaration released by neighborhood.

At this point, it is very crucial to talk about the »annuity (rant)« struggles for urban land in Istanbul, intensively affecting the condition of Karanfilköy. In the neo-liberal period, the urban land turned out to be an important investment field that resulted in a situation where the urban land gained speculative value. According Şenyapılı (1998), the upper class who wanted to get rid of the negativity, which has risen because of the social distance from other urban classes, demands the urban land in order to create »villa ghettos«. On the other hand, the middle class also wants to claim the land in order to build some co-op buildings. At the end, the illegal lands that the immigrants hold are the perfect places for them to realize their projects. When big capital also enters into this competition, the picture is completed. In brief, immigrants, upper and middle classes and big capital groups come up against each other so that urban land becomes the concrete place where the power struggles between these actors are carried out.

In these power struggles, *gecekondu* areas seem to be the appropriate places for visions of these different groups. Moreover, *gecekondu*s are, now, in the city centre, at very strategic points such as being so close to finance centre, airports or shopping centers. In this respect, the character of land in the *gecekondu* areas of Istanbul is changing itself, from being a residential area to becoming a commodity, with high financial value that sharpens the struggle over land (Akçay 2005). In addition, in the people's mind, these lands were always seen as commodities because of being illegally occupied by immigrants. The fact that they received their temporary title deeds did not mean that they were accepted by the city, but their existence was only tolerated. In other words, the immigrants were already out of the urban life of the metropolis that they couldn't have rights to be in structuring of the urban life. They should already be out of the game in the other urban classes' imagination. Mostly with the urban transformation projects, these lands are opened to the usage of the strong bodies in the metropolis.

Hence, Karanfilköy, as one of the *gecekondu* areas of Istanbul, should be examined in this frame; the reality of the annuity struggles between these actors and the automatic exclusion of immigrants from urban life in the other's mind. The neighborhood was always the centre of attraction for the municipality, as well as big capital, whose concrete expression is that Karanfilköy experienced demolitions two times in 1996, in order to implement a project called the »Akatlar-Alkent Settlement Project«, where high-qualified housing and some business centers were supposed to be built. In the same year, the building height allowances were increased from 6.5 storeys to 15.5 storeys, supporting the possibility of the project and increasing the interest of these actors even more.

Demolitions in the neighborhood

The first demolition was realized in July 1996 and the next one in September of the same year, in order to implement the project which was developed for this area by the Greater Municipality of Istanbul. This act finds its expressions in the declaration of Karanfilköy as it is:

»The Greater Municipality of Istanbul attacked Karanfilköy with 4000 police, 500 municipal police, armed combat car and many other types of equipment as if they were going to a war. This action is, in fact, a brutal ›abolition operation« which is tried to ground on the act that ›I have demolished apart-kondu. [...] Now, Karanfilköy is like a place after an earthquake. 17 neighbors took shelter in the houses of other neighbors, the rest lives in tents.«

In the first demolition 28 and 25 in the second, *gecekondu* have been destroyed. However, it was declared that renewal of the houses would be tolerated.

According to Arıkanlı, right before the elections in 1994, the mayor of the municipality declared that *gecekondu*s, which will be built until the elections, would be tolerated; however, the ones after the elections will be demolished. Although the title deeds would not be given to the people, they could build two storey concrete buildings. When there were some attempts in Karanfilköy to build more than this, the municipality found legal reasons to demolish the. According to the neighborhood, »the renewal and reconstruction of some buildings in the neighborhood was tolerated for a while in order to legitimize the demolitions and to provide appropriate conditions for it«.

In brief, these two facts (the new project and the construction attempt of Karanfilköy) reinforced the idea of demolition in the neighborhood. For the municipality, Karanfilköy wanted to gain profit from the urban land like the other *gecekondu* areas, which were converted into apartment buildings (*post-gecekondu*), so that they do not have any right to stay there anymore as invaders. However, the demolition was resisted by the inhabitants together and this even increased the existing solidarity in the neighborhood.

The role of the media

The experience of demolitions in the neighborhood was not the only obstacle for Karanfilköy. This action found a broad place in the media during a period that »the media, in their research for sensational events, bring forward those cases where *gecekondu* people have contravened the

law or protested against the political system« (Erman 2000). People from *gecekondu* areas gained a new title, *varoş* which »are elaborated upon as they have appeared in the media- since the public discourse on the *varoş* and *varoşlu* has been largely shaped by the media« (ibid.).

The demolition in Karanfılköy was also projected in the media during this period so that people living in *gecekondu* areas were introduced to society with this new identity, which carries very negative meanings. Under these circumstances, Karanfılköy was shown to the public as a place where the inhabitants wanted to gain profit from the land.

The media's interpretation of Karanfılköy claims that although the inhabitants of Karanfılköy, like most *gecekondu* inhabitants, seem to be »poor« and »helpless«, they are, indeed, quite rich because of their attempt to gain profit from the urban land. Furthermore, these people are also culturally degenerated in a way that they lost their human values and became money oriented. It is also indicated that they will become dangerous politically. This comment fits exactly with the new image of people from *gecekondu*; *varoşlu*. According to expressions in the media, Karanfılköy is not treated as the urban poor or rural people living in the city anymore. This is the image which finds its place in the urbanites' mind about firstly, *varoş* and then about Karanfılköy. With this image, which was attributed to the neighbourhood, the demolitions were somehow legitimized. The municipality has a right to demolish these areas where these people want to gain profit. The municipality and public treated the inhabitants of Karanfılköy with this mentality that they have become an inferior part of this story. A woman whose house was demolished comments about the role of media in this process that:

»We wanted to ask for a help from the media. We thought that everybody should know about this. They used our images, our crying, our misery and used them as an advertisement on TV near the image of Tayyip Erdogan. They did not care about the situation. They did not think that we are a part of this land and we worked hard to form it here as it is.«⁵

However, the same media was also an important means for Karanfılköy in order to construct their image and talk about the demolitions, their resistance and its reasons. The neighborhood released several declarations about their problems, sent these to several media institutions and started to build some support in the public arena. They appeared on some TV programs to explain their points and raised discussions about the general *gecekondu* and *varoş* problems. Since the inhabitants were quite aware

5 Interview during fieldwork 2006.

of the fact that they can repair their image with the same medium through which their bad image was originally promoted, they were trying to make the other people be aware of their problems in public. It can be concluded that they found a considerable amount of support, which made the state hesitate about its actions, as well as the bad image about the neighborhood constructed by the same medium.

Counteractions in the neighborhood

It seems that a weak picture of Karanfilköy has been formed until now, because of the dramatic experience of demolitions and its portrayal in the media. However, it should not be misunderstood that they are powerless and dismissed from this struggle. Karanfilköy had already built a strong cohesion with their everyday life experiences in the neighborhood. Especially with the demolitions and media's negative propagating to the public a strong solidarity and resistance came into being as a counteraction. Moreover, the action was not only resisted but also responded to very cleverly. In other words, they did not only stay and accept the role and position which had been attributed to them in urban life, but they started to make counteractions combining the collective action of the inhabitants and the other actors, who have influence on urban life.

After the first demolition, the inhabitants came together under the leadership of AKDER (Akatlar Culture and Cooperation Association) and started to lobby in different fields. They negotiated with the authorized people in the Greater Municipality of Istanbul 14 times in order to find a solution to demolition and future development of the neighbourhood. During this period, several declarations were released to the media, in order to explain the life and standing of the neighbourhood that they do not want to gain profit from the land and they even want to be a good example with their living approaches to the others in the city. However, in the end these acts were not successful as the second demolition could not be prevented.

After the second demolition, the inhabitants directed their actions to the public after being unsuccessful with the authorities, because it was clear that the municipality would not make any concessions about their plans. Their actions this time were to explain themselves as a locality with a different kind of life style and to deny the kind of images which were attributed to them in the media and to prove that they are not the ones who want to make a profit from this precious land. They were aware of the fact that they should develop their own public support and change their image that was presented in the media, as they believed that

if they can carry these demolitions and their problems to the public, it would become very difficult for the state to initiate a project with the exclusion of the inhabitants. For this reason, they started to act in different fields, which will reach out to other people to express themselves as a locality and their problems.

First of all, they organized the 1st Solidarity Festival, expressing their desire about being a part of urban life and announcing their basic rights to own their »living space« which they have been forming for 50 years. This festival took place in the neighborhood, with the participation of some scholars, other organizations, political parties and the supporters of the neighborhood. The 1st Solidarity Festival found its place in the declarations as:

»Today, the inhabitants of Karanfilköy explain themselves at the 1st Solidarity Festival, despite of demolition threats. Listen to us. We will speak about our solution proposals, the creation of our neighborhood and neighborhood solidarity, which becomes nearly a part of fairy tales of our grandmothers. We will explain that we are not helpless as it is thought, there can be also »other kind« of life, concrete is not a destiny and talk about what we have created and how we participate. We will talk about our obstinacy in participation in urban life«.

The next step was to invite some urban scholars to initiate a research project about the neighborhood, in order to ground the mobilization process in academic works. In this context, the Mimar Sinan University Sociological Research Club, with the support of urban scholars, started to make a field survey about Karanfilköy under the frame of »The Right to Shelter is the Right for Convivial Space« (Barınma Hakkı Dost Yaşam Hakkıdır) project, in order to constitute a support in academy and art terrains.

In the same frame of this project, Karanfilköy was involved in the 5th International Istanbul Biennale in 1997, with the »Kültür Research and Exhibition Project«, which »focused on issues of migration, urban politics and Istanbul's plan to become a global city«. Karanfilköy became a part of this art project so that an open-air night forum on urban politics was organized on city politics in Karanfilköy, together with civil organizations, an association of progressive architects and urban scholars. The final products, which have been created together in the neighborhood, were presented in the exhibition of the biennale. In this way, Karanfilköy, as a locality, became a part of an international (global) art event with its significance of being victimized by the global city scenar-

ios of globalizing city-Istanbul that finds again its existence because of the globalization process.

Since there were intensive attempts from the inhabitants that Karanfilköy and its demolition process found its place in the public broadly, the project that was being planned was withdrawn. The neighborhood resistance prevented the further visions serving as a disadvantage for the inhabitants. However, this resistance was planned in way that it tried to solve the problems and produce future perspectives about the neighborhood, together with the support of urban scholars, artists and people from other NGOs that made them even stronger in the minds of the urbanites. Their resistance was not a pure reaction to the physical attack on the neighbourhood, but they constructed their image again and legitimized the struggle for their living space in the public arena. Their actions can be named, firstly, as a resistance and, then, a countermove to prevent the further demolitions and to solve the most important problem of land ownership in the neighborhood. The resistance is also commented by Mehmet Yıldız from Beşiktaş Municipality:

»Tayyip Erdoğan has raised the building permit until 5 storey building blocks and prepared a plan for Karanfilköy aiming at removing people from this land. However, this project could not be realized because of the strong resistance by the neighborhood. People in Karanfilköy are very well organized and they have a great sense of their locality. They had even negotiations with the construction companies which would implement the project there. The project stopped because of their pressure on the government and private interests.«

The collective action of the inhabitants is not limited only to these activities. They continued with lobbying for gaining the property rights of their houses, under the umbrella of AKDER. Especially, the successful resistance to the demolitions has raised the belief that through their power the organization gained a capacity of dealing with the problems and processes in their relation to the other actors exercising power.

Counter-discourse

In order to make further attempts to gain their rights, the inhabitants needed to create a discourse that represents them and identifies their existence, in this part of the city, to the state elite, as well as to the urbanites in Istanbul. First of all, it should be proved that the image of *varoşlu* is not valid for them, although they were presented to the public as such. They promote an image about Karanfilköy that they are very different from the other *gecekondu* neighborhoods with their understanding of

life, their culture and their consciousness about urban life. In their press releases and declarations, the traces of this discourse can be easily found. It is quite often stressed that Karanfilköy is different from the other *gecekondu* areas in terms of being conscious of their environment and social and urban life. It is claimed that they have already constituted a different kind of living, which is concentrated on the cultural and social activities that are practiced with different organizations, focusing on distinct fields.

The same observation can be made according to the result of the interviews. All of the interviewees think that Karanfilköy is relatively different from other *gecekondu* neighborhoods. They believe that they have already completed their integration to the city life and that they should not be seen as rural in the city. Moreover, they are also culturally very different from *varoşlu*. Aysel Zorlu as one of the inhabitants points out:

»Karanfilköy is quite different from the other *gecekondu* areas. We completed our urbanization although we live in *gecekondu*. Since we are the very early comers to Istanbul, we have already completed most of our needs physically as well as culturally. Most of the children of families studied. I think that Karanfilköy is also different culturally. When it is compared to Sultanbeyli and Esenyurt, I consider this here as a place where well educated and open-minded people live. I am proud of living in *gecekondu* but I think that Karanfilköy advanced itself when it is compared to the others.«

Stressing the difference from the other *gecekondu* areas, physically as well as culturally, means that they want to change their position in the urban life of the metropolis. They declare that they are not so different from the urbanites in Istanbul and even, in some cases, they are more advanced with their consciousness about urban life. If it is so, they should gain their rights to the land, which is a prerequisite for being a part of the metropolis.

Creating this discourse definitely helps them to hold a position in the view of the state elite. In fact, the reason for the creation of such a discourse is a desire to obtain a strong position in the view of the state elite. The image – which does not carry the characteristics of *varoşlu*, but an image of inhabitants who have completed their integration into the city, and who are modern and well-educated – is necessary for them to be legitimized spatially and socially by the state elite. They do not insist on keeping their *gecekondu* identity, but they are ready to integrate into urban life as urbanites. They are not confrontational; on the contrary, they are ready to compromise to solve their problems. With this image, there is a high probability of being taken seriously so that most of the legiti-

mized reasons for their removal (making profit from the land, ignorant and with backward culture) from the area are no longer valid. They appear as a strong locality, they are very conscious of their collective actions and aware of ways to defend and promote themselves in front of the state elite.

Integrating into the urban network – Being urban in the metropolis

The actions of the neighborhood starting with resistance to the demolition continued to solve the real problem of property rights in Karanfilköy. Until today, they have been lobbying for the neighborhood in different institutions with the help of people from the academy and some NGOs. Some meetings were held with the Beşiktaş Municipality where the necessity for a solution to the problem were explained several times. Finally, a year and a half ago, informal negotiations started with the Beşiktaş Municipality in order to make a proposal for the neighborhood and present it to the Greater Municipality of Istanbul, which is the final decision maker.

During the negotiations processes, Karanfilköy always presented their difference and their understanding about how an urban transformation should be. In other words, they were well equipped in presenting their standing about the condition and future of Karanfilköy. It seems that it was not a pure demand in a way that »we want our property rights«. On the contrary, it reflects a well-prepared, conscious kit of proposals reflecting their approach to urban transformation, relations between different actors in this process, rights to the urban land and life. Şınası Yalçın, president of AKDER explains what they understand from an urban transformation project:

»This project (the project developed by the municipality and ended up with demolitions) was called an urban transformation project aimed at cleaning and bulldozing all the *gecekondu* areas in Istanbul. Some amount of money is paid to the people who have been already living there and they are sent to the outer parts of the city. People living in the *gecekondu* areas are sent away and other people are settled instead of them that is called an urban transformation project. However, this cannot be an urban transformation project for us. Urban transformation should increase the living standards of the people, develop the neighborhood in order to attain modern living conditions...For that reason, we have decided to develop a project for 1.5 years in order to solve the problem of Karanfilköy with the technical help of architects and urban planners.«

While expressing their demands and possible proposals about their neighborhood, they claim that they also have a different approach to conflicts. For them, negotiating through the local organizations with the municipality and showing them that they are also important and strong, shows their difference from the other *gecekondu* neighborhoods. Their consciousness about this makes them an important actor in the view of the state elites. This approach has also been strengthened with the counter-discourse, which has been discussed before. They claim that they are not the weak side of the overall picture but they can be strong with their local capacity and their already changed profile of the inhabitants, which became skilful in urban life. Şinasi Yalçın explains what kind of approach they developed for dealing with their problems with the state elites:

»In Turkey, the traditional relation between the local/national government and the *gecekondu* areas are always problematic and based on fight. In other words, one side wants to demolish and the other side always resists with a reaction. Using the power on this field creates tension in the society and at the same time it does not solve the problems. In this process, we see suffering, crying of people, and demolition of houses. Therefore, we tried to explain to the people who do not take this neighborhood so seriously because of being a *gecekondu* district how this situation would be.

[...] our children attain the ›urban culture‹. This neighborhood became a place full with urbanites so that the approach which underestimates people's capacity here and thinks this place as a simple *gecekondu* neighborhood is not valid anymore...Now, it is time to solve the problem of Karanfilköy after all these sacrifices without any fight with the government. We tried to find a solution and make a proposal for the municipality with the technical help of some architects and planners [...].«

Finally, after the negotiations with the Beşiktaş Municipality, Karanfilköy started to prepare the details of the project. In this process, the Municipality of Beşiktaş is working as a negotiator between the inhabitants and the Greater Municipality of Istanbul. They also provide technical support, such as finding experts on the urban transformation of *gecekondu* districts for the neighborhood. Together with the inhabitants of the neighborhood, some people from the municipality and experts and architects, the project has been prepared.

Conclusion

Case study findings

Karanfilköy is a very good representative example for understanding the position of the local in the global restructuring process of Istanbul, which has aimed at becoming a global city. Thus, the urban politics and strategies of the city have been set according to the overwhelming criteria which global city discourse offers. In order to see the concrete results, projects were implemented to transform Istanbul as a showcase in the global arena. The very concrete result of this thinking is that the decaying, dying and unrepresentative areas started to be converted into places of prestige. Karanfilköy's position can be described with these facts in a way that it has a very strategic location, that is extremely close to the finance centre, gated communities, shopping malls, and prestigious neighbourhoods. Furthermore, it is supposed that Karanfilköy with its *gecekondu* identity should not exist in this very special position physically as well as socially. These facts create certain struggles in order to obtain the land in this part of the city. In these power struggles over the land, the state, and big capital in the certain period and the locals themselves are the conflicting actors. From the state point of view, Karanfilköy is just one of the *gecekondu* neighborhoods that wants to make a benefit from the land due to the commodification of the *gecekondu* neighborhood in the neo-liberal period. However, from the Karanfilköy's point of view, it is observed that the situation is more complicated. First of all, the neighborhood is the living space of inhabitants where they constructed very close social ties, a place where they are connected to the city through their locality, a body that gives self-confidence to the individuals to participate in urban life. Furthermore, in the last 2 years, it has become a medium which they can reconstruct their image and integrate into urban life. As all these factors are considered, the actions and mobilization of Karanfilköy means more than a struggle for land, it is a struggle for being legitimized in the urban life spatially and socially.

The first main concern about Karanfilköy is to explain how they manage to gain power in order to have a capacity to deal with the problems that have arisen in the neighborhood. The investigation showed that the neighborhood serves beyond the housing needs and it plays a very important role in the construction of locality. In the neighborhood, a strong sense of social cohesion and sense of belonging to space have been found that is a first step to the sense of belonging to the city. In order to be strong in an urban field, they had to form their locality and re-

define it according to the social, political and economic changes during distinct time periods. Thus, their locality gives security as well as self-confidence to the individuals who want to have a share in urbanity, spatially and socially.

Along the same line, the land for the inhabitants of Karanfılköy has a different meaning, which is beyond only being a shelter for them. It is rather a step to become an urbanite in the metropolis. Their desire of becoming urban is strongly connected to the physical ownership of the place where they live with their negative *varoş* identity that is constituted in the minds of urban elites. This conclusion is very crucial in order to understand the importance of struggle over their living space as it is also related to a desire for attaining a higher urban class and getting rid of the negative image attributed to them in during neo-liberal period.

The existence of the local organizations as an indication of their strong locality in Karanfılköy is also very important for their mobilization and their search for a right to the city. Furthermore, grouping around organizations is crucial in order to be strong in the power struggles as the poor are excluded from direct participation in politics and decision making in the case of Istanbul. In order to compensate for this exclusion, they had a tendency to establish organizations.

The concrete expression of these struggles was the demolitions in the neighborhood. However, this »intervention« directed to the neighborhood has been resisted with the well-prepared set of strategies and actions that make the neighborhood different from any other local group in Istanbul. These series of actions determine the distinctness of the neighborhood when the local-global interrelation is considered.

Beside demolitions, the media was also a very important actor who has a position about these power struggles and its reflection on society. With the media, the demolitions and Karanfılköy's resistance were projected to the public arena. While the image of *varoşlu*, which has been also created by the media, was employed in the case of Karanfılköy, the same media was also an important medium for Karanfılköy in order to reconstruct their image and discuss the demolitions, their resistances, its reasons and possible solutions. The inhabitants were quite aware of the fact that they can repair their image with the same medium by which their bad image was promoted.

The distinctiveness has also increased with the creation of a counter-discourse, which was used in their representation to the public. They promoted an image about Karanfılköy, which stresses their difference from other *gecekondu* neighborhoods. With the new image, they present themselves to the public as a strong locality who are very conscious of their collective actions, aware of ways to defend and promote them-

selves in front of the state and urban elites. It is observed that this image creation worked very well and has changed their position, especially in their relation to the state elite.

In the end, the mobilization of Karanfilköy starting from the resistance to the further actions on rights to the city resulted in a way that they will be able to acquire their property rights with the urban transformation projects initiated by the neighborhood itself, which is one of the rare examples when Turkish cities are considered. Consequently, they have accomplished their aims because of their careful and conscious attempts to defend and present themselves.

In brief, their actions starting with the resistance are a search for a right to the city. They want to be legitimized by the state and urban elites legally as well as mentally. They reject the identities (*varoşlu*, occupants, backward culture) that have been attributed to them. Their power comes from their locality, not from being a *gecekondu* neighborhood due to their will of being connected to the city. The way that they mobilize is the concrete visualization of their strategic approach to the problem. Their effort to represent themselves in the media, organizing a festival to describe the neighborhood and its demands, involving themselves in the 5th International Istanbul Art Biennale, contacting scholars to initiate academic works about the neighborhood and cooperating with other NGOs, finally endless lobbying and negotiation attempts with the government point to very conscious and powerful organization of the neighborhood drawing its power from its locality. All these actions allow them to be more capable of dealing with the problems that they have been faced with during the process. In other words, they learnt how to represent themselves, developed solidarity, political consciousness and organizational infrastructures within the process. Karanfilköy gained capability of mobilizing that their resistance has turned to an organized action in order to gain their rights in urban life.

Shifting boundaries of locality

Hopefully, with the case study, the changing characteristics and position of a locality have been discussed in its relation to globalization. In a globalizing city like Istanbul, weaker urban groups are generally victimized in the further development of the city and its desire to be connected to the global network. These groups are expected to be generally the passive side of the struggles because they do not have enough infrastructure and opportunities for exercising power. Furthermore, as the dominant globalization discourse supposes, localities tend to be shown either as passive receivers or completely oppositional to the global restructur-

ing of society and space. However, the example of Karanfilköy shows that opposite fiction is also possible. Karanfilköy is a place taking its power from its local everyday practices; however, it also interacts with the outer developments. Karanfilköy as a locality has adapted to the changing life of the globalizing city and tried to take an active part in the structuring of urban life. In the case of Karanfilköy, deeper intentions were found more than only attaining the title deeds of the land. In other words, a high desire to integrate to the urban system has shown that these struggles indicate more than a struggle for property rights. This is all related to the redefining of the position of a locality within cultural, social and economic changes in the context of globalization.

Furthermore, the way of mobilization in the neighborhood also shows very well that the borders of locality have been changing. As it is discussed in detail, Karanfilköy was always attempting to redraw its image with the mediums that can reach out to the public arena. Taking part in the media and involving themselves in the International Art Biennale, contacting urban scholars are the examples proving that they want to go beyond their terrain and represent themselves in their relation to the other actors. For this reason, it is necessary to »reproblematize the local/urban/global configuration by articulating different kinds of localization and their relationship to difference, power, conflict and possibilities for oppositional politics« (Hamel/Lustiger-Thaler/Mayer 2000).

The relation between distinct groups has also changed itself different from the national development period in a way that the localities have become separate entities, which do not operate within the values and rules set by the state anymore. There are rather other interest groups in the city positioning themselves according to the changes in social, economic and politic environment. However, the state still emerges as the strongest entity which can form the physical space of the metropolis, but it is changing its structure and orientation that does not imply the »end of state« as the dominant globalization discourse supposes. This time, the state should bargain with other groups, which are supposed to be weak like in the case of Karanfilköy. Since they can find their solutions in other mediums that are very influential on the public, the state does not appear as the only and absolute solution in order to attain their demands in urban life. This implies that different social groups including the state are re-organizing themselves in intricate and complicated ways that open new possibilities.

In this sense, the representative example of Karanfilköy does not seem a closed and embedded locality. It is rather a place that brings resources, meanings and knowledge from outer and global settings. Their actions, especially resistances seem to be oppositional to the global re-

structuring of the city, as they have been influenced by the policies directly. However, when the overall picture is contemplated, they became an important and powerful group due to their openness to the outer scene, their adaptation to the ongoing processes and have benefited from the opportunities that have appeared in the globalization era. In other words, the power of localities is accelerated by globalization. Localities are, now, an inseparable part of globalizing metropolises; they are »complex, contingent and contested outcomes of political and historical processes, rather than as timeless essences, also challenges the theoretical framing of locality as an inexorable space of resistance to globalization« (Smith 2001).

Multi-dimensionality of globalization

Hopefully, the case study points to the slippery terrains and borders of some assumptions, which have been drawn very concretely by the dominant globalization discourse. Even one example can indicate that globalization is not a singular process ignoring the nature of the concept and different dimensions of the cultural and political life specific to the globalizing cities. Furthermore, it is also illustrated that globalization resulted differently when global flows have entered very specific local contexts although some common patterns can be found in the life of metropolises. Furthermore, it is observed that the nation state is still the most dominant actor exercising power, the new urban cultures have emerged in the neo-liberal period and even some of them have been invented that all these unevenness affected the urban life of Istanbul. These changes prove that affinities and processes vary according to different economic, social and cultural contexts as well as different local and historical characteristics of the space where globalization is performed or experienced. They interact with each other in different circumstances, which develop unsymmetrical and variable consequences and effects. In other words, the global processes do not end up with one and unique result but »present a set of discourses and practices that are juxtaposed in complex ways in local contexts« (Ghannam 1997).

The case of Karanfilköy should be examined according to this frame; first placing globalization in case of Istanbul and then its uneven and heterogeneous results in the specific local context. In order to understand the complexity of the problems, deeper investigation in the real life of globalizing cities is necessary rather than accepting an approach that is scoped from above; that is what this paper intended to do.

References

- Akçay, E. (2005): »The beginning and end of politics: The case of Istanbul«. The text was presented at the conference »Beginning and Ends of Political Theory« in University of California, Berkeley in 2005. <http://criticalsense.berkeley.edu/akcay.pdf>.
- Appadurai, A. (1990): »Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy«. In: Appadurai, A, Theory, Culture & Society, London, Newbury Park and New Delhi: Sage.
- Berner E. (2005): »Metropol İnkilemi: Kresel Toplum, Yerellikler ve Manila`da Kent Arazisi İin Yrtilen Mcadele«. In: nc/ Weyland (ed.), Mekan, Kltr, İktidar: KreselleŖen Kentlerde Yeni Kimlikler, İstanbul: İletişim
- Berner, E. (1997): Defending a Place in the City: Localities and the Struggle for Urban Land in Metro Manila, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Dicken, P./Peck, J./Tickell, A. (1997) »Unpacking the Global«, Lee, R. and Wills, J. (ed.), Geographies of Economies. New York, Arnold.
- Erder, S. (2002): Kentsel Gerilim- Enformel İliŖki Ađları Alan AraŖtırması, Ankara: um:ag Vakfı Yayınları.
- Erman, T. (2000): »The Politics of Squatter (Gecekondu) Studies in Turkey: The Changing Representations of Rural Migrants in the Academic Discourse«. Urban Studies, Vol 38, pp. 983-1002.
- Featherstone, M. (1995): Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity, London: Sage Publications.
- İŖık, O./Pınarcıođlu, M. (2002): NbetleŖe Yoksulluk- Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları: Sultanbeyli rneđi, İstanbul: İletişim
- Jessop, B. (1995): »Regional economic development and strategies in post-sociologist societies: contexts, constraints and conjectures« In: Europe: Central and East. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Black Rose Books.
- Kalaylıođlu, M. (2006): Representations of Gecekondu in Mainstream Print Media- From Housing Question to VaroŖ. Unpublished master thesis: METU.
- Leyshon (1997): »True Stories? Global Dreamers, Global Nightmares and Writing Globalization«. In: Lee and Wills (ed.), Geographies of Economies, Arnold: New York.
- Long, Norman (1996): »Globalization and Localization: New Challenges to Rural Research«. In: Moore H. (Ed.), The Future of Anthropological Knowledge, London and New York: Routledge.
- McGrew, A. (1998): »The Globalization Debate: Putting the advanced capitalist state in its place«, Global Society, 12(3), pp. 299-321.

- Marcuse, P. (1997): »Glossy Globalization: Unpacking a Loaded Discourse«. In: Droege (ed.) *Intelligent Environments, Spatial Aspects of the Information Revolution*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Nelson, J. M. (1979): *Access to Power: Politics and Urban Poor in Developing Nations*, Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Öncü A./Weyland P. (1997): *Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalizing Cities*, London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Robertson, R. (1994): »Globalization or Glocalization?«. *The Journal of International Communication* 1(1), pp. 33-52.
- Smith, P. M. (2001): *Transnational Urbanism, Locating Globalization*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schuerkens, U. (2004): »The Sociological and Anthropological Study of Globalization and Localization«. In: *Global Forces and Local Life-Worlds: Social Transformations*, London: Sage.
- Şenyapılı, T. (1998): »Cumhuriyet'in 75. Yılı, Gecekonduunun 50. Yılı«. In: *75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Fortress Istanbul. Gated Communities and the Socio-Urban Transformation

ORHAN ESEN/TIM RIENIETS

Like many other metropolises around the world, Istanbul has become the target of socio-urban transformations, which can also be identified as »neo-liberal urbanism«. In the last decades Istanbul's enormous population growth was to a large extent absorbed by informal urbanization: myriads of uncoordinated and unplanned, small scale building activities, which have shaped the city. Since the 1980s, however, an unprecedented alliance of political, economic and social forces has transferred resources and responsibilities for the production of urban space into hands of the private sector. Within a few years Istanbul has witnessed remarkable changes of its urban fabric, most visible through numerous private large-scale developments: Exclusive urban islands for housing, shopping or business are mushrooming in and around the city. This article will focus on the domestic version of this urban development – the so-called »gated communities« – and its social and cultural implications on everyday life.

Gated communities are residential developments enclosed by walls or fences, accessible only through an entrance gate. Most of them are equipped with security technology (surveillance cameras and alarm systems) and guarded by private security personnel. Gated communities are privately developed and maintained, often characterized by legal agreements, which tie the residents to a common code of conduct. They are either newly developed – mainly at the suburban periphery of cities – or they are based on existing urban structures, which are retrofitted with barriers to control access.

The phenomenon of gated communities emerged in the USA, where they have become a ubiquitous typology of urban development all over the country. But gated communities are no longer just an American phenomenon. They are appearing all over the world, in developed and developing countries alike. Although most gated communities around the world are of striking similarity, featuring an American suburban lifestyle, they are evolving from different socio-historical circumstances and express distinct cultural meanings.¹

In Turkey, the phenomenon of gated communities emerged in the 1980s, in the course of economic liberalization and the establishment of new building laws. The first gated communities of neo-liberal urban development have been established in metropolises and bigger Turkish cities, although other gated communities have also been emerging in coastal zones as second or summer housing compounds (Baycan/Gülümser 2004).²

The number of gated communities in Istanbul was estimated to be around 650 at the end of 2005 and construction of more than 150 new gated development started in the same year (Dani/Perouse 2005: 93). No further research is available indicating the actual numbers for 2007 and 2008, but since then the big corporation construction business has been booming, in particular in the areas adjacent to the second peripheral highway. Within this context, not a single »project« has been completed or planned - no matter at which location or for which target group without bearing the distinctive properties of a gated community. Projects by publicly owned big housing agencies or companies like Toki, Emlak, or Kiptaş make no exceptions.

1 For further descriptions and definitions of gated communities see: Low 2003, McKenzie 2006 and Snyder 1997.

2 Actually, this is rather a re-export of a residential model to the geography of its humble origins after it has undergone changes in the metropolis: Since the 1960s, summer residential compounds ('sites' in local jargon) constitute one of the roots of the later gated community in the local Turkish context. In these settlements, Turkish urban middle classes had exercised bottom-up community building processes in a non-commercial setup. Construction companies were then at their service for building communities and not vice versa. Security was a natural by-product of social coherence, not yet of technology, and was still not rendered as a professional service of the architectural services, as is the case in the US. The other specific root from within the local context were the republican bureaucratic elite's housing situation in gated compounds, again mostly in the provinces. In particular, the families of military establishment members resided behind gates since the 1930s, where security played a major role in the people's choice to live in these communities.

The application of the recently adapted law »5366«, for the so-called »sustainable use of downgraded historical real estate through protection by renewal« which exclusively applies to areas with historical listed building stock will soon result in the construction of more gated communities in Istanbul's historical core. The projects in historical areas of Süleymaniye – managed by the municipally owned housing company Kiptaş, and by the private sector company GAP İnşaat with projects in Fener-Balat and Tarlabası – will soon create yet more gated communities, labeled as protection in ensemble, with historical façades in the very heart of Istanbul.

The emerging typology of upscale residential towers in downtown Istanbul, particularly in the districts of Beşiktaş and Şişli, clearly demonstrate features of »vertical« gated communities.

A new law on »urban transformation« – still to be passed by the Parliament Commission – will help to produce, within the existing urbanized area, a vast number of large scale units. »Erase and rebuild« is regarded as the major strategy for diminishing metropolitan earthquake risks. In the past, Istanbul's building industry was heavily influenced by the existence of smaller plots suitable for the investment and transactions of millions of small actors. The redistribution of power within the urban construction process in favor of large, private actors is likely to produce gated communities in many parts of the city in a business as usual way – unless a u-turn towards sustainable urban transformation is initiated.

The social implications of gated communities has been widely discussed and criticized. Most literature, however, focuses on North American urban conditions, while there is considerably limited research on gated communities elsewhere. This article describes a case in Istanbul: the town Göktürk on the north-western periphery of the city, which has become a gated community hot spot. The article consists of three parts: the first part by Orhan Esen describes the social and historical background of this contemporary socio-urban transformation. Esen argues, that the gated communities are no longer manifestations of the upper class's residential choice, but that the notion of »gatedness« has long become a characteristic of all market segments in the housing sector. He brainstorms about what socio-psychological motives lead to a middle class demand for a built environment »without change«, where segregation of the urban fabric into smaller units simulates a situation »under control«.

In the second part Orhan Esen introduces the case study of Göktürk, locating it within the wider context of Istanbulite production of built environment. The uniqueness of Göktürk is the result of a remarkably early

decision in the early 90s by the town-fathers to adopt a master plan, which prohibited the subdivision of the large estates. Such large plots of land were ideal for the construction of large scale projects which soon followed.

The third part of this paper, by Tim Rieniets, describes everyday life as well as analyzes the particular built environment inside and outside the walls of Göktürk.³ Whereas most research on gated communities focuses on social and legal issues behind their walls, Rieniets tries to look beyond the gates and to understand the mutual economic, social, and cultural dynamics between the »insiders« and the »outsiders«. Rieniets argues that the recently-established gated communities – despite their strict isolation and their wish for remoteness and stability – have triggered other, sometimes even opposite trends, such as a rapid urban transformation and densification and an influx of new, low skilled migrants.

As Göktürk's development is not representative of Istanbul's development, this article is unable to provide a prognosis on contemporary urban patterns in Istanbul. However, by focusing on Göktürk's example, we provide insight into Istanbul's recent urbanization trends, which are likely to be integrated into mainstream practices of urban production and reproduction.

Investing in a scenario with an obvious ending

In the mid-1980s new upper classes started to emerge in Istanbul. Orhan Pamuk considers their predecessors, the upper classes of the 1950s to the 1980s, to be the »*nouveaux-riche* without manners« (Pamuk 2006). However, the new upper class of the mid 1980s to 1990s surpassed the old *nouveaux-riche* in their lack of civilized behavior. That older generation had constituted a relatively coherent »republican« elite in itself with common group identity and shared cultural values They were used to sharing their urban space with the middle class positioned just below them, just as they shared their cultural and political values and their ide-

3 These observations derive from a student's research project of the »Urban Research Studio« (ETH Zurich, professorship Kees Christiaanse. www.urbanresearch.ethz.ch). The »Urban Research Studio« investigates local urban spaces by means of empirical and investigative research methods, such as mapping, photographs, video, and by interviewing experts, inhabitants and other stakeholders. The research in Göktürk has focused on the production and use of urban space under the conditions of social, economic, and cultural polarization. The project was conducted in 2005/06 and was led by Tim Rieniets and Orhan Esen.

als. Hence, they respected the habitually adapted codex of common behavior in a tightly built urban space. Regardless of their wealth, those who had internalized a codex of specific values through education and socialization were accepted as members of the old elites and were granted access to common social space. The recent upper classes lack this ability for several reasons.

Today, wealthy sections of the population, those who can invest in property with ease, are remarkably heterogeneous in terms of origin, cultural, and political background. They are part of a world where background, or better, formerly disregarded clan identities and properties – be they by birth or acquired – often play an important role to access the new elites. The belonging to this New Class that emerged since the mid-1980s is primarily defined by financial capacity. Cultural properties acquired through republican education do not matter anymore: As long as one has the money, he has access. As a result the new elites grew very fragmented, they even split into culturally, socially and politically rivaling groups. Hence their spatial strategies also became fragmented. As shared customs of a common urban space or »cityzenship« dissolved, the urban landscape became disjointed, with the gated communities projecting the fragmentation of the urban space. Permanent, generally accepted patterns and tools of ideological legitimization are missing, due to the incoherence of the New Class. As a result, the security industry took over the role of a temporary »pin«⁴ between fragments of a divided urban space. The new money elites proved incapable of differentiating themselves as a class, or better: forming a class »for itself« and therefore its fractions became more and more dependent on products and services provided by the security industry as a tool to distance themselves from the »others«. The term »others« does not necessarily or exclusively refer to lower classes, but as well, or even primarily, includes other fractions of their co-elites with money, whose manners, lifestyle, ideological and political attitude they regard as unbearable or intolerable. They seek immunity from that urban texture, which they consider a jungle. Distancing here is simply an intuitive reaction to the existing situation,

4 In Turkish, the term »teğel« stands for the first, light stitching when the tailor provisorily or temporarily sews the parts of a piece of dress or suit together to see whether it will fit. In the next phase this »pre-stitch« (*teğel*) is replaced by the permanent one. Here the metaphor »teğel« is used for the security sector within an urban setup, which entirely consists of gated communities, as it functions here as a replacement for the permanent ties of a society, for instance via public domain. »Pinned together city or urbanism« (*teğellenmiş kent/lesme*) refers to this temporary or in-between situation which tends to consolidate and finally simulate »the« real society as we know it or as it should be.

rather than a well thought or planned strategy. However, the spatial manifestation of this temporary escape movement out of the legitimization crisis of a new upper class, yet just in itself, threatens to spread out to all segments of society and freeze and dominate urban space permanently.

Pioneered by the detached new upper classes, this »pinned together urbanism« with the gated community phenomenon is spreading at a very high speed. Having emerged a mere two decades ago, these phenomena are yet to be thoroughly studied. We still lack a common vocabulary to begin a meaningful discourse. Yet, this new form of urbanism has rapidly superseded inner urban socio-economic and spatial-topographic thresholds and has affected almost every sector on all social levels. The gated community movement already influenced growing number of new areas with companies of the construction industry active there. However, the phenomenon is likely to expand even more rapidly in the near future as it has turned out a model desired by the middle and lower-middle classes, who covet the gated communities. Construction, automotive, and security industries as well as the mass media have become allies in this ideological attack comprising of aggressive marketing strategies for a gated lifestyle. The society simply turned its other cheek, willingly. The gated communities are now not only restricted to the nouveaux-riche of the neo-liberal era, but many Istanbulites also covet them. The closed-settlement solution is today far from an »unavoidable solution to the housing problem«, as it has grown to be an object of desire for the Turkish middle class, it is the demand. The situation has become so standard and unquestionable that, when an architect fails to include walls or gates in a new project, the landscape architect will make sure to insert them into his design. Would he forget, too, the client or the investor would bring in the foremen to do the job.

Although retreating behind gates became so normalized, the phenomenon has not yet been thoroughly explained. There are some vague justifications in circulation. The need for security is underlined by and connected to the »need« for status and prestige. By creating physical, spatial distance, the nouveaux-riche desire to guarantee social disintegration. The uses of architecture of security (walls, fences, gates), security technology (surveillance cameras, control centers) and services (security personnel) have indeed become indicators of status and prestige. Fences are quickly put up to surround even some residential areas that were built long before the emergence of the gated communities. At the bare minimum, these communities install cheap plastic barriers and pre-fabricated guardrooms. If trained security personnel cannot be hired, then the old porter is given a serious looking full dress uniform. While

these measures are taken to create an appearance of security, they fail to provide a real security system, considering that burglaries are frequently reported in gated communities. Still, the appearance of security boosts property values and is a matter of prestige.

The security sector has now proven to be an autonomous, self-sufficient business. With an ever-increasing number of seriously competing companies, the number and the variety of the provided services and products has increased. As a result, the price of these products and services has decreased, and to some extent also their quality. Thus, they have become available to a much larger population. The sector was in need of a larger market and this was a logical outcome, with it having developed its own dynamics. However, a serious comparative study would show that among global big cities, Istanbul is not necessarily dangerous. Instead of a real lack of safety throughout the city, there is a subjective feeling of insecurity, which is a result of the relatively increasing crime rate since the 1990s. This feeling has almost certainly been fueled by a systematic manufacturing of urban legends. Marketing strategies of the security sector are built exactly upon this increasing »feeling of insecurity«. These strategies, in turn, are fueling social disintegration and isolation of different social groups. The isolation takes place as not only the *nouveaux-riche* situate themselves against the others, but as all other social groups are also encouraged to confine themselves. In other words, the security sector first needs to disintegrate and dissolve the urban texture in order to aspire to attach the pieces together again. Naturally, it cannot do any better than to create a loose patchwork.⁵ Istanbul is a highly dynamic city with intense vertical »social« and horizontal »spatial« movement. It is unimaginable that the upper classes can distance themselves spatially and socially without concessions. When they attempt to do so, »life« or the »city« always gets in the way and such plans tend to fail: what they are running away from follows them, finds them, and settles just next to them. Moreover, their »escape plans« are being imitated successfully for much cheaper rates. It comes as no surprise that the phrase »what a nightmare!« caught on so well as part of an upper class discourse.

In everyday behavior however, nobody seems to mind that gated-ness much. It is more like a situation where everyone is trying to make his pragmatic way through the labyrinth without questioning it much, but also without taking it serious either. As if in internal agreement, every-

5 Studies on the implications of domestic security measures are rare. However, some of them suggest, that the presence of security personnel and devices are rather increasing the »felt insecurity« (Genis 2007: 773).

body recognizes the spatial disintegration and walling in/off strategies for nothing more than nonsense. »We just take it for granted and accept it as a conventional standard, like many other things in life we don't question much but don't take too serious either. It is how things are.«

So what product or service is really acquired through investment in a gated community? All indications point to the stability and the permanence of the built environment and the attached value of social integrity. In this sense, large-scale projects hold a monopoly. Only they can provide a guarantee that no physical features of the construction will be modified. The offered product most importantly features being »complete«; its defining trait is its built-in »total design«, and completed and final state. Small-scale investments have been shaping the city's familiar urban landscape for the last sixty years and they have never been able to promise this feature even approximately. Even when this traditional small-scale development is fault-free and complete – albeit this is rare – it, by definition, allows or even encourages additions, modifications, and transformation.

The sale conditions of large-scale project housing prevent any modification of its outward appearance. The sale contracts are loaded with intricate regulations, restricting modifications to the outward and sometimes interior appearances. The property right, which would normally grant power of disposition to the owner, seems to be suspended entirely. One should not conclude that this is coercion or simply a fancy of an eccentric architect imposed through the construction company. On the contrary the potential gated community residents aspire to join in, precisely for these restrictions on their property rights. They know that the same rules will apply to their neighbors. What they buy is really more than just a property: it is the finality, the permanence of the property, and the confidence, that the neighbors have all agreed on the restrictions, too. As a result, the investment is primarily made for the permanence of the physical environment and the collective promise to keep it unchanged as well as for neighbors with an according attitude and expectation.

Istanbul is a city where change is the rule. Even moving beyond change, it founds itself anew everyday. For decades, familiar urban surroundings have changed from one day to the next. This intense need for permanence reflects the standards of the middle classes, which lack the ability to cope with this situation. The unresolved collective traumas that led to this situation make up rather a complex topic, that it would take another essay to sufficiently highlight them.

Driven by the new middle classes, the booming demand for a new lifestyle behind gates has created an ever-increasing national consensus.

- The public sector is happy as it charges for services like garbage pickup and cleaning, repairs/renewal, illumination and security, whereas gated people pay a second time for these services directly to their community administrations: areas to be served by the public sector are practically diminishing.
- The private sector has discovered the advantages of marketing built environments that promise full control within a limited space. Marketing material carefully ignores the existing city outside (of the gated communities) and simulates islands of no sorrow.
- Academia and professionals of built environments are euphorically celebrating their comeback into business after 60 years of discouraging exclusion. During that period, the built environment production had largely taken place in a self-service model of the concerned: hence it was perceived so chaotic, so impossible to grasp, or penetrate and re/shape (see Esen 2005). The gated community opens up areas with well-defined boundaries, so that worlds of total design are facilitated and even guaranteed to be endured by sales agreements.

With its forestland and an aqueduct, the town of Göktürk as a whole has a distinct »restricted« or »isolated« quality. It is a restricted space in every sense, be it visual or physical. This is apparently perceived as an additional assurance for the permanence of the town, which will remain after the upcoming consolidation process. Göktürk is perceived as a role model, as an incarnation or anticipation of a neo-liberal Istanbul of anti-urban islands. Mehmet Şenay, the head planner of the community since the 1990s, has spoken enthusiastically of »exporting the Göktürk model.«⁶

Göktürk: The main framework

Göktürk is originally a rural settlement; situated in the near periphery of Istanbul, south of the Belgrade Forest and 8 km north of the second beltway. It is separated from its unlikely twin, Kemberburgaz, by the Uzunkemer, an aqueduct built by Mimar »the architect« Sinan, on a Roman foundation. There used to be two main roads leading to Kemberburgaz and Göktürk. The first is a valley road following the natural course of the Kağıthane River. The Alibeykoy valley was on the second left and over the Hasdal threshold, the former city dump ran parallel. Recently, a semi-legal highway connection from the Hasdal viaduct has

6 Oral statement during research in Göktürk.

been added, in addition to these two older roads.⁷ Indeed, nowadays local real estate agents are confidently boasting to their clients that this connection is none other than the north junction of the third Bosphorus bridge to be built.




Figure 1: Göktürk (ca. 2005), Urban Research Studio, ETH Zürich

The Göktürk village was originally called Petnahor(a) until 1958. Before the »exchange of populations« between Turkey and Greece in the 1920s, the village hosted a mixed population, including Greeks. The sole historic building in the village though is a 17th century mosque. Until recently, the population consisted of Turkish re-settlers from Thessalonica region. The main source of income throughout this period was agriculture.

From the end of the 1970s on, the spread of the industrial areas from Alibeykoy and Kagithane also affected Göktürk. Consequently, immigrants started coming to the village, mostly from the eastern Black Sea region and from Kastamonu at the western Black Sea coast. Around this period several things began to take place: forestland was cleared for agricultural usage; squatting increasingly became a means of settlement; and agricultural plots of land were sold to migrant workers, who illegally reorganized them into residential areas. This chain of events was happening in almost all other surrounding settlements of Istanbul. Without exception, Göktürk promised to be another Dudullu, Arnavutköy, or Sultanbeyli. These former peripheral villages north of Istanbul are typi-

7 A »semi-legal highway« means it was authorized by the ministry of public works in Ankara but listed as non-existent to be outlawed by Istanbulite master plans.

cal venues of a second generation of informal land taking for residential purposes since the mid-1980s. This second wave of development mainly targeted agricultural soils that were either privately owned or collectively owned by villages, but was intermediated by »informal developers« (in colloquial terms: »land mafia«). This class was formed as a result of the first wave of informal land taking in Istanbul between the 1950s and the mid-1980s. It was meant to serve mainly the interests of small scale investors, who had a countryside origin, and entailed splitting the land into small plots. Nevertheless, Göktürk took a different course of development because of an atypical intervention, to be explained below.⁸ This alteration was brought about by the Kemer Yapı Construction Co. and the originality of the town fathers' reaction to this movement.



Figure 2: Village life in Göktürk, with the new mosque in the background. Photograph by Urban Research Studio, ETH Zürich

Kemer Yapı, a construction company that settled in Göktürk at the end of the 1980s, triggered this unusual situation. They were coined as »the men that came in a helicopter« or, »the helicopter people« by a highly popular local myth. This myth, of which we have heard numerous versions, was based on the information that the investors toured Istanbul from the air in a helicopter to find an appropriate location for their purposes. This works well as a metaphor for the disconnected outsider or the potential harshness of the first confrontation.⁹

8 Much later, the village Çekmeköy would partly follow the same course as Göktürk.

9 There is a certain resemblance to the myth about colonists of the new world. For example, the Aztecs were first confronted by the Spanish conquistadores on horses. Not having seen horses before, the Aztecs could

In a public relations publication from the municipality, the »event« is referred to as of groundbreaking importance (Göktürk Municipality 2006). The text does not even bother giving details. It is assumed that the reader will already be familiar with the myth from oral sources. Readers are allowed, even encouraged, to embellish the myth as they please, and to join in establishing the myth. »The men that came in a helicopter« serves like a cryptic codeword which only the enthusiast can grasp. Clearly, what matters more is the metaphor itself. If the event took place at all or how it took place is of secondary importance. Hence the story has become a founding myth.

»As the helicopter took off the men inside did not really have faith in finding what they were looking for. Who knew how many more trips it would take them until they would find an appropriate place. So it is easy to imagine how happy they were to discover the village of Göktürk on a forest land northern of Istanbul.« (Göktürk Municipality 2006)

These men laid the foundation of »Kemer Country«, now considered a classic gated community, and what can be considered the beginning of a second generation of gated community development in Istanbul. There were examples before this movement in Göktürk, which we can call the first generation: In the 1980s, the first beltway (1973) defined the city's macro form anew. Some former peripheral areas, like the larger Baghdad street district, Altunizade/Çamlıca, the Ulus/Ortaköy axes, and the hills overlooking Bosphorus, were now easily accessible off the junctions of this first highway belt. The first generation of gated communities began to emerge here, often as purely residential developments on a small to medium scale, initially within former *köşk* estates of the Ottoman political elite. They were low-profile on a social platform as inherited from the 1970s. In this sense an exception and a pioneer was Kastelli's Caddebostan »palaces«. Apart from Kastelli's houses, the first generation gated communities tried to attract as little attention as possible. Kemer Country however, came up with the discourse of a new urban role model for the very first time in Turkey. It claimed to offer more than just a new type of dwelling. With its exaggerated dimensions, hosting various functions and boasting new historicist architecture, it presented itself as a lifestyle, an existential choice. »The warmth of human proximity and a closer relationship with nature were all lost to modernization and urbanization« and Kemer Country was to restore that relationship and rec-

only explain the newcomers in supernatural terms: horse and horsemen being one. In turn, they surrendered easily to this fictive superiority (see Galeano 1971).

reate the feeling of a real neighborhood, and in doing so, rediscover a presumed golden age of the lost *mahalle*. With this attitude, they applied innovative (or depending on your stance, »aggressive«) marketing strategies. As its statement moved beyond marketing gimmicks and was furthermore carried to academic and semi-academic platforms, the gap between Kemer Country and its predecessors widened even more.

The town fathers' reaction to the Kemer Country movement is probably more extraordinary, and thus more important. This reaction differs from the initial vision of the investors and it was more realistic and foresighted.¹⁰ Probably this is the reason why it was the most formative factor in deciding how Göktürk should evolve. The town fathers acted on the presumption that other investors would also act on a similar interest sooner or later. They defined the basic policies that were to conform to the demands of a new generation of big-scale corporate investors. These policies also created the legal infrastructure to support a new master plan, which was necessary in order to supply large-scale plots. In terms of Istanbul's urban development mechanisms, this reaction was revolutionary and it constituted a first.

The business as usual for decades was to split up and divide existing plots prior to construction (be it legal, illegal, or semi-legal) – a result of small-scale actors' hegemony over the real estate market – while holding an insignificant level of capital accumulation. A fundamental belief that profit was only possible through split-and-sell policies reigned and ultimately determined urban development policies. From the 1980s onwards, the big businesses that had previously remained passive in the urban production process began making their moves to get involved. They had found that they could not operate due to the lack of large-scale plots and the inability to acquire such plots. One option was to appropriate the city's green areas like parks at the center, but this could not really work for several reasons. To develop these centrally-located areas was politically very risky, and therefore troublesome and not very cost effective. Additionally, their limited potential was not suitable for housing production. An organized »grassroots initiative« of landlords of large-scale plot production and supply was formed in Göktürk for the first time. The Göktürk experience constitutes a breakthrough in this sense. In accordance with the vision of the neo-liberal ANAP government of

10 While this text was being edited shortly before printing in April 2008, news about the bankruptcy of the Kemer Construction Co. came to press. According to news, owners of real estate in Kemer Country were preparing to buy the company themselves in order to prevent a potential buyer from outside from further investments on those grounds still owned by the company.

the 1980s/1990s, Göktürk gained municipality status in 1993. The newly-formed municipality's first important action was to adopt a construction plan. The new standard was to outlaw the split-and-sell of agricultural land and to reserve it for corporate buyers' large-scale construction operations. This plan has been executed with consistency until today. Modifications were only allowed with further merging of plots and public road removal. Needless to say, the same political party and mayor have remained in power during this whole process. In this light, Göktürk should be seen as the practical execution of the Özal/Dalan¹¹ vision on an urban scale.

As already stated, the town fathers' presumption was more to the point than the Kemer Yapı Construction Co.'s naïve approach. In the first half of the '90s that first gated community in Göktürk was not yet complete, the village had not yet grown with new waves of immigration, and the third generation of investors was not yet effective. The initial dream of the investor was for the gated community and the village to exist side by side in a low-density, rural environment. Although deeply divided, they would depend on each other to some degree. It would be a utopia for these two villages to live next to each other amidst the greenery. With the investors' initiative, an »Association for the Beautification of the Göktürk Village« was created. This organization mainly dealt with the village houses' aesthetic appearance, such as their façade. It was predicted that the village would maintain a low density with detached, one- or two-story houses. They would »not let the village become a concrete jungle«. In Göktürk, »back to nature« would become the catch phrase for the marketing campaigns. The organization attended the Habitat II Conference 30 May to 14 June 1996, organized by the UN Center for Human Settlements (Habitat), and made an appearance on the civic arena. They formulated the problem as »how to prevent the cementing and the vertical growth of the village in future«. On one side there would be an idealized/romanticized, relatively poor, but peaceful village, and on the other side, suburbia with all the same attributes but with the exception of wealth. This naïve-utopian vision – that these two could symbiotically live next to one another – disintegrated rather quickly. Kemer Country had already abandoned the villa model with its third development phase and began constructing high-density adjoined houses and blocks. The town fathers saw through the maneuver and were prepared for this change of course. They had an adaptable con-

11 Responsible political leaders of ANAP, the »Motherlands Party«: Turgut Özal, founder of the party, prime minister, and later president (1989-1993) and Bedretti Dalan, mayor of the Greater Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (1984-1989).

struction mechanism ready, and the village began its transformation to a town. The 1999 earthquake solidified the new upper-middle classes' belief in the »northern earthquake-safe zones« myth. The construction sector began producing and marketing real estate in so-called geologically-safe lands, which were further away from the fault line south of the city. They targeted these marketing campaigns at an enthusiastic demand profile of the middle, and the process ultimately played a major role in the accelerated development of Göktürk. Today it is a complete boomtown, with content citizens as long as the growth continues. Currently, Göktürk offers people from every status, origin, or qualification – be it the eastern construction worker or the white-collar, high-rank employee from the central finance district Levent – a place to live. Disputes on socio-economic matters and inequalities in this town do not exist for the time being, but will most likely – although not desired – come in the future. This collective suppression of potential conflicts keeps the town politics in order, in strictly neoliberal terms.



Figure 3: Walls (black lines) surrounding gated communities in Göktürk (2005), Urban Research Studio, ETH Zurich

Approximately 20 years after the municipilization, in the aftermath of the 2002/2003 crisis, Göktürk saw the most intense execution of its new construction plan. The results are now clear: the final form of the built environment is visible. The outcome can be summarized in two main, and six sub-categories:

Physical spaces produced by »Big Capital«

- On the eastern part of the settlement, the Kemer Group project takes up roughly one third of the overall land. This project can be called a town within a town.
- The larger plots, which were formerly the villagers' fields, host about three dozen medium-scale gated communities. Most of these are situated on the plain, while a few are also on the hillside or on the fields inside the village. They all contain some common (green) space, as far as the land permits, and a unit they call »social facilities«. Every one is gated, without exception, with private security, and offer in-house parking. These communities, especially those closer to the former village center, are all in close contact with the residents of the town to some degree. The walls, gates, and the security systems define their borders.
- On the edge of the plain, the main transit road (Istanbul Street) runs parallel to the former village center. Along that road, old industrial facilities have been transformed into so-called »plazas« and »agoras«. These take up relatively smaller plots than those mentioned above. They are either solely shopping malls or blocks with shopping malls on their ground floors, and upper-middle class residences on their upper floors. These areas are the densest in Göktürk. The Istanbul Street side of their ground floor hosts shopping areas, which do not exist in the gated communities. Especially for those living »behind« the gates, this strip serves as a common public space. Because of its transit route character, Istanbul Street is only accessible with a car. Car ownership serves as a filter for accessing these places. A second, linear public space has been created with the agoras along the street.

These first three categories consist of organized large-capital projects. They take up roughly three quarters of the total land that was formerly agricultural and industrial plots. The remaining quarter consists of former village houses and their gardens, being overtaken by the structures of an emerging *kasaba* or township. In this second category, we can observe three different settlement/spatial organization categories:

Physical spaces produced by »Small Capital«

- The old houses and their gardens along the main streets of the former village were transformed by small-scale building contractors. Here we find the usual adjoined / attached apartment blocks of a

town. These arteries follow the main topographical ridges of the village.

- This structure is getting densified at central points. Buildings with a shop on the ground floor and apartments on the upper floors dominate. Consequently, these areas become the townships central trade areas. For those living outside of the »gates«, these are the common public spaces and they are easy to reach, also on foot.
- On the western side there are areas opened illegally from the forestland. On these so-called »status 2b« lands, there are no property rights: the state partly tolerates them and partly litigates them. These areas still partly host rural structures with some subsistence horticulture with partly first-generation *gecekondu* type workers' shelters, and partly »popular«-type lower middle class villas. There are also some remains of demolished buildings, all in a detached, low-density setup. In short, it is Göktürk's least densely developed area. Although they are not yet on the legal real estate market, they could be in the future. There will likely be a speculative pressure and a process of gentrification when the »sale of the 2b areas to their possessors« law, which the last president vetoed, passes through under the current political constellation. (For the time being, the law is highly contested, with several environmental NGOs fighting it.) The divided plots will not allow for any large-scale housing complexes – i.e. gated communities within business as usual models – to be built on them.

As explained above, the built environment is far from the initial prediction of the first settlers: a mega gated community and a static agricultural community that are »symbiotically related«. It evolved into a much more fragmented, complex structure. As Tim Rieniets shows in the following chapter, this six-piece structure also provoked dynamics of resemblance and adaptation. Accordingly, the dual city model of the first glance has only limited validity.

In the middle of the settlement, growing along the former village roads, is what we still might call »the village«. In reality, however, 95% of the population here has a very recent immigration background from areas including various parts of Istanbul itself: a group of people and households with very different skills and educational backgrounds. If looking at Göktürk as a whole, which is technically defined as a municipality¹², and as a new typology of a township, we should call this central

12 Well, not anymore: On April 14th 2008, just during the last review of this article, a new law was enacted and all township municipalities (*belde be-*

part the »inner or core township«. The inner town's people are united by a common desire to maximize the benefits of an ever-growing economy. The effect is similar to a gold rush, the town could be compared to a mining town. Göktürk is the land of opportunities today. Yesterday's construction worker can become tomorrow's contractor while his son can go from caddy to the national golf team.

While Göktürk appears to be surrounded by impenetrable forests on the map, separated physically from the city, it is not self-sufficient at all. Not only the residents of the gated communities, but also a number of the inner town's people work in Istanbul. Only a part of those, who perform domestic duties for the gated communities live in Göktürk. A large number of people come and go to Göktürk on a daily basis by shuttle buses, public transport, or even chauffeurs transport a number of people. There is an increasing number of people who live in gated communities, but run shops in Göktürk or in the agora. The population today is estimated to be around 15,000 to 20,000. While the municipality anticipates a potential holding capacity of 35,000 to 50,000 people, the investors are estimating around 70,000 to 80,000. As the metropolitan municipality has become the ratification authority after a recent reform¹³, it is likely to exercise power in order to limit the potential demographic growth in Göktürk as in all other township municipalities in the northern territories

belediyeleri), a decentralizing tool invented in the Özal era, were shut down and were incorporated into existing or newly established districts. Hence, the number of Istanbul's districts has increased to 39. Göktürk was expected to be established as a new district together with the neighboring Kemerburgaz and some further Black sea villages into a new district: this would have been the perfect tool »to export the Göktürk model«. Instead, it was incorporated into the district of Eyüp (22 kms away), with shows (post-) industrial character and is dominated by post-gecekondu structures. This decision has been perceived as a conquest by the other, a conquest by those ghosts from whom one was on permanent escape. This decision has fully traumatized local politics and social atmosphere. Outcomes, for example on real estate market development, demographic composition and social structures, will have to be observed. However, it can be stated for sure that that particular era, resulting from a specific amalgamation of economic, social, political and administrative patterns as described in this article, has come to an, at least preliminary, end.

- 13 This reform is about two years old. Until that time, the ratification authority for development plans of township municipalities was the Ministry of Public Works in Ankara, which was easily lobbied by big construction business. Metropolitan municipality, on the other hand, is stronger influenced by environmental groups and public opinion, as well dominated by a planning bureaucracy, all of which are critical to urban sprawl and hence enforce politics that diminish demographic pressure on the northern territories of the province.

of the province. There is an expectation that all construction and primary real estate marketing activities will end in the next five years, and the physical environment and the demographical structure will be consolidated. All players are betting on that day. The opposition of the losers will be visible on that day.

In spite of what the first glance may suggest, there is no hint of a coarse dichotomy here. On the contrary, there is an ever-changing, complex structure that deserves more in-depth analysis. It is nevertheless meaningful to analyze the basic differences of those parts of the town which are the remnants of produced from former fields or former housing plots. Obviously, the security sector can also find a large market in a community where everyone is a stranger and they stand on guard, suspicious of one another. It would indeed be fruitful to further analyze what the first perspective suggests: a dichotomy defined by security systems. Such questioning, though, should avoid perceiving this dualism as the static rural province versus the active, modernizing dynamic changing it. This analysis will only prove fruitful if these categories are not taken as absolutes.

Denial, exchange and adaption to everyday life

Gated communities and other common interest developments have become the most important project of urban transformation and expansion in the city. An increasingly powerful real estate market, tolerance by politics and planning, and wide acceptance by the public has driven their development. This process is not only changing the general urban and architectural patterns, but also the changes of social and economic structures on local levels. While social and economic structural changes are perhaps of equal importance, they are widely overlooked. Although gated communities are designed as strictly isolated and detached enclaves, they are causing new relations between the »insiders« and the »outsiders«. Additionally, they are causing new and unintended urban dynamics, even though they are marketed as readymade and unchangeable environments. Taking Göktürk as an example, some of these mutual processes going on between the newly established gated communities and the village, can easily be recognized.

As explained in the beginning of this article, mainly two groups with different cultural backgrounds are competing for dominance in the production and use of urban space in Istanbul. One group consists of urban inhabitants, still rooted in a traditional, agriculturally-based village lifestyle. They have immigrated from rural areas to Istanbul in the last fifty

years, and joined the new, emerging urban labor market from Istanbul's rapid industrialization. Nevertheless, they still practice traditional, sometimes semi-rural, forms of urban life. The other group can be described as the *nouvelle riches*, a newly established elite class which emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, and is mainly defined by its income. This new elite class has emerged too rapidly to develop any acquired social gestures or historic narratives in order to distinguish itself from the less privileged groups of society. Thus, this new »uncultivated«, but economically potent class prefers to exclude itself by other means. Instead of social and cultural techniques of differentiation, they have established other techniques which strongly rely on urban space as a stage to express exclusiveness. Equipped with 4x4 jeeps and sunglasses, the *nouvelle riches* make their way through the »impassable« metropolis of Istanbul, a space conceived as chaotic, poor, and insecure. Protected by video surveillance, security services, and barbed walls, they are living in enclosed residences and close themselves off from the rest of the urban world. This sudden and conspicuous presence of the new rich has blasted the traditional boundaries of old class positions in Istanbul (Esen 2005).

It is not surprising that the first high-class American-style gated community of Turkey was established in Göktürk, Kemer Country. This project was unique, not only because it sold the best living conditions, including golf courses, horse riding, and all kinds of individual services spread over a vast and well-maintained territory. For the first time in Turkey, clients of this development did not just buy a home to live in, but a carefully designed environment to celebrate a luxurious, western-oriented way of life.

This model gained so much attention, that there was a common interest to imitate the Kemer Country concept and to benefit from Göktürk's qualities: Many villagers sold their land to investors in order to ensure their share of the emerging real estate boom, and the investors launched new projects feeding the growing appetite for luxurious residences. Since then, more than 30 such gated communities have been constructed, the population rose from 1500 in 1993 to approximately 15,000 to 20,000 in 2006, and land prices skyrocketed. Within a few years this urban gold rush entirely changed the spatial and socio-economic patterns of Göktürk. And ironically, this boom has engendered urban conditions similar to those which the newcomers had originally fled from: urban density, permanent changes of the environment, and close proximity to underprivileged classes.

Today, the former village has reached an »urban« density. Nevertheless, situations usually associated with urbanity, such as unexpected encounters, mutual exchanges, or a free flow of information are seemingly

absent between the villagers and the new residents of the gated communities. Instead, Göktürk's newly built urban structures are designed in order to control, restrict, or even avoid the mixture of people, goods, or information. Instead, two different towns with different social, economic and spatial features are occupying the same territory today, but living in separated worlds. There is, on the one hand, an archipelago of urban islands, staging West Coast suburban living conditions. These islands are large-investment developments, designed and constructed in one go according to the requirements of the upper class real estate market. Their inhabitants have their social and professional roots in Istanbul, commuting to the metropolis every day to go to work, enjoy shopping and leisure facilities, or bring their children to school. For them, living in Göktürk is a financial investment into the real estate market, into status symbols, and into a prefabricated way of life.

On the other hand, there is the heterogeneous urban fabric of the village, an accumulation of hundreds of uncoordinated small-scale building activities, designed according to individual needs and possibilities. Their inhabitants stem from rural areas, maintaining traditional and familiar social networks celebrated in public space. For most of them, living in Göktürk is an ongoing financial investment, and gives them social and practical resources for the improvement and consolidation of their traditional village life.



Figure 4: Public roads (grey) and private roads (black) in Göktürk (2005). Urban Research Studio, ETH Zurich

Today, the gated communities are covering the majority of Göktürk. However, instead of adapting to the existing public infrastructures, they

have established their own infrastructures wherever possible. New private access roads are built, sometimes just a wall-width apart from the existing public roads. Private security guards in black uniforms are playing the role of a permanent presence of police (although they are not authorized to apply force); gardeners and housekeepers are maintaining houses and public spaces, replacing insufficient municipal utilities. However, private infrastructures are not just a matter of comfort: they used to pretend to be independent from the insufficient public sector, and to symbolize social distance. Fashionable logos or city arms in retro design ornament front gates, uniforms of private service personnel, and public outdoor furniture. Even covers of the (publicly owned) sewage system are decorated with the corporate identity of the (private) housing companies. These privately maintained and represented urban spaces seem to have fulfilled a promise which the public sector has failed to keep: a life in security, beauty, and stability.

In spite of the carefully designed lifestyle of the gated communities, villagers are practicing their own strategies of identity building. However, in contrast to their gated community neighbors, they are showing their identities in public space: women wear scarves, men celebrate faineance in tea rooms, gardens are used for subsistent agriculture, and domestic animals are kept in all kinds of open spaces and so forth.

The most striking urban intervention, however, are the newly built mosques, which oppose the western-oriented lifestyle represented by the gated communities. The biggest one is by far exceeding the size of the historic mosque in the village center. Their minarets have established new landmarks in Göktürk and their loudspeakers penetrate the walls of the neighboring gated communities. Evidently, some inhabitants of gated communities also visit the village. However, the real estate market has already adjusted to the needs and desires of potential costumers and has recently begun to plan a Muslim gated community with an integrated mosque.

Thus, all social groups living in Göktürk have a coded urban space with all kinds of attributes which allude to social status, ethnicity, or religion. Tendencies of segregation have not just divided urban space into gated communities and remaining villages, but have also generated a multi-faceted space of identities.

Although segregation seems to be the dominant pattern of Göktürk's recent urban development, complete denial of the »other« is impossible. Instead, a thin but indispensable network of economic, social, and cultural interaction is at work, connecting the seemingly separated fragments of the town. However, these exchanges are mainly a matter of mutual economic advantages, rather than a will of social integration.

Most frequented places of exchange are patrol stations, supermarkets, or pharmacies – places where generic products are sold that do not allow exclusiveness or expression of life-style. Mutual exchanges between villagers and gated community inhabitants, however, are mostly taking place inside the gated communities, as a side effect of hierarchic employer-employee relationships: many villagers benefit from job opportunities in the emerging service sector of the gated communities. There, they are employed as gardeners, housekeepers or nannies, and have regular access to the otherwise-inaccessible everyday life behind walls. Ironically, some villagers work as security guards, protecting the gated communities from the seemingly dangerous environment, where they have their own homes and families.

In Göktürk, we can observe on a local and domestic level what was long ago identified as a global urban trend by theorists like Saskia Sassen. There is an economic alliance between a growing financial elite and the demand for low paid services, and the low skilled workers who are attracted by this new urban labor market (Sassen 1994). The result is a spatial concentration of rich and poor and – as we can see in Göktürk – the evolution of new social, economic, and spatial patterns on a local scale. Even the trend towards a new migration of low skilled work, as described in Global City theory, has happened in Göktürk. New inhabitants from the Black Sea region have moved to Göktürk to work in the new local labor market and live in informal settlements on the edge of the village.

The exchanges between different groups are no contradiction to the tendencies of segregation, but rather the opposite: social and economic differences are exploited from both sides for mutual benefit. The village provides a large pool of low paid workers to serve the gated communities, whereas the increasing demands for services inside the gated communities offers attractive job opportunities and a new source of income for the villagers.

Social and economic differences have stimulated a local economy, which offers benefits for both sides - the gated communities as well as the village. Because the economic boom in Göktürk is taken for granted, the win-win situation caused by strict segregation is not questioned. The individual benefits of this economy seem to still outweigh the negative effects of segregation. Yet, what happens, if in the future not everybody can benefit from the added value generated in Göktürk? What if all construction sites are completed and no more building land is available? What if villagers have to compete with other low skilled workers for jobs in the service sector? And what if the *nouvelle riches* and their capital leave Göktürk in favor of another place?



Figure 5: Villa of a gated community in Göktürk (Göktürk Municipality: Dream to Reality 2006: 74)

Nevertheless, one can find tendencies today, which are eroding the economic, social and aesthetic differences, which are the bases of the system. The booming local economy – based on the construction and maintenance of gated communities, and on other directly or indirectly related services – is making it possible for many Göktürk villagers to financially catch up with their new neighbors, and potentially giving them the opportunity to share a similar lifestyle. For the time being, the process of mutual adaptation is mainly played out by architectural design, especially in gated communities. Given that gated communities are one of the most important ways for the new wealthy class to express their social status and to exclude themselves, they unintentionally became a subject of mutual assimilation. The better paid jobs, whether directly or indirectly linked to the gated communities, enable villagers to invest in their own built environment, and to imitate architectural styles of the gated communities. Villagers, who work at one of the numerous construction sites, import their technical know-how from the gated communities to their own construction sites. Others just admire the modern and well-constructed buildings from a distance and try to imitate it. Some old houses are decorated with new details, and new constructions are incorporating architectural features from the »other side«. Thus, the village is steadily upgrading its architectural appearance, sometimes professionally, sometimes just as a clumsy bricolage.

However, while the village architecture periodically shows signs of aesthetic upgrading, the architecture of gated communities, which is being constructed after the pioneering development of Kemer Country, shows general tendencies of downgrading. In the need to feed the real estate market, investors are constantly lowering the standards of their

developments, targeting new costumers at the lower income levels. As a result, most of the newly built gated communities in Göktürk are far less luxurious and spacious than their predecessors. Recent developments are even exceeding the urban density of the village. Thus, the real estate market has triggered a paradox dynamic of mutual assimilation: villagers are slowly catching up with their new neighbors while the average standards of gated communities are decreasing. The once distinct differences between the luxurious estates on one side and the underdeveloped village on the other side are becoming obscured.



Figure 6: Decorated village house in Göktürk. Urban Research Studio, ETH Zürich

Conclusion

Master-planned gated communities – similar to those described in this article – are still confined to the peripheries of the metropolis today and occupy only a negligible percentage of land. However, the peripheral land will soon be scarce. Like in Göktürk, the construction of more suburban developments will only be possible at the cost of public forestlands and will stress the already overused ecological resources of Istanbul's environment.

In the last two decades, gated communities have been built devoid of any ecological considerations. Local municipalities like Göktürk fostered them as the settlement of new upper and middle classes. The gated communities brought new wealth, controlled the building processes, drove up real estate prices, and diminished overall expenses of the municipalities. The metropolitan area's worsening environmental situation, however, has generated awareness for the problems of urban sprawl and has reflected poorly upon gated communities. Suburban gated communi-

ties are increasingly perceived as »decadent« and »ecologically intolerable«. Such views dominate planning circles around the metropolitan administration.

A very recent reform of administration and planning has finally put the entire province of Istanbul (roughly around 8000 sq km), with all its conurbations, under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan administration. Previously, the metropolitan administration had only planning authority for approximately 70 % of the built-up area (total built-up area about 1800 sq km). A new strategic development plan for greater Istanbul has been created in accordance with the new planning framework, which was designed by the Istanbul Metropolitan Planning agency (IMP) and has been approved by the city council. This new development plan has clearly addressed ecological sustainability problems. If this plan is implemented, the sprawl of gated communities would be restricted due to ecological reasons. However, such an implementation would not be easy: the construction and automotive industries as well as the land speculation lobbies work through the ministries of public works, industry, and transportation in Ankara, torpedo metropolitan plans and use a »national priority« planning for a third »northern« Bosphorus passage as a major strategic tool.

As shown in this article, ecological sustainability is not the only problem which arises with the establishment of gated communities. Even if the ecological implications of the neo-liberal urban transformation were realized, the social implications as well as the quality and type of civic life of the metropolis are still unclear.

There are also additional major guidelines of the new plan:

- The transformation of Istanbul into a service-dominated, white collar metropolis.
- Reduction of the earthquake risks by large scale reconstruction works, mainly implemented through the abovementioned law for urban transformation of the inner city, drafted in the IMP and still awaiting approval of the national assembly. This guideline calls for vast expropriation and replacement of illegally constructed and unsafe buildings. Forty-eight areas have already been declared regeneration projects,¹⁴ and one million buildings will be demolished, with repairs being carried out on another 200,000 buildings in Istanbul.

14 Murat Diren from Istanbul Municipal Planning Agency as a panel speaker at the conference: »Urban Design: Public Domain, Political Tool or Consumer Choice? New Forms of Urban Segregation in Istanbul«, KAHAM, Istanbul, November 3, 2007.

bul (Alp/Sentürk 2007). Inner city areas around the new planned extension of the Central Business District, particularly on the European side – the so-called western corridor – are due for cleansing. While these areas have been affected by the manifestations of an urban space dominated by labor-intensive production processes, after cleansing they will be transformed into residential areas acceptable for white collar population groups. The new planning paradigms proclaimed by the metropolitan authorities, have to be critically examined concerning their social implication: these might be catastrophic if Göktürk's model is exported to a metropolitan scale.

Under the new official planning guidelines, the real estate industry will be urged to allocate resources from the periphery to the inner city. Instead of building urban exclaves outside the city, an increasing number of exclusive urban enclaves will be build inside the city: islands for upper class housing, modern office space, and commercial programs. Although different in typology, density and style, these urban enclaves are using the same mechanisms to generate the exclusiveness of their suburban counterparts, namely master planned design, high living standards, extra services, restricted access, and security measures. Unlike suburban gated communities, these projects are not composed of detached houses, but rather they are either designed as »vertical gated communities« (condominiums), or as enclosed city blocks.

In comparison to suburban gated communities, which are increasingly perceived as irresponsible elitist projects, the urban gated communities are presented as having common advantages. They will not only help to increase the earth quake safety of the city, but they will also improve urban living conditions and enhance the image of Istanbul as a modern metropolis. These projects are legitimized as a counter model to the existing city, at the same time indirectly criticizing it as being backward, chaotic, and insecure.

With this process of urban reconstruction, tendencies similar to those observed in Göktürk will enter the inner city. Like Göktürk, the new urban islands will attract both high-skilled professionals – mostly from the international business sector – and low-skilled workers who are attracted to the emerging local service sector. But unlike »the island« of Göktürk, a boomtown within strict physical boundaries, not all of the local inhabitants of a vast metropolis will be able to participate in this process. Many of them will get marginalized in their neighborhoods, and possibly have to move to other areas where they can still afford to live.

Was Göktürk the inevitable anticipation of an Istanbul in the upcoming future, or shall we succeed in learning from the recent experiences of

self-service urbanization? If we have learned from these experiences, we should steer the processes of urban transformation into socially and economically sustainable paths, building upon the interactive qualities of a unique public space.

References

- Alp, A./Sentürk, O. (2007): »Gigantic Transformation project to rebuild Istanbul«. Turkish Daily News, November 15, 2007.
- Bayca, L. T./Gülümser, A. A.(2004): »Production and Marketing of Gated Communities in Istanbul«, ERSA conference papers from European Regional Science Association.
- Blakely, E./Snyder, M. G. (1997): *Fortress America: Gated Communities in the United States*, Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Dani S. D./Pérouse, J. F. (2005): *Zenginliğin Mekanda Yeni Yansımaları: İstanbul'da Güvenlikli Siteler*, Toplum ve Bilim. İstanbul.
- Esen, O./Rieniets, T. and students (2006): *Göktürk*, semester documentary, Institute for Urban Design, ETH Zurich.
- Esen, O. (2005): »The Tightrope Walk of the Middle Class in a Fractured Istanbul«. In: *Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (ed.) Art, City and Politics in an Expanding World. Writings from the 9th International Istanbul Biennial*, İstanbul: İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, pp. 120-133.
- Galenao, E. (1971): *Open Veins of Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Genis, S. (2007): »Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in Istanbul«. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp. 771-798.
- Glasze, G. (et. al) (2006): *Private Cities*, New York: Routledge.
- Göktürk Municipality (2006): *Dream to reality: Göktürk*. İstanbul: Publication of Göktürk Municipality. Second Version.
- Graham, S./Marvin, S. (2001): *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. Routledge: London/New York.
- Low, S. (2003): *Behind the Gates*, New York/London: Routledge.
- Massey, D. (1996): »The age of extremes: concentrated affluence and poverty in the twenty-first century«. *Demography*, No 33 (4).
- McKenzie, E.C. (2006): *The dynamics of privatopia: global and local perspective on the rise of private neighborhoods*, In Glasze, G. (et. Al): *Private Cities*, New York: Routledge, pp. 9-30.

- Pamuk, O. (2006): *Istanbul: Memories and the City*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Sassen, S. (1994): *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press

Peripheral Public Spaces. Types in Progress

ELA ALANYALI ARAL

Istanbul, like many cities throughout the world, is continuously changing due to the developments in technology and comparative alterations in lifestyle. One of the most frequent and rapidly spreading spatial typologies in the city comprises spaces along urban motorways, in accordance with the increase in the quantity and speed of motorized transport.

These spaces are usually conceived and treated as green areas by local authorities - only as visual assets to the city. Yet, as in many Turkish cities, many of these spaces also remain untreated. Regardless, they still attract a considerable amount of urbanites for certain types of uses. Users of these spaces, if not only trespassing, are mostly enjoying the surroundings; standing, sitting, resting on the ground, having a look around, talking to each other, even having picnics, especially in good weather.

Repeated observations of such uses, which are public in character, have initiated contemplation on the role that these spaces play in the public life of the city. In that regard, this chapter includes a discussion about the significance and potentialities of spaces along urban motorways as public spaces. While doing this, two primary concerns to be discussed in subsequent parts will be to comprehend how users in Istanbul, and thus in Turkish cities and culture in general, perceive and conceive these spaces, and to investigate the role of the circulation networks in the formation of urbanity and public spaces.

Discussion on public space

Hannah Arendt identifies the public realm with the urban milieu of the polis in ancient Greek culture »where everybody had constantly to distinguish from all others, to show through unique deeds or achievements that he was the best of all«, and it was »reserved for individuality; the only place where men could show who they really are and inexchangeably were« (Arendt 1958: 52).

Comparatively, the public realm implies an individual or a group that presents his/her/its own specific qualities, and a »public« observing them from diverse perspectives and aspects (Arendt 1958: 57). In that context, public spaces are those which embrace individuals or groups revealing diverse peculiarities as well as the observing public - also with manifold features as being formed by individuals/groups from different formations. Specifically, public spaces in the city refer to all urban spaces physically containing users who express themselves, and observers who perceive and experience these expressions. Throughout the discussion on spaces along urban motorways, their qualifications and potentialities as public open spaces in the city have been portrayed.

Appropriation, as a spontaneous and self-expressive activity, becomes an agent for the revelation of identities in space, and it may be praised as an opportunity for enhancing the public realm of the city (Alanyalı Aral 2003). The diversity of the user profile and how intensely and frequently the urban space is used become important matters in substantiating any contribution of spaces to the public realm.

Public space, when defined as the space of encounter and self-expression, entails two key properties:

- The coming together of a large number of urbanites – due to accessibility and activities in the space.
- Appropriation presenting the circumstances for the revelation of identities (Alanyalı Aral 2003).

In contemporary debates, public space is being discussed with regards to its validity for the masses that live in urbanized areas. For the fact that no other means of communication has been substantive enough to replace face-to-face contact, public spaces still hold the core of research and contemplation. As technology increasingly introduces agents that alter everyday life, qualities and characteristics of public spaces alter.

New forms of public space evolve as new functions, new types of use and new institutions arrive on the scene; movie theaters, shopping malls and play centers for video games are some of the public space

types introduced since the last century. On the other hand, urban open spaces which welcome numerous and diverse urbanites – streets and squares as the basic typologies – preserve their prevalence in the contemporary city. They acquire great public value for their accessibility and dense use, especially as spaces also comprising the indispensable spaces of circulation.

Public open spaces of the past have extensively generated models for the production of contemporary ones. Yet, the existence of praised historical public spaces in our lives rarely goes beyond nostalgic images and experiences predominantly used as attractions in tourism. For many city dwellers, living environments are not comprised of such places and some of the individuals in urbanized areas do not even experience any public open space that we would conventionally mention as a plaza or a square. In many cities throughout the world, daily experiences mostly depend on high-speed travel by vehicular means; aiming to bypass the inevitably experienced public open spaces – specifically those along circulation routes – in the shortest possible period of time.

Cities become exposed to most heterogeneous life patterns in cultures and economies under rapid change; this change for the most part being produced by the mobility of populations in both spatial and socio-economic terms. The diversity of dwellers is reflected in urban space: for every group – or even individuals - somehow holds a territory in urban space; and by expressing themselves to others.

Metropolitan areas, especially in developing countries, present an unsettled social milieu, as they are places where great numbers of people from different origins continually face each other in different contexts and modes. Such cities, which are under great changes due to social, political or economic compulsions, produce more breaks in the urban area where their dwellers find the opportunities to develop their own informal use patterns. Seemingly chaotic, they engender more leftover spaces - »leftover space« being defined as a space that is not »possessed« by people (Alanyalı Aral 2003) - which signify more uncontrolled and more temporary spaces, and more spontaneous uses. Today, Berlin is one example of this type in Europe, and Istanbul is another one at the crossroads of Europe and Asia.

While discussing the future of public open space as a medium for serendipitous encounter of urbanites, a primary concern should be to understand what is actually displayed in urban areas; involving specific current spatial typologies and use patterns in cities. Apart from regular and planned types of public spaces, there exist a variety of emergent contexts in contemporary cities, mostly in disregarded urban areas (Oswalt/Overmeyer/Missewiltz 2004).

Spaces along urban motorways comprise a common urban spatial typology in contemporary cities. These spaces challenge closer investigation in the context of Turkish cities, for they display some specific public urban space qualities as spaces of encounter and self-expression. Spaces along urban motorways entail two key properties: the bringing together of large numbers of urbanites, due to the dense use of the motorways and high accessibility; and the potential for appropriation, allowing urbanites to reveal their identities through spontaneous use patterns.

Searching for ongoing patterns in public open spaces

Spaces along urban motorways in Turkish cities, and in Istanbul in particular, display instances of unexpected and extensive uses by urbanites. The circumstances behind present usage characteristics should be studied in order to gain a proper comprehension of how users perceive and conceive these spaces.

Perception and use of spaces vary to a great extent in different cultures and different geographical regions. We may suggest that these circumstances are much related to the cultural formations and expectations of users, which can be tested through a survey on use patterns of public open spaces in Turkish cities throughout history. Yet, this inquiry can by no means determine whether we may appraise or devalue present use patterns in the city; it can only contribute to determining the motives which bring them about. Whether or not related to the motives of the past, use patterns in the contemporary city do exist with their significances for the public realm in the city, and their qualities and inadequacies should be well understood and re-considered for decisions about their future and for designing new spaces.

In this part, for a better understanding, the common peculiarities of urban public open spaces coming from the past will be outlined; namely in Anatolian cities in the earliest and latest centuries of the Ottoman period, questioning also their possible relation to the legal layout.

Rigid classifications and definitions are mostly problematic when examining historical incidents. There may be many alternative ways to investigate common characteristics in cities, regarding different periods, regions or specific attributes like three port cities being evaluated in Eldem, Goffman and Masters'(1999) inquiry; their approach does not necessarily aim to embrace all cities in the extensive lands that remained under Ottoman reign in different periods.

Eldem, Goffman and Masters (1999: 15) reject both the Weberian exclusion of Islamic cities, and the definition of European or Arab cities as normative, as the ideals to which other civilizations must be measured against. Likewise, Tanyeli (1987) has shown that many features of the Islamic city model were not applicable to Anatolian Turkish and early Ottoman cities. Furthermore, it has been discussed that »there does not exist a typical Ottoman, Arab, or Islamic city that imposes fundamentally unique and thus ghettoizing characteristics upon all such urban centers and their inhabitants« (Eldem/Goffman/Masters 1999: 15).

There is a limited number of research works on the urban characteristics of cities in the earlier periods of Anatolian Turkish cities. For that period, Tanyeli (1987) portrays a comprehensive study and he states that Turkish tribes brought not only a nomadic but also an urban culture to Anatolia in the 11th century, along with stimulations from various cultures, such as the Iranian culture. Many motives in Anatolian Seljuk cities and also in later Ottoman cities have also been rendered as relevant to the nomadic past of Turkish tribes (Evyapan 1972) or Turkish cities in Asia: For example, Kuban (Cerasi 1999: 86) relates the Ottoman cities' principle of detachment to the Turkish cities in Asia, which were formed of three different parts: the city of aristocrats and »*zanaatkâr's*« –namely »*şehrîstan*«, the settlement area in the inner castle, and bazaar area –namely »*rabâd*« or »*birun*«, which exists outside the walls and far from both.

On the other hand, Cerasi (1999) introduces an extensive study about urban civilization and urban architecture portraying Ottoman cities in Balkan and Anatolian Ottoman cities in the 18th – 19th centuries. When relevant studies are compared, it is possible to sort the shared characteristics; some basic properties have been in existence from the beginning of the Turkish period in Anatolia and can be traced in the later periods – even in Cerasi's discussions on the cities in the latest period of the Ottoman Empire.

In the scope of this paper, the shared characteristics, especially physical properties and use patterns in public open spaces of the past, have been studied relying mainly on the comprehensive studies of Tanyeli (1987) on Anatolian cities in the 11th – 15th century Turkish Anatolia and early Ottoman periods, and of Cerasi (1999) on the Anatolian and Balkan Ottoman cities in 18th – 19th centuries.

The urban layout and the physical properties of public open spaces

Tanyeli (1987: xi and 128) claims that the earliest Ottoman settlement pattern appeared at the beginning of the 15th century and that it was unique: Anatolian cities contained the earlier Byzantine fortress area, yet the city did not only expand from the old nucleus outwards, but expanded also from the margins of the city inwards: The commercial center extended outwards from the old fortress-city and the »bedesten« became the most outstanding element of this area, whereas in the surroundings semi-rural units were formed around »imaret« complexes. Afterwards, the evolution occurred through the intensification of this semi-rural texture no more as an outward expansion, but as an inner development – the process he names as »counter-focused« expansion of the Ottoman city.




Figure 1: The »counter-focused« expansion of the early Ottoman city, by Uğur Tanyeli (1987)

»S« indicates the palace, »K« indicates the gates of the castle from earlier periods, dark areas indicate the commercial area, lighter areas show the settlement areas and the lightest areas show cemeteries.

In the earlier Ottoman cities in Anatolia, especially *fituvvet* mosques were located on the outer surroundings of the city, and new districts were formed in these half-rural half-urban areas by inhabitants who were comprised probably of nomads and former villagers (Tanyeli 1987:

130). So the fortress walls were not definitive for the cities; they were rather open cities with no definite boundaries between inside and outside, or between the rural area and the city (Cerasi 1999: 79). The loose and fragmented growth pattern left great vast areas between the numerous neighborhoods in the city.

As a multi-centered structure the old center mostly retained, whereas other settlement areas gathered around centers with social buildings like mosques, schools, religious buildings (*tekke* and *zaviye*), libraries and public baths (*hamam*). These centers were scattered around critical locations within the topography, leaving vast areas in between (Cansever 1996: 379). These vast areas mainly encompassed four types of activities:

- supplementary areas like agricultural and breeding land
- spaces for sport and military activities (*at meydanı, ok meydanı*)
- social / meeting activities (*bayram yeri*)
- recreational activities (*dere boyu/mesire yerleri*) (Cansever 1996: 382).

Within this urban layout, in the cores of fragmented district groups, there existed public spaces like mosques, schools, baths, etc., with their open spaces like the courtyards of mosques and complexes. On the other hand, another group of public open spaces with social and recreational activities emerged in between and sometimes just on the peripheries of the fragmented neighborhoods of the city.

A closer investigation shows that predominantly two factors were important in the formation of these public open spaces: the natural virtues of places and their location, and relationships within the city.

Ottoman cities have usually been discussed to produce informal public open spaces in physical terms. The urban design during the Ottoman period gave buildings freedom for expression; the monumental public buildings were designed to be observed not only from a close vicinity but also from a far distance (Tanyeli 1987:xi). As (*imaret*) complexes or as single buildings, they were usually of a high geometrical order. Except for the monumental and religious complexes, Ottoman cities had a rather disorderly settlement pattern, which was loose and coincidental (Erzen 1991) with a great amount of vast areas.

These vast areas included public open spaces which were rather indeterminate in their formal characteristics and in harmony with the natural characteristics of their specific location. Usually, they were not designed nor were they orderly urban spaces, but pieces of land left in their natural characteristics.

Cerasi (1999: 229) claims that Ottoman interventions absolutely adapted the existing forms in the natural space both in urbanization schemes and in open space forms. Love and the enjoyment of nature were important attributes to them. Nature was seen as one of the complementary values in Ottoman Istanbul; there were always fragments of nature in the city like gardens, graveyards, green courtyards and vacant lots (Erzen 1999: 94). Regarding the preservation of natural characteristics in most public spaces, the intrinsic qualities themselves seem to have been inspiring – or sometimes determinant – for city dwellers in appropriating them for certain activities, as in the case of gardens: Evyapan (1972) states that the Turkish garden was located according to the properties of place due to its qualities, with a regard for weather, water, view and other conditions. These properties of place inspired people to decide making a garden by way of using and improving them.

As the second important factor, the relationship of spaces to the inner-city movement arteries and to the city entrances was decisive for the public quality of open spaces. Primarily, public spaces developed on the main arteries and close to city entrances.

Tanyeli (1987: xii) claims that one of the specific public open space typologies, *meydan*, was formed from the earliest periods on and has continued to exist as an »unlimited« open space just near the outskirts of the city – there were inner-city *meydans*, but these were living public squares continuing their functions from earlier Byzantine periods.

The relationship of open spaces to the inner-city circulation arteries and to the peripheries played an important role in qualifying their public character: Those close to the city entrances, like Namazgâh in Ankara, in important locations and along the main arteries of the city (Atmeydanı in Istanbul as a public square continuing its function from Byzantine period) were the primary multi-functional gathering public open spaces of cities; whereas those rather remote ones emerged as merely recreational public spaces: Evliya Çelebi (Cerasi 1999:203) mentions ten strolling areas outside the walls of Istanbul in the 17th century, which all social classes used, Bazaar areas outside the walls and far from the city, or marketplaces just outside the city walls like in medieval cities in Europe (Carr/Francis/ Rivlin/Stone 1992: 54) were also seen in other cultures. Yet, one typical location for public open spaces in the Ottoman city was the vast areas in-between fragmented groups of neighborhoods. Specific public spatial typologies like *çayırlık*s, or cemeteries, which were used as *gezinti* strolling areas, were located at the exits of these neighborhood groups; mostly on hills with a panoramic view (Cerasi 1999: 201).

Main Types and characteristics of public open spaces

As far as public open space typologies go, Ottoman cities included mainly *meydan*, *mesire*, *çayırılık* and *pazar*.

Meydans (public squares) in Anatolian Ottoman cities existed from the earlier periods on, and though there was no disagreement in function – as »an open space to serve the whole city for some urban-social functions« – *meydans* were different in design from those in the West (Cerasi 1999: 201), not being defined by buildings on at least three sides and not having a geometrical order, as was prevalent in Western cities since the Renaissance.

Usually *meydans* were vacant, unenclosed, wide areas, which were placed on the outskirts of settlement areas. They were not designed or orderly urban spaces, but rather pieces of land left in their natural circumstances. While the basic functions were essentially the same – namely to bring many people together for public interaction – use patterns and qualities were different in Ottoman cities as opposed to Western cities. Cerasi (1999) mentions that while informal in character, they showed inconceivable use patterns in the context of western plazas – embracing tents and huts, groups of people sitting in circles, eating, playing games, even meditating. The Persian term »*maidan*« was translated into Turkish as connoting a vacant, unclosed, wide area:

Meydan: »1. Flat, open and wide place, area – like *Taksim meydanı* [in English: Open space, public square, the open square]; 2. Field of game / contest or combat – like *savař meydanı*, *at meydanı*, *ok meydanı* [in English: Field, area]; 3. One’s immediate surroundings – like in ‘*meydanda kimse yok*’ [in English: Arena] [...]« (Okyanus Ansiklopedik Sözlük IV 1981: 1931).

»*Meydans*«, for all their differences in their formal representative qualities and usage qualities, were rather likened to the campo in Italian cities, which were rather more informal than the piazza: an open and undefined empty space where daily activities, like bazaars etc. took place (Yerasimos 1996). In the Ottoman city, such wide-open spaces were almost always casual and they lacked specific purposes. These properties are also valid for *meydans* in Turkish villages (*köy meydanı*), where the land is not designed or altered for a strict order, but used in its natural character, with a minimum of intervention.

»*Mesire*« was a recreational public space where people could stroll and spend time in nature. *Mesire*: »Place to stroll, to enjoy open air and to entertain, walk« [in English: Promenade, excursion spot] (Okyanus Ansiklopedik Sözlük IV 1981:1916).

The »*çayırılık*« was also one of the main typologies, and there was a *çayırılık* with trees in every settlement in western and eastern Turkey (Hobhouse 1913 in Cerasi 1999). These were areas left in their natural layout and used publicly as strolling places and they were widespread in cities in the 18th century. Sports games and public entertainment/ festivities on special days were held in these spaces, as in Cebeci *çayırığı*, Ankara.

»*Pazar*« (bazaar) was another public open space in the Ottoman city, and every city had one or more grain or animal bazaar in its peripheral area. *Pazar* areas were also usually *meydans* with regard to the great flexibility of activities that could occur there.

All these typologies had some common properties in their formal and programmatic qualities, namely the overlapping of activities and serenity and holding place as behavioral patterns in public open spaces.

Features like the informality of public open spaces in physical terms and the use of cemeteries, *çayırılıks*, and *bostans* (Cerasi, 1999), in addition to *meydans*, for recreational purposes, formed the definitive properties of Ottoman cities' distinctive character. Tanyeli (1987: 169) explains the reasons for *meydans* to be placed on the outer skirts of the city in relation to their flexibility of usage –as they were also used as bazaar areas (for easy access of nomad groups), horse riding sports areas, and for ceremonies and celebrations (which sometimes necessitated large areas for sultan tents).

Main public open spaces, like *meydan*, *mesire* or *çayırılık*, were mostly experienced in their natural properties. All these types were very close in their use characteristics so that even a very well-known *meydan* in Istanbul – At Meydanı – could be mentioned as a *mesire* in Seyahatname (Evliya Çelebi 1971: 146).

Likewise, Cerasi (1999) refers to *çayırılıks* as *mesire*, claiming that they represent the attempts to appropriate or re-appropriate a natural environment of the city, the materiality of a place with its meadows, ambience and panorama. This point signifies that it was possible to view the same kinds of use in many public open spaces, with the essential characteristic being the enjoyment of nature.

In Ottoman cities, functions were overlaid in the urban context, for example open spaces, like cemeteries being used as public open spaces (public gardens where dwellers could stroll, enjoy, sing, eat etc), and fruit gardens along the Meriç river in Edirne being used as public strolling areas (Cerasi 1999: 201, 203).

The specific use typologies and preferences in public open spaces in Ottoman cities can be considered as a reflection of the overall behavioral patterns of urban dwellers.

Ottoman use – or Balkan and Anatolian Sociabilité (Boué in Cerasi 1999: 199) – was different from uses in Europe; it was more static and sometimes lead to contemplative and more multi-functional activity (the group sits, rests, sings, eats...). Many urban public open spaces appeared like rural picnic areas, and families or groups of friends occupied a certain location and stayed/enjoyed being there for hours and even for days with tents (Boué in Cerasi 1999: 205). This feature may be related to the fact that in Ottoman cities, the rhythm of daily life was rather slow – without rush – as observed in the long greetings, elongated business dialogues and bargains as mentioned by Mantran (1999) for the case of Istanbul in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Cerasi states that *meydans* were used in astounding ways: Tents and huts were set up and there were groups of people sitting in circles, others eating, and some playing games on horseback. These *meydans* were multi-functional and they also provided the milieu for meditating, as a group or a person appropriated a location in the space to sit, like a corner in the field (Cerasi 1999: 199).

These use patterns depend mostly on the main properties of the public open spaces. The enjoyment of nature as it is and the multi-functionality produce their specific atmosphere: a calm, static, slow and peaceful way of occupying a place which brings together singing and eating groups with those meditating within the same space.

Legal layout of public open spaces in the Ottoman city

Ottoman cities shared some common principles with the Islamic cities in general, but they were particular in their open space typologies (like *çayırlık* and *mesire*) and use characteristics. Yerasimos (1997: 67) claims that individual and collective properties are determined through the two main principles in the Islamic city: positive benefits and negative benefits. This means that anyone who can evaluate a common property without disturbing others has the right to possess it. This principle was applied to many spaces, a significant example being the formation of dead-end streets typical also in Ottoman cities.

For this impermanence, public spaces in Islamic cities were mentioned as merely areas of transition or temporary use, institutionalized no further than their usage properties (Yerasimos 1997: 67). As mentioned before, many features of Anatolian Turkish and early Ottoman cities were incompatible with these models and definitions. Moreover, it is not possible to state that they were temporary, for some of them have continued to exist until today or until very recently.

In Ottoman cities, it is difficult to state that public open spaces were not institutionalized. As they received regular care and maintenance, meydan, çayırık and mesire were well maintained by responsible groups like »çayır bekçileri« and »fideciler« (Cansever 1996: 382) and »bostancılar« (Cerasi 1999: 199). There was also a specific legal structure defining public and private spaces.

Land ownership patterns

In the earlier periods of Ottoman cities in Anatolia, the different characters of the old centers and new centers (in their »counter-focused« expansion) were also reflected in the difference of land ownership patterns in these areas. The outer lands, where new centers emerged, were not »mirî« – which means that as state-owned land, they cannot be the property of individuals, but were only rented to them. Inner old center land however could be private property (Tanyeli 1987: 132). This »mukataa« system was in use only in earlier periods, but can not be spotted after the 15th century.

The Ottoman system was based on land owned by the State, except for *mülk arazi*, which was comprised of privately owned land, including the land of houses and their use areas in villages and towns (Sönmez 1998: 205).

In the Ottoman property system, common land (»*res publicae*« in Roman law) was the category of *metruk arazi*. Land in this category also belonged to the State and was reserved for the use and utilization of the public or of the inhabitants of a certain settlement (Sönmez 1998: 205). These comprised routes, *meydans*, *namazgâhs*, *mesires*, *pazars* and *panayır*/festival places and was protected strictly in the sense that they could only be used for the purposes they were reserved for – through laws forbidding any personal utilization/appropriation (Sönmez 1998: 206).

Another category was the *mevat arazi* or *hali arazi* (»*res nullius*« in Roman law), which applied to the land that was in nobody's ownership – though its *rakabe* (*kuru mülkiyet*) belonged to the State – and where no permanent appropriation occurred. These lands were not reserved for the utilization of the public. They were not usable in any way – neither available for agriculture nor for buildings – and they started 1.5 mile from the buildings at the peripheries of a settlement (Sönmez 1998: 207). By definition, these lands could not be considered as urban lands in Ottoman period, however in the Republican period, with the enlargement of city areas, they were converted into public and private property in the urban context.

The Ottoman property system brought spontaneity and disorder to ownership patterns, which was also reflected in the physical properties of settlements, in their irregular and compact structure (Günay 1999). It was only by the end of the 19th century that spontaneous possession of land, spurred by urban growth of the Ottoman city, began to be replaced by planned ownership-based real estate (Günay 1999: 235).

Layout of the transportation network

As in many Islamic cities, streets in Ottoman cities were either held in common property or they were the shared property of neighborhood dwellers - like in the case of dead-end streets, which could be closed to strangers by the decision of these dwellers (Yerasimos 1996: 10).

Basically, Ottoman cities had three types of streets, including main streets, which connected the entrances of the city to the center, streets connecting the center or the wider streets to the neighborhoods (*mahalleler*), and streets in the neighborhoods (Yerasimos 1996: 13). The latter two street typologies formed a *salkım* type of neighborhood development with dead-ends which were later connected to the main axis, whereas main streets formed a radial-concentric scheme, with public buildings like *keravansarays*, *zaviyes*, *hans*, *medreses*, closed bazaars and great mosques along them (Yerasimos 1997: 68-9).



Figure 2: At Meydanı and İbrahim Paşa Sarayı with Sultan Ahmet mosque. Engraving after Antoine-Ignace Melling, in Maurice, Cerasi (1999): *Osmanlı Kenti – Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllarda Kent Uygurlığı ve Mimarisi*, p.370

Public open spaces are also usually placed in relation to these main streets – like *meydans* and bazaars at the main entrances of the city, and promenades (*çayırılık*s, cemeteries etc.) at the exits of city fragments and neighborhood districts.

As an overall evaluation, public open spaces in Ottoman cities included several typologies, some of which we may call »peripheral« public spaces. Peripheral public spaces were usually natural in their formal characteristics; they suggest a ruralized urban scene. These spaces presented an overlapping of several functions: *as meydan*, *çayırılık*, *mesire* or cemetery, they were promenades and sports areas, and being used for gatherings and contemplation at the same time. Appropriation patterns included serenity and enjoyment of nature as well as persons or groups occupying a place sometimes over extended time periods with huts or tents.

Public spaces as defined with regards to circulation networks

The previous discussion has demonstrated that Ottoman cities – specifically in Anatolia – had some particularities in the formation and use patterns of public open spaces. A second step should be to evaluate their significance in relation to contemporary discussions about the definition of public open space with regards to circulation networks. We may then evaluate whether these particularities remain or if they form a basis in the use and formation of typologies of the contemporary city – particularly in Istanbul – with positive or negative implications.

The periphery and centrality

The duality of center and periphery was questionable within the settlement and growth pattern of Ottoman cities. The fragmented open city model produced numerous centers and in-between areas, which signified the transitory character of open spaces resembling the rural in the urban.

Cupers and Miessen (2002: 31-33) claim that this distinction was rigorous in the western city until very recently, yet the divisions in western culture as rural and urban, or center and periphery, no longer structure the geographical position of the city. Today the center, or rather the centers are spread over the nodes of the network; the peripheries are smeared over the folds of the urban fabric (Cupers/ Miessen 2002: 33). We may claim that this layout of the contemporary western city has some similarities with the settlement pattern in Ottoman cities.

The role of the periphery with reference to centrality is being discussed in various dimensions. Nijenhuis (1994: 14) states that the distinctive opposition between center and periphery is secondary and misleading - it is rather the networks of movement that create the city.

Primarily, the city is formed and informed by heterogeneous speeds – by the difference between inertia and traffic. The form of the city is thus, finally, an unstable effect.

The robustness of peripheries was an expression of the power controlling them. Thus, the surrounding walls meant a cautious insurance of security for the wealth acquired through the control of goods passing through the city gates – a model which accounts well for the existence of markets just inside or outside the city walls, near the city gates. This characteristic of cities faded away in 19th century Europe with the strategies following Saint-Simonian thinking, which attempted to liberate the flux of goods, people and information (Nijenhuis 1994:16).

The »ordinary urban« and the »supergrid« defining centrality

Bruyns and Read's (2006: 63) definition of the city is also constructed upon the idea of the city as an outcome of movement networks. They propose that the superimpositions of space-time frames and speeds produce the »event« of the place, which affects the centrality. The crucial point in this model is the intersection/overlapping of two networks with different speeds and different scales of movement:

»Centrality emerges [...], in a developed traditional type urban fabric, out of a relation between two distributed infrastructural grids rather than being a simple inverse to the edge condition as it would be in a village... the active principle [...] is a matter of [...] the focus of one scale of movement or relation towards another. The first urban »revolution« [...] is one of the addition of another scale of movement and connectivity grid over the first, and a shift in the focus of activity and centrality towards this new grid« (Read 2006: 75).

What emerges in the areas of superimposition is defined as the »ordinary urban« spatial pattern, which supports the sociability by making possible the encounter of people from different origins.

The shift from a simple centering of one scale on itself, to centering as a structured interface between two scales means a shift from an identification of the social unit and its activities and movements with a static internally centered space, to one which founds a social space, or rather the social effect of urban space, in a systematic dynamic exchange between local people and activity and people and activity of a wider surrounding. The spatialities concerned account on the one hand for the immersion of the individual in a world of familiarity and local identification, and on the other for his or her exposure to a world where he or

she is confronted on a regular basis with the unfamiliar, with people from other neighborhoods and other ways of life (Read 2006: 75).

Concerning the properties of public space, the ordinary urbanity is a model which accounts for the public realm in urban space emerging through the capability of movement networks to bring together people from different origins (Alanyalı Aral, 2003).

Read's definition signifies the complexity of a »public« milieu where urbanites meet a range of others. Urbanity or rather the centrality (as this quality is basically what makes a real center) evolves as far as people spend time in these spaces of encounter. Then, they have the opportunity to view others, while at the same time expressing themselves to this variety of people.

In Europe throughout history, the marketplace close to city walls sustained this role as the meeting place of locals and strangers. Then, with the disappearance of city walls, there emerged an altered centrality more distributed through the main movement axis:

»Urban infrastructure development from the early 19th century was characterised by boulevard and avenue building, creating networks geared to the increasing size of the city and the increasing mobilities of its populations at that time. These primary movement networks [...] were the »freeways« of the day cut to the speeds and mobility ranges of their time, and these longer routes through the dense fabric of the European centre reveal themselves as surprisingly coherent grids – we'll call them »supergrids« [...]« (Bruyns/Read 2006: 61).

The center-periphery relationship was different in that model than the conventional urban models. The center of the urban whole was distributed through the grid which integrated it into an already multi-place, multinodal entity (Read 2006: 76), and this was continued in European cities until recently.

Like Nijenhuis' (1994: 15) approach, which renders the city as an inhabitable circulation which is formed from the boundary, the ordinary urban model regards the edge as a productive frontier rather than a barrier. In the history of European cities, the edge formations were incorporated into the spreading urban fabric, leaving as their relics significant crossings and spaces, which themselves became centers in the larger-than-local infrastructural network (Read 2006: 78).

We can discuss the existence of peripheral public spaces in Ottoman cities in the context of the ordinary urban model: Public spaces were located either as nodes/centers, around which neighborhoods were shaped (Cansever 1996) – with public buildings and public open spaces like

mejdans and bazaars on main streets (Yerasimos 1997: 68f), or they (especially *bazaars*, *çayırlıks*, cemeteries etc.) were scattered throughout these neighborhoods, close to their exits on the routes which connected them to other neighborhoods and other cities.

Centrality in the Ottoman city has comparable properties with that of the 19th century European city without walls. The sequence of public open spaces along the main circulation arteries included different types, ranging from the squares of the mosques, which were formal in the overall layout, to a variety of loose informal public open spaces.

Considering the fact that use characteristics were almost the same in all typologies of informal public open spaces, one can see a particular centrality effect in these spaces of encounter, almost producing rural qualities in the urban.

The dilemma of centrality in the contemporary city

A major subject of criticisms directed towards the contemporary city comprises the deficient public role of urban spaces: the isolation of the individual from the public sphere in connection to the regression in means of encounter and expression. This issue is much correlated to the improved means of transportation and accordingly increased speed of vehicular traffic in the city.

Taking into consideration that post-fordist needs have mainly been determined by mobility, one might argue that today's loss of street life is mainly connected to the fact that the street's function has been lowered to that of pure infrastructure (Cupers/Miessen 2002:18).

This speedy movement system on the circulatory arteries in the city fails to generate the appropriate milieu for urbanity, as is also discussed by Virilio (1997). Mutual relationships necessitate the overlapping of a rather moderate vehicular movement system with one where pedestrian movement is possible and enlivened.

Bruyns and Read (2006: 62) state that in the late 20th and early 21st century the primary city development networks were built at the scale of the metropolis and the mega-city region, at which dominant movement takes place, and that this represents the main problem for urbanity:

»Our loss of a certain place quality today is substantially due to the fact that we have stopped building particular grids (the supergrid – a grid which today could intervene and mediate between local and metropolitan scale grids), which carried those qualities in the 19th century«. (Read 2006: 80)

In search of urbanity and new public spaces

Today, the urbanity of urban space in conventional means has become questionable. New attitudes that have evolved elucidate unrecognized types of urbanities and public spaces in cities. Bearing in mind that public space is the space of encounter and self-expression, these attitudes may embrace all accessible urban open spaces – including the daily experienced voids and leftover spaces usually disregarded or undervalued – for their probable public qualities: »When void space is relatively visible to locals or strangers it can turn into a local meeting space [...]« (Cupers/Miessen, 2002: 95).

Public space as an outcome of action

Baird (1995: 337-339) distinguishes two attitudes in the formation of public spaces: One is the consideration that the public realm can only proceed from the individual act cumulatively outward to the resultant collectivity, the other is the attitude of using the iconographic power of architecture to constitute a new public realm.

When exposed to actual urban spaces, the public realm proceeding from the individual act outward to the resultant collectivity is an outcome of action in urban space.

Unless the place is a spiritual, ethnic, national or historical one, where indirect experiences form images and meanings that are evoked by the name, repeated direct experience is a requirement for connections to develop. By means of observations of spaces through time, it is possible to find out the patterns of action producing meaning.

Appropriation, defined as a self-expressive action, may or may not alter urban space physically. Physical modification of the urban space by spontaneous action may be realized either through intended alterations or unintended alterations – these two may well exist in urban space at the same time:

»Unintended alterations by spontaneous action in space are acquired by means of appropriation through repetitive use and continuity of appropriative activity in time. These are activity-based ways of making space meaningful; altering space through leaving traces of action in space. Examples comprise path formation in vast spaces, defining a specific space by sitting on the same part of slope all the time, etc.

Intended alterations of inhabitants may embody spontaneity at a different level: appropriation through building/altering within urban space by inhabitants following their own organization patterns: appropriation through act of

self-organised alterations. These are building-based ways of altering space and they do make space meaningful somehow« (Alanyalı Aral 2003: 133).

These two attitudes both produce expressions of individuals or groups shaping these spaces – to be perceived as elements of the public realm – as a resultant collectivity of spontaneous action.

Activity-based alterations, as observed through traces of action in the urban space, are more expressive of spontaneous preferences and behaviors, though they usually are ephemeral. In that context, spontaneous actions of inhabitants reveal self-expressive qualities.

There evolve two different groups of appropriation to be examined and evaluated:

- Typical ones – continuous, repeated, which may also have become patterns with the traces they leave in the space
- Exceptional ones – may be valuable with regards to their contribution to the public realm (Alanyalı Aral 2003).

Observation of appropriation patterns and traces of action in space, which are formed through continuous and repetitive use, may construct the basis of evolving attitudes for the elaboration of public urban spaces.

Public space and urbanity has always been connected to disorder, functional heterogeneity, and diversity (Cupers/Miessen 2002, Sennett 1970). Daily experience – though underestimated – includes examples of them with spaces along urban motorways forming one extensive linear typology.

Spaces along urban motorways as public spaces

Crawford (1999) mentions the incoherent landscape of roads among everyday spaces, which defeat any conceptual or physical order; as everyday spaces comprise »the connective tissue that binds daily lives together, amorphous and so persuasive that it is difficult even to perceive«. It is the space that we experience every day through our movements for daily activities like work, home and school.

Spaces along urban motorways are spaces left over beside/along/ between/under/within urban motorways. They also include spaces along or under elevated highways passing through urban areas. These spaces are almost always free for everybody's access and use, so they do present a potentiality for appropriation.

Spaces along urban motorways exist everywhere around circulation routes in the city. Their sizes and shapes vary: some are linear in shape,

as related to the route form, usually leveled and sometimes treated for greenery.

Such spaces are among the non-places according to Augé (1995), for they are spaces experienced through journeys. Lampugnani (2006: 304) mentions them as the emblem of globalization, as their dramatizations are interchangeable everywhere, and he groups them as »benign« residual spaces – spaces which may contribute to the city like the spaces left between the carriageways on highways –, and »malignant« residual spaces – spaces like viaducts and underpasses as hopeless cases which should not be allowed to arise in the city.

The contemporary city continuously produces its own structures and systems in relation to the evolving/changing life patterns within. Spaces along urban motorways anyhow are among evolving public spaces in the contemporary city, as they present public qualities due to their inherent characteristics - as spaces visually and physically accessible to inhabitants (Alanyalı Aral 2005).

As a result of their transparency, these spaces obtain a certain stage character: no matter how ephemeral or small-scale, the space attracts theatrical behavior (Cupers/Miessen 2002:95).

In many western cities, surfaces facing these spaces – mostly beneath elevated motorways – are usually used as boards for graffiti exposed to passers-by either as pedestrians, or traveling in cars or on bicycles.

Perception of these spaces is related to the physical qualities and speed of movement through the circulation axes. Motorway travelers in passing vehicles usually grasp a short scene from the life in these spaces –seeing the action itself as appropriation patterns, or traces of action. The expression of life within these spaces is what makes one typical experience of the public realm in the contemporary city:

»They do not carry strong stories [...], but are charged with meaning in a different way. The minor traces that remain in this kind of space are its little »signifiants« [...]: Cigarette ends, empty cans, broken toys, rubbish or paper tissues. These traces point to the fact that meaning in these spaces is constituted through ephemeral use rather than built matter« (Cupers/Miessen 2002:95).

The isolation of the driver from the surrounding space, increasing as the speed of the vehicle increases, signifies the hindrance for the encounter in this widespread urban space typology of the contemporary city. On the other hand, these spaces entail another type of experience for pedestrian users, which includes the actual enjoyment of space.

In Turkey, spaces along urban motorways are extensively used. Appropriation of these spaces evolves as either traceless appropriation, or appropriation leaving traces on the space.

Traceless appropriation comprises recreational activities, indicating many typical appropriation patterns in open spaces, like standing, sitting, leaning, sleeping, eating and drinking, having a picnic, playing, etc., which are performed by single persons or groups. These activities leave almost no trace in space – except for some litter sometimes. Recreational activities may take place easily in any adapted space, like in spaces along vehicular routes.



Figure 3: Traceless appropriation of spaces along urban motorways, photograph by Melih Aral

On the other hand, appropriation that leaves traces on space comprises mainly path formation, activities like vending in temporary or permanent additions to space, and minor traces left in the spaces after any actual enjoyment of it.



Figure 4: Appropriation that leaves traces in spaces along urban motorways -path formation, photograph by Melih Aral

Path formation is usually related to trespassing, which is typical in many spaces in which public access is not blockaded, as in spaces along urban motorways. Path formation emerges due to repetitive and continuous use, and is expressive in the sense that it presents the route preferences of users. Sometimes, spontaneously formed paths are converted into permanent hard-surface pedestrian routes by an intervention from the municipalities.

Vending is also typical, as temporary cars sales and counters usually appear in spaces along urban motorways, and sometimes trucks and cars appropriate an area next to vehicular routes to sell goods. A rather atypical pattern in this category is the appropriation of old ruined cars as vending huts. This kind of appropriation is relatively permanent in space, usually on some well-used spot/on route, so as to be seen, and bringing liveliness and a chance for encounter to users. Vending may introduce a richness in immediate experience (sounds, smells, etc.), together with an increased number of users – bringing together a diversity of many people.

Conclusion: Istanbul case and potentialities

Istanbul, until very recently, was a city physically circumscribed by walls at least on one side: Except for some neighborhoods outside the Yedikule and Mevlevihane gates, the city was surrounded by walls at the western edge, and the outer area comprised cemeteries, *bahçes* and *bostans* (Kuban 1998: 36, 41). Until the Republican period, in the walled area there were huge gardens and voids used as urban *mesires*, like the valley of Bayrampaşa Deresi, Langa and the area between Yedikule and Topkapı (Kuban 1998: 36). Outside the inner-wall area, there existed scattered fragments of neighborhood groups in Üsküdar, Galata, and villages in many spots along Boğaziçi (Figure 8).

Istanbul presented much of the public open space patterns of Ottoman cities. The urban pattern in the city was like a disorderly network with knots; with its dead-end streets and public buildings like *mahalle mescitleri*, *çeşmeler*, *sıbyan mektepleri* on knots; and *külliyes* on bigger knots (Kuban 1998: 27). The enjoyment of nature in the city was observable in the extensive green areas throughout as *bahçes*, *bostans* and *mesires* within the fragmental growth pattern of the city.

Much of the overall layout of the city remained in the first decades of the Republic. After the 1950s, the city began to develop more rapidly due to high rates of immigration and an increase in construction activities. The city, with alterations in circulatory networks like bridges over

Haliç and Boğaziçi, and perimeter ways, in addition to the squatter zones, changed into a collection of regular and irregular settlements dispersed in a wide area.

In contemporary Istanbul, settlement areas are no more groups of neighborhoods scattered in a fragmented pattern with *bostans*, *çayırliks* and *mesires* in-between, but there are still peripheries in the city, in a different manner. When observed from the air, spaces along urban perimeter ways evolve as huge green areas with their surroundings, which break the congested settlement areas into pieces: In fact, these speed routes themselves draw peripheries within the city. Thus, they are regardless peripheral spaces, in varying sizes, mostly as linear green bands. Some of the spaces along urban motorways – especially those by the perimeter ways, contain considerably huge green areas within the urban fabric, and in some cases their size validates their use as public open spaces.

It is interesting that many spots within the spaces along the urban motorways emerge as informal public spaces with a variety of activities: These spaces on peripheries perform as modern public spaces, used for casual observation, picnic and retail areas. As an ongoing pattern, there is the enjoyment of the surrounding as it is, even though these spaces next to vehicular routes seem too unexpected and polluted for such public recreational uses. These spaces mostly offer high accessibility for users from the surrounding neighborhoods and from other parts of the city, and this is a primary factor in their use as public spaces. Pedestrian access is usually the case for numerous users living in the vicinity, and in situations when peripheral spaces are appropriated as picnic spaces, users usually travel much greater distances by vehicular means.



Figure 5 and 6: Picnic in spaces along urban motorway in Istanbul, photographs by Melih Aral

Users of spaces along urban motorways are mostly from lower and middle classes. Observations show that people usually prefer to be in loca-

tions where they can watch others, movement – of other people or vehicles – or enjoy a nice city view. Thus they usually stand, sit or lean on higher parts of inclined areas, or in any location where the view of the surrounding is not blocked. Natural-looking, spacious locations or green areas along and between fast urban perimeter ways are used as recreational spaces, since users do not demand neat and treated spaces.

The spontaneous use and appropriation by urbanites in such spaces transpire as actions or traces of actions, and they present patterns when observed through time. Traces of actions usually comprise path formations in spaces frequently used for trespassing, or vending cars and temporary huts placed by the motorways. Expressions and use/ appropriation patterns contributing to the public realm, very rarely lead to a permanent alteration in these spaces, like in cases where a pedestrian path formed through repetitive use is fixed as a concrete path by the local authority.

There are certain questions about the validity of spaces along urban motorways as peripheral public spaces. The crucial question lies in the public quality of these spaces, depending on whether they really function as spaces of encounter in the city: if they can bring together numerous and diverse urbanites.

The two main problems of encounter in these spaces are both related to high speed vehicular traffic on motorways: One is the fact that speedy motorways regardless detach the two sides generating a dangerous and polluted edge for parts of the city. As the spaces on the sides become bigger, these negative effects are lessened and they evolve as more usable pedestrian spaces.

The other problem is related to the isolating character of speed and vehicles as capsules, since travelers can perceive what and who exists in outer spaces only to a certain extent. Spaces along urban motorways are valuable to most urbanites for they are urban spaces that offer spaces physically and visually accessible to all groups in the city: For Istanbul, 94% of passenger transport, that is about 10 million travels per day, is held on urban motorways (Akay 2003). Drivers and travelers see pedestrians enjoying these spaces, and pedestrians watch the flow of cars; but the degree of the mutual relationship may only define a distinct limited sociability.

The contemporary problem in producing a network scaled to generate social space is valid for our cities, as observed in Istanbul (Read 2006: 80). Spaces along urban motorways may not necessarily be considered as centers in the city, but they may moderately retain the culture of peripheral public spaces if the appropriation patterns that they present

are tolerated and improved upon, along with precautions in upgrading their specific experience.

Actions and traces of actions in these spaces are generally disregarded by both authorities and designers, and they inevitably disappear in the contemporary city. Appropriation patterns in these informal public spaces do present valuable features of contemporary urban space use culture, also reflecting a specific public open space culture. Ways to tolerate their existence and learning from them should be searched out and the first step can be their consideration as assets of contemporary urban life.

Observations in the city are the foremost step for comprehensive investigation about peripheral public spaces. Yet, further studies involving detailed information about the specific physical characteristics, as well as questionnaires and other participatory techniques for learning users' profiles and preferences are necessary in order to develop ideas on how peripheral public spaces may retain and better serve public life in cities. Research on these spaces may primarily aim to improve the concern for these spaces and uses within, by designers and authorities, and may serve to integrate projective processes with such peculiarities of the existing urban life.

References

- Akay, A. (2003): »Istanbul: Bir Eğlence Megapolü«. In *Cogito-Yeni Istanbul*, no:35, pp. 181-184.
- Alanyalı Aral, E. (2005): »Spaces Along Urban Motorways – An Opportunity for the Public Realm in the City«. In *Abstracts UIA 2005*, Istanbul: UIA, p. 324.
- Alanyalı Aral, E. (2003): *Leftover Space as A Value and A Potentiality for the Public Realm in the City*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ankara: METU, Faculty of Architecture.
- Arendt, H. (1958): *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Augé, M. (1995): *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (translated by John Howe), London, New York: Verso.
- Baird, G. (1995): *The Space of Appearance*. Massachusetts, London: The MIT Press.
- Bruyns, G./Read, S. (2006): »The Urban Machine«. In: Stephen Read /Camillo Pinilla (eds.) *Visualising the Invisible – Towards an Urban Space*, Amsterdam: Techne Press, pp. 52-67.

- Carr, S./Francis, M./Rivlin, L. G./Stone, A. M. (1992): *Public Space*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cerasi, M. (1999): *Osmanlı Kenti – Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllarda Kent Uygarlığı ve Mimarisi*, İstanbul: YKY. Altan Yayıncılık.
- Crawford, M. (1999): »Introduction«. In: Chase, John / Crawford, Margaret/Kalinski, John (eds.) *Everyday Urbanism*, New York: The Monacelli Press, pp. 1-27.
- Cupers, K./Miessen, M. (2002): *Spaces of Uncertainty*. Dortmund: Tuschen.
- Eldem, E./Goffman, D./Masters, B. (1999): *The Ottoman City Between East and West – Aleppo, İzmir, and Istanbul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erzen, J. (1991): *Mimar Sinan Cami ve Külliyesi –Tasarım Süreci Üzerine Bir İnceleme*, Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi.
- Evyapan, G. (1972): *Eski Türk Bahçeleri ve Özellikle Eski İstanbul Bahçeleri*, Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Günay, B. (1999): *Property Relations and Urban Space*. Ankara: METU Faculty of Architecture Press.
- Kuban, D. (1998): *Kent ve Mimarlık Üzerine İstanbul Yazıları*, İstanbul: YEM Yayın.
- Lampugnani, V. M. (2006): »The City of Tolerant Normality.« In: Graafland, A./Kavanagh, L. J. (eds.), *Crossover, Architecture, Urbanism, Technology*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, pp. 295-307.
- Mantran, R. (1991): *XVI.-XII. Yüzyıl'da İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat*. İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık.
- Okyanus Ansiklopedik Sözlük (1981) İstanbul: Pars Yayınevi.
- Oswalt, P./Overmeyer, K./Missewiltz, P. (eds.) (2004): *Urban Catalyst: Strategies for Temporary Use – Results of the European Research Project 2001-2003*, unpublished report.
- Read, S. (2006): »A Brief History of Flights to the Periphery and Other Movement Pattern«. In: Read, Stephen/Pinilla, Camilo (eds.) *Visualising the Invisible – Towards an Urban Space*, Amsterdam: Techne Press, pp.68-82.
- Sennett, R. (1970): *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sönmez, T. (1998): *Osmanlıdan Günümüze Toprak Mülkiyeti –Açıklamalı Sözlük*. Ankara: Yayımevi.
- Turgut, C. (1996): »Osmanlı Şehri«. In Vecdi Akyüz (ed.). *İslam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir ve Yerel Yönetimler v. I*, İstanbul: Bayrak Matbaacılık, pp. 373-388.

- Tanyeli, U. (1987): *Anadolu Türk Kentinde Fiziksel Yapının Evrim Süreci (11.-15.yy)*, İstanbul: İTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Baskı Atölyesi.
- Virilio, P. (1997): *Open Sky* (translated by Julie Rose). London, New York: Verso.
- Yerasimos, S. (1997): »İslâm Şehrinde Sınır ve Geçiş«. In Zeynep Aktüre (ed.), *Sanat ve Çevre*, Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Basım İşliğı, pp. 67-70.
- Yerasimos, S. (1996): »Tanzimat'ın Kent Reformları Üzerine«. In Dumont, P./Georgeon, F. (eds.), *Modernleşme Sürecinde Osmanlı Kentleri* (A. Berktaş, trans.), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, pp. 1-18.

Old City Walls as Public Spaces in Istanbul

FUNDA BAŞ BÜTÜNER

Throughout history, city walls have consistently been important urban components expressing both power and existence of cities. Whether natural or man-made, securing defensible boundaries was a vital requirement in the formation of early settlements. While the natural advantages of hilltops or rivers assisted in the defense of early towns, man-made walls were also built to guard settlements from external dangers. As Nijenhuis states, »[...] location, city walls and gates are the result not of mythic but of military thinking [...]« (Nijenhuis 1994: 15). However, walls did not only function as defense elements, they also became important components in shaping and controlling cities' physical, symbolic, political, and economic territories. Furthermore, city walls served to define where these symbolic, political, and economic activities could take place, thus generating two conflicting spatial milieu: inside and outside the city wall. Between this inside and outside a flow of people, goods, capital and even information passed on a regular basis.

Today, city walls no longer hold the same symbolic value as they have in the past. Particularly in cities where the traditional urban fabric has been destroyed, city walls have grown as obsolete monuments, no longer referring to the existing urban structure. Since walls, ditches, and water defenses are wide edges covering larger areas of land, the redefinition of these structures became an important urban planning concern in the nineteenth century. In many cases, obsolete walled edges, viewed as problematic urban components, were demolished as a result of urban modernization in the mid 1800s. During this time, some cities' walls reappeared as public spaces, urban parks and boulevards such as Vienna

Ring Strasse (Ring Street) and Parisian Boulevards. Similarly, as Kostof argues, a Wall Street or Linien Strasse (Line Street) can be found in almost in every city, illustrating how city walls are incorporated into cities as they continued to grow (Kostof 1991). Instead of demolishing city walls, other cities absorbed old walls into their changing urban fabric. This new coexistence of walls with developing spatial structures posed challenges in terms of circulation and use of and around the walls. Whether destroyed or preserved, however, areas in which city walls once existed, have generally been transformed into urban spaces serving the public.

Istanbul illustrates exciting examples of both preservation and destruction of the old city walls. As in Vienna and Paris, walls in the neighborhood Galata were destroyed and new streets and buildings were constructed in their place. On the other hand, in the case of Istanbul's Historic Peninsula, the old city walls were preserved and enclosed with expansive green spaces, serving several public uses. In cases, Galata and the Historic Peninsula, remains or traces of old city walls have become incorporated into the ordinary daily Istanbul life. In this context addressing only archaeological significance, preservation concerns, restoration processes or conservation problems of Istanbul's old city walls is not sufficient for understanding the significance and importance of walls. Contrary to usual interpretations of old city walls as historic heritages, this study intends to reveal Istanbul's walls as public spaces in the contemporary urban context by evaluating two cases: Galata and the Historic Peninsula. Before analyzing the selected cases, a historic and conceptual evaluation of walls is presented in order to clarify the study's main argument. This essay is therefore developed in three parts: first, evaluation of generic characteristics of old city walls and secondly, an examination of the Historic Peninsula and Galata in Istanbul followed by an analytical discussion of these two cases.

Generic characteristics of »Old City Walls«

Istanbul is a unique case that exposes two different ways in which defense walls were treated in the same city. Although, every city has its own specific evolution pattern, a general discussion describing the significance of city walls is useful for this paper. This part of the study therefore examines old city walls and evaluates the conceptual and Historic growth of city walls.

Conceptual evaluation of »Old City Walls«

In order to discuss the problems of walled edges in contemporary cities, it is first necessary to analyze their characteristics. For example, are walls barriers or lines of exchange and interaction? How do walls built in ancient times now serve contemporary cities? Do they create problems or offer opportunities in the restructuring of modern cities? These are some of the questions that will be discussed in this part of the study. In the first part however some general terms such as edge, border, boundary, and interface that directly refer to city walls will be defined; and in the second part of the paper some conceptual theories about city walls and their incorporation into cities will be evaluated.

By defining a rigid outer line away from a city's centre or in deteriorated parts of cities, walls can be identified as »urban edges« where non conforming communities and activities usually settled. As Ashworth describes: »Outside the walls of medieval cities could generally be found those trades too dangerous or noxious to be permitted within« (Ashworth 1991: 130).

»The edge of a city is a philosophical region, where city and natural landscape overlap, existing without choice and expectation. [...] In the middle zone between landscape and city, there is a hope for a new synthesis urban life and urban form.« (Holl 1994: 87)

In the past, walls not only defined city limits, but also functioned as »borders« between spaces in opposition to one another such as the city center and countryside, old town versus new town, urban versus rural, life versus death, controlled versus uncontrolled, closed versus open, and defensive versus non-defensive. Moreover, Deleuze and Guattari's »smooth space« and »striated space« also describe city walls as a confrontation line between smooth and striated. Bonta and Protevi define smooth space as an uncontrollable, non-metric, accentuated and directional space where various landscape features exist. It is a »space of intensive process« (Bonta/Protevi 2004: 143). Whether desert, steppe, sea, or ice, all are types of smooth spaces (Deleuze/Guattari 1987: 534). On the other hand, striated space can be defined as places »that are controlled from some central place above« (Bonta/Protevi 2004: 9) and also »that can be owned, held as stock, distributed, rented, made to produce, and be taxed« (Bonta/Protevi 2004: 80). This conceptual discussion underlines the challenging character of walled zone:

»Smooth space and striated space – nomad space and sedentary space – are not of the same nature. [...] the two spaces exist only in mixture [...] but the two spaces do not communicate with each other in the same way. [...] the simple opposition between the two spaces; the complex differences, the passage from one to another [...] entirely different movements.« (Deleuze/Guattari 1987: 524)

Furthermore, the city wall can be defined as a »boundary«. The term boundary is defined by Bonta and Protevi as »the line between an interior and exterior, or between two states of being, that is in some way fixed rather than fluctuating or in free play« (Bonta/Protevi 2004: 65). This definition emphasizes the hard and rigid qualities of walls. Although walls were constructed around cities to control and sometimes block the circulation of people, money and goods, walls also served interactivity too. In fact, they were the most vital urban elements of old cities, places were cities connected to the external world and interacted with other cultures. The term »interface«, therefore refers to a flexible and transparent edge which is more convenient, but also unusual for the definition of a city wall. Several meanings of the concept can be revealed in the following way:

»[...] the first meaning of the word as 'surface forming a common boundary between two bodies, space or phases'. The second meaning is »the place where independent systems meet and act on, communicate with each other'; broadly, 'an area where diverse things interact'. The third meaning of the term is rather contemporary; interface is referred as the screen of a televised screen. What is common in all these different usages is the concept of interactive boundary: in physical, virtual or metaphoric sense.« (Eral 2001: 18)

Besides these terms that directly refer to wall there are also some basic and contemporary conceptual arguments that emphasize the challenging position of walls in urban context. In a very general term, existence of walls in cities can be discussed based on Kevin Lynch's definitions that he describes in his book *The Image of the City*. Although, as stated by Etlin, »[...] the image of the city can not be entirely explained by the notion of topological »legibility« outlined by Kevin Lynch, in terms of paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks« (Etlin 1994: 2), a brief review of these terms helps to underline the complex nature of walls. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, walls can be described as »edges«; »Edges [...] are the boundaries between two phases, linear breaks in continuity: shores, railroad cuts, walls. [...] Such edges may be barriers [...] which close one region off from another; or they may be seams, lines along which two regions are related and joined together« (Lynch

2000: 47). Being an edge between the inner and outer city, walls often define the historic inner city center in contemporary cities, that can be called »districts«. »Districts are the relatively large city areas which the observer can mentally go inside of, and which have some common character. They can be recognized internally, and occasionally can be used as external reference as a person goes by or toward them« (Lynch 2000: 66). In this context, gates built into city walls are critical elements that facilitate access between the inner district and outer zone. Besides their functional role, gates had also symbolic meanings in the urban life. As Baker describes in the case of Istanbul

»*Top Kapoussi* [...] and in the gateway you may see signs of commercial enterprise, small booths and stalls doing trade in a dignified and oriental way [...]. From sunrise to sunset, this place is full of the sounds and sights that travelers in the East are wont to enjoy, but at night it is given over to haunting memories.« (Baker 1975: 195-196)

The significance of gates is still relevant in contemporary cities. Access between the inner Historic city and outer districts is possible only through the gates. Gates can be identified as urban »nodes« as well. »Nodes are points, the strategic spots in a city into which an observer can enter, and which are the intensive foci to and from which he is traveling. They may be primarily junctions, a crossing or convergence of paths, moments of shift from one structure to another.« (Lynch 2000: 47). On the other hand, walls also function as »landmarks« in both Historic and contemporary urban contexts by being one of the most dominant and significant elements of cities. Lynch describes landmarks as »[...] another type of point reference [...] the observer does not enter within them, they are external. They are usually rather simply defined physical objects [...]« (Lynch 2000: 48), while Yenen, Erkan Biçer & Yüçetürk elaborate: »City walls with towers, gates and walls are distinguished by their construction from the general landscape of a town. [...] Monumental characteristics of city walls cause them to function as references (landmarks)« (Yenen/Biçer/Yüçetürk 2004: 28). Finally, in most contemporary cities, both existing and destroyed city walls became a reference for a linear circulation system in cities – »paths« – as seen in the case of the walls in Istanbul's Historic Peninsula and Galata. »Paths are the channels along which the observer customarily, occasionally, or potentially moves. They may be streets, walkways, transit lines, canals, railroads« (Lynch 2000: 47).

Another way of conceiving city walls is by »territory«. This term does not refer directly to individual walls, but it identifies an area de-

finned by wall. For Deleuze and Guattari people need to mark their territory in some way (1987). Sack's definition of territoriality clarifies this idea: »[...] Territoriality in humans supposes a control over an area or space that must be conceived of and communicated [...] Territoriality in humans is best understood as spatial strategy to affect, influence, or control resources and people, by controlling area [...]« (Sack 1986: 1). Based on these definitions, walls define territory »city« that contains various physical, social, and economic elements that function together.

Sack discusses the term »territory« as an important determinant not only in the definition of ancient cities, but also in the configuration of space too. For him, there are several abstract reasons in the formation of territory:

»Territoriality, then, forms the backcloth to human spatial relations and conceptions of space. [...] People do not just interact in space and move through space like billiard balls. Rather, human interaction, movement and contact are also matter of transmitting energy and information in order to affect, influence and control the ideas and actions of others and their access to resources. Human spatial relations are the result of influence and power. Territoriality is the primary spatial form power takes.« (Sack 1986: 26)

So, in ancient cities, walls embodied the physical configuration of territoriality. But, according to Sack, there is also a social construction of territoriality. Walls can be perceived as the physical emergence of social concerns in ancient cities as well: »[...] territoriality is always socially or humanly constructed in a way that physical distance is not. [...] Territoriality does not exist unless there is an attempt by individuals or groups to affect the interactions of others« (Sack 1986: 30). In this context, territory is an important concept in the production of culture and habits of the city.

Based on these concepts and definitions, some directly referring to walls themselves, (edge, landmark, boundary, interface) while others indicating an urban space defined by wall (district, path, territory), it can be stated that walled edges are among the most challenging and distinctive urban spaces in cities.

Historic Evaluation of »Old City Walls«

The changing position of walls in the urban context is also critical in the representation of contemporary city walls. Throughout history, walls manifested themselves in cities in diverse ways. Like the ever-changing dynamics of the city, the meanings of the city walls also changed: for-

mer symbols and proud of cities turned into obsolete urban spaces. Today, it is hard to understand the significance of walls in the foundation and development of early cities. But, in ancient times, as the need for protection and defense was the most vital necessity for settlers, city walls were among the most important settlement components. Even in the Paleolithic period, men aimed to guard entrance of their caves against external dangers. With the development of a more settled way of life, primitive and temporary defense methods of the Paleolithic period shifted to more systematic structures and early fortifications began to be constructed. These permanent defense structures became important determinants of the size, shape, form, and also culture of early cities. For example, in the pre-classical antiquity »The great importance which Mesopotamians attached to the walls of their cities is reflected in the long and propitious names they gave to them and the fact that they were placed under the protection of deities« (De La Croix 1972: 15). Although development in the technology of weaponry caused modifications in fortification systems, the need to protect cities with walls remained until the modern era.

In fact, defense was not the only function of city walls. Their existence in the urban context exposes various political and symbolic meanings. Politically there was a tendency to provide social control over the limited inner walled city area. »In New York, for example, when the gate was locked for the night and in other cities when the gate was closed, a sense of civic belonging may have been generated, similar to that described by Mumford as one of the advantages of the medieval city.« (Nelson 1961: 21) On the other hand, the presence of walls also had a symbolic significance for cities and citizens as well. They functioned as significant monuments which could impress visitors. As size and design of walls were determined by the wealth and power of the city, some cities were constructed with double or triple wall circuits. As described by Etlin:

»The first requirement for a city's magnificence was to present the approaching visitor with the image of a distinct physical entity. [...] At mid-century, the abbé Marc-Antoine Laugier suggested establishing numerous barriers around Paris. These gateways would be placed at regular distances to transform the perimeters of the city into a regular polygon. Beyond this boundary the city would not be permitted to extend.« (Etlin 1994: 3)

Besides their symbolic, political, and defensive value, walls were also an essential component to the development of urban structure. »The traditional Chinese words for city and the wall are identical [...] The English

word »town« comes from a teutonic word that means hedge or enclosure« (Kostof 1992: 11). As stated by Ashworth, »[...] the wall becomes in many cultures essential to the definition of a city and the very symbol of urbanism itself« (Ashworth 1991: 13). Defense walls limited and marked the boundaries of cities. They emphasized and affected urban form. »Robert Dickinson, in speaking of the relation of the wall to the present »townscape« of European cities, emphasizes that the lie of the streets and the arrangement of the blocks show close adjustment to the wall, even when it has disappeared.« (Nelson 1961: 21) Consequently, old city walls defined, shaped, and also monumentalized the urban structure.

This significance of walls – defensive, political, symbolic and physical – remained approximately until the nineteenth century. With the development of new military technologies, walls lost their significance first in defense and later in other aspects too. At that time, the challenging condition of walls for cities began to emerge. Changing physical, social, and economic structures of cities turned walled edges into obsolete and indefinite borders. In contrast to the restricted form of medieval cities, modernization introduced a new open city model. Haussman's destruction of nineteenth century Paris was the most significant case of such development. Sanitarization and beautification were the two leading concepts of these modernization attempts. So, at that time, by functioning as barriers in expanding cities and also by creating unsanitary urban conditions, city walls turned into unwanted monuments. As mentioned by Nijenhuis »Modernity was characterized by the systematic demolition of strongholds and increasing dysfunctionality of fortresses, city walls and city gates« (Nijenhuis 1994: 13). Therefore, in the nineteenth century, the demolition of walls emerged as the major concern of urban planning in most cities.

After that period, city walls were dealt with in two different ways. In the first case, walls were destroyed as a result of the construction of new boulevards, streets, and parks in their place. In fact, destruction of city walls offered great potentials for modern cities; during this process, new urban components, such as boulevard¹ and esplanade², were introduced.

1 The term boulevard »derived through a French corruption of the Dutch word bolwerk, or artillery bastion« (Ashworth 1991: 170), »originally meant the horizontal portion of a rampart, and eventually the promenade, usually tree lined, laid out on the space made available by a demolished fortification. It is a common feature of many European Cities. Rampart street in New Orleans, Oglethorn Avenue in Savannah [...]« (Nelson 1961: 21).

2 Esplanade refers to a »military-engineering term for the open space in front of fortification« (Ashworth 1991: 170).

The boulevard started as a boundary between city and country. Its structure rests on the defensive wall. [...] In 1670, with the destruction of the medieval walls of Paris and filling of the old moats, these sites were transformed into broad elevated promenades, planted with double rows of trees and accessible to carriages and pedestrians. These tree-lined ramparts eventually became a system of connected public promenades, »a recreational zone at the edge of the city« (Kostof 1991: 249).

Vienna, a city developed within a ring of roman walls, is one of the most remarkable examples of transformed walled edges. In the eighteenth century, the city began to enlarge and expanded outside of its walls. In order to connect the old city with newly developing suburbs, a competition was held in 1859 for the design of empty space left behind by the demolition of the city walls. »The key to the physical reorganization of the city was clearly the removal of the fortifications.« (Sutcliffe 1980: 35) The winning project proposed to construct a »Ring Strasse« (a ring road) lined with theaters, museums, a concert hall, law courts, university buildings, parliamentary buildings, dwellings and parks in the place of old city walls. »Ring Strasse« was a unique case that became a model for other world cities.

In the second case, walls were not demolished, but preserved and continued to exist in the urban context. Today, there are many towns, cities, and even metropolises such as Istanbul that still preserve their former defense walls. For a long period of time, former defense structures remained obsolete and walls that were not destroyed became challenging urban components for many cities. In twentieth century cities, walls lost their symbolic and conceptual representations as well. Once being an interactive boundary, city walls and their surrounding urban spaces are still interactive today? Or, by defining new territories in old cities, are current conditions of walls still forming controlled, civilized urban districts?

These challenging conditions of defense walls in cities today can be identified through the changes in the meaning of territoriality that was the main *raison d'être* of walls in cities. According to Sack, »Territoriality is a primary geographical expression of social power. It is the means by which space and society are interrelated. Territoriality's changing functions helps us to understand the Historic relationships between society, space, and time.« (Sack 1986: 5) As mentioned before, the limited closed form of cities was no longer adequate for current urban development. Although the concept of territory is still valid in contemporary societies, it does not express itself as an architectural monument in the urban structure. So, today, many old city walls exist in cities today without their original physical, social, or symbolic functions.

Further challenging issues are the changing urban concepts that have, in part, lead the development of contemporary cities. Most of the terms describing former urban developments and their possible relationships with surrounding walls lost their significance. As contemporary urban development is produced mostly under the dominance of global relations, attraction of international investment became one of the most determining factors in the development of cities. In this context, transformation, regeneration, revitalization, redevelopment, and renewal of existing deteriorated or obsolete urban lands in city centers emerged as one of the most significant attempts in the redefinition of the cities' image. »Large areas of the city appear to be uncared for, forming an entropic landscape returning to a condition of nature. The contradictions in the contemporary cityscape are creating new fields of action for architects and planners.« (Woodroffe/Papa/Macburnie 1994: 8) These spaces, empty in terms of function and meaning, create an ambiguous setting. On the other hand, existence of obsolete and ruined urban lands cause problems in the social, cultural, and physical analysis of the city as well. They are obsolete but at the same time they are dynamic. In most cases, obsolete spaces generate various urban processes which are generally unsafe and marginal. Furthermore, due to the increasing urbanization in the second half of twentieth century, obsolete buildings and lands became potential urban areas in the development of cities. These vacant structures encourage urban transformation processes:

»How do we read and interpret the tangle of overlapping and intertwined stories that this collection of people, objects and events offers? As we walk down what seems to be an endless labyrinth, we may wonder about change in this urban scene. We may be conscious of a constant transformation of this landscape, or rather cityscape, around us, a mutation that we have come to associate with livelihood. Without movement and change, we have learnt, there is no life.« (Madanipour 1996: ix)

But, different from the other vacant urban structures, old city walls are generating unusual processes in cities. Their architectural structure is not suitable for a functional transformation and on the other hand they still function as boundaries in current cities. Hence, old city walls are challenging obsolete structures, even without transforming, revitalizing, regenerating, or redeveloping contemporary cities.

Old city walls of Istanbul

Romance and history of walled cities are inseparable. We have not felt this to be so at the sight of hoary ruins lichen-clad and ivy-mantled, that proudly rear their battered crests despite the ravages of time and man's destructive instincts. It is within walled cities that the life of civilized man began: the walls guarded him against barbarian foes, behind their shelter he found the security necessary to his cultural development, in their defense he showed his finest qualities. And such a city and such a history is that of Ancient Byzantium, the City of Constantine, the Castle of Caesar (Baker 1975: vii).

Throughout history defense structures have always been significant components of Istanbul. They were urban elements that shaped and dominated the physical and social structures of the city. Even today, both existing walls and traces of disappeared walls have led to Istanbul's urban configuration. As mentioned before, Istanbul is one of the unique cities with two typical cases in the evolution of walls; »demolished walls« of Galata and »preserved walls« of the Historic Peninsula. Although the Historic Peninsula and Galata area situated on the opposite sides of Golden Horn, close to each other, their urban development differed greatly from one another (figure 1).




Figure 1: Historic Peninsula's and Galata's walls (Morris 1979: 64)

City walls in the Historic Peninsula experienced a different evolution than the walls of Galata (table 1). In Galata, the old settlement walls were destroyed and redesigned as urban streets. In that case, the emergence of walls in the city context as public space is very apparent. On the other hand, in the case of the Historic Peninsula, old city walls still exist within the urban fabric. But in this case too, walls define a zone in which various public activities take place. In this context, in the following part of the study, these two opposing cases will be analyzed.




Table 1: Historic evolution of Galata's defense walls and Historic Peninsula walls (made by the author)

From wall to urban street: The case of Galata

Similar to Vienna, walls in nineteenth century Ottoman cities also underwent significant transformations. Ottoman ambassadors, who lived in Europe, described boulevards, parks, squares and grid plans of European cities with great enthusiasm when they returned to Istanbul. At that period, a desire to restructure Ottoman cities after Western models followed. The nineteenth century is a period of Westernization not only within the city scale, but also in many other fields of the Empire. Within this scope, the Tanzimat Decree of May 1939 caused radical changes in the structure of the Ottoman Empire. As mentioned by Yerasimos, the existing condition of Ottoman cities was totally rejected by the statement of the Decree. With the declaration of the Tanzimat Decree the term »modern« became a key word in almost all of the Empire's urban attempts. Galata was the first settlement in the Empire that experienced such modernization process. Throughout history, Galata, being situated at the opposite site of the Golden Horn, had been always a significant settlement and port in the history of Istanbul. Like the other port cities, various ethnic and religious groups settled in Galata. In fifteenth century, Italians, Jews, Armenians, and Turks were living in Galata, each in their own neighborhood separated by walls.



Figure 2: Former walls of Galata



Figure 3: Renewed streets of Galata in 19th century (Çelik 1998: 10)

The nineteenth century was the most critical period in the history of Galata's settlement. Many new urban standards and ideas were implemented for the first time in Galata. Among the most remarkable was the demolition of the old walls and construction of new streets in their place in 1860's (figure 2-3). As mentioned by Akın, Galata's walls were two meters wide and 2,8 kilometers length, enclosing an area of 37 hectares. There was a ditch 15 meters wide on the northern side of the wall (Akin

1998). The demolition of Galata's walls therefore offered great potentials in the formation of a new street network. This new wide, linear, paved, and planted streets were constructed based on European models, still largely unfamiliar to Ottoman cities at the time. In this regard, former defense walls of the district turned into urban streets and facilitated public access between the Karaköy waterfront and inner neighborhoods such as Pera. As Galata was Istanbul's business and commercial district, the new streets strongly influenced public life. Today, more than a century later, these streets still exist, while the traces of old city walls of Galata are still visible in the contemporary street pattern of the district.

From walled edges to green zones: The case of the Historic Peninsula

During the evolution of the city, various city walls were constructed in the Historic Peninsula including Byzantion Wall, Septemius Wall, Constantin Wall and Theodosius Wall. In particular Theodosius Wall is of great significance in terms of size, strength, and construction technique. Land walls are the most important part of this system. They are composed of three parts, including a ditch, a front wall and a great wall. These walls therefore cover a large area of land in the city. Their immense size makes these walls among the most remarkable urban spaces, even in contemporary Istanbul.

At the end of nineteenth century, similar to the plans for Galata, authorities planned to destroy the walls in the Historic Peninsula and to sell the lands obtained through the demolition. This attempt was highly criticized, and subsequently the walls remained. The presence of the walls, however, lends the Historic Peninsula a more distinctive character since it is home to one of the few remains of Constantinople's city walls.

The history of land walls can be evaluated in four main periods (table 2). As in many other cities, walls were the most dominant and significant architectural monuments of Constantinople. Not only did walls facilitate the interaction of the city with its surrounding regions, but the walls also hosted diverse urban events. Besides their defense and territorial control capacities, walls also served cultural and symbolic meanings in the life of the city and citizens. Gates situated along the walls produced memorable moments in the history of the city. Moreover, they also served for both military and public uses. The gates became a major focus of stories and legends of the city. As described by Baker: »This is the Golden Gate, the ›Porta Aurea‹ of so many glorious moments in the life of Constantine's great city« (Baker 1975: 126). So, walls of this early period can be identified as the symbol and proud of the city:

»[...] Nearby three centuries later another Emperor, Heraclius, entered in triumph through this gateway, on his return from the Persian wars. One hundred years later Constantine Copronymus followed through these golden arches, after defeating the Bulgarians. Then came Theophilus in the middle of the ninth century, to celebrate his hard-won victories over the Saracens.« (Baker 1975: 141)




Table 2: Evolution model of the Historic Peninsula land walls (made by the author)

But, the glorious image of the city walls began to decline in nineteenth century due to the development of new defense technologies and the emergence of urban modernization that caused various changes in the life of citizens. Although for most of the citizens and authorities, demolition of walls was a significant practice in the development of a modern and well organized city, others were opposed to their demolition. They argued that with the destruction a great amount of Historic value would be erased from the urban fabric. Differing from the Galata case, land walls in the Historic Peninsula were preserved. However, at that time, the walls began to function as obsolete monuments as described by Baker:

»Climbing a bank, we reach a little Turkish Cemetery, its weird and tumbling tombstones shaded by those solemn, watchful cypress-trees. Now look towards the walls: between us and them is a deep fosse, where fig trees grow and throw out their twisted branches as if to protect these ancient ramparts from crumbling further to decay.« (Baker 1975: 126)

It is after this period that the challenging and problematic condition of walls in the city began. These monumental structures and their surrounding urban lands became potential locations for many legal and illegal activities; activities that differed greatly from traditional functions of the wall. Due to the increasing population from the 1950 onwards, new neighborhoods began to expand outwards. Obsolete walled zones became places of uncontrollable and unauthorized developments. Small-scale manufacturing, warehouses, and illegal houses existed on the ruins of walls. At that time, city walls gained a poor reputation, known for their lack of safety.

In 1980's a new period began in the history of landwalls. With the addition of city walls to the World Architectural Heritage list in 1985, the preservation of walls arose as the major concern for the Istanbul Municipality and government. Between 1985 and 1989, the Istanbul Municipality restored walls in the Historic Peninsula. Murat Belge describes this attempt: »Maybe, Turks were the only nation in the world who constructs walls in twentieth century« (Belge 2000, translated by the author).

As previously mentioned, besides their architectural values, walls consume space due to their triple defense system. Conservation of land that was shaped by ditches and ramparts therefore became the main planning concern in the Historic Peninsula district, where a green zone was constructed along the walls. This green zone enhanced by various recreational activities, such as sport fields, playgrounds, and tea-gardens. Through this process, the former land walls - Constantinople's ancient defense structure - today serve as a background for various public uses. The transformation of the walls into a green zone can be understood through various planning attempts that took place during the twentieth century. In 1939 Henri Prost urban developed a plan for the city of Istanbul. Until then the walls were ignored for many years due to wars and economical recessions. The main intention of Prost's plan was to modernize the city without destroying its archaeological and architectural values. So, conservation of the land walls was proposed and construction of new buildings was restricted in an area of 500m from the walls. Although Prost's plan was not totally implemented, it became a guide for future planning attempts.

In the second half of twentieth century, several conservation plans were also proposed for the Historic Peninsula. But, at that period, changing urban conditions of the city generated various undesirable developments. The city's population increased and new neighborhoods were constructed to keep up with the growth. In order to facilitate access to new suburbs in the growing city, transportation became the main concern. In an effort to ease traffic congestion, the Historic Peninsula's traditional structure was destroyed; existing narrow streets were widened and new transportation axes were constructed.

These infrastructural changes also affected the condition of the land walls. Some gates were enlarged. Moreover, due to rapid urbanization caused by migration, walls also served as illegal residential and working places too. Illegal housing units, warehouses, and small-scale manufacturers set up in deteriorated areas near land walls. To prevent these unauthorized developments, similar to Prost's plan, regulations requiring a continuous green zone within 500 meters of the wall's edge were proposed as part of the 1964 Historic Peninsula inner wall plan. The green zone included cemeteries and *bostan*³ and was intended to isolate and protect the wall. Despite these regulations, however, the undesirable condition of the area did not change.

Another planning approach that emphasized the potentials of walls as urban space is Istanbul's 1990 Conservation Plan. The main object of the plan was to develop the Historic Peninsula as a tourist, culture, and recreation area. In this scope, various recreational activities were proposed along the walls and their surroundings. Consequently, land walls were defined within a protected green zone in all subsequent plans developed for the district. However, such planning and design approaches are not appropriate for the development of these lands. Land walls continued to serve – and are still serving – as a boundary, border, edge, or urban interface. Vehicular and human traffic between the Historic Peninsula and outer districts is still passing through gates. This controversial fact is in conflict with the contemporary planning concepts and Istanbul's urban condition:

»For people who live within the area surrounded by walls, city walls are border elements, both physically and visually. For instance, the highway and open space left to the west of the land walls in the Historic peninsula strengthened this peculiarity; city walls define a specified area for settlement and control

3 *Bostan* is a Turkish word that means vegetable garden. Throughout the history *bostan* has been always an important element of the city. Due to the rapid urbanization in 1960's most of them were destroyed and new buildings were constructed in the place of *bostan*.

access in and out through the gates and harbors.« (Yenen/Biçer/Yüçetürk 2004: 28)

Lastly, in 2005, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality approved a new Conservation Master Plan for Historic Peninsula. This plan involved several principles for the development of land walls and their surrounding areas as well. According to the plan, the use of land walls, ramparts and ditches for cultural purposes is essential. Moreover, parks, recreational areas and open spaces for the exhibition of archeological relics will be also constructed along the land walls (İBB Planlama ve İmar Daire Başkanlığı 2003).

Consequently, the city of Istanbul is experiencing various remarkable transformation processes. Former decayed and abandoned urban areas – especially old industrial zones in the Golden Horn district – were developed as new cultural and recreational centers. Such projects became important instruments in the remaking of Istanbul's urban image and also for the city's marketing in the global network. In this context, urban lands that cannot be transformed, revitalized, or regenerated become challenging spaces. Former defense zones of Constantinople became public spaces hosting uses and activities such as *bostan*, sport fields, and parks all placed in a green line parallel to the land walls. Today, walls serve entirely different purposes than they did in ancient times. »Standing on the ramparts of this ancient stronghold it is difficult to realize the old days of stress and storm. In the clear air and sunshine life seems too serene for the fierce passions that drove a swarm of Saracens in repeated attacks against the grey walls.« (Baker 1975: 149) In spite of their calm appearance, there is a hidden complexity in the contemporary walls and their surrounding urban spaces.

Conclusion

In contemporary cities, meanings and perceptions of ancient defense walls have entirely changed. By defining two different environments – inside and outside – city walls were places of exchanges in ancient times. Walls marked urban peripheries; they defined important edges, boundaries, borders, and territories in the city. But, in nineteenth century these principal characteristics of walls changed. Being situated in city centers, they became obstacles between the old center and newly developing peripheral districts. The development of city walls thereafter emerged in two diverse ways; some city walls were destroyed and others were conserved. In both cases walls underwent various transformations:

they were transformed from edges to paths, from celebrated urban symbols to dull urban spaces, from hard edges to loose historic monuments. Therefore, besides being important historic heritage, city walls exist in contemporary urban contexts in a new way as public spaces. The city of Istanbul is a remarkable example of this argument. Although Galata and the Historic Peninsula experienced different urban evolutions, walls or traces of walls reappeared as public spaces in both cases.

»In Europe today a number of boulevards and other streets follow the lines of former walls [...]. Are open spaces present or is there land in public use as the result of the location of former fortifications? Are there any other features present in today's urban landscape that reflect the presence of earlier walls?« (Nelson 1961: 2)

These questions can be asked in the case of Galata. Situated on a sloping terrain, Galata has a dense urban pattern. In late eighteenth century, new districts outside the walls on the north side of Galata were built. After some time, however, the presence of the wall restricted accessibility from the waterfront to upper neighborhoods. In an effort to redevelop and facilitate circulation, patterns based on western cities, led to the destruction of Galata's walls. Although, Galata's old city walls do not exist in the contemporary city, their traces can be easily recognized in the street pattern of the district. In the case of Galata's, the old walls were transformed into urban spaces including both public and private uses. Moreover, as Galata was divided into several districts by walls, after the demolition, streets that were constructed in the place of walls formed a street network that facilitates public access.

On the other hand, the condition in the Historic Peninsula is very different, and more challenging, than Galata. Land walls in the Historic Peninsula defined a strict edge between the inner and outer zones of the city. Although settlements began to grow outwards in twentieth century, their control within the urban formation continued. Today, the linear and continuous character of the walls remains a remarkable sight within this urban context. Historic Peninsula's land walls form a different type of urban space. Unlike those in Galata, the walls in the Historic Peninsula do not form a network, but exist in the city as one singular urban element defining an urban zone. This zone serves a variety of public uses. Sport fields, parks, *bostan* and also some illegal uses such as guards who control the vehicular traffic on the gate of walls all take place in the area along the walls. Moreover, land walls play both physically and conceptually complex role in the daily life of citizens. They still serve as barriers, as interaction nodes (through gates), as historic landmarks, as ve-

hicular and pedestrian paths or as unsafe districts. Despite the challenging nature of the activities around the wall, all recent planning attempts protect city walls as historic monuments and preserve a green zone around them. This approach has defined the development of several public spaces and uses along walls; however, largely ambiguous, unsafe and mostly problematic public spaces have emerged.

By evaluating two opposing cases – Galata and the Historic Peninsula this study sets out to analyze new interpretations of old city walls as public spaces. Today, Istanbul's old defense walls are rarely evaluated as urban components in academic researches and studies. Most of the time, walls are revealed as an issue of restoration, urban conservation, or within the context of historic studies. But, existence of old city walls in contemporary Istanbul is also an issue of urban planning and design. Therefore they have to be discussed in the scope of landscape architecture, urban design, and urban planning disciplines as well.

References

- Akin, N. (1998): 19.Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Galata ve Pera, İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık.
- Ahunbay, Z./Ahunbay, M. (2004): »Conservation of the Land Walls of İstanbul and Proposals for Future Work«. In: G. Perbellini (Ed.), Restoration and Evaluation of The Walled City Of İstanbul, Netherland: Europa Nostra Bulletin 58, pp.15-20.
- Ashworth, G. J. (1991): War And The City, London: Routledge.
- Baker, G. (1975): The Walls Of Constantinople, New York: James Pott&Co.
- Bekkering, J. (1994): »Periphery of the Heart«. Architectural Design 64, no 3/4, pp. 36-39.
- Belge, M. (2000): İstanbul Gezi Rehberi, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Bonta, M./Protevi, J. (2004): Deleuze and Geophilosophy: A Guide and Glossary, Edinburgh: Edinburgh Pres.
- Çelik, Z. (1998): 19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Başkenti Değişen İstanbul, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Deleuze, G./Guattari, F. (1987): Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.
- Erkal, N. (2001): »Haliç Extra-Mural Zone: A Spatio-Temporal Framework for Understanding the Architecture of the Istanbul City Frontier« (Ph.D. Thesis), University of Metu.

- Etlin, R. (1994): *Symbolic Space*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Holl, S. (1994): »Edge Of A City«. *Architectural Design* 64, no 3/4, pp. 87-89.
- Hort de la Croix (1972): *Military Considerations in City Planning: Fortifications*, New York: George Braziller.
- İBB Planlama ve İmar Daire Başkanlığı (2003): *Tarihi Yarımada 1/5000 Ölçekli Koruma Amaçlı Nazım İmar Planı Raporu*, İstanbul: İBB.
- Kostof, S. (1992): *The City Assembled*, Canada: Bulfinch Press.
- Kostof, S. (1991): *The City Shaped. Urban Patterns and Meanings through History*, Canada: Bulfinch Press.
- Lynch, K. (2000): *The Image of the City*, USA: MIT Press (Twenty-Seventh Printing).
- Madanipour, A. (1996): *Design of Urban Space*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Morris, A.E. J. (1979): *History of Urban Form Before The Industrial Revolution*, Harlow: Longman Scientific & Technical.
- Nelson, H. J. (1961): »Walled Cities of the United States«. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 51, pp. 1-22.
- Nijenhuis, W. (1994): »City Frontiers and Their Disappearance«. *Architectural Design* 64, no 3/4, pp.12-17.
- Özler, Ş. (2007): *Cumhuriyet Dönemi İstanbul Planlama Raporları 1934-1995*, İstanbul: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası İstanbul Büyükkent Şubesi.
- Prost, H. (1938): *İstanbul Nazım Planı İzah Eden Rapor*, İstanbul: İstanbul Belediyesi Matbaası.
- Sutcliffe, A. (1980): *The Rise of Modern Planning 1800-1914*, London: Mansell.
- Sack, R. D. (1996): *Human Territoriality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woodroffe, J./Papa, D./Macburnie, I. (1994): »An Introduction«. *Architectural Design* 64, no 3/4, pp. 6-11
- Yenen, Z./Biçer, N. E./Yüçetürk, E. (2004): »Transformation of the Meaning of the City Walls of İstanbul«. In: Perbellini, Gianni (ed.), *Restoration and Evaluation Of The Walled City Of İstanbul*, Netherland: Europa Nostra Bulletin 58, pp. 21-30.
- Yerasimos, S. (1999): »Tanzimatın Kent Reformları Üzerine«. In: Dumanot, Paul/Georgeon, Francois (ed.), *Modernleşme Sürecinde Osmanlı Kentleri*, İstanbul, pp. 1-18.

Regenerating »Public Istanbul«.

Two Projects on the Golden Horn

SENEM ZEYBEKOĞLU

Today, under the impacts of economic globalization, many of the world's largest cities are witnessing major economic and spatial restructuring (Fainstein 1990), a multidimensional process involving international flows of capital, goods, people, cultural values and consumption of information (Van Kempen/Marcuse 1997) on a non-tangible level. On physical level, developments in transportation and communication technologies (Giddens 1998), the changing spatial structure of economic activities (Van Kempen/Marcuse 1997), and the increasing ability of transnational companies to conduct transactions in non-spaces (Judd/Parkinson 1990) are also part of this economic globalization. Furthermore, the declining autonomy of the nation states over the control of their economies (Sassen 1998) is also leading to economic restructuring in many cities.

Within this changing economic environment, major cities find themselves in severe competition. Cities competing for mobile capital invest in technological infrastructures and transportation systems such as airports, highways, bridges. To attract headquarters of transnational companies, cities invest in high-tech office-buildings and luxurious residential enclaves to house their workers in. To appease the newly emerging professional class who is part of this new economic system, many cities are providing more spaces for consumption and recreational activities. Major festivals, sports events, concerts and international conferences that a growing number of cities are hosting are also indicators of a newly emerging international economy (Short/Kim 1999).

With the election of Turgut Özal's neo-liberal Motherland Party (ANAP) in 1983, Turkey also began to feel the impacts of economic globalization. While the exact nature of economic restructuring, privatization and liberalization in the 1980s depended on the ruling power of Turkey's central government, Turkey's large scale economic restructuring was concurrent with that of other countries at that time.¹ During this period, Istanbul was designated and promoted as a »world city« (Türkün/Kurtuluş 2005) and experienced major infrastructural and spatial changes. New highways were built, and a second bridge over Bosphorus was constructed. A new master plan allocated certain parts of the city to international business district (Öktem 2005), new residential and recreational areas serving the emerging upper and middle classes were built (Gürsel 1990), and formerly publicly governed parts of the city, such as docklands and railway yards were sold to private enterprises (Bilsel 2006). This period also witnessed the implementation of various urban regeneration projects, including transformation of former industrial areas into new cultural or educational areas, and rehabilitation of historic districts.

Within this context, the main objective of this essay is to analyze the spatial ramifications of urban regeneration process in Istanbul's Golden Horn area. The essay will focus on two regeneration projects, Bilgi University's Santral Istanbul Campus in Silahtaraga district and Kadir Has University's Kadir Has Campus in Cibali district, in order to seek answers to the following questions: In what ways did the foundation universities take place in the urban regeneration process of Istanbul? On what terms and according to what values do these universities shape themselves and their discourses? And last but not least: In what ways do they transform the publicness of the Golden Horn area?

The essay is divided into four main parts. The first part will give brief historical introduction of the Golden Horn area. The second part of the paper will evaluate the transformation of the public sphere in Turkey since the establishment of the republic. The emergence of the Foundation Universities in Turkey after 1980s is discussed next. The final part of the essay evaluates the two newly established foundation universities

1 For a more detailed reading on Istanbul's encounter with globalization and the restructuring of the city, see: Keyder, Çağlar/Öncü, Ayşe (1994): »Globalization of a Third-World Metropolis: Istanbul in the 1980s«. Review, 17/3, 383-421; Öktem, Binnur (2005): »Küresel Kent Söyleminin Kentsel Mekânı Dönüştürmedeki Rolü: Büyükdere-Maslak Aksı«. in Kurtuluş, Hatice (Ed.) Istanbul'da Kentsel Ayırışma, Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar, Istanbul: Bağlam; Gürsel, Yücel (1990): Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Kent ve İnsan, Istanbul: E Yayınları.

and their campuses, with the aim of understanding their attitudes towards their urban environment, their position within the international academic arena, and the role they play in the public life of the city.

The Golden Horn: A history of urban modernization

»Golden Horn« is the name given to the estuary which separates the European part of Istanbul into two parts, namely the Historical Peninsula and Galata (Map 1). The Golden Horn, creating a natural opening to the city, developed as a commercial centre and a port, connecting Istanbul to the world of trade. Not only the international trading but also people of different ethnicities and religious origins (Greeks, Armenians, Jews and Muslims), who lived in the area, gave the Golden Horn its multicultural identity. The Golden Horn's important economic function, resulting from its geographical significance especially having sea access and proximity to important centers such as the Historical Peninsula and Beyoğlu district, one of Istanbul's cultural arteries, played a central role in Istanbul's development and also provided many attractive features for potential investors.²



Map 1: The location of the Golden Horn in Istanbul

- 2 For a more detailed reading on the history of the Golden Horn, see: Korkmaz, T. (2006): »On the Regeneration of the Golden Horn«. In Sarkis, H./Dwyer, M./Kibar, P. (eds.), *Two Squares: Martyrs Square, Beirut and Sirkeci Square, Istanbul*, Cambridge/MA; London: Harvard University, Graduate School of Design, 96-113; Çelik, Z. (1986): *The Remaking of Istanbul Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.

During the late Ottoman period, the Golden Horn continued its growth as an industrial area with the establishment of industrial compounds, such as Feshane Fes Making Factory and Cibali Tobacco Factory during the 19th century. In early 20th century the Golden Horn became Istanbul's electricity producing center with the establishment of Silahtarağa Electric Central. These factories, established with foreign and domestic capital, did not only introduce a new architectural typology to Istanbul, but also re-structured socio-spatial relations in the area (Gümüş 2006).

After the establishment of republic in Turkey in 1923, Turkey's government capital was relocated from Istanbul to Ankara, resulting in the redirection of modernization efforts by the government to the new capital (Kezer 1999). As a consequence, Istanbul faced problems of shrinkage and a declining economy in the 1920s (Tekeli 1991). In 1936, in an effort to inject the former capital with much needed economic growth, Henri Prost, French architect and planner, who had prepared a master plan for Paris in 1934, was invited to set up a development plan for Istanbul (Tekeli 1991, 1994; Gül/Lamb 2004). In his proposal, Prost allocated the shores of the Golden Horn for the »development of national commerce and local industry« (Gül/Lamb 2004: 79). With that aim, »[...] areas extending from the Atatürk Bridge towards the source of the Golden Horn were allocated for large scale industry« (Gül/Lamb 2004: 79). He also proposed the renewal of the northern shore of the Golden Horn, which entailed the destruction of many buildings in old neighbourhoods (Gül / Lamb 2004: 80).

In the late 1950s »the largest urban modernization project in Turkish History« (Tanyeli 2002: 93) spearheaded by the Prime Minister of the time. Two objectives of the modernization project, according to Tekeli, »[...] seem to have underlined this reconstruction program. One was to solve traffic congestion and the other was to adorn the city. Both objectives were in conformity with the approach of the Prost Plan« (Tekeli 1994: 118).

As the industrial core of the city, Golden Horn from the 1950s onwards was »invaded« by squatter settlements. Industrial production, its accompanying pollution, and the squatter settlements remained major characteristics of the Golden Horn until 1980s (Korkmaz 2006: 110).

The election of Bedrettin Dalan, a member of ANAP, as Istanbul's Municipality Mayor in 1984 marked an important turning point in the city's history. His economic policies, in line with those of the central government, formed the determining vision for the city (Gürsel 1990). His aim was to »transform Istanbul from a tired city whose glory resided in past history, into a metropolis full of promise for the twenty-first century« (Keyder/Öncü 1993 cited in Aksoy/Robins 1994: 58). Dalan was also in-

terested in transforming the Golden Horn area, which – from his point of view – posed an obstacle for the city’s development in accordance with his aims (Bezmez 2007). In addition to these economic policies, a major structural change in the city administration was also introduced which equipped the mayor with enormous authorization and power over the city (Keyder/Öncü, 1994).

During his mayoralty, Dalan commenced a »cleaning« operation in the Golden Horn, which resulted with the de-industrialization of the area. Many factories were moved to the outskirts of the city and the negative effects of pollution were reduced. The price paid for this partial success was the loss of many important monuments, telling of Istanbul’s industrial heritage. The remaining buildings were either demolished or remained empty for years. Furthermore, recreation areas built to replace the old complexes today still remain vacant (Korkmaz 2006: 109).

Within the last two decades, former industrial complexes around the shores of the Golden Horn began to be transformed into cultural and educational functions, including universities, cultural centers, museums and exhibition areas. Through their functions as spaces of gathering and communication, these newly emerging cultural and educational facilities carry the potential of turning into public spheres. Thus these projects bring forth their own definitions of openness, accessibility and publicness.

Transformation of the public sphere in the Turkish context

In his article, »The Ideological Transformation of the Public Sphere: The Case of Turkey«, Ömer Çaha discusses the transformation of the public sphere in Turkey, focusing on the developments after the establishment of the Republic in Turkey (Çaha 2005). He describes the period between the years 1925-1980 as the »process of a closed public« (Çaha 2005: 18). The establishment of the republic in Turkey, a project of modernity, aimed at creating a modern and civilized Turkish state and society in accordance with the norms and values of the western world (Tekeli 1999). These modernizing efforts carried out by the Turkish political elite became visible in many aspects of life, from architecture and urban planning to education, from politics to daily life, from language to culture. New official buildings were constructed in order to reflect the power and authority of the state. In each city a boulevard was named af-

ter Atatürk³, while iconic statues of him adorned cities' prominent squares. Public houses were introduced to small towns and villages in order to teach people the values and norms of a civilized and westernized modern daily life (Yeşilkaya 1999). The education system was based on training »loyal citizens in the official ideology« (Çaha 2005: 20).

The reflection of this modernization project on the social and cultural life of Turkish society was the imposition of a unifying and homogenizing official culture against the »[...] actual culture, with its religious, ethnic, linguistic and cultural pluralism« (Aksoy/Robins 1997: 1938). Aksoy and Robins describe this as the »culture of repression« and continue: »The elite sought to maintain order against the (imagined and feared) forces of disorder, and this has pitted »official« culture against »real« culture, state against civil society, and centre against periphery« (Aksoy/Robins 1997: 1938).

The state's attitude was also evident in its total control and hegemony over public life in Turkey. According to Çaha, »[t]he government unitized public life by prohibiting the existence of media, independent organizations, associations, social movements, political parties or an ordinary social organization outside the government structure« (Çaha 2005: 18).

During the single party period, the homogenizing power of the state continued to promote its official ideology. After 1950, with the introduction of the multiparty system, this hegemony started to break down, giving way to the development of some political and social resistances. According to Keyder, this was the »[...] defence of local culture against a transformed [...] and authoritarian great culture, the upholding of mass values against elitism [...]« (Keyder 1993 cited in Aksoy/Robins 1997: 1939). Despite including some elements necessary for a civil public life, it was still impossible to talk about an independent and unified public sphere in the period between 1950 and 1980s (Çaha 2005: 20).

From the mid 1980s, Turkey has been going through a process of socio-economic and political changes, the nature of which depended on the global forces and neo-liberal economic policies practiced by the central governments at time. For Aksoy and Robins (1997: 1945) »the logic of globalization was breaking open Turkey's protectionist economy and subverting its inward-looking and defensive political stance«. According to their account, the »synchronization« of Turkey »with a rapidly changing world« brought about an »ideological deconstruction« for Turkey (Aksoy/Robins 1997: 1939). Çaha describes this period as a crisis situa-

3 Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is the founder of the Turkish Republic.

tion for the ideological public sphere in Turkey, due to pressures from different elements of civil society (Çaha 2005: 21).

In accordance with these developments, voices of diverse and conflicting elements began to be heard within the public sphere. For Turkish people, the ideological discourse of the state started to loose ground and there was a shift towards a discourse of »rights«. The commencement of broadcasting of private TV channels during the 1980s facilitated this development (Aksoy/Robins 1997), and the state started to develop a more moderate approach towards the emergence of civil society organizations. This was also a period during which the state started to allow the establishment of foundation universities.

The emergence of foundation universities in Turkey

The 2007 report of Turkey's Higher Education Council (HEC) indicates that there has been a growing gap between the demand and supply for higher education in the last 30 years. The presence of the foundation universities, which are founded by private foundations for non-profit goals and which are in essence private Turkish universities, is essential in order to accommodate the increasing demand and reduce growing pressure on public universities (HEC 2007).

According to Article 130 of Turkey's 1982 constitution, the state is the primary provider of higher education services. The same article allows the establishment of higher educational institutions by private foundations under the supervision and control of the state. In accordance with this law, Bilkent University was established in 1984 as the first Turkish foundation university (HEC 2007).

By allowing the opening of foundation universities, it is clear that the State changed its attitude towards the higher education system, which previously was subject to the total control by the state (Yalçınan/Thornley 2007). The opening of these new »private« foundation universities accelerated Turkey's globalization process and injected cities in which the universities were located with further economic growth (Yalçınan/Thornley 2007).

Yalçınan and Thornley's article, »Globalization, Higher Education and Urban Growth Coalitions: Turkey's Foundation Universities and the Case of Koç University in Istanbul«, relates the changes in the higher education system around the world in context with the globalization processes and the emergence of an information society. With reference to Manuel Castells' works, they claim that in the global age, »informa-

tion and knowledge« are accepted to be the most important aspects of production in order to achieve economic and social development. This line of thinking brings the authors to the concept of an information society, in which »[...] information becomes real capital as well as the real source of wealth« (Yalçınan/Thornley 2007: 823). The service sectors which use the information and innovative technologies predominantly have been replacing the traditional industrial production sectors. These service sectors emphasize the importance of »human capital«, which needs to be created via »[...] the processes of education, training, research and specialization«, for economic development (Yalçınan/Thornley 2007: 824), and higher education institutions are the places where this human capital is produced.

Even if the HEC report justifies an increase in the foundation universities by arguing that the government was merely responding to Turkey's increasing demands for higher education, it is clear that the government also responded to the demands of the global economy too. Considering the restructuring of the country in accordance with the neo-liberal economy policies of the time, this shift was not unpredictable.

On closer examination of the foundation universities themselves, it is possible to observe their efforts to position themselves in accordance with the requirements of the global market economy. This effort is evident even in their advertisement slogans which frequently make use of words and phrases such as »globalization«, »relationships with international academic environments«, »education in world quality«, etc. In addition, most of the foundation universities' academic programs cater towards the demands of the service sector; administration, law, advertisement, etc are among the subjects most commonly offered at these universities. Finally, most of the foundation universities chose to locate in Turkey's largest metropolises such as Istanbul, Ankara and İzmir. This indicates that they want to be »[...]a node in the wider network« of global flows of »capital, people, ideas, goods and technology in Turkey« (Yalçınan/Thornley 2007: 832).

Santral Istanbul – From an electric central to a center of cultures

Santral (Central) Istanbul is the name of a cultural and educational complex, which occupies the former site and buildings of Silahtarağa Electric Central. It is located in Silahtarağa district on the northern bank of the Golden Horn. The factory complex was transformed by Bilgi University and now houses various cultural functions such as museums, a

library, exhibition areas, and some of the programs of Bilgi University. While Bilgi University has restored the existing buildings to accommodate cultural facilities and new educational functions, it has also invested in new buildings (Aksoy 2007).



Figure 1: New and the old buildings together at Santral Istanbul, photo by Senem Zeybeykoğlu

Silahtarağa Electric Central was built in 1911 by the Austrian-Hungarian »Ganz« Electric Company under the name Osmanlı Anonim Elektrik Şirketi (Ottoman Anonym Electric Company) and during its life passed through many hands. In 1914, when the facility started to produce energy for the first time, it was handed over to SOFINA (Societe Financiere de Transports et d'Entreprises Industrielles a Bruxelles). In 1923, SOFINA made an agreement with the newly established republican government and changed the company name to Türk Anonim Şirketi (Turkish Anonym Company). In 1937, the state purchased the Silahtarağa Electric Central. In 1939, the central started to operate under the newly established Istanbul Electric, Tram and Tunnel Enterprise (İETT). In 1962, İETT alienated the electric central to Etibank. The complex was handed over to the Turkish Electricity Institution (TEK) in 1970. In 1983, the factory ceased functioning, and in 1991 it was declared as a cultural heritage complex by the Council of Preservation of Cultural and Natural Properties (Aksoy 2007: 29).

According to the conditions set out by The Council of Preservation of Cultural and Natural Properties, the future use of the factory complex was limited to educational and cultural purposes (Kadak 2005). In 2004,

Bilgi Foundation acquired a 20 years lease from the Ministry of Energy and Natural Sources, a period in which Bilgi intends to transform the area into a multi functional cultural complex. In March 2005, the architectural design for the Santral Istanbul project was approved by the Higher Council of the Monuments (Grouiller 2005). In 2007, Santral Istanbul opened its doors for cultural and educational uses.

Financial support for the Santral Istanbul project came from various institutions and actors. A number of Turkish companies such as Doğuş, Ciner and Kale provided credit for the project.⁴ A limited amount of funding also came from the Publicity Fund of Prime Ministry of Turkey, indicating state support for the project. The Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and the Eyüp District Municipality also lent their support to the project in kind (Grouiller 2005). However, the main initiator of the project is the Bilgi Education and Culture Foundation.

The Bilgi Education and Culture Foundation was established in 1994 and developed the Bilgi University in 1996. Among the university's founders are Turkey's leading intellectuals, academics and businessmen who also play an active role in the University's Board of Trustees.⁵

The aim of the Bilgi University is, as stated on their website »the advancement of knowledge« and the pursuit of »happiness and well-being of the individual and of society«. On the same web site, it is indicated that:

»Istanbul Bilgi University seeks to educate free-thinking, creative, intellectually-curious and enterprising individuals who will contribute to a world in which knowledge is the primary driving force in society, in which knowledge is accessible to all and, indeed, in which access to it has come to be seen as a fundamental human right.«⁶

Bilgi University sees the provision of an academic environment in which both students and teachers can learn and produce knowledge together as its primary responsibility. In such an environment, the university believes it will »enable Bilgi graduates to meet the boundless challenges of an ever-changing future« (ebd.).


The Bilgi Foundation established university campuses in »economically and socially depressed areas« in Istanbul, such as Kuştepe and Dolapdere and it pursues, as also stated on their website, »a very active and

4 Santral Istanbul'a Kale İmzası: <http://www.ntvmsnbc.com>

5 Bilgi Fou ndation and board of trustees of the Bilgi University:
<http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/pages>

6 <http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/pages>

effective social and community program«, following a motto coined by the university, »training for life, not for school«. This choice of location reflects the university's emphasis on being a »city university« (Gültekin 2007).



Map 2: Locations of Bilgi University's Campuses

Istanbul's importance as a regional centre, its proximity to Europe, and its cultural and artistic scenes play a significant role in the university's programmatic and curricular emphasis. In this way, Bilgi University aims to create a bridge between the Golden Horn and the rest of the world by promoting an interdisciplinary cultural and artistic production and education through its Santral Istanbul Campus (Grouiller 2005).

Santral Istanbul's program includes a number of functions. A Museum of Contemporary Art, which will also function as a research centre, »aims at awakening the interest of young people in contemporary art«. Preserving the old electricity machines, the main power plant has been transformed into a Museum of Energy. This museum will show the history of Turkish energy production, contemporary and future global energy challenges and possibilities for the energy conversion. A library and information centre will also be open till late in the evening (Grouiller 2005). Santral Istanbul also leads an international residency program, in which a number of international artists, academics and researchers will be accommodated in Santral Istanbul's campus for periods from one to six months. The artists will be housed in buildings originally intended for workers of the central (Grouiller 2005). The aim of this program is to create an international cultural network.

Santral Istanbul emerged as a result of active participation of a group of internationally known contemporary Turkish architects and academics. Their presence is, in part, the reason why this project has received unprecedented attention from the popular media. These architects, who

also teach at Bilgi University, did not simply design the campus's buildings but they also publicized their projects in the architectural and popular media, organized workshops, made international connections and developed classes to involve university students in these processes.⁷



Figure 2: The interior of Museum of Energy former main power plant, photo by Senem Zeybeykoğlu.

Santral Istanbul's audience includes, but is not limited to, national and international artists, academics, students and researchers. Santral Istanbul claims to be a centre of gravity for the socially and economically underprivileged local communities in the area and in Turkey by encouraging their participation and involvement in its artistic activities. The university aims to provide artistic education for young people from underprivileged regions to »underline how art can become a crucial element for their lives«. Serhan Ada, the Director of Santral Istanbul and the Coordinator of Management of Performing Arts Programme of Bilgi University, remarks that the University's aim is to contribute to economic and social development by making use of the creative dynamics of culture, art and education. Santral Istanbul will be open to everyone; it does not have a particular group to which it is oriented, though positive discrimination will be practiced in the application process in an effort to increase the number of impoverished youth at the educational and cultural programs of Santral Istanbul (Grouiller 2005). According to Ada, Santral Istanbul aims to reconceptualise the mission of the university as a public sphere which can bring different segments of society together through embracing the dynamics of the public life.⁸

7 The architects of the project and professors from Bilgi University's architecture master program organized a workshop with students in 2005. For a more detailed information, see Bilgi's webpage »Silahatarağa Atölyeleri«: <http://mimarlik.bilgi.edu.tr/pages/>

8 From a speech of Serhan Ada, in »Hayırseverler ve Mesenler/Çağdaş Bir Kent ve Kültür Politikası İçin [Patrons and Philantropists in the City/ To-

Kadir Has University - Industry takes over

Kadir Has University is located on the western bank of the Golden Horn between Istanbul's Unkapamı and Cibali districts on the grounds of the former Cibali Tobacco Factory complex. The University renovated the old factory for its use, and also built additional buildings for educational use on the site.

In 1884, the Reji İdaresi (Reji Administration) was granted the rights to collect and process tobacco for 30 years. The tobacco factory was founded in the same year, but it wasn't until 1900 that it started producing cigarettes. After the establishment of the Turkish Republic, it sustained its cigarettes producing function as part of TEKEL (Turkish Monopoly) (Işın/Akbayar 1994). The factory was renewed in 1984, but ceased operations in 1990.



Figure 3: The exterior of Kadir Has University, photo by Senem Zeybeykoğlu

In 1997, Turkey's Ministry of Finance leased the old factory building to the Kadir Has Foundation for 29 years, a period which might be extended according to the agreements between Ministry and Foundation. In this period, Kadir Has Foundation would transform the old factory into its main campus.⁹

Kadir Has University is an initiative of Kadir Has Foundation, which was established in 1991 as a family foundation by Kadir and Rezan Hasoğlu. In addition to his family legacy, Kadir Has was also one of

wards a New Cultural Policy]«seminar, 25-28 January 2008, Pera Museum, Istanbul.

9 »Tütün Kokan Cibali Eğitime Sevdalı Bir İsimle Yıllar Boyu Yaşayacak« Akşam, 19.07.2007, <http://www.khas.edu.tr/BasindeUni/2007/temmuz/utunkokan.jpg>

Turkey's leading industrialists, especially in the automotive sector.¹⁰ He also initiated the opening of factory branches of foreign industries in Turkey and had close connections with the central governments during his business life.

According to the University's rector, the founding of Kadir Has University was »a response to Turkey's growing need for education that conforms to international standards«.¹¹ Its main objectives included »becoming a leader in higher education and being an international centre for research and scientific development«. With reference to the historical factory building in which many of the university's facilities are located, the university seeks »to build a future on the heritage of the past«. Kadir Has University seeks to serve the increasingly changing needs of Turkey and the world via a »centre which brings together culture, education and research in the heart of Istanbul.«¹² Kadir Has University's mission is »to educate bright individuals in international relations, technology, and culture [...] to turn out students who have consciously assimilated Atatürk's principles and reforms and who have thus become better citizens«.¹³

Kadir Has University describes its educational philosophy under four ways, striving to become »a leader in higher education, competitive in scientific knowledge and its pursuits, innovative in education and progressive in research«. Furthermore the university will be able to provide the quality of a world university to »our youth«, which constitutes the »future and hope of our country«.¹⁴

Kadir Has University owns two other campuses located in Bahçelievler and Selimpaşa (Map 3) and includes English Preparatory School in Bahçelievler Campus, Vocational School of Technical Sciences and Vocational School of Social Sciences in Selimpaşa Campus. The main campus in Cibali, however, houses the rector's and deans' offices, and all of the faculties including the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Faculty of Engineering, the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, the Faculty of Communications, the Faculty of Law, and the Faculty of Fine Arts. The central library, classrooms, conference rooms, labs and recreational facilities are also located at the main campus in Istanbul.¹⁵

10 »Who is Kadir Has« Kadir Has University (KHU) web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/who.htm>

11 »A Message from the President« KHU web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/messagefrom.htm>

12 »History« of KHU: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/history.htm>

13 »Missions« of KHU: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/general.htm>

14 »Our philosophy« KHU web page <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/mentality.htm>

15 »Campuses« of KHU: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/campus.htm>



Map 3: Locations of Kadir Has University's Campuses

According to the architects in charge of the restoration of the building, the primary emphasis of the new university design was »to preserve the original character and architectural integrity of the buildings, while at the same time enhancing the space to suit the university's needs«. The result is, »elegant facades, sunny atria, and large, airy interiors with quality education and research facilities« (figure 4). The restoration of the project received the 2003 Europa Nostra Award the European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage.¹⁶



Figure 4: The atrium of Kadir Has University, photo by Senem Zeybeykoğlu

Kadir Has University tries to construct an image for itself through utilizing the history of the factory building. This is evident in the university's branding, a logo of the factory building. In addition, its annual rowing

¹⁶ »History« KHU web page : <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/history.htm>

races organized in the Golden Horn and running races which are named after the Golden Horn¹⁷ emphasize the willingness of the university to establish links with the image of the Golden Horn.

A comparative look

Comparing the two universities and their newly established campuses gives us the chance to understand the differences between their approaches towards education and the city. From these differences, two ways of thinking on educational philosophy, social responsibility and relationship with the city emerge.

The location of the universities in the Golden Horn area is crucial to their development and growth of their surroundings. After the de-industrialization processes during the 1980s, the neighborhoods around the Golden Horn started to go through a process of economic, social and spatial decline. Thus, these two projects carry the potential of becoming regenerating agents for their surroundings.

The presence of the universities can have a regenerative effect on the Golden Horn area in a number of ways. Firstly, the factories which were transformed into university campuses both belonged to the central state. The allocation of the factories to the foundations was approved by the central state and local governments in both cases. The foundations renovated the buildings and transformed them for their own purposes. Bilgi University transformed the factory complex as a whole, utilizing the historical buildings through restoration. Kadir Has University also carried out a successful restoration process of the historical tobacco factory and made some additions as well. These two projects can be considered as the first regeneration efforts in their neighborhoods, which essentially needed economic, physical and social improvement. It is unlikely that the government would have carried out similar renovation processes to these areas, let alone build universities in these neighborhoods which generate and stimulate economic and social growth.

In addition to this, both universities have identified themselves with the historical images of the factories that they occupy. The name Santral Istanbul refers to the electricity production and distribution of the former factory which functioned as an electric central. With this title, Santral Istanbul also undertook the duty of production and dissemination of cul-

17 »Basında Üniversitemiz« KHU web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/Basin-deUni/2007/Mayis/GencleraltinboynuzOdulluYolKosusuda.jpg>

ture (Kadak 2005). On the other hand, Kadir Has University started to use the image of the former tobacco factory for its logo.¹⁸

When we look at their aims and academic programs, we see that both of the universities seek to participate in the international academic environment. Both have international faculty members, students and links with foreign universities and educational institutions. In addition to »maintaining strong ties with all segments of Turkish society« and providing »service to the local communities in which its campuses are located« Bilgi University also aims at training »internationally active top level managers, artists and researchers, brave entrepreneurs and leaders who will influence the future of their country with an understanding of the rapid changes taking place in the world«. ¹⁹ Bilgi puts a strong emphasis on »diversity of individuals with different lifestyles«, »universal values« and the »knowledge society«. Its programs are based on arts and sciences, communication, economics, administration and law turn out professionals prepared for the still emerging service sector industry. It also offers certificate programs in European Union, capital markets, real estate appraisal, design culture and management, NGO training, and consumer and mortgage finance.²⁰ The aim of the Kadir Has University, on the other hand, is to give »a quality education in a world university« to their students who are »both the future and the hope of [Turkey]«. In addition to arts and sciences, communication, economics, administration and law, Kadir Has University also offers computer, electronic and industrial engineering programmes of study in their Faculty of Engineering.²¹ Even though the academic program at Kadir Has University is synchronized with the service economy through its many courses offered in the social sciences, it is also keeping its affiliations with the traditional industrial sectors through the presence of its engineering faculty.

In addition to their educational activities, both of the universities host other events as well. Kadir Has University is more focused on sports such as rowing and running as previously mentioned.²² It also hosts famous politicians, artists and businessmen such as former presidents, actors and actresses, sports leaders, and political party leaders

18 The logo can be viewed on the home page of KHU: <http://www.khas.edu.tr>

19 Missions of Bilgi University: [http:// www.bilgi.edu.tr/ pages/](http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/pages/)

20 Faculties and Departments of Bilgi University: [http:// www.bilgi.edu.tr/](http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/)

21 Faculties of Kadir Has University: [http:// www.khas.edu.tr/eng/faculties/ faculties.htm](http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/faculties/faculties.htm)

22 Information on KHU's extracurricular activities can be followed on the web page of Kadir Has on the media: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/tr/hakkinda/basinda.htm>

who teach students in seminars. There is a museum and exhibition gallery inside the university building, which are open to the public.

Bilgi University's additional programs and events include social projects for its neighborhoods, social advertising, publishing, art events, and international conferences on social and political issues. For example, advertisements against smoking, which have been prepared by Bilgi University, are broadcasted on multiple Turkish TV channels. The opening ceremony of the last international Istanbul Biennial, a contemporary arts event, which is organized biannually, took place in Santral Istanbul campus in 2007. In 2005, when a state university was prohibited from organizing a conference titled »The Armenians during the Last Period of the Ottoman Empire: Scientific Responsibility and Democracy Issues« the conference was hosted by Bilgi University in its Kuştepe campus instead (Abakan 2005). In addition, Bilgi hosts other conferences and workshops on issues of conscious objection, human rights, violence on women, and many other issues.

Conclusion

Although both of the cases show comparable features, such as being foundation universities, acquiring former industrial compounds directly from the state and transforming them for cultural and educational functions, some major differences inherently exist. Kadir Has University was founded by Kadir Has himself, one of Turkey's most powerful industrialists. As a result, the presence of the Kadir Has Foundation can be strongly felt in the university's functioning. Kadir Has's influence is even felt in the university's memorial room, in which a series of photographs displaying Kadir Has with presidents and prime ministers of Turkey are exhibited.

Kadir Has University draws many parallels with the general discourse of a developed university. Kadir Has University is equipped with a high level technological infrastructure and aims at training professionals for the changing needs of the world and society, who assimilated Atatürk's principles. Kadir Has shows its differences to Bilgi through its »harmonious relationship with the historical fabric of the city«, »a number of social and cultural activities, including a wide range of sports activities«, »a wide selection of courses that aims to keep pace with a rapidly changing world and in accordance with changing social needs«, and »a developed infrastructure that reflects a modern educational institution«. Within this »modern educational« structure focusing on social and cultural issues, Kadir Has University's intention is to remain neutral in

political discussions, and it tries not to oppose or criticize the government or other political institutions.²³

On the other hand, Bilgi University's main concern is training »free-thinking, creative, intellectually-curious and enterprising individuals«. Instead of being an educational institution of the traditional sort, it aims to create an academic environment, in which both students and teachers can learn and produce knowledge together. Its motto »learning for life, not for school« is evident in the social programs it conducts. Through many conferences, art facilities, seminars and workshops, unlike Kadir Has, Bilgi tries to take part in the political and social life of Turkey through its activities.

Both universities try to establish links with the society and put an emphasis on being »global« or »world standard« educational institutions. Kadir Has tries to do this by training its students for business and industrial services; providing a diverse and experienced faculty, a developed infrastructure and »opportunity for student placements with professional organizations«. ²⁴ On the other hand, Bilgi practices its societal integration through its »contemporary universal values«. ²⁵ It assumes a social responsibility for the city and the neighbourhoods that it is located in. It »views service to the local communities in which its campuses are located as an integral part of its mission«. ²⁶

What makes Santral Istanbul campus so different from Bilgi University's other campuses is its open access to the campus area and the buildings inside. In addition to its national and international audience including academics, artists, students and researchers, Santral Istanbul also seeks to create a magnet for the inhabitants of Istanbul, and the local community. In this way, it is the university's aim to create an accessible public space, attractive not only to the knowledge society, but also to people living in the immediate area. This is also evident from the words of Serhan Ada, who describes the initial aim of Santral Istanbul campus as becoming a public domain, which can bring different segments of society together. ²⁷

Both universities, presented in this essay, are successful in adding economic, cultural and physical value in the areas that they are located

23 »What makes us different« KHU web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/different.htm>

24 see 23

25 Missions of Bilgi University: <http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/pages/>

26 Missions of Bilgi University

27 From a speech of Serhan Ada, in »Hayırseverler ve Mesenler / Çağdaş Bir Kent ve Kültür Politikası İçin [Patrons and Philantropists in the City / Towards a New Cultural Policy]«seminar, 25-28 January 2008, Pera Museum, Istanbul.

in, Cibali and Silahtarağa on the Golden Horn. By renovating and re-inhabiting derelict places, they successfully injected significant industrial heritages of Istanbul with much needed life and vitality. With their educational functions, cultural and social activities, they have the potential of contributing to their environments by their regenerating effects. In addition, their emphasis on innovation, technological infrastructure and training in a variety of disciplines, both universities provide alternative education opportunities for students. In contrast however, since both institutions are private foundation universities and most of their resources depend on student loans, they both carry the risk of altering »the principles of education to the advantage of the capital« (Yalçintan/Thornley 2007: 826). So, despite their trying to become open to all segments of society and serving to the needs of the all, they in fact only service a small fraction of society; those who can afford to pay. Consequently, their claim to the creation of a new public sphere for all falls quickly apart.

References

- Aksoy, A. (2007): Silahtarağa Elektrik Santrali, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Aksoy, A./Robins, K. (1994): »Istanbul between Civilization and Discontent«. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 10, pp.57-74.
- Aksoy, A./Robins, K. (1997): »Peripheral Vision: Cultural Industries and Cultural Identities in Turkey«. *Environment and Planning A* 29, pp.1937-1952.
- Bezmez, D. (2007): »The Politics of Urban Regeneration: The Case of the Fener and Balat Initiative«. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 37, pp. 59-86.
- Çaha, Ö. (2005): »The Ideological Transformation of the Public Sphere: The Case of Turkey«. *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 4/1-2, pp. 1-30.
- Çelik, Z. (1986): *The Remaking of Istanbul Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Ellwood, W. (2002): *Küreselleşmeyi Anlama Kılavuzu* (translated by Betül Dilan Genç), İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Fainstein, S. (1990): »The Changing World Economy and Urban Restructuring«. In Judd, Dennis/Parkinson, Michael (eds.), *Leadership and Urban Regeneration, Cities in North America and Europe*, Newbury Park/CA; London/UK: Sage Publications, pp. 31-50.

- Giddens, A. (1998): *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, Cambridge/UK: Polity Press.
- Gül, M. M./Lamb, R. (2004): »Urban Planning in Istanbul in the Early Republican Period: Henri Prost's Role in the Tensions Among Beautification, Modernization and Peasantist Ideology«. *Architectural Theory Review* 9/1, pp. 59-81.
- Gürsel, Y. (1990): *Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Kent ve İnsan*, İstanbul: E Yayınları.
- İşin, E./Akbayar, N. (1994): »Cibali Tütün Fabrikası«. In İşin, E./ Akbayar, N. (eds.), *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı; İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, p. 429.
- Judd, D./Parkinson, M. (1990): »Urban Leadership and Regeneration«. In Judd, D./Parkinson, M. (eds.), *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*, Newbury Park/CA; London/UK: Sage Publications, pp. 13-30.
- Keyder, Ç. (1999): »The Setting«. In Keyder, Çağlar (ed.) *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Lanham/MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 3-28.
- Keyder, Ç./Öncü, A. (1994): »Globalization of a Third-World Metropolis: İstanbul in the 1980s«. *Review* 17/3, pp. 383-421.
- Kezer, Z. (1999): *The Making of a National Capital, Ideology and Socio-Spatial Practices in Early Republican Ankara*, unpublished PhD Diss., University of California at Berkeley.
- Korkmaz, T. (2006): »On the Regeneration of the Golden Horn«. In Sarkis, H./Dwyer, M./Kibarer, P. (eds.), *Two Squares: Martyrs Square, Beirut and Sirkeci Square*, İstanbul, Cambridge/MA; London: Harvard University, Graduate School of Design, pp. 96-113.
- Köksal, G. (1996): *Historical and Technological Development Process of the Golden Horn Arsenal and Some Suggestions for Its Conservation*, unpublished PhD. Diss, İstanbul: İstanbul Technical University.
- Öktem, B. (2005): »Küresel Kent Söyleminin Kentsel Mekanı Dönüştürmedeki Rolü: Büyükdere-Maslak Aksı«. In Kurtuluş, Hatice (ed.), *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma, Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, İstanbul: Bağlam, pp. 25-76.
- Sassen, S. (1998): *Globalization and its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money*, New York: New Press.
- Short, J. R./Kim Y.-H. (1999): *Globalization and the City*, New York: Longman.
- Tanyeli, U. (2002): »İstanbul'un İmarı 1957-1960«. *Arredamento-Mimarlık* 10, pp. 93-96.
- Tekeli, İ. (1991): *Kent Planlaması Konuşmaları*, Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası Yayın Komitesi.

- Tekeli, İ. (1994): *The Development of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area: Urban Administration and Planning*, Istanbul: International Union of Local Authorities Section for the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East Region.
- Tekeli, İ (1999): »Bir Modernleşme Projesi olarak Türkiye’de Kent Planlaması«. In Bozdoğan, S./Kasaba, R. (eds.), *Türkiye’de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik*, 2nd ed., Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Türkün, A./Kurtuluş, H. (2005): »Giriş«. In Kurtuluş, H. (Ed.), *İstanbul’da Kentsel Ayırışma, Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Istanbul: Bağlam, pp. 9-24.
- Van Kempen, R./Marcuse, P.(1997): »A New Spatial Order in Cities«. *American Behavioral Scientist* 41/3, pp. 285-298.
- Yalçınan, M.C./ Thornley, A.(2007): »Globalization, Higher Education and Urban Growth Coalitions: Turkey’s Foundation Universities and the Case of Koç University in Istanbul«. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 25, pp. 822-843.
- Yeşilkaya Gürallar, N. (1999): *Halkevleri: İdeoloji ve Mimarlık*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Internet resources

- A Message from the President, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/messagefrom.htm>
- Abakan, A.(2005): »Ermeni Konferansı Sona Erdi«. BBC Turkish.com, 26.09.2005, http://www.bbc.co.uk/turkish/europe/story/2005/09/050926_armenian_conference.shtml
- Basında Üniversitemiz, KHU web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/BasindaUni/2007/Mayis/GencleraltinboynuzOdulluYolKosusuda.jpg>
- Bilsel, Cana (2006): »Kentsel Dönüşüm, Çözülen Kentler ve Parçalanmış Kamusal Alan«. *Mimarlık*, 327, <http://old.mo.org.tr/mimarlikdergisi/Campuses>, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/campus.htm>
- Faculties and Departments, Bilgi University web page: <http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/>
- Faculties and Departments, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/faculties/faculties.htm>
- Foundation, Bilgi University web page: <http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/>
- Grouiller, J. (2005): »La reconversion de la centrale électrique Silahtarğa à Istanbul Analyse d’une opération de reconversion de friche industrielle urbaine au travers de ses références et des acteurs impli-

- qués«. <http://www.artfactories.net/IMG/pdf/MemoireJulienGrouiller.pdf>
- Gültekin, S. (2007) : »Konuk: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Dekanı Prof. Dr. İhsan Bilgin«. Interview with İhsan Bilgin, NTVMSNBC, 10.07.2007, http://www.ntvmsnbc.com/ntv/metinler/dogru_tercih/temmuz_2007/10.asp
- Gümüş, K. (2006): »Sütlüce Unutuldu mu«. Radikal Newspaper, 12.12.2006. <http://www.radikal.com.tr/>
- History, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/history.htm>
- Kadak, Ş. (2005): »Sanat Virüsü Müzenin Yolunu Açtı«. Interview with Oğuz Özerden, Sabah Newspaper, 25.12.2005: <http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2005/12/25/eko101.html>
- »Kadir Has'tan Menderes Adına Okul«. Star Newspaper, 13.12.2006: <http://www.stargazete.com.tr/>
- Missions, Bilgi University web page: <http://www.bilgi.edu.tr/pages/>
- Missions, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/general.htm>
- Our Cibali Building with Europa Nostra Diploma, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/nostira.htm>
- Our philosophy, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/mentality.htm>
- »Tarih Kokan Üniversitesi«. Arkitera 27.10.2004: <http://www.arkitera.com/v1/haberler/2004/10/27/kadirhas.htm>
- Turkey's Higher Education Council, 2007, »Report.on Foundation Universities«. <http://www.referansgazetesi.com/UPLOAD/haber/dokuman/2007/12>
- »Tütün Kokan Cibali Eğitime Sevdalı Bir İsimle Yıllar Boyu Yaşayacak«. Akşam Newspaper, 19.07.2007, <http://www.khas.edu.tr/BasindeUni/2007/temmuz/tutunkokan.jpg>
- »Santral İstanbul'a Kale İmzası«. NTVMSNBC, 30.06.2006: <http://www.ntvmsnbc.com/news/378516.asp>
- Silahtarağa Atölyeleri, Bilgi University web page: <http://mimarlik.bilgi.edu.tr/pages/events.asp>
- What makes us different, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng/different.htm>
- Who is Kadir Has, Kadir Has University web page: <http://www.khas.edu.tr/eng>

Public Transformation of the Bosphorus. Facts and Opportunities

EBRU ERDÖNMEZ/SELİM ÖKEM

Public spaces are places in which relations beyond the private sphere are established, creating a sense of community. They are among the most important elements of a modern city and they are the places from which urban culture and consciousness emerge.

Historically, urban public spaces are places in which the people's differences and diversities are exposed. As opposed to urban communities and neighborhoods that show categorical, cultural, and ethnical distinctions, urban public areas are spaces in which people from different social and cultural groups are able to meet and interact with each other. Public spaces play a particular role in the formation process of cities (Erdönmez 2005).

In this respect, the research we have conducted aims to make a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis of six Bosphorus neighborhoods and residential areas which include Ortaköy, Bebek, Rumelihisarı on the European continent, and Beylerbeyi, Kanlıca, and Kandilli on the Asian side. Our research began with a short historical examination of these areas and a land-use analysis of the neighborhoods, investigating their potential for future public use. Land-use analysis data was then used to determine public potential index values which will be explained under the chapter »case study« below. An additional survey, about social expectations of public spaces and their new uses was also conducted. This qualitative data material of the survey was then compared to the public potential index.

Brief history of the area

As the city that connects two continents, Istanbul owes its unique identity to a 30 km long and narrow strip of sea called the »Bosporus«. The urban character along the Bosporus is defined by steep slopes of dense vegetation, interspersed by imperial buildings, commercial docklands and *yalı*.¹ The shoreline was inaccessible to the public, except for boat stations and now-extinct public beaches and sea baths, before the coastal roads of the Bosporus were constructed between 1956-1960. Located in the neighborhoods along the river, defined by their inclining green landscape rising from both shores of the river, are the *yalı* grounds stretching along the coastlines, dwelling areas on the natural terraces behind and above the coasts, and village settlements on the bays, and valleys opened by streams. As the city expanded, new roads were constructed to accommodate the growing population. Making the area accessible, these roads were also an opportunity to transform the shores into a public space, although there were complaints that this new establishment had damaged the historical characteristics of the Bosporus and interferes into the relationship of a *yalı* with the sea.

When we examine Istanbul's historical development, we can identify three distinct nuclei which have guided Istanbul's growth over the centuries. These three centers emerged along the waterways that served as trading routes between Asia and Mediterranean hinterland, the Bosporus and the Golden Horn, a natural harbor in which goods traveling between the Balkan and Anatolia passed. The Golden Horn divides so-called »Historical Peninsula« at the southern end, »Galata« located the northern part of the Golden Horn. Since the 5th century, »Galata« functioned as the non-Muslim political and cultural center.

In the Byzantine era, the Bosporus had no organic ties with the city center, the development of which was confined to its city walls, away from the river. During this period people lived inside the city walls in order to guard themselves from continuous threats of attack. Nonetheless, along the shores of the Bosporus small farming and fishing villages developed in addition to monasteries with sacrificial altars and fortifications controlling the Black Sea and the Bosporus. In the 17th century, Istanbul's city borders expanded along the shores of the Bosporus. As a result, villages that had previously been isolated from Istanbul were now connected to the city by the Bosporus. The entire region along the river,

1 *Yalı*s are prestigious private dwellings in a typical regional wooden villa style, often used as summer residences for upper class Istanbul inhabitants.

defined by the enclosed village clusters, thus became an important summer recreational area for Istanbul's inhabitants.

In the Ottoman period, the settlements along the Bosphorus settlement were home to both Muslims and non-Muslims. Roman villages were built in Anadoluhisari and Kanlica on the Asian side and in Ortaköy, Arnavutköy and Bebek on the European. On the Asian side, non-Muslims lived in Kuzguncuk and Çengelköy. In Kanlica, and also in Anadoluhisari, Beylerbeyi and Beykoz on the Asian side, there were settlements with a Muslim majority in the 17th century. These villages were organized around fishing and farming activities. In addition, some wealthy people from Istanbul owned summer houses in these villages.




Figure 1: Historical Development of the Bosphorus (Geymen/Baz 2008: 455)

The Bosphorus gained importance for both the Europeans and the Ottomans in the 18th century. The tendency for settlement in the 18th century was between the actual city and the sea, a location which could integrate the social functions of the city with the economic functions of the Bosphorus. During this time, Istanbul's urban density began to increase, while in the second half of the 19th century, with the construction of the Dolmabahçe, Çırağan, and Yıldız Palaces, the administrative core was relocated to the shores of the river.

Today, Istanbul has grown into a full-fledged metropolis. Green areas, which were part of the *yalis*, were split up as a result of highway construction. Two additional bridges were built over the Bosphorus. Parallel to these developments, the construction of roads and the proliferation of industry alongside the shoreline have restricted public use of the

strait. Similarly, as a result of the construction of the first bridge over the Bosphorus and its related bypass roads in 1973, and the construction of the second bridge in 1989, land-uses on both sides of the Bosphorus have become negatively influenced because of the urban growth alongside the bypass roads of the Bosphorus bridge.

Regarding the rapid urbanization process and demographic growth Istanbul is presently experiencing, protection of the cultural and historic aspects of the Bosphorus is of great concern. »Bosphorus Law No. 2960«² was implemented in November 1983 in order to protect the cultural, historical and natural attributes of Istanbul's Bosphorus region. The protection of this area was intended to serve public recreational uses, but also to restrict the population growth and increasing urban density across the area affected by the law.

With its growing population, Istanbul's contemporary planning strategies tend to deal with urban problems in technical ways whereas social planning issues, that need to be addressed properly, are frequently overseen.

The traditional Bosphorus dwelling: *Yalı* architecture

Traditional dwellings, that lend the Bosphorus region its identity, are known as *yalı*, a large number of which are located along both sides of the Bosphorus. These wooden buildings have a unique relationship to the water. *Yalı*, as a basic residential unit, typically contains an inner and an outer garden, which are connected to each other by a bridge built over a road or a tunnel. The garden starts at the edge of the shore and continues upwards, rising as required by the topographical conditions of the landscape. This green area can be on the back or at the side of the *yalı* building itself. *Yalı* grounds usually include terraced gardens, sitting quarters, outdoor sitting areas, and a little kiosk for watching the moon at night. Living and sleeping quarters are situated inside the wooden *yalı*, while the kitchen, the bathroom and other service quarters are situated in a separate building, which is detached from the *yalı* itself. The *yalı* can only be reached from the river by boats, which are docked on private slips. The private nature of this settlement formation does not allow public access to the water.

2 The purpose of this law is to preserve and improve the cultural and historical assets and natural beauty of the Bosphorus, taking into consideration the public interest; also, to organize the development regulations to limit the structuring and the increase of the population density in the area.

With the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and its accompanying social, economic, and cultural restructuring, *yalis* were no longer considered valuable.

Background

Social aspects of cities have far-reaching and important effects for the cities' inhabitants. Streets, squares, parks and open areas are places in which citizens can meet; they are a stage for spontaneous encounters between strangers; a platform in which citizens can individually and cooperatively express themselves both politically and culturally: urban public spaces are generators of urban culture. Meanings and experiences associated with a city's public space represent significant forms of communication between an individual citizen and the society as a whole (Erdönmez, 2005: 75-82).

Although humans identify themselves as individuals, they are social creatures. Since public spaces are spaces in which people can interact with others, places in which feelings of belonging and a sense of society is generated support this social nature of human beings. Perception and meaning assigned to space by its users play a critical role in the shaping of these spaces. Within this context, the formation process of society begins in open public spaces where the relationship between individuals and society are established and supported by the physical environment (Erdönmez 2006: 67-73).

Society is a concentration of individuals who share common interests and are thus linked to each other by means of their shared commonalities. In case of the urban process, the spatial element of the city represents a shared commonality; in this case, the common spatial elements are public spaces. While the number of people who share public places is unpredictable and subject to change, spaces shared by a definite number of people, such as our homes and office spaces, are private.

Habermas (2001) describes events and occasions as »public« when they are accessible to all, in contrast to closed and exclusive affairs. A »public building«, however, does not generally refer to public accessibility, a public building may even be closed to general public access; instead, public buildings are called public because they house state institutions or public authorities representing public interest and acting on behalf of the common good.

Today, public areas are frequently evaluated by researchers concerned about socio-cultural functions and uses of the spaces. Given and Leckie state that:

»[...] it seems rather futile to attempt to define public space by a characteristic, such as ownership, or a physical attribute, such as openness. Contemporary public spaces perhaps can be more usefully thought of in terms of the activities that take place within them and the socio-cultural functions that these spaces perform.« (Given/Leckie 2003: 367)

Zukin defines public domain as an ever changing condition, defined by its users and their public and private demands (Zukin 1995: 10-11). Zukin focuses on concepts like »public culture« and »public domain«, stating that public culture and public domain are socially configured. Public culture and public domain are produced by the social correspondences of everyday life that take place in shops, parks and streets. The right to use those spaces, and the investment made in these spaces by individuals generate a sense of ownership, yielding an ever-changing sense of public culture (Erdönmez 2006: 67-68).

One of the most important functions of public urban spaces is to create social life in the city. The interaction of strangers in these open public spaces generates a mutual identity important for the social and cultural formation of society. This social texture includes playing children, celebrations, conversations, collective actions and passive communication (Gehl, 2001:23-29), seeing and hearing.

In Istanbul a social texture has grown over two continents. The Bosphorus, cutting through the center of the city, is a space with great potential for the formation of public spaces. Like streets and parks, the banks of the Bosphorus can provide places in which it is possible to encounter people who dress and speak differently, where different opinions can be expressed and where people engaged in a diversity of recreation activities can be seen. Currently, people tend to use the narrow coastal sidewalks as places of gathering and for various recreation activities.

Methodology

The above description shows the specific importance of the Bosphorus for Istanbul: geographically, it divides the city on two continents. It is an historic site of urban development and it has an important aspect for transportation. However, urban culture, like the planning of this growing city, is a permanent process, but the contemporary attempts by the city's public authorities to rearrange the urban landscape seem not to focus on the needs of the people.

Open public area activities, which are influenced profoundly by the physical environment (Gehl 2001: 13-15), can be distinguished into nec-

essary activities, optional activities and social activities. Necessary activities, which most people participate in, include transportation to school or work. Optional activities depend on the availability of space and how much individuals wish to participate. Examples of optional activities include taking a walk, relaxing in the park, or sunbathing. Activities like these can only take place according to the suitable outdoor conditions, and only when the space is available and in the desired quality.

Fields of research: Ortaköy, Bebek, Rumelihisarı, Beylerbeyi, Çengelköy and Kandilli

Our case study includes a brief morphological analysis of six selected Bosphorus settlements: Ortaköy, Bebek, Rumelihisarı, Beylerbeyi, Çengelköy and Kandilli. These neighborhoods are located next to another on either sides of the Bosphorus.

As stated above, these neighborhoods are characterized by *yahıs* in which privileged state officers, capital holders or traders lived during the Ottoman Empire. Some of the *yahı* also served as summer house embassies of different countries. The coastal transportation line, which began operation in 1956, along with its negative externalities, brought in new perspectives for the public use of those settlements.

The traffic route has different effects on the land formation on each side of the Istanbul Strait. On the European side, starting from Ortaköy, the southernmost village of the Bosphorus, and until the northernmost settlements of Tarabya, there are few possibilities for the construction of buildings. The existence of pedestrian strips however, which partially extend towards the strait, offers potential for public access, and therefore contact with the sea/river. Apart from Kuleli and some sections of Beykoz, the coastal road and the adjacent sea are continually interrupted by private buildings, restricting the formation of open public spaces on the Asian side.

Ortaköy, our first case study, is inserted between the coastal transportation line and the Istanbul strait. Among other things, the neighborhood accommodates recreational and commercial spaces like cafes, brasseries, small art galleries and gift shops. The main open public space is organized around the ferry port and Mecidiye Mosque, onto which narrow streets open. Apart from the mosque, Ortaköy also accommodates the Etz Ahayim synagogue and the Surp Asdvadzadzin Ermenian church, both service congregations of substantial scale.



Figure 2: View from Ortaköy³

The second case study is Bebek. Bebek is a wealthy neighborhood in which well-to-do people live. A ferry port with public service connects the community to the inner city. On the edge of the neighborhood, there is a green city park. A small mosque designed by Kemalettin Bey in the beginning of the 20th century, a good example of the first national architectural style, is located at the other end of the park. The park also houses two cafes, one of which is rather luxurious. A walkway, which is commonly used by the locals for jogging and walking, provides access to the water for fishing.



Figure 3: View from Bebek

Rumelihisarı, on the European side, is characterized by an old castle bastion and walls that lend the neighborhood its name. A steep ridge, which extends along the strait, restricts the formation of vast open public spaces, although places with sociopetal functions, such as cafés or restaurants, could expand along a narrow strip of green along both sides of the coastal transportation line.

3 All photos in this article are taken by the authors



Figure 4: View from Rumelihisari

On the Asian side, Beylerbeyi is our first research case. The settlement was named after the Palace of Beylerbeyi, which was a popular summer destination during the 19th century. The Bosphorus bridge connects Ortaköy and Beylerbeyi. The settlement has grown around a mosque built in the last quarter of 18th century, designed in Ottoman baroque style. There is a ferry port for intercity maritime lines. A small breakwater is encircled by fish restaurants and taverns; it also provides possibilities for fishing.



Figure 5: View from Beylerbeyi

Çengelköy, the next settlement chosen as a case study, accommodates one of the oldest and finest examples of *yalı* architecture, the Sadullah Paşa yalısı; a palace, that was built in the last quarter of 18th century. Another important architectural element in this area is the Kuleli military building. Çengelköy also hosts an active ferry port and small piers for boats.



Figure 6: View from Çengelköy

Kandilli is most famous for its observatory building, which sets the Turkish time. The village is located at a broader part of the Bosphorus and there is a panoramic view over the river and its shores.



Figure 7: View from Kandilli

Case study

Aerial views and photometric maps provided by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality are the basis of the land use readings made for this study. Furthermore, field data was collected from various parts of the city, including interviews that were conducted with a number of people from Istanbul.

Land-use readings from the photometric maps of the settlements provided data for the »developed« areas - areas in which buildings, roads, green areas, and open public spaces are located. The photometric maps also provided information about the dimensions of the public spaces that

lie on the coast of the Bosphorus. In order to compare different settlements with each other, land –use indexes were generated. For example, to compare the building density of each settlement, the ratio of the built area to the total amount of land is required. Square meter dimensions of different types of land use (building areas, green areas, public areas and road areas) in different settlements have been divided by the total land areas of each settlement to determine their land-use indexes and can therefore be compared to each other. Likewise, public areas – such as the public coast line index, were derived by dividing the coastal length of a particular settlement by the average value of coastal length of all of the selected settlements.

Finally, all the indexical values are combined to form a hypothetical equation, which presumed to calculate the public potential of an open space. This hypothetical equation aims to distinguish two important factors concerning the public character of Bosphorus settlements in determining the strength and weakness of the related open public areas. The first factor is the public saturation value, which is determined by the proportion of the public area index (P_a) to the building area index (B), which basically gives the proportion of public area to building area, i.e. $P_a:B$. A ratio of 1:1 would indicate that the selected settlement has the same amount of building and public areas.

The second factor determines the public potential of selected settlements, which is defined by the ratio of the public area index (P_a), the public coast line index (P_c), and the green area index (G) to the total built area index, which is defined by the sum of building areas (B) and road area (R) indexes. This formulation assumes that public open areas are contiguous with one another and the sea is an attractive factor for people to use those public places. Also, green areas are presumed to be of great potential for these public areas, extending positive behavioral effect on people attracted to those areas. Therefore, green areas are formulated to be directly proportional to »public potential«.

The index of the total built (sum of building area and road area indexes) is assumed to be a restrictive behavioral factor and inversely proportional to the hypothetical equation of public potential (Table 1). Indexed data gathered from land-use readings have been utilized to determine the strength and weaknesses of the public potential of the selected settlements. This reading provides additional information on issues like:

Indicator	Significance	Strength/ Weakness	Opportunity /Threat
Building area index (B) (building areas/total land area)	Negative impact on environmental perception, detract public use	■	
Road areas index (R) (road areas/total land area)	Negative impact on environmental perception, detract public use	■	
Green area index (G) (green areas/total land area)	Positive impact environmental perception, provides potential for public area, attracts people	■	
Public area index (P _a) (public areas/total land area)	Public potential indicator	■	■
Public coast line index (P _c) Public coastline length/average length of public coast lines	Public potential indicator	■	■
public saturation index (P _s) building area index / public area index $P_s = B / P_a /$	Public potential indicator	■	■
index of public potential (P _p) $P_p = (P_a \times P_c \times G) / (B+R)^*$	Public potential indicator	■	■

Table 1: The indicator and signification of the main issues in the land use readings

A public survey about people's use and perception of the open public determined the opportunities and threats to the public potential, in addition to the strengths and weaknesses of the settlements. The main issues included in the surveyed were:

indicator	signification	strength/ weakness	opportunity/ threat
Frequency and duration of visits (how many times a year/for how long each time)	Indicates character of the public area as to whether it is recognized to be socio-petal or socio-fugal (its degree of public recognition)	■	
Nature of visit (optional /obligatory)	Optional presence enhances public potential when combined with physical environmental input		■
Associated activities	Indicates which activities people perform in public open spaces; which positive concepts are associated with the public open areas in the selected settlements	■	
Spatial capacity, functional equipments	Sufficiency/inadequacy of the open public spaces, direction of public area transformation		■

Table 2: The indicator and signification of the main issues in the survey

 <p>Ortaköy</p>	 <p>Building</p>  <p>Road</p>  <p>Green</p>  <p>Public</p>	<p>Landuse Indexes</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Index Type</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Building Area Index</td> <td>0.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Road Area Index</td> <td>0.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Green Area Index</td> <td>0.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Public Area Index</td> <td>0.04</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Index Type	Value	Building Area Index	0.40	Road Area Index	0.20	Green Area Index	0.13	Public Area Index	0.04
Index Type	Value											
Building Area Index	0.40											
Road Area Index	0.20											
Green Area Index	0.13											
Public Area Index	0.04											
 <p>Bebek</p>	 <p>Building</p>  <p>Road</p>  <p>Green</p>  <p>Public</p>	<p>Landuse Indexes</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Index Type</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Building Area Index</td> <td>0.16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Road Area Index</td> <td>0.09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Green Area Index</td> <td>0.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Public Area Index</td> <td>0.08</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Index Type	Value	Building Area Index	0.16	Road Area Index	0.09	Green Area Index	0.32	Public Area Index	0.08
Index Type	Value											
Building Area Index	0.16											
Road Area Index	0.09											
Green Area Index	0.32											
Public Area Index	0.08											
 <p>Rumelihisar</p>	 <p>Building</p>  <p>Road</p>  <p>Green</p>  <p>Public</p>	<p>Landuse Indexes</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Index Type</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Building Area Index</td> <td>0.09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Road Area Index</td> <td>0.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Green Area Index</td> <td>0.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Public Area Index</td> <td>0.02</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Index Type	Value	Building Area Index	0.09	Road Area Index	0.05	Green Area Index	0.40	Public Area Index	0.02
Index Type	Value											
Building Area Index	0.09											
Road Area Index	0.05											
Green Area Index	0.40											
Public Area Index	0.02											

Table 3: Land use analysis of selected Settings on the European side: Ortaköy, Bebek and Rumelihisar




Table 4: Land use analysis of selected settings on the Asian side: Beylerbeyi, Çengelköy and Kandilli

Table 3 and 4 show the land uses of the selected settlements. Amongst them, Ortaköy seems to be the most dense, while Bebek seems to have the most amount and Kandilli the least amount of open public areas. The figure below shows the public sea line index values of the settlements, relating to the length of each public open area adjacent to the sea.




Table 5: Public area – sea adjacency of the settings

Table 5 shows that existing open public spaces in Ortaköy, Çengelköy, and Kandilli are more saturated than the other settlements. Ortaköy has the highest urban density, while Kandilli has the least amount of public open area. The graph indicates that Ortaköy and Kandilli also have the lowest public potential. Index potential values in Bebek, Rumelihisari and Beylerbeyi are higher than their public saturation values, indicating that those settlements are more likely to need no additional areas for public purposes. Furthermore, when these areas are equipped with adequate and convenient functions and facilities and provide better physical environmental conditions, they are better equipped to serve public functions.




Table 6: Public use and potential of selected settings.

The survey

Twenty-six people from upper-middle and middle income groups were surveyed, 70 percent of whom were between the ages of 21 and 30 at the time of the survey. Eighty-nine percent of the participants were university-educated. Data derived from the survey indicates that the frequency of visits to public areas on the European side of the Bosphorus is higher than the frequency of visits to the Asian side. Survey data also shows that Ortaköy has greatest public potential in terms of both frequency and duration of visit.

Next, survey participants were asked to indicate what attributes they associate with public spaces. Those qualities include some positive aspects we assume an open public space should include. Figure eight shows, which qualities participants associate with public spaces in the selected settlements. All the public spaces in the selected settlements show in the graph that they lack safety, quietness, green, transportation access, and cultural activities. Contrasting to the results from the land-use survey in the previous section, the sea and interaction with the sea was perceived to be the strongest aspect of all the public spaces in the selected Bosphorus settlements. Participants also indicated that public spaces adjacent to the sea offer a good view of the Bosphorus, strengthening the quality of the public spaces.




Table 7: Opportunities/Threats: The perceived conditions of public spaces in the selected Bosphorus settlements

To determine which opportunities and threats apply to the future development of these public spaces, participants were asked to evaluate the conditions shown in the table above on a scale from one to three, one indicating poor condition of space in need of enhancement; three indicating that participants found the existing condition of the public space satisfactory. According to table 7, derived from the response of participants, Kandilli was lacking appropriate spatial quality and services in almost each category.

Conclusion

In this research, data gathered from the physical environment and behavioral responses of users have been compared with each other in the form of a SWOT analysis. In brief, depending on the saturation and potential comparison of the public spaces shown in table 6, Ortaköy, Beylerbeyi, Çengelköy, and Kandilli show limited public potential; the size and quality of the public spaces in these areas as well as the public access to the shore need to be addressed. The data in this study show that the perception of these areas differs greatly from their true qualities and nature. People continue to believe that the settlements in question provide good opportunities for their interaction with the sea. This perception is important to ferry operators, since they provide a pleasant alternative for public transportation. Apart from Ortaköy's mediocre transport perception data (see table 7), all the other settlements are evaluated as »weak«.

Furthermore, experiencing other people in public spaces represents a particularly colorful and attractive opportunity. In addition to the perception of buildings and other inanimate objects, experiencing people, who communicate and move about, offers a wealth of sensual variation. »At sidewalk cafés, as well, the life on the sidewalk in front of the café is the prime attraction. Almost without exception, café chairs throughout the world are oriented toward the most nearby active area«.

As the physical quality of open public spaces increases, ways in which these spaces are used also expand with the needs and expectations of their users. Many activities enable public spaces of better quality.

References

- Erdönmez, M. E. (2006): »Public Places City and Society«. Mimarist 22, pp. 67-73.
- Erdönmez, M. E./Akı, A. (2005): »The Role of Public Spaces« Megaron 1,s: 67-87, <http://www.megaron.yildiz.edu.tr/>.
- Erdönmez, M. E (2005): Role of Open Public Spaces in Structuring Society, Maslak, Levent, Büyükdere Axis, PhD Thesis in YTÜ, İstanbul.
- Gehl, J. (2001): Life Between Buildings, Copenhagen: Danish Architectural Press.
- Geymen, A./Baz, I. (2008): »Monitoring urban growth and detecting land-cover changes on the Istanbul metropolitan area«. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 136, pp. 449 – 459.
- Habermas, J. (2001): The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Given, L. M./Leckie, G. J. (2003): » Sweeping the library: Mapping the social activity space of the public library«. Library & Information Science Research 25, pp. 365–385.
- Zukin, S. (1995): The cultures of cities. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

PART 2 EXPERIENCING ISTANBUL

Introduction: Spaces of Everyday Life

KATHRIN WILDNER

Standing on a terrace in the Galata neighborhood, Istanbul is all around me: a panoramic view of the historic silhouette, mosques and minarets on seven hills. It is all there, as if printed in the pages of a coffee-table-book. Turning slightly, my gaze travels across the Bosphorus, countless ferries cross the water to Üsküdar and the Asian side of the endless city; under the bridge, toward the modern towers of the Central Business District in the Maslak and Levent quarters. Between my position on the terrace and the downtown towers lie hotel complexes displaying advertisements on screens and high-rise congeries, rooftop bird cages, clotheslines and other useful things. A closer look at the rooftops and buildings around me reveals a multitude of construction sites. Behind refurbished art-deco facades, dwelling structures currently inhabited by large (immigrant) families are transformed into spacious homes for wealthy urbanites. The building right in front of me houses a huge loft with large windows. It is full of floor-to-ceiling bookshelves and heavy wooden furniture.

My perspective on the terrace corresponds with a panoramic view of the city and its urban meta-structures, or with the strategic view of urban planners. But there are other perspectives on the city. At street-level there are human densities; flows of commodities, interaction and communication. »Walking in the city« is experiencing the repetitive, situative and strategic ways urban actors create spaces by interacting with the architecture and with each other (de Certeau 1984). These everyday practices are a significant dimension in the production of urban space.

At first, Istanbul amazed and intrigued me. The diversity and complexity, the metropolis' permanent state of movement, transformation and urban life was surprising, irritating, fascinating and challenging. The way historical layers and contemporary economic structures manifest themselves, compete and interfere with each other in physical and social space was challenging. The usual tenets of social and cultural studies for research of urban phenomena seemed inadequate. »Modernity«, »tradition«, »globalization«, »center«, »periphery«, »religion« and »public space« seemed insufficient, abstract concepts, which refer to dichotomies – obviously these have to be questioned with regard to Istanbul and other urban agglomerates. Intellectuals in Istanbul and other urban scholars confirm my impression that its urban complexity and ongoing processes of transformation compete with persisting clichés as part of the imaginary representation of Istanbul.

Urban space is an ongoing and dynamic process of social and cultural construction, which materializes in physical sites, social interactions, imagery and narratives. Urban space is thus variable and temporary and has differing criteria for meaning (Wildner 2003). The constitution of urban space is a social process based on spatial structures and space constructing activities (Löw 2001). Accordingly, this means thinking of spaces less in territorial terms, but as a process of creating social and discursive meanings. Looking at these spaces of interaction and flow, brings the micro-cultures of everyday life into greater focus (Rogers 2005:406).

Most scientific approaches investigate urban transformation processes as calculable and structural principles in the context of global and neo-liberal conditions on a macro level. A focus on urban phenomena as specific implementations, informal practices, local characteristics and symbols opens up another perspective on processes of transformation that are not always predictable (Flusty 2003). Contemplating everyday life on the micro level, where global conditions are finally translated into material spaces and interpreted into cultural practices; more or less hierarchically disputed, experienced and lived, seems not only appropriate, but necessary. It is the move from a panoramic perspective to street level, to »reading the urban texture« (de Certeau 1984), concentrating on the routines, banalities and practices of everyday life (Lefebvre 1991). The quotidian dimension of urban life, the »coping with« and sustaining of life in complex situations – embellished by material details, social strategies, narratives and symbols – manifests the diversity of cultural knowledge and its significance in the production of urban space.

Focusing on the complex phenomena of everyday life in cities like Istanbul requires appropriate methodologies. Ethnographic approaches

do provide a spectrum of research objectives and instruments. Doing urban ethnography signifies the investigation of space as a material site or »built environment«. It composes physical boundaries, as well as symbolic meanings. The investigation of these physical places, and the ways different actors experience, perceive and appropriate, is part of ethnographic work. The social spaces created by networks and cultural practices, as well as the notions of space manifested in city models, in narratives, imageries and urban representations are also possible objects of investigation. An ethnographic approach focuses on micro situations in order to understand the meanings and contradictions inherent in spaces in the wider context of the urban condition. The object of study, the micro situation might be a contested neighborhood, a social network as part of an urban movement, discourses surrounding a public event, a dispute about urban planning projects, the biography of a migrant family or a specific urban location like a restaurant. The different trajectories of »multi-sited ethnographies« allow us to observe and interpret the complexity of local, everyday practices in their respective contexts (Marcus 1995). Thick descriptions of places, practices, and discourses provide a range of material for the analysis of temporary constructions of space. Applying the main techniques of urban ethnography – systematic descriptions, extended interviews and participant observation – means to take part in everyday situations, leaving the distant, amazed view from afar, being in the urban situation, listening and observing, talking and discussing, and learning about everyday practices in their urban contexts. In this case the observer cannot maintain the position of a neutral outsider. In participating in the situation the ethnographer describes. The interpretation must include a reflection of the researcher's role in the field. Subjectivity is not to be excluded, but to be reflected (Burawoy 1991).

Not all of the contributors in this part of the book describe their approach as ethnographic, but I still think it is appropriate to embrace historical analysis, cultural description and subjective interpretation of urban phenomena as ethnographic approaches to understanding the constituent aspects of everyday life in the processes of urban space. All of the articles presented here emphasize everyday experiences, daily routines and urban rhythms as a frame of reference. By focusing on specific sites, practices and social networks these authors study fields in which urban spaces are constantly reproduced and reinvented.

A study of labor migrants in the 19th century leads us to the significance of the appearance of urban institutions like newspapers, theaters and cafes to provide new public spheres in the formerly strictly territorially organized city of Istanbul. In another article, it is a small restaurant

run by ethnic entrepreneurs, which might take the role of a place of refuge and contact for »strangers«. These are examples of how specific migrant groups create their own urban spaces to exchange information, trade goods, gather and communicate. Especially under dominant global conditions of spatial and social segregation and the ever-increasing fragmentation of cities, research on a local level reveals the complexity of everyday practice as it creates niches through spatial appropriation and invention.

On the other hand, a look at contemporary transformational processes in Istanbul also provides examples of heavily contested spaces. This becomes obvious through the establishment of a public beach, where middle-class inhabitants blame the working-class and rural immigrants for invading public space with the culture of their everyday lives.¹ Further, in a case-study on the transformation of a whole street into a private consumption area, images of cosmopolitan, urban culture are re-invented.

Focusing on gender roles, female spaces – evidently accurately defined as private or public – are challenged by the activities of the women themselves. As a background for representations of urban »modernity«, the analysis of movies from the 1950s reveals the construction of gendered space. Places for women are spatially limited but even more significantly, they are defined by behavior patterns and styles of dress. The style of dressing, especially the scarf is still an important element in the supposed distinction of the private and the public. A study about women migrants from the country shows that they create their own independent networks and challenge images of »modern« urban life. In this case, veiling is an open demonstration of the emancipated, public self (Göle 2004: 23), defiance of governmental rules, or the everyday assertion of one's »right to the city«.

Following Henri Lefebvre and his visionary concept, it becomes apparent that »the right to the city« not only demands access to urban infrastructure and institutions; but also refers to participation in social activities and discursive spaces, to the creation of spaces of representation, and last but not least, to the experience of desire as an active position in the production of urban public space (Lefebvre 1996).

In Istanbul as elsewhere, there seem to be different meanings, vivid discussions and even conflicts about the definition of public space, locality and identity. There are still ongoing »ideological battles over the control of public space and its function as a symbol of public morality«

1 Derya Ozkan, paper presented on the conference »Public Istanbul«, Weimar 2007.

as described by Çağlar Keyder nearly ten years ago. The potential is greatest in those spheres where »public space cannot be privatized where interaction is unavoidable« as in schools, on sidewalks or when confronted with billboards (Keyder 1999: 25). Following Nilfür Göle, Istanbul's urban space seems to be organized and ruled by strategies for anonymous public life, limiting spaces for strangers, organizing the city in *mahales* (neighborhoods) and controlling the body in public. The multiple mechanisms for controlling public life are quite different from definitions of an emancipated, liberal, modern identity and the principles of public space as postulated in western contexts (Göle 2004: 42). It seems difficult to overcome polarization or »dismanteling binarism« (Kandiyoti 2002: 3). But there do seem to be some proposals for spaces »in-between« as articulated in the contemporary, heterogeneous discussions about qualities and representations of public spaces – keeping in mind that the discussions themselves should be read as public spheres (discussions on the conference »Public Istanbul«, Weimar 21st and 22nd of January 2007).

Doing urban ethnography shows that urban public space cannot be analyzed as a given established space, but has to be examined within the processes of its own constitution and the continuous negotiation of everyday practice. The challenge faced by contemporary urban studies is to examine and focus on differences, not as insuperable conflicts, but to look at them as constructive friction, in the interest of overcoming dichotomies and exclusive definitions of self and space.

References

- Burawoy, Michael (1991): »Introduction«. In: Burawoy, M. et.al. *Ethnography unbound. Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*, Berkley: University of California Press, pp. 1-8.
- Certou, M. de (1984): *The practice of everyday life*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Esen, O./Lanz, S. (2005): *Self Service City Istanbul*, Berlin: b_books.
- Flusty, S. (2003): *De-Coca-Colonization. Making of the Globe from Inside out*, New York: Routledge.
- Göle, N. (2004): »Die sichtbare Präsenz des Islams und die Grenzen der Öffentlichkeit«. in: Göle, N./Amman, L. (eds.) *Islam in Sicht. Der Auftritt von Muslimen im öffentlichen Raum*, Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 11-45.

- Kandiyoti, D. (2002): »Introduction: Reading the Fragments. In: Kandiyoti, D./Saktamber, A. (eds.) *Fragments of Culture. The Everyday of Modern Turkey*. London/New York: I.B: Tauris, pp. 1-25.
- Keyder, Çağlar (1999): »Istanbul«. In: Keyder, C. (ed.) *Istanbul. Between the Global and the Local*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 3-28.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991): *The Critique of Everyday Life*, London: Verso.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996) »The Right to the City«. In: Kofman/Lebas (eds.) *Writings on Cities, Henri Lefebvre*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp 147-160.
- Löw, M. (2001): *Raumsoziologie*, Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.
- Marcus, G. (1995): *Ethnography in/ of the World System – The Emergence of Multi-sited Ethnography*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24, pp. 95-117.
- Rogers, A. (2005): »Observation on Transnational Urbanism: Broadening and Narrowing the Field«. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31.2, pp. 403-409.
- Wildner, K. (2003): *La Plaza: Public Space as Space of Negotiation*, http://www.republicart.net/disc/realpublicspaces/wildner01_en.htm (20.02.2008)

Istanbul's Worldliness

ASU AKSOY

Exactly ten years ago, Kevin Robins and I carried out a small-scale study examining the fragmentation of urban space in Istanbul, focusing on modernisation policies of the peripheral municipality of Esenyurt, and specifically on the relationship between its *gecekondu* area and its new »modernised« zones of Esenkent and Boğazköy (Aksoy/Robins 2000). Esenyurt's municipal leader, coming from a background of 1960's and 1970's radical left wing youth movements, was trying to impose a comprehensive order on the perceived disorder of the migrant urban space of Esenyurt. This modernising project was no less than »bringing a civilised way of life« to what was described as »a place with no architectural aesthetics, neither a city nor a village, lacking in trees, roads, water, infrastructure and social facilities« (Aksoy/Robins 2000: 345). After failing to introduce modern planning rules to the unruly and impoverished setting of the neighbourhood, made up of illegal settlements by migrants from the south-eastern regions of Turkey, the mayor then decided to tackle the problem of modernisation by means of a different strategy. He tried to re-locate the poor dwellers to the new satellite towns of Esenkent and Boğazköy, areas adjacent to Esenyurt, on the other side of the motorway. These satellite colonies were to be developed on a vast land that the municipality expropriated from its private owners, on the basis of a law permitting the seizure of property in order to halt the spread of illegal *gecekondu* settlements. The mayor was defiant, in the face of acrimonious court battles, defending his actions by saying »it is the first time that private land has been appropriated and distributed to the people« (Aksoy/Robins 2000: 347). These satellite towns were to be both modern and model cities, with green areas, and

parks, shopping centres, schools, and hospitals, and cultural and sporting facilities. The architecture of the new settlements was resolutely modern, though very dense, and intended to symbolise and sustain the lifestyle of ordered modern urban culture.

The satellite project was in the heroic tradition, and driven by a great modernising idealism. In its aspiration to re-order the city, or rather to constitute an alternative order beyond the imagined disorder of the migrant city, it constituted a utopian plan for the future of Istanbul. The municipality's avowed intention was »to transform the migrant populations, who had become marginalised as a result of the damage they had inflicted on the city, into citizens who would take care of the trees, the roads, and the green areas, and who would put pressure on the authorities with their democratic demands«. However, the people of Esenyurt – the people in whose name the project of Esenkent and Boğazköy had been undertaken – did not choose to come and live in these new areas, did not want to share in this utopian ideal city. Soon enough though, the satellite towns were inhabited by Istanbul's expanding middle classes looking for »homogeneity of a lifestyle cleansed of urban clutter – of poverty, of immigrants, of elbowing crowds [...] a world of safe and antiseptic social spaces« (Öncü 1997: 68-9). This was in 1998. Our conclusion was that the utopian civilising mission which had encountered resistance, then had to rethink its approach to the city – to realise its objectives, not at the scale of the city as a whole but through the construction of small islands of modern urbanity at the outskirts of the city, in cleansed environments, made safe through the homogenization of residents' profiles. This was the basis of the fragmenting city – on one side Esenyurt with its poor migrant populations holding on to their squatter settlements, and on the other, Esenkent and Boğazköy with their upcoming moneyed middle-class residents in clean and orderly environments.

Back in 1998, the relatively few luxury and gated-housing developments for middle classes, such as Bahçeşehir, Kemer Country, constituted isolated and dispersed islands in the cityscape, next to or circled by large swathes of poor squatter areas (Kurtuluş, 2005). Now, in 2008, the city landscape looks very different, where high density and large scale commercial land development projects of residential and non-residential kinds squeeze out the informal settlement areas of the migrant poor. One after another, old squatter areas with mixed land ownership patterns are being targeted for urban regeneration. What urban regeneration here invariably means is the tearing down of poor housing areas along with their entire neighbourhood, and the incorporation of these cleansed out spaces into the development projects of large real estate companies. This

constitutes now the once and for all victory of the modernising vision – getting rid of informal housing settlements with their »squatter culture« and what recently our prime minister Mr. Tayyip Erdoğan said of one of these neighbourhoods being demolished, their »hideous-looking monstrosity«.

If we remember that the present AKP government came to power with the decisive support of the urban poor, how do we interpret the switch in their policy and rhetoric, their explicit gentrifying logic that targets the urban poor with their informal economies, housing and coping mechanisms? AKP policies take the form of cleansing operations where the aim is gentrification of the city space and culture, and in this they join in forces with the old »elites« of Istanbul, that is the secular elites whose interests now lie with the positioning of Istanbul as a globally open city with all its required accoutrements. In what follows I will elaborate on the urban regeneration policy of the present AKP government as it is implemented in Istanbul by central and local authorities and on the recent city branding initiatives by the top business elites of the country. Both urban regeneration programmes and city branding initiatives reveal a decisive strategy of modernisation through the production of regulated, purified and homogenised spaces. And they are accompanied by a similar idealism to that of the mayor of Esenyurt – that being a profound conviction that, be it the residents of squatter settlements, or self-run informal businesses, they would like to »develop« and modernise. The present day local governments march on with equal determination and top-down authoritarianism to what amounts to »changing the society« by the production of gentrified space. We may also note that the programme of gentrification is very much linked to their desire to use Istanbul as a stage to demonstrate their modernity and globalism. AKP is compelled to tidy up this stage, to eradicate what seems pre-modern and erect gentrified spaces to the norms of global cities as their décor. But, perhaps what is significant is that relating to Istanbul as a stage forces the ruling Islamic-origin AKP to constantly revise its position towards global openness. This is because global openness is an uncontrollable process whereby conflictual images of Istanbul find fertile ground for articulation and reception. The Roma of the devastated and threatened neighbourhood of Sulukule are invited by the Green Party of the European Parliament to a conference in Strasbourg in support of their cause. Istanbul's liberal nightlife culture makes headlines in prestigious international magazines such as Newsweek. The marginalised poor get all kinds of ideas from social movements elsewhere in the world. Global openness helps sustain the kind of diversity that is being threatened by the double onslaught of authoritarian and elitist gentrifica-

tion in the city. The public culture of the city then feeds on the AKP government's neo-liberal politics of globalisation, developing a disposition towards what I term worldliness, finally leaving behind inward-looking, self-obsessed import-substitution modality that has hitherto marginalised the city, condemning its people to what Orhan Pamuk aptly describes as provincialism and isolation.

However, the murder of Hrant Dink, the journalist, writer and civil rights activist of Armenian origin by a youth of ultra-nationalist connections, in front of the office of the newspaper he edited in Istanbul, put into perspective how the new cultural orientation in the city is tentative and fragile. Dink's murder demonstrated that, if there has been a certain opening up, diversification and reinterpretation of the mental maps of the citizens over the last two decades or so, this has also been accompanied by a parallel convergence of a range of reactionary positions, whose common denominator seems to be precisely the fear of openness. As Orhan Pamuk recently said, during his tour in Germany from his residence in the US, »we may have been mistaken in thinking that we have become liberal and open to the world« (Pamuk 2007). What has surfaced is the precariousness of the culture of openness, now increasingly challenged by the very tensions it has given rise to. In the coming sections, I will also try to highlight how Istanbul's worldliness is being threatened by a widespread and endemic disavowal that we see in the AKP's thinking and in the urban elites of Istanbul concerning the implications of a roll-out neo-liberalism for issues concerning social justice and cultural diversity.

Deep cleansing of Istanbul

Very recently, the National Directorate of Privatization Administration oversaw the selling of 100, 000 square meters of the National Highway Authority's land in Zincirlikuyu Istanbul to a Turkish business group for 800 million US dollars, raising the price per square meter of land in this central business area to 8,000 US dollars. Then, a couple of months later, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality finalized the bid process for a 46, 000 square meter warehouse space belonging to the Istanbul Transport Authority, situated immediately adjacent to the Highway Authority's land. It was sold to a Dubai-based real estate company for 705 million US dollars, with declared plans to build what have been dubbed the »Dubai Towers«, at an estimated cost of 5 billion US dollars. With this municipal sale, the per square meter value of property in the area rose very quickly to 15, 000 US dollars, surpassing average central

business district prices in London or Tokyo. What was shocking was the speed with which the land price almost doubled, indicating the appetite of global real estate investors for sites in Istanbul.

And there is plenty of land, for sure. The transfer of land to global commercial interests is no longer limited to one particular area of the city, as was the case in the mid-eighties in Istanbul. Public spaces dotted around the city are coming into focus, one by one, for large-scale privatization and development initiatives. The Galataport and Haydarpaşa areas, situated at the two key entrance ports to the city from both sides of the Bosphorus – the Anatolian and European sides – are now being considered for redevelopment, involving massive stretches of land. Considering that there is also the political will to get on with privatization – as Prime Minister Erdoğan recently confirmed, declaring that his duty is to market his country – Istanbul is going to witness more and more global capital pouring into the beleaguered urban space.

The new round of globalisation in Istanbul is then primarily real estate driven. As Çağlar Keyder remarks, »land has finally become a commodity« (Keyder 2005: 130). It is within this context that we should evaluate the recent political initiative to push through large-scale urban regeneration programmes all across Istanbul, targeting neighbourhoods with low-quality housing, or with derelict but historically valuable properties. Politicians, from the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality to the prime minister, are now frantically drawing up metropolitan-scale visions and plans to help prepare the infrastructure for the coming wave of investments. Kadir Topbaş, the metropolitan mayor, has masterminded a new concerted planning initiative, setting up the Istanbul Metropolitan Planning office (IMP), with around 500 employees. Cash-strapped municipal authorities are finding solutions for their problems in area development, through large-scale projects undertaken by powerful investment and construction companies. In a recent interview, the head of TOKİ, the Prime Ministry Housing Development Administration, declared that half of Istanbul's housing stock (3 million in total) would have to be replaced in the coming 20 year period and that they will start this operation in twenty slum housing areas from 2008 onwards (Alp/Şentürk 2007). Residents of many areas in Istanbul – Sulukule in the old Istanbul; Süleymaniye, again in the old part, within the city walls; Tarlabası in the Pera district; Zeytinburnu next to the city walls, towards the west of the city – are now subject to municipal programmes, involving the expropriation of private properties in return for cash compensation or a share in new far-flung developments. Thus, the historic Tarlabası district in Beyoğlu, with its abandoned Greek Orthodox churches and its rows of dilapidated nineteenth-century houses – now occupied by Kurdish popu-

lations from the South East of Turkey, living side by side with local gypsy populations and illegal African immigrants – is being targeted to be cleaned up by a development corporation that will turn the rows of houses into »attractive« residences with parking spaces and shopping areas, of course keeping some of their unique character by retaining their facades. And construction companies are about to move in to start pulling down their neighbourhoods. All these regeneration and redevelopment projects are driven by an explicit agenda to turn city spaces into money-making assets, through becoming sites for heritage tourism, for real estate development tailored to the expanding moneyed classes, and for shopping, entertainment and congress tourism.

In this new round of globalisation, real estate investments are flooding into the most profitable sectors, which have nothing more to do with the industrial profile of the city. What is attracting investors is the skyrocketing consumer demand in Istanbul for high-quality housing, recreational and retail facilities, and, perhaps not so surprisingly, for cultural tourism. The city authorities are planning to transform industrialised areas of Istanbul one by one. In the words of Kadir Topbaş,

»Istanbul should shed its industrial profile [...] Istanbul should become a city with a qualified workforce, a city with a different attitude towards the world [...] Istanbul should, from now on, become a financial centre, a cultural centre, a congress tourism centre.« (Boztepe 2007)

We are already seeing the results of this turn in Kartal, a heavily industrialised area with over 100 factories along the seashore, occupying 550 hectares of land and situated on the Anatolian side of the city. The local mayor of Kartal recently announced their plan to attract 5 billion US dollars from foreign investors to develop a yacht harbour with a capacity to accommodate 1000 boats, plus hotels, residences and plazas – a project to be undertaken by, nobody less than Zaha Hadid. Companies with factories in Kartal are moving their production base and turning their much sought after plots into shopping malls and recreational centres.

What in fact started back in the mid-eighties – the project of globalising Istanbul, turning the city into an internationally competitive city, attractive to investors, businessmen and tourists – is now being fully realised. This is the reason for characterising this new moment of urban change as the new round of urban globalization. In the eighties and throughout the nineties, the global vision achieved partial and piecemeal results in practice. The global city, as Murat Güvenç remarks, had been grafted on the existing urban fabric, thus, leading to the emergence of two Istanbuls.

»One that had been expanding in an unregulated fashion and with its own internal dynamics and the other designed to accommodate the actors of the global world, aiming to secure them attractive and secluded living and working environments.« (Güvenç n.d.)

Hence, central business districts with multi-storey ultra modern office blocks and gated communities were initiated in the early nineties. These projects were undertaken by the large and diversified holding companies that dominated the Turkish economy, and were serving the needs of their professional workers. For the affluent populations of Istanbul, many new residential projects were being built at the outskirts of the city, such as the Alkent 2000, on a 7,000 square meter land, in Büyükçekmece, advertising itself as being only eight minutes away from the airport, or the Kemer Country in Kemerburgaz, on the green belt of Istanbul. New highways, transportation infrastructures, shopping malls, and five-star hotels, like the Swiss Hotel, the Four Seasons, Hyatt Regency, were all being erected. What distinguished this phase of globalisation, though, was that all these developments did not so much touch most of the city; and did not penetrate the life world of its citizens. Instead, they remained secluded preserves of the globalizing elites of the city, driven mainly by Turkish-origin conglomerate capital. Istanbul entered the new millennium as a »dual city« (Robins/Aksoy 1996).

However, now, in the new millennium, every part of the city is exposed to radical change as more and more land is pulled into the market sphere, catapulting the whole of Istanbul into a non-reversible process of large-scale urban change. It is an overwhelming and all encompassing change, because of the alliance of national and local political wills and economic interests and of course because of the scale and scope with which global capital has entered the scene.

Cultural Gentrification

This new round of urban globalisation though is not just real-estate driven and we are not only talking about global investments in bricks and mortar either. It is also a cultural project. As life practices and cultures of existence in the public domain are increasingly falling into the orbit of global businesses that develop and manage large swathes of public space, »our very existence itself, our public experience«, as İhsan Bilgin argues »starts having a life of its own as part of a pre-designed consumption experience« (Bilgin 2006: 173).

As public spaces fall one by one within the ambit of design and management businesses, which are invariably extensions of global property development projects, the city's public space becomes a business proposition, in which public experience is conceptualised in terms of consumption and recreation. The Kanyon shopping mall, recently opened in Istanbul's central business district of Maslak, is a good illustration of this incorporation of public space into the culture of hyper-consumption. In as much as it covers nearly a 38,000 square meter area, the mall literally turns a huge public space into an affluent middle-class consumption space, but one that has been designed as more than just a mere shopping experience. As the four floors of the winding structure wrap themselves around a canyon-like open-air environment the feeling that is evoked is that of being on a street lined with up-market retail outlets, with well-groomed street vendors selling traditional food from designer carts, and with arty street lighting and furniture. The aim of the designers – the Los Angeles-based Jerde Partnership who created Tokyo's Roppongi Hills – is »to not only offer Istanbul folk a chance to stroll outdoors (with sliding store windows that can be opened in summer), but also a planning scheme that makes each of the four levels seem like individual streets« (Menkes 2006).

However, as the publicity material puts it, unlike a city street, most walking areas are covered and climate controlled, blending natural light and open air with comfort that allows visitors to enjoy every season without suffering its excesses. What Kanyon offers then, is a new interpretation, a new culture, of what the experience of a city and its variety of streets should be like.

In not so dissimilar a fashion local authorities too are putting into place large-scale programmes to regenerate city quarters using culture as a vehicle. The Beyoğlu Municipality was the first to give permission to private developers to actually turn a whole street in the run-down part of the old Pera district into a themed street. The theme was French street lifestyle, so the name of the street was changed from Algeria Street to French Street. From street furniture to wall paintings, from street sculptures to the design of the interiors of the cafes and restaurants, everything was styled to evoke a Montmartre atmosphere. The street, which had once been a public space, has now become a commercial area managed by a business association, dictating the outdoor music, the architectural features, and advertising placements. At one point, there was even an attempt to install security guards at the entrance to the street in order to monitor the flow of »customers«. There are further plans to turn more streets into themed spaces – an Italian street, a Japanese street, and so forth. The Müze-Kent (Museum City) project of the metropolitan mu-

nicipality on the other hand, is unveiling its cultural leanings in its drive to replace the informal and neglected housing and workspaces with residential quarters designed in »the Ottoman style«.

Kanyon introduces to Istanbul the culture of the »modern, metrosexual consumer« (Dyckhoff 2006), as its managing director puts it. New urban regeneration projects and residential developments all come with a cultural approach to urban living. Culture is used by property developers to promote lifestyles. As İhsan Bilgin has argued, the city is »fragmented into self-sustaining enclaves, each with their swimming pools, jogging tracks, cinemas and shopping arcades, all built side by side but in no communication with one another« (Bilgin 2006: 175). As the marketing concept of one massive residential development project on the Anatolian side of Istanbul called »My World Ataşehir« expresses it, the new urban culture is informed by a dream of a world perfectly thought through; one where »you will find the life you are looking for«. Residents can now live perfectly happily within their own environments, with their own kind of people, without having to rub shoulders with others, even the next-door neighbours; they need only leave their enclaves to go to work, and, at weekends, to go downtown to enjoy a bit of heritage or arts.

Culture – in its anthropological sense as a way of life, in its economic sense as a business opportunity, and in its symbolic sense as a seat of power and status; is shifting in terms of all of these meanings. Investing in art and culture has become the fashion of the day in Istanbul, and major business conglomerates and their foundations are competing with one another for suitable spaces to build arts and cultural centres. After the opening of Istanbul Modern, founded by one of the prominent business empires, the Eczacıbaşı family, a recent announcement has come from the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation – a husband and wife enterprise closely connected through both descent and marriage to the conglomerate Koç business family,. They have launched a bid to turn what is known as the *Tüyap* area in the heart of the city – an area that belongs to the metropolitan municipality – into an international centre for culture and arts. There are plans for a new cultural complex, to be designed by none other than Frank Gehry, and costing 160 million US dollars (the Kıraç Foundation put aside in total 500 million US dollars for arts and culture). For the first time, global capital involvement in the traditionally unprofitable arts and culture sector is also taking place, through joint venture agreements and collaborations. Thus, a five-year protocol has just been signed between the Sabancı Museum and the Louvre for artistic and scientific cooperation – whereby the Louvre will be bring cultural capital in the form of exhibitions, know-how and net-

working to Istanbul. Laureate Education – one of the world's leading international providers of higher education – recently struck up a partnership deal with Istanbul Bilgi University, one of the top private universities in Turkey, and became a strategic partner in Bilgi's new cultural initiative, Santral Istanbul.

Culture is implicated in everything now. Companies use culture for their image building capacity, not just for the sponsor, but investment in arts and culture pays itself back through affording profile and stature to the city – which then, of course can help to boost its overall profile for the investors, visitors and residents alike. The central government as well as the local municipalities are now undertaking huge cultural infrastructure projects. The cases of the Atatürk Cultural Centre in Taksim or the Muhsin Ertuğrul Theatre Hall in Harbiye, both in the city centre, are good illustrations of this trend. Both these existing cultural facilities are being targeted for demolition in order to allow for the building of super-modern, prestigious and multi-functional cultural spaces. The Istanbul Metropolitan Plan recently completed by the Metropolitan Planning Office makes a great deal of projecting a contemporary image of the city for competitiveness through investing in culture (IMP 2006).

The development of policies and infrastructure for cultural industries, for cultural tourism and for conservation of historic and cultural heritage are key policy elements of the metropolitan planning office's recommendations. Istanbul's international arts and cultural festivals are highlighted as very useful mechanisms to promote the city and demonstrate its attractiveness globally. Culture is seen as capital to be exploited in the global competitive game, by now a familiar vision of most globalizing cities. However, this cultural turn in public policy and discourse for Istanbul is something quite new and tremendously significant in its implications.

The end of »import substitution« modality

As a recent feature article in the New York Times puts it, Istanbul is a city enjoying a renaissance. Istanbul is regarded as one of the most dynamic cities in the world, open to change, and, indeed, changing fast. And not only that. As the front cover of a Newsweek (2005) magazine put it, what we have is a »Cool Istanbul: Europe's Hippest City«. The picture on the cover displayed a scene from a very western looking night club with a scantily dressed young man and a woman dancing to dimmed red lights – not like the old and what may be regarded orientalist depictions of Istanbul with whirling dervishes or squatter areas. What

has changed in Istanbul? The key to understanding this lies in the shift in public culture away from an inward-looking stance in parallel with the globalization of the city. A new round of urban globalization forcing open the city's urban spaces and cultural practices has brought with it a parallel process of cultural openness. The city is finally relinquishing what we may call the modality of import substitution, a post-second-world war economic policy of protecting the local market from imports from the industrialized markets and producing these imported products locally. This policy was used by most developing countries to redress disadvantages in international trade, condemning them to permanent poverty against the industrialized producers of the North.

Orhan Pamuk, in his speech accepting the Nobel Prize, characterized this shift very well:

»In the 70s, I too, began, somewhat ambitiously, to build my own library. I had not quite decided to become a writer – as I related in *Istanbul*, I had come to feel that I would not, after all, become a painter, but I was not sure what path my life would take. There was inside me a relentless curiosity, a hope – driven desire to read and learn, but at the same time I felt that my life was in some way lacking, that I would not be able to live like others. Part of this feeling was connected to what I felt when I gazed at my father's library – to be living far from the centre of things, as all of us who lived in Istanbul in those days were made to feel, that feeling of living in the provinces[...]

As for my place in the world – in life, as in literature, my basic feeling was that I was 'not in the centre'. In the centre of the world, there was a life richer and more exciting than our own, and with all of Istanbul, all of Turkey, I was outside it. Today I think that I share this feeling with most people in the world. In the same way, there was a world literature, and its centre, too, was very far away from me. Actually what I had in mind was Western, not world, literature, and we Turks were outside it. My father's library was evidence of this. At one end, there were Istanbul's books – our literature, our local world, in all its beloved detail – and at the other end were the books from this other, Western, world, to which our own bore no resemblance, to which our lack of resemblance gave us both pain and hope.« (Pamuk 2007)

The image of import substitution in cultural terms refers to this feeling of isolation and provincialism that characterized Istanbul's public culture up to the late eighties, and maybe even into the nineties. Relinquishing the import substitution modality in the field of culture can be translated as the liberalisation of the cultural field. As business conglomerates compete with one another as to who undertakes bigger investment in museums, art collections, galleries and exhibitions, the old model of centrally controlled cultural provision is becoming obsolete. State-run

cultural organisations, such as the State Painting and Sculpture Museum or the Atatürk Cultural Centre in Istanbul, are now having acute difficulties in maintaining their place in the new cultural scene – difficulties in attracting both audiences and sponsors, and management and financial difficulties as a consequence of being state-controlled. Sponsoring commercially-funded events like the Istanbul Biennale now commands status and image for companies, and, hence, Istanbul's Biennale is flourishing, and has now become one of the key artistic events in Europe. The fact that the non-state sector relies on trans-national connections with art institutions across the world pushes toward making the old, closed and inward-looking modality in cultural provision a thing of the past. I have already mentioned the Sabancı-Louvre collaboration. Additionally, Santral Istanbul, the new arts museum initiated by the Istanbul Bilgi University is talking to the Tate Modern in London about collaborative programming; Istanbul Modern is signing a deal with the Pompidou Centre; and we hear that there will be more to come in this type of trans-national cooperation.

The appetite for joint projects and internationally ambitious artistic undertakings is translating into growing openness in the arts sector. The hiring of British art historian and curator David Elliot, formerly in charge of both the Moderna Museet in Stockholm and the Mori Art Museum in Tokyo, as the director of the Istanbul Modern Art Museum illustrates the shift in Istanbul's cultural scene towards global openness. And this global openness demands self-confidence and vision. Hence, in his first major interview with the media, Elliott's formula for Istanbul Modern comes across in a confident tone, as one of centring Istanbul, »looking at the world from Istanbul« (Onat 2007). As Andrew Finkel, an experienced journalist and commentator on Turkish affairs puts it: »Istanbul Modern under his watch is not going to be Orhan Pamuk's Istanbul of nostalgia, melancholy and regret«. It seems, rather »to make the city aware of its own capacity for change« (Finkel 2007). Liberalisation in the cultural arena comes with a desire to shed some things of the past, and with an urge for change. Now, as we approach 2010, when Istanbul will be the European Capital of Culture, this yearning for liberalisation, seems to be finally taking hold.

This turn towards greater openness and interconnectedness is an outcome of and is ultimately driven by the project of gentrification of the city. The city space itself is being mobilised »as an arena both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices« (Brenner/Theodore 2002: 368). The »projected city« is a collection of gentrified spaces, and cultural imaginary is being increasingly shaped by this very project of gentrification. In this projected city there is no more

room for the squatters or their culture. What is significant, in the context of Istanbul, is the relentless rise to ascendancy of this imaginary. Squatters should be »modernised« (or in other words, tamed). They should accept to give up their squalor and inhabit the mass housing schemes developed for them. As many media columnist these days openly express with no hesitation, the squatters should not be allowed »to occupy our common land and build illegal and ugly constructions that start off as single storey buildings and then get higher and higher« (Özkan 2008). We are urged to »stop migrants lowering further down the city's life standards and its image« (Uras 2008). And behind it we find a previously unanticipated coalition of urban elites of Istanbul. This coalition involves what Orhan Esen calls the »North-Istanbul elites« (the post-eighties generation of secular, middle-class and professional workers) and the rising commercial elites of the Islamic-oriented traditional circles, politically represented by the »innovative group« in the ruling AKP (Justice and Progress Party). These two elite groups, who had, until now, remained polarised, now share a common aspiration, which informs their actions and their discourses (Esen 2005). What is held in common is a vision of Istanbul as a city that is globalized and gentrified, providing orderly and clean public spaces and residential quarters, with an attractive public image and world class services and goods. We may argue, then, that the opening of the cultural field is underwritten by the gentrified class base of the neo-liberal regime. Cultural liberation progresses in the direction of what suits the needs of the rising elites of the city, in ways that respond to their expectations of higher living standards.

Worldliness in danger

What I have described so far is the global opening up of Istanbul along neo-liberal lines. Istanbul has become a stage for the unfolding and relentless reproduction of the neo-liberal dynamic. Having found a convenient argument in globalisation as a way of building a political programme that served to answer anxieties from both the secular Republican political camp and also the conservative Islamic side (Çınar 2003), the ruling AKP government have shown little hesitation about the way ahead in terms of opening up Istanbul to market-driven global forces. In this respect, Istanbul's transformation has been a state-led project. The pro-globalisation position of the ruling AKP government has turned the state, as Neil Smith puts it into »a consummate agent – rather than a regulator of – the market« (Smith 2002: 443).

This restructuring of the city along neo-liberal lines suits the aspirations of – and is being driven by – its globalising elites and the city's propertied classes. At the present moment, the property-owning residents of the city have too much to gain from the opening up of Istanbul to market-driven capitalist growth. And considering that according to the latest census results of 2000, 58% of the households, out of around two and a half million households in total, have declared that they are living in their own property, we are talking about a considerable proportion of the city population whose fortunes are directly implicated in the changing economy of the city. The scale of real-estate focused market activity is far more extensive today, touching and transforming even the slum housing that has been legalised over the years. It is perhaps not surprising, then, to witness a lack of interest – and sympathy – for the social exclusionary outcomes of the transformation that is being unleashed in the city. There is a broad consensus behind this project for the globalisation of Istanbul, a confluence of interests with an interest in remaining silent in the face of the new exclusionary dynamics. Hence, when Kadir Topbaş announces his views on curbing internal migration into the city by »increasing the cost of living in Istanbul to the level of Paris« (Topbaş 2007), there is generally no protest. He seems to be echoing the desire of the growing base of urban elites for Istanbul's gentrification.

The forceful evictions that are beginning to be rolled out in various urban gentrification projects undertaken by one municipality after another in the city are meeting with no major resistance from the city's urban elites. In the historic inner-city area of Sulukule, for instance, almost all of the 690 households – some of which are Roma, and where at least six residents live per household – are targeted for evictions, as most of them do not hold property deeds despite the fact that they have been residents in this area for a century or so. The same fate awaits the recent Kurdish immigrants from the south east of Turkey in the Tarlabası district. These residents are very poor, but, more significantly, they do not hold the deeds which would enable them to take part in Istanbul's increasingly market-oriented housing economy. It seems that those who are not in a position to use their land deeds to bargain their way into the new economy of Istanbul will be quietly relegated to the status of the invisible. They will be no longer heard of in the public sphere except when they become junkies, dealers, criminalised youth.

And, with lack of welfare state structures and the increasing collapse of informal and identity-based incorporation mechanisms in the city – as Çağlar Keyder remarks, »the older mechanisms of social integration that helped incorporate the migrants into the urban world of Istanbul no longer provide a remedy« (Keyder 2005: 130) – we begin to see exclu-

sionary dynamics operate on a much larger scale than ever before. With high levels of unemployment, an unqualified labour force and the continuing influx of immigrants from the rural areas of Turkey – as well as from neighbouring countries, and now from Africa – social exclusion find fertile ground in Istanbul (Behar/Islam 2006). Considering the extent to which Istanbul's population increased in the last seven years – from around 10 million in 2000 to over 12 plus million in 2007 – almost all through new migrations, the scale of the social problem becomes clear. Yet, Istanbul's new elites lack a social vision to begin to engage in the exclusionary dynamics of market-based relations. They are woefully lacking in any self-reflexivity to those processes that feed their own self-interests. On the contrary, if anything, all the different elite constituencies vie for power in order to maximise their benefits from the new economy of the city. This is the generalised state of disavowal in the city that I am referring to.

Unless a corrective to this self-interest focused neo-liberalism can be invented, there is a strong possibility that the exclusionary dynamics that are building up will eventually find their expression in social fracturing, division and conflict. In a context where the division between the excluded and the included is dramatically increasing sharpening, and where the familiar mechanisms of incorporation are increasingly being weakened, religious and ethnically-informed identity positions can become ready ciphers for frustration and anger. This new round of urban globalisation is characterised, moreover, by the sheer scale and power of global capitalist dynamics to undermine small-scale and individual efforts of urban constituencies to determine the basic conditions of their everyday lives. Before this neo-liberal programme turns into a grim scenario where powerlessness feeds a backlash of political conservatism and authoritarianism, there is clearly a need for a new politics of openness – a new perspective, as Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore argue, »for imagining and ultimately implementing strategies for pushing back the current neo-liberal offensive« (Brenner/Theodore op.cit.: 376). Istanbul's new urban elites need to capture »the sense that a different global is possible« (Smith 1999: 105). This is a project requiring, above all, a prolonged process of negotiation, with an explicit agenda about the kind of globalisation and openness that might enlarge public spaces of interaction, engagement, and mutual responsibility – against the grain of the fragmentation and commercialisation in city spaces that underscore growing social inequality and exclusion. This is what I have in mind with the concept worldliness – a disposition not to reject openness, but to think, as Çağlar Keyder argues, »about new modes of embedding the market« (Keyder 2005: 103).

Is this all just a dream? Would it ever be possible for Istanbul to embrace worldliness? As I have argued above, apart from isolated and increasingly marginalised voices of opposition, globalisation of the city is embraced enthusiastically. However, in the context of the killing of Hrant Dink, in a context where Orhan Pamuk, Turkey's first Nobel-prize author, is not able to walk freely in the streets of his beloved city, in a context where the hundreds and thousands of people flocking to an anti-government demonstration in a central square in Istanbul are giving out very confused signals about where to vent their anger and look for solidarity, the prospect of worldliness keeps appearing and disappearing. In a context where even the commissioning of internationally renowned architects like Zaha Hadid and Ken Yeang to undertake some of the public projects in Istanbul is facing mounting anger, with protestors posing the issue as a confrontation between local (re: Turkish) versus the international (re: Outsider), the vulnerability of even the neo-liberal project of openness becomes clear. The »old order« may be dismantling on the ground, where traditional and non-formal structures are no longer able to act as incorporating mechanisms, but it is clearly not being written off at the discursive level. From privatization projects to architectural commissions, to international arts prizes, calls for privileging the local (re: the »national«) values are finding eager reception. Defensive and fearful responses to what are in fact »complex, confusing and often highly contradictory implications of this ongoing neo-liberalization of urban political-economic space« starts slipping easily and seamlessly into an exclusionary language, to the rejection of difference and diversity and ultimately to nationalistic fanaticism.

The task, then, is to address the widespread disavowal that is threatening Istanbul's worldliness. The real challenge to the AKP government and to the new urban elites is, first, to confront the urgent need for a corrective to deepening social exclusion. As Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder remark in their report titled »New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey« for UNDP, »[t]he risk of social exclusion becomes all the more severe in a situation where traditional support mechanisms have ceased to be effective along with the decline of formal employment opportunities and the rise of permanent poverty« (Buğra/Keyder 2003: 49). In this context, where also the gentrification of urban space and culture underscores the increasing disempowerment of the urban poor to shape the urban space for their survival, it is crucial to pose worldliness as a strategy to reconstitute the neo-liberal project for socially just outcomes; to pose worldliness as a framework for demanding »democratic re-appropriations of city space« (Brenner/Theodore 2002: 376). The second, and perhaps even harder challenge to take on board, is the dis-

comfort towards the idea of diversity, plurality of life forms, and plasticity of spaces, in short towards the uncanny – qualities that seem to be most threatened by the utopian idealism of modernist visions.

References

- Aksoy, A. and Robins, K. (2000): »Worlds Apart and Together: Trial by Space in Istanbul«, In: S. Watson/G. Bridge (eds.) *A Companion to the City*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 342-353.
- Behar, D./İslam, T. (eds.) (2006): *Istanbul'da »Soylulaştırma« İstanbul: Bilgi University Publications*; also refer to O. Işık/M. Pınarcıoğlu, (2001): *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk*, İstanbul: İletişim; Kurtuluş, Hatice (2005).
- Bilgin, İ. (2006): »Kent üretiminin ve kamu yaşamının örgütlenmesinde güncel eğilimler«, *Toplum ve Bilim* 105, p. 166-178.
- Boztepe, E. (2007): »Topbaş: İstanbul'un trafik sorununu çözmek için 15 milyar dolar lazım«, *Radikal*, 2 January.
- Brenner, N./ Theodore, N. (2002): »Cities and geographies of "actually existing neoliberalism«, *Antipode* 34, p. 349-379.
- Buğra, A./ Keyder, Ç. (2003): *New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey*, Ankara: UNDP, p S1-56.
- Çınar, M. (2003): »Yenilikçi gündem küreselleşmeye mi ihale edildi?«, *Görüş*, March.
- Dyckhoff, T. (2006): »Turkey's new delights«, *Times Online*, 15 August.
- Esen, O. (2005): »The tightrope walk of the middle class in a fractured İstanbul«, *Writings from the 9th International İstanbul Biennial*, İstanbul: İKSV, p.120-133.
- Finkel, A. (2007): »İstanbul Modern«. *Today's Zaman* 11 March.
- Güvenç, M. (n.d.) Unpublished Manuscript for İstanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture Project.
- IMP (2006): »İstanbul Çevre Düzeni Planı: Özet Rapor«, İstanbul: İstanbul Metropolitan Planning Office.
- Keyder, Ç. (2005): »Globalisation and Social Exclusion in İstanbul«, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29, 1, p. 124-134.
- Kurtuluş, H. (2005): »Bir »ütopya« olarak Bahçeşehir«, In: Hatice Kurtuluş, (ed.), *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma*, İstanbul: Bağlam, p. 77-127.
- Menkes, S. (2006): »A futuristic mall is new Turkish playground«, *International Herald Tribune*, 4 December.

- Onat, A. (2007): »Dünyaya İstanbul'dan Bakmak«. Milliyet 15 March.
- Öncü, A. (1997): »The Myth of the ›Ideal Home‹ Travels across Cultural Borders to İstanbul«, In: A. Öncü/P. Weyland (eds.), Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalizing Cities, London: Zed Books, p. 56-72.
- Özkan, F. (2008): »Vatandaş Omuz Vermezse Kentsel Dönüşüme 500 Yıl da Yetmez«, Radikal, 10 January.
- Pamuk, O. (2007): »Avrupa yanlıları baskı altında«, Der Spiegel interview with Orhan Pamuk published at the same time in Radikal, 29 April.
- Pamuk, O. (2007): http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureate/2006/pamuk-lecture_en.html accessed on 5 April 2007, translated by Maureen Freely.
- Robins, K./Aksoy, A. (1996): »İstanbul between Civilisation and Discontent«, City 5-6, p. 6-34.
- Şentürk, A. O. (2007): »İstanbul'da 1 Milyon ev yıkılacak«. Ekonomist 11 November.
- Smith, N. (1999): »Which new urbanism? the revanchist '90s«, *Perspecta*, 30, p. 98-105.
- Smith, N. (2002): »New globalism, new urbanism: gentrification as a global urban strategy«, *Antipode* 34, p. 427-450.
- Topbaş, K. (2008): »İstanbul için Yeniden Adayım«, *Bugün*, 20 January.
- Uras, G. (2007): »İstanbul'un Marka Değerini Düşürüyoruz«, *Milliyet*, 26 December.

Public People. Temporary Labor Migrants in Nineteenth Century Istanbul

FLORIAN RIEDLER

This paper examines public spheres and public spaces in Ottoman Istanbul from a special vantage point. By showing how marginalized temporary labor migrants (*bekar*) were integrated into city life, this paper aims to develop a better understanding of meanings of »public« in Ottoman Istanbul. With this approach I respond to the recurring demand of historians to extend research on the public sphere beyond the existing research on bourgeois publics of Western Europe. On account of this critique in European historiography, the examination of the historical development of *the* public has given way to an envisioning of multiple publics, which were differentiated according to class and gender (Eley 1992).

In a similar vein, research about the public sphere in non-European societies was informed by an attempt to leave behind this monolithic concept of the Western bourgeois public. Lately, different forms of traditional Muslim publics have been in the focus of this research. Most of these publics had a strong affinity with religion, because they were organized by *ulema* (Islamic religious scholars), but also by more popular and heterodox *sufi* movements. Institutional underpinnings of traditional public spheres in Muslim organizations such as *waqf* (endowment) or the notion of Islamic law and community in general have been singled out (Hoexter/Eisenstadt/Levtzion 2002). However, secular institutions like trade and craft guilds as well as coffeehouses are relevant in this discussion, too (Arjomand 2004).

First I will examine how labor migrants were connected to traditional publics and their supporting institutions. On a basic level the status of migrants and the spaces they were allowed to occupy in Istanbul was defined by public morals and state law. Private and public spaces inform debates concerning the concept of the »Islamic city« in which the notion of private and public has been singled out – often polemically – as one of the key features setting European cities apart from Muslim cities. With reference to this debate, temporary migrants offer an example which shows the layering of various forms of public and private spaces in nineteenth century Istanbul. On an institutional level, trade guilds were charged with the task of integrating migrants into the Ottoman labor market. Whether guilds in Istanbul could be conceived as voluntary public associations that, like in Europe, formed the nucleus of a civil society has similarly been a recurring topic in the debates on the Islamic city (Gerber 2000).

The second part of the paper focuses on the emergence of new public spheres and public spaces in Istanbul during the second half of the nineteenth century. The emergence of these spaces were part of a general transformation Istanbul and Ottoman society, in which migration was an important factor in the acceleration of this transformation. In the second half of the nineteenth century we encounter new publics in the form of philanthropic societies, places like cafés and theatres, and through the availability of print products such as newspapers and books. In general these were publics of an emerging bourgeoisie, but as a result of the spreading nationalisms, these spaces also offered an opportunity for integration of non-bourgeois groups such temporary migrants.

In my analysis of factors responsible for the integration of workers into the public sphere and public spaces of nineteenth century Istanbul different understandings of terminologies relating to the private/public dichotomy are mixed deliberately, because, though overlapping and contradicting, they are nonetheless thematically linked. The two main forms of »public« in this context are the political-deliberative public as well as a public understood as a sphere of sociability (Weintraub 1997). It is my aim to show how migrant workers belonged to »public Istanbul« in many different meanings of the word public and, in turn, to analyze their position in a corresponding »private Istanbul«. Hopefully, this will lead to a more detailed picture of public spheres and public spaces in the Ottoman capital and will also help to understand temporary labor migration in the Ottoman Empire beyond a purely functional economic explanation.

Labor migration in the Ottoman Empire

Labor migration is an old phenomenon in the Ottoman world that, according to some, can be traced back to Byzantine times. Connecting underdeveloped areas with population surpluses to more developed areas suffering from a scarcity of labor is the economic rationale behind labor migration. In order to maintain their economic power, and due to their poor hygiene conditions and recurring epidemics, cities were in constant need of population replenishment; migrants played an important role in maintaining both population and power. Temporary migration – a form of migration in which migrants (usually male) do not settle permanently in the place they work – was and still is a special arrangement offering additional benefits to both migrant as well as receiving cities. The arrival of temporary migrants allowed cities to grow with less strain on their natural resources since the reproduction of the workforce remained located in the mostly rural home regions of the workers and their families. The temporary worker, on the other hand, could profit from the difference between the low cost of living in the village and the high wages offered by city jobs.

Not just men, but also young girls and women came to Istanbul from the countryside to work as servants and maids. As women frequently disappeared into the privacy of the households they were serving, little information is available regarding the particularities and patterns of female labor migration.

In nineteenth century Ottoman cities, this temporary labor migration worked much in the same way as in Europe where historical forms of temporary and seasonal migration have been studied much more intensively (Lucassen 1987; Moch 1992). Although the picture is incomplete, scholars have described temporary labor migration in the Balkans and Anatolia at different times from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century (Faroqhi 1984; Palairat 1987; Kırılı 2001; Ginio 2002; Riedler 2008). The Ottoman capital, Istanbul, being the largest of all Ottoman cities and a world city, was particularly dependent on workers from outside. According to population counts around 1850 more than 75,000 temporary labor migrants worked in Istanbul amounting to more than 35% of the city's male population at the time (Karpas 1985; Behar 1996).

Jobs requiring little training were typically filled by male temporary workers. Boatmen, shuttling goods and people from one part of the city to the other, porters distributing goods to the markets, water carriers who distributed drinking water from the public fountains to private households, or bakers and butchers who supplied the city with bread and meat are just a few examples of the jobs migrants in Istanbul occupied. These

professions, usually part of a guild, were critical to the upkeep of the city's infrastructure and were therefore partially controlled by the government. Likewise migrants worked as street vendors and peddlers that also played a crucial role in distributing foodstuff to the residential quarters of the city, but were less supervised.

In principle, these migrants were temporary, i.e., they were no permanent residents of the city. However, unlike seasonal workers in agricultural jobs rowers, porters or street vendors sometimes stayed for several years in Istanbul, before returning to their families in the countryside, only to set out again soon after they arrived. These arrangements as well as their precarious economic condition made them live a life in between the city where they worked and their homes where their families stayed.

Istanbul's authorities insisted on the temporary status of the city's migrant workers. Separation from the city's permanent inhabitants formed the official principle for their »integration«. It should be added, however, that it is difficult to assess if and how this separation was enforced. Temporary workers were not considered normal inhabitants, but strangers in the city. Economic factors coupled with moral and legal norms led to the specific form of life labor migrants experienced, also determining their use of public and private spaces in the city.

The Ottoman government prescribed and sometimes enforced separation of temporary workers from the city's population in order to prevent migrants from becoming permanent inhabitants of Istanbul. After Istanbul had been conquered by the Ottomans, it became the largest city in the Empire and perhaps in Europe. The city's growth coupled with its function as capital, called for additional labor. However, migration above a certain level that could not be controlled was unwanted, because the authorities felt unable to provision a rising city population. Fearing a loss of taxpayers and production capacity in the countryside, the Ottoman government repeatedly evicted workers or tried to prevent migration to the capital in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Aktepe 1958). In an effort to control labor migrant traffic in and out of the city, and make it impossible for labor migrants and their families who often followed closely behind settle permanently in the city internal passports (*mürur tezkeresi*) were introduced at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

One of the clearest calls to prevent migration to the capital and control temporary workers was formulated in 1826, the year when the Janissary Corps was abolished by the sultan. The Janissaries were the city's police force and had also controlled Istanbul's urban economy, collecting dues and protection-money not sanctioned by the government. Thus

new arrangements for the city's security and the regulation of its economy had to be taken by the government. One important step was the reorganization of the Market Inspection Office. Since the fifteenth century, the market-inspector (*Ihtisab Ağası, Muhtesib*) had been part of Istanbul's urban government and was not only responsible for collecting taxes and controlling prices, market weights and measures, but it was also his duty to supervise public morals. In the nineteenth century the Ottoman government discontinued farming out this office and thirty years later it evolved into Istanbul's head of administration (*şehremini*).

A regulation issued in 1826 reorganizing the Market Inspection Office (*İhtisab Ağalığı Nizamnamesi*) (Ergin 1995: I, 328-41), maintained the market-inspector's traditional tasks, but stressed the necessity of supervising migration as well as the different types of temporary workers. To regain lost control over labor migration in the early nineteenth century, the government's new regulations required every worker to register at checkpoints upon entry to the city. Workers were then forced to stay in four supervised inns (*han*) in the bazaar-area of the inner city or in similar institutions in the Galata, Üsküdar or Eyüp suburbs before being handed over to the worker's respective guilds. The new regulations illustrate the governments' consciousness of urban geographies as it tried to abolish previously uncontrolled areas in the city, such as the Saraçhane saddler bazaar (Ergin 1995: I, 335-6).

The regulation of 1826 is a good example for the traditional Islamic understanding of public order (*hisbe, ihtisab*). For the Ottoman government public order meant maintaining the city's security and economy. In practice, the government was responsible for provisioning the city with staples such as grain, bread and meat and controlling its prices (*narh*). Additionally, the maintenance of public order also had religious implications such as the surveillance of the inhabitant's moral conduct (Ak-gündüz 2005).

As Michael Cook (2000: 469) notes, *hisbe* is an important measure for the demarcation of public and private spheres in Muslim societies. *Hisbe* is exercised in the public sphere – the sphere in which the government is allowed and obliged to enforce »good order« according to the principle of »commanding right and forbidding wrong«, as it has been called in classical Islamic discourse. In Ottoman Istanbul to a large degree public space identical with the economic sphere of the city, in spatial terms the bazaar area, as the concrete tasks of the office responsible for public order, the *muhtesib/ihtisab ağası*, suggests. The next sections of this paper will deal more extensively with the spatial implications of public and private in Ottoman Istanbul in the context of the debate on

the »Islamic city«. Recapitulating this debate will help to understand the normative nature of the separation and surveillance of labor migrants.

Private and public in the »Islamic city«

For quite some time the appearance and function of cities in Muslim societies has attracted scholarly attention and, in older scholarship, has led to the construction of the so-called »Islamic city« model. Since the 1960s this model has increasingly been criticized on account of its orientalist assumptions and its rigidity. Critics pointed out that the traits of the »Islamic city« were generalized characteristics of cities in the Maghreb while other significant cities in other Muslim countries were overlooked. Moreover, the model saw religious norms as the predominant factor in shaping cities in Islamic societies, while many other urban characteristics could be explained with reference to secular factors such as geography and technology. Several critics rejected the term »Islamic city« and instead attempted to introduce wider and supposedly more neutral descriptions such as »traditional« or »oriental« city or »city in dar al-Islam« (Hourani 1970; Wirth 1975; Abu-Lughod 1987).

Despite this critique, revisionist literature also describes common structural elements found in cities in Muslim societies, which is called their »deep structure«. One of these elements is the division between private and public spaces. On opposing ends of the public and private spectrum are bazaars (public) and residential quarters (private) – a dichotomy that traditionally has been interpreted as a strict separation between the two spheres. In between, however, there are multiple zones of semi-private and semi-public spaces like courtyards, cul-de-sacs and small streets in residential quarters that question this separation between public and private. Furthermore, the divisions between public and private could switch according to time of day and use, so that a very complex pattern developed that defied a static spatial division of the public and the private. The main factor causing this deep structure was the gender divisions in Muslim societies. Female/private spaces and male/public spaces were segregated, but linked through social constructions of in-between spaces that assisted cities to function more smoothly (Abu-Lughod 1980).

After Istanbul became the capital of the Ottoman Empire, it shared many features with other cities in the Muslim Middle East. One of these features was the function and composition of the city's neighborhoods (*mahalle*). The *mahalle* was not only an important administrative unit, but also provided a framework for social interaction and the traditional

communitarian lifestyle of the city's residents. In Istanbul the *mahalle* usually comprised a few hundred houses, grouped around a mosque, church, or synagogue and a public bath. Its population was not socially stratified; poor and rich inhabitants shared the same space. The *mahalle* was a small community with strong solidarities and code of honor that had to be protected against outsiders. The imam of the local mosque functioned as the middle-man between government and population. In the early nineteenth century a secular official (*muhtar*) replaced the imam in this function (Duben/Behar 1991: 29-35).

During certain periods, the organization of the Istanbul neighborhoods showed similarities to neighborhoods in the cities of the Maghreb that mainly inspired the »Islamic city« model presented above. One was the common origin of people living in the same quarter. After the conquest of Constantinople, people from various regions of the Empire were given plots to settle in the city. Often the names given to new quarters gave away the settlers' origins as for example, in the case of Aksaray, Çarşamba and Balat. Another example of such a similarity is the seclusion and self-sufficiency of quarters. At the end of the sixteenth century, some Istanbul neighborhoods were furnished with gates that were supposed to be locked by night. In general, however, these similarities were vanishing from the sixteenth century onwards. Istanbul's quarters, unlike those in some other Muslim cities were not autonomous or self-sufficient entities that could seal themselves off from the city proper and exist independently. Moreover, solidarities between inhabitants that did rely on external factors such as origin lost their predominant influence on shaping the settlement patterns in the city. To a certain degree this is also true for religion. Although Istanbul neighborhoods were usually formed along religious rather than along social lines there are many examples of areas with a religiously mixed population (Kreiser 1974; Işın 1995: 39-40; Behar 2003: 3-10).

Literature on urban structure in Muslim societies has attributed neighborhoods with »private« functions in contrast to the »public« character of the market. However, also inside the neighborhoods being the basic building blocks of the city there existed public space. During the sixteenth century the coffeehouse became one of the main places where the public of the *mahalle* congregated. It coexisted with and integrated the public functions of the mosque and, to a lesser degree, public baths (*hamam*). In the coffeehouse the men could meet and discuss politics and other matters of local concern; coffeehouses were places in which public opinion was expressed. For men the coffeehouse functioned as the extended public part of their home, the *selamlık*, where they could welcome visitors. Especially for poorer inhabitants the coffeehouse as a

selamlık was particularly important, since their homes were too small to allow the functional differentiation into female/private and male/public spaces (Hattox 1985: 122-30; Georjon 1997: 40-45; Kırılı 2004).

While in the coffeehouse the aspect of public as sociability – the open sociability of men in contrast to the hidden sociability of women who could meet friends at home – was dominant, other institutions mediated between *mahalle*-society and state. Many Istanbul neighborhoods established foundations to collect municipal taxes (*avarız*) from the quarter's inhabitants. Through these local foundations, the neighborhood was connected to one of the most important institutions of the traditional public sphere in Muslim societies, the *waqf/vakıf*. As has been noted, such foundations provided the framework for citizens to express and negotiate their interests relatively unimpeded by the state also on a larger and less local scale (Gerber 2002: 75-77).

As strangers to the city, at least in theory, temporary migrants had to be kept away from the »private« world of the *mahalle* and therefore also had limited access to its relatively closed publics. It is telling labor migrants were called *bekar* in Turkish, a word that originally meant »without a (proper) job«, but in the course of time became to mean »bachelor«. This shift points to the public image of migrant workers who were perceived as unattached – although many migrants had their own families in their villages – and thus were perceived as potentially threatening to the family values of the *mahalle*.

The dwelling places of migrants, inns (*han*) or bachelor rooms (*bekar odaları*), were a world almost opposite and separated from that of the neighborhood. The *han*, usually a rectangular two-storey building in which cell-like rooms were arranged around a large courtyard, was a multifunctional building that was used as accommodation for strangers in the Ottoman city such as travelers and merchants, but could also contain shops and workshops. These large buildings were located in the bazaar area of cities, but sometimes also near the city gates. Besides offering shelter at night it also allowed strangers to obtain legal residence during their visit to the city. The *han* acted as an official address that was valid for business transactions; the inn-keeper was the residents' guarantor (*kefil*), and was responsible for their security, their belongings, and generally supervised the *han*, too. Functionally speaking, the *han* served as the travelers' »homes« and was a private enclave within the public space of the bazaar where they were usually situated. For the individual, however, there was little privacy or intimacy to be found in a *han*. European visitors have described them as places where !! »everything was done everywhere«; eating, sleeping, washing, praying etc. was performed with or close to the other inhabitants of the inn. These de-

scriptions show differing definitions of privacy that depended on the social and cultural origin of the observers (Tamdoğan-Abel 1997).

Not only merchants and travelers lived in inns during their visits to the city, but also labor migrants could choose a *han* as their residence. In the case of Istanbul such a migrants' *han* was usually not one of the prestigious big buildings in the city centre that have survived until today, but a smaller, less impressive structure. Usually migrant workers of the same profession lived together in one *han*. Most of them were not in the business district around the Grand Bazaar, but in Fatih, Üsküdar and Tophane. Boatmen and day-laborers typically resided on the outskirts of town. An eye-witness account of the life in two such inns or »rooms« (*oda*) from a British consul describes the following:

»1. There are 150 lodgers [in total]. In a room, 12 feet by 15 feet, and 12 feet height, lodge 5 men. The rent of a room is 10s. a month. It contains scarcely anything beyond bedding-quilts and three small boxes. Within the *oda* is a coffee-house, where pipes, coffee, and raki are to be found, and to which a barber is attached. There is likewise a shop where cabbages, onions, and lemons are sold, as well as bread, candles, and charcoal. The entire building is of wood,
2. The *oda* contains the means of lodging 350 persons. The master is a Turk. Of 36 rooms 29 are inhabited by Armenians and 7 by Mussulmans. The rooms, all of wood, are on two storeys. In the courtyard vines grow. There is in the centre a large tank. The *oda* contains a coffee-house and a kitchen. The lodgers have one meal a day, in the evening. The food now being prepared is soup, with pieces of meat in it, dolmas (leaves of cabbage stuffed), and beans. A quantity of cherries is being reduced to syrup.« (Watson 1869)

However, more often, temporary workers could be found in smaller rooms, so-called *bekar odaları*. In order to save money, many labor migrants lived in the rooms above their work-places, shops and workshops. Many workshops were concentrated in certain areas of the city, as where the *bekar odaları*. Evliya's seventeenth century description of Istanbul recalls numerous examples of such living and working quarters, in which the shoemakers of the central bazaar are perhaps most famous for their unruly population of young men (*Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*: II, 123-4 and V, 394). Like the inns, the *bekar odaları* were controlled by the police and each of them was required to have a headman (*odabaşı*) responsible for the inhabitants. The rooms were plain and contained little furniture, reflecting the low economic status of the labor migrants who lived in them, as well as the fact that the migrants were not at home in the city. Descriptions of such places like the following of an Armenian baker are rare.

»The room that we had taken was a dry place adjacent to the storage room for the flour. In front of the window a bench [spanned the length of the wall.] [...] There was not even a chair because we had no time to sit down anyway. Every night we spread out our beds on the floor and lay down. And every morning we gathered them together again. Well, the bishop [a frequent visitor] knew this and even was used to the emptiness of the room.« (Mintzuri 1993: 71)

These rooms potentially disturbed the urban order that divided the city into residential and business areas, its private and public spaces. The aforementioned regulation of 1826 that envisioned centralized lodging for all labor migrants explicitly addressed this problem. It banned rowers and porters from living in rooms »here and there«. Instead they were ordered to take up residence in inns assigned to them and stay there when not working. Likewise, landlords were instructed not to rent their rooms to people from abroad (Ergin 1995: I, 332).

The regulation of 1826 made an interesting exception to this rule regarding water-carriers (*saka*). With the permission of the neighborhood's imam, water-carriers were allowed to stay overnight in residential districts to be able to deliver the water on demand, and so they could be on site quickly in the case of fire. This exceptional and sometimes venerated status of the water-carriers was confirmed by a European traveler who came to Istanbul later in the nineteenth century (Ergin 1995: I, 335; White 1846: II, 16-19).

The separation of the residential population from the temporary migrants remained an ideal, and explains the standard »Bekar Sokağı«, a Bachelor Street, many Istanbul neighborhoods contained. In later censuses many labor migrants were registered in residential quarters outside the central bazaar area (Duben/Behar 1991, 29-30). Debates over the uses of urban space also seemed to occur frequently. In the early nineteenth century complaints about *bekar odaları* were handled by the *kadı* (Ertuğ 2006: 146), but later the police and city authorities were responsible. A case in 1905 shows that even a *han* in a busy quarter like Ak-saray could be regarded as unsuitable to house labor migrants on account of its location not only on the edge of a Muslim quarter, but also in the vicinity of a mosque and a sufi lodge (*dergah*). In one case a group of women in Beyoğlu complained to the authorities, because they felt disturbed by *bekar odaları* in their neighborhood. The inhabitants were expelled and a warning given to the owners of the *bekar odaları*. Additionally, the authorities considered the erection of a wall to separate the *bekar odaları* from the other houses (BOA: ZB 375-112, 11 Şubat 1322 and A.MKT.MVL 47-50, 26 M 1268).

All this shows that the separation of temporary workers from permanent residents was managed on a finer scale than the spatial order assumed by the model of the »Islamic city« or the Ottoman authorities in the regulations discussed above. Research on Istanbul's micro-level spatial structure reveals the internal division of neighborhoods into residential and business zones. In the nineteenth century Istanbul had to absorb all kinds of newcomers, such as refugees and other immigrants, apart from temporary migrants. Moreover, many temporary migrants became permanent inhabitants by either marrying into Istanbul families or bringing their families from the country to the city. The former was the only legal way to settle permanently in the capital and there seems to have been a market for marriage brokers and match makers (Koçu 2002: 179-80).

Bringing a family from the country to the city was, despite its illegality, common and, as it turns out, at the end of the nineteenth century, it was not difficult to obtain the necessary papers to legalize one's stay. Usually newcomers to the city relied on networks consisting of other people from their region who had already settled in Istanbul. Through these networks migrants to the city could find shelter and work in the informal sector. In such networks, not surprisingly, owners of coffee-houses played a crucial role in acting as guarantors for migrants who wanted to settle in the city (Behar 2003: 95-129). Although these coffee-houses were set apart from the usual *mahalle*-coffeehouses, they nonetheless served similar functions. For example, particular coffeehouses in Istanbul's business-district were known to be frequented by people from certain regions to exchange news, transact business, or to rent a room while they were in the city (Georgeon 1997: 51). Many conversations in these places were concerned with the situation in home provinces, as spy reports from the 1840s reveal. The behavior of officials like governors and tax collectors in the provinces was a favorite topic of discussion. Thus also the coffee-houses of migrant communities were places of public political opinion (Kırlı 2004: 89-90).

In some cases members of labor migrant networks also organized themselves politically to react to the conditions in their home provinces. In 1846 a group of laundry men from Nevşehir, a town in Cappadocia, petitioned the Ottoman government to exempt them from paying their taxes, due to the bad harvest in their home region. Petition writing was as an important political activity in the traditional public sphere (Quaert 1994: 24-25).

From traditional to new publics

Traditional forms of public in Istanbul were anchored in city neighborhoods defined by the extent their inhabitants participated in social activities that centered around the mosque (or church or synagogue) and the coffee-house. Labor migrants were not supposed to inhabit these publics on account of their separation from the residential population of the capital. Nonetheless, despite government precautions, there seem to have been plenty of opportunities for migrants to settle in the city. Usually their entry into the neighborhoods was facilitated by regional networks that also assisted migrants, even those who did not intend to settle, to integrate into city life. Often such regional networks operated in the framework the established guild-system as well as in the informal labor-market.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Istanbul saw the development of new public spheres and spaces beyond the traditional ones that were associated with *mahalle* and religious life. They were – sometimes unintended – effects of the official modernization policies or part of global trends the Empire was subject to. A developing bourgeoisie, Muslim and non-Muslim alike, adapted European models and practices of sociability which they enacted in their city. The resulting publics were open to various degrees of participation. While, for example, mason lodges were somewhat elitist establishments, participation in voluntary associations, newspaper reading, visiting the new-style cafés, or the attending the theatre included a wider cross-section of inhabitants disregarding ethnic and religious boundaries. Together with these new forms of sociability, new political nationalist publics also came into being which often countered bourgeois cosmopolitanism. The concluding paragraph of this essay will assess the position of temporary workers in this field of non-traditional publics.

First by the government and later on a private basis newspapers were one of the most palpable innovations in Empire's public sphere. Despite severe censorship in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman capital maintained a large and varied press. A special journalistic genre called »City Letters« (*şehir mektubları*) popular at this time, is particularly relevant to this paper, as these letters describe many of emerging public places such as streets, parks, and cafés generating a public image of this new Istanbul. The journalists' subjective descriptions contained in the City Letters of the particularities of city life, hinting at curiosities, grievances and nuisances, enabled the readers to envision themselves as common inhabitants of the city. The organizing principle of these letters was the idea of a stroll through the city and

people and places mentioned or left out reinvented the city according to the tastes and needs of the newspaper audience (Bartolovich 2000).

These letters were intended for the newspaper reading male inhabitant, which usually did not include labor migrants, most of whom were illiterate. Migrant stories, perspectives and interests were similarly neglected. If they were mentioned, migrants were considered to spoil the imagined order of the city. A column by Basiretçi Ali Efendi, one of the first journalists who regularly used this genre in his newspaper from 1871 to 1878, demonstrates how migrants were omitted from the narration. In the rare cases that working class people were written about, they were portrayed as either cheating on other citizens, molesting women, or were associated with contagious diseases. Dirty conditions in the inns in which people were »stacked like firewood« were a common subject of complaint. These conditions were no longer reprimanded in the moral language of court chroniclers like Cevdet or Şanizade in the first half of the nineteenth century, but it seems that the journalist neglected to call for a betterment of their lot (Basiretçi Ali 2001: 24, 41, 76, 129, 180, 218).

One of the most prominent columns written by the most famous letter-writer Ahmed Rasim maintains a lighter tone, but is primarily occupied with bourgeois problems and public places like parks and restaurants. The tendency to overlook Istanbul's working class in descriptions of the city makes it difficult to assess in how far they really participated in various new public spheres and places. A scarcity of self descriptions written by the workers themselves reinforces this problem. The biographical account of Hagop Mintzuri, mentioned previously, an Armenian who came to Istanbul from Eastern Anatolia just before the turn of the century to work with his father and uncles in a bakery in Beşiktaş, but also to attend school in the capital, therefore is a very important source of information. His stories relate much of the precarious integration of the labor migrants in the city and their access to old and new publics and public places.

In general, Mintzuri's account conveys the feeling of dissimilarity between migrant workers and Istanbul residents. These dissimilarities were not limited to status, but were also defined by tastes, clothes, and language. Mintzuri's ventures into the residential quarters where he delivered bread allowed him observe the strict rules of privacy relating to the female sphere of homes to which strangers were not permitted (Mintzuri 1993: 22-25). At the same time his account provides an insight into the networks that facilitated the migrants' survival in the city. Here, the most important binding element is neither religious nor ethnic belonging, but geographical origin, *hemşehrilik*. Turkish, Armenian and

Kurdish migrants from the east in the milieu of small shopkeepers and craftsmen assisted each other with their business, as described by Mintzuri. It seems that migrants from different religious and ethnic backgrounds formed, to a certain degree, a common public that maintained strong relations to the home provinces.

According to Mintzuri's account, factors preventing labor migrants' participation in modern city life were primarily of economic nature. Putting aside money even to pay for the horse drawn tram was avoided in order to save. Moreover, regarding other public spaces a serious cultural barrier seems impacted their use by migrants. A Sunday visit to the Bomonti beer-garden is cut short, because the drink differs from the author's usual diet. But even more traditional products like olive oil are inedible to the people from the east – an experience also familiar to other Turkish immigrants as related by the Turkish author Aziz Nesin in his autobiography (Mintzuri 1993: 20-25; Nesin 1966: I, 56-58).

This almost natural exclusion of migrants due to class and culture could nevertheless be overcome due to a strong affinity modern public spheres maintained to nationalism. In their political understanding, publics promised the equality to their participants. To the degree that such publics focused on and tried to define ethnic-national groups they offered means of integration even for poor newcomers. Flourishing philanthropic societies offering schooling and material help to various members of society provided the main vehicle for this integration. Once again, Mintzuri, one of the few migrants who could read and write, illustrates this mechanism in the context of the Armenian community. Before entering Robert College he attended the Getronagan School in Galata which also was attended by many other boys whose fathers worked in Istanbul as inn keepers (*hançî*), caretakers (*kapıcı*), or porters (Mintzuri 1993: 81). The school was run by the established Gregorian community of Istanbul and certainly had no overt nationalistic goals. However, it had to react to attempts by, on the one hand, Protestant missionaries and, on the other hand, nationalist Armenian groups to win the support of migrants for their organizations.

This new generation of pupils was able to participate in literary culture like Mintzuri did, who discovered in particular Armenian and French literature. The main place of this emerging culture was the reading room (*kıraathane*), yet another evolution of the coffeehouse. Here one could read newspapers or books, discuss politics or other topics, sometimes listen to lectures, and have a cup of coffee and a smoke. In principle, these establishments were open to anyone who could read; because they offered free papers the reading rooms could be also frequented by people who could not afford to buy a paper. It is an interest-

ing fact that the first reading room in Istanbul, Serafim Efendi's Kiraathane-i Osmani, had, on its top floor, a residence for Armenian labor migrants. Whether or not they also frequented the lower floors, however, is unknown (Georgeon 1997: 66-70).

In the late nineteenth century, Greek Orthodox voluntary associations multiplied at such speed that this phenomenon was referred to as »club-mania«. Some of these associations had philanthropic goals that also included assisting Greek migrants in Istanbul and in their home regions. Like in the case of the Armenians, education offered the chance of social advancement including the teaching of a »proper form« of Greek to inhabitants of distant and rural parts of the Empire like Cappadocia or the Pontos. In the public spheres these associations created Hellenic nationalism flourished, although in most cases their principal aim remained philanthropic (Kitromilides 1989: 168-72).

The nationalization of these publics was by no means inevitable as it has sometimes been portrayed. The late Ottoman state, well aware of the possible sedentary effects philanthropy and education might have upon its non-Muslim subjects, tried to create an imperial public as a counterweight. By tolerating certain philanthropic associations and launching donation campaigns for patriotic goals the state tried to expand its legitimacy and create a positive image of the Sultan. In the long run, however, the imperial aims of this policy and consideration of different publics – among these a Muslim public, which was especially dear to the Sultan – were in conflict with each other. Turkish intellectuals began to form a counter-public to the official imperial discourse. It was not until after the Young Turk Revolution in 1908, however, that this group was able to shed its marginal status (Özbek 2005).

Only at the beginning of the twentieth century the first examples of how workers and their organizations were drawn into nationalist politics appear. In the struggles with the foreign companies who operated the new harbor facilities in Istanbul, the porters' and rowers' guilds found themselves in opposition to their government that had conceded to the foreign companies. The porters' and rowers' guilds became natural allies of the Young Turks who, after the revolution of 1908, tacitly supported them against the Port Company in a dispute over port control, employment rights and pay. The guilds, at the same time, were instrumental in bringing the boycott against Austrian goods to a success (Quataert 1983: 95-120).

Only further research can show if there were other examples of how labor migrants were integrated into the nascent Turkish national public and how they were later integrated in the public of the Turkish Republic. Apart from classical labor organizations, voluntary organizations

founded by labor migrants like the so-called *hemşehri örgütleri* began to emerge in the 1940s. In the present day, thousands of these organizations exist (Hersant/Toumarkine 2005). These voluntary organizations created public spheres and spaces for migrants under the particular economic and political conditions of Republican Turkey. If and how these organizations evolved from the informal networks of Ottoman times would offer an interesting vantage point of the evolution of public spheres from Empire to nation state.

Conclusion

This paper examined temporary labor migrants, the publics they formed as well as their relation to other publics in Ottoman Istanbul. They are an example of a non-bourgeois and non-elite group in a non-European setting. Under »public«, I mainly understand a sphere and space of sociability. Such sociabilities, the popular culture that gave shape to them as well as emerging plebeian publics (Medick 1982) have not only been a field of historical research in Europe, but in the Ottoman context inquiries have also been made into this thematic field (Faroqhi 1995; Georjeon/Dumont 1997) without, however, consideration of temporary migrants.

Family and work are the two basic factors that conditioned urban life styles of non-elites, be it in early modern Europe be it in the Ottoman Empire. These were the factors that also had an impact on popular culture, sociabilities and its public spheres and spaces. In the case of the Ottoman city, the sphere of the family was the *mahalle* which therefore acquired the quality of a private space vis-à-vis the whole city. The life worlds of the *mahalle* and that of the temporary migrants in the city were in opposition with one another. On account of their status as single males, at least in theory, labor migrants had little access to the world of family of the ordinary city dweller. City authorities tried to police the borders between the different spheres of the city according to the status of their inhabitants. The only »home« and thus privacy these migrants were allowed in the city were the inns, which paradoxically were situated in or near public bazaars. While the private life of temporary migrants lacked intimacy, whether their lifestyle was altogether different from the situation of non-elite Istanbulites, remains questionable. It has been claimed that the notion of »intimacy« gained popularity among urban populations in the Ottoman Empire from the eighteenth century onwards (Faroqhi 1995, 311-2). However, its form and manifestation according to class and social status must be determined in greater detail.

In addition to its overall »private« function, the *mahalle* allocated special places for male sociability and its publics, the most important being the coffee-house. Access to these male publics by labor migrants was also restricted. Instead they had places, often coffee-houses, of their own in which extended publics from their home regions formed. These publics were expressions of the migrants' networks on which their survival in the city was dependent. If there were other places in Ottoman Istanbul where migrant publics formed, remains another question for further research. Investigating if and how labor migrants used marginal and peripheral public spaces in Ottoman Istanbul (cf. Alanyalı Aral and Bas Bunter in this volume) could yield interesting results.

While the family formed one important element of urban life worlds, work was a second important conditioning factor. For migrants, work assisted their integration into the urban society providing them an opportunity to earn a living and the right to stay in the city. Trade guilds that were supposed to control the temporary workers also offered their members a public sphere, however little is known about the nature of this public. More information about the relationships between temporary workers and guilds in urban settings is needed. It is an ongoing debate as to the extent guilds were voluntary organizations that represented the interests of their members or whether they have to be regarded as instruments of the government used to control economy and society. This question of guild-migrant relations, however, only concerns a certain proportion of temporary labor migrants who worked in one of the organized and officially sanctioned sectors. Others who worked in the informal economy had to find their own ways of integration into the labor market.

Finally, during the nineteenth century process of modernization in the Ottoman capital, increasingly expressions of a new kind of sociability emerged in public spheres and places. Many of these such as theatres and newspapers were formed and frequented by a new type of urban bourgeoisie that prima facie excluded non-elite groups. However, increasingly the public could now be understood in the sense of political deliberative publics that became part of the process of the formation of nations and nationalisms (Eley 1992). Armenian and Greek temporary labor migrants were especially involved in these processes; through new publics they were recruited to communities that increasingly began to resemble nations. Whether Muslim labor migrants also experienced and drove such a process remains, still, and open question.

References

- Abu-Lughod, J.L. (1980): »Contemporary relevance of Islamic urban principles«. *Ekistics* 280, pp. 6-10.
- Abu-Lughod, J.L. (1987): »The Islamic City – Historic Myth, Islamic Essence, and Contemporary Relevance«. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 19, pp. 155-76.
- Akgündüz, A. (2005): *Osmanlı devleti'nde belediye teşkilâtı ve belediye kanunları*, İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Aktepe, M.M. (1958): »XVIII. asrın ilk yarısında İstanbul'un nüfus mes'alesine dair bazı vesikalar«. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* 13, pp. 1-30.
- Arjomand, S.A. (2004): »Coffeeshouses, Guilds and Oriental Despotism. Government and Civil Society in Late 17th to Early 18th Century Istanbul and Isfahan, and as seen from Paris and London«. *European Journal of Sociology* 45, pp. 23-42.
- Bartolovich, C. (2000): »Inventing London«. In: M. Hill/W.Montag (eds.), *Masses, classes and the public sphere*, London: Verso, pp. 13-40.
- Basiretçi Ali (2001): *İstanbul Mektupları*, (ed. Nuri Sağlam), İstanbul: Kitabevi.
- Behar, C. (1996): *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun ve Türkiye'nin Nüfusu*, Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.
- Behar, C. (2003): *A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul. Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap İlyas Mahalle*, Albany: SUNY.
- BOA: Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi/Prime Minister's Ottoman Archive, İstanbul.
- Cook, M. (2000): *Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong in Islamic Thought*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Duben, A./Behar, C. (1991): *İstanbul Households. Marriage, Family and Fertility. 1840-1940*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, 8 vols., İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Eley, G. (1992): »Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century«. In: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, pp. 289-339.
- Ergin, Osman Nuri (1995): *Mecelle-i Umur-u Belediye*, 9 vols., İstanbul: Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları.
- Ertuğ, N. (2006) (ed.): *İstanbul Mahkemesi 121 Numaralı Şer'iyye Sicili*, İstanbul: Sabancı.
- Faroqhi, S. (1984): *Towns and Townsmen in Ottoman Anatolia. Trade, Crafts and Food Production in an Urban Setting 1520-1650*, Cambridge: CUP.

- Faroqhi, S. (1995): *Kultur und Alltag im Osmanischen Reich*, München: Beck.
- Georgeon, F. (1997): »Les cafés à Istanbul à la fin de l'Empire ottoman«. In: H. Desmet-Grégoire/F. Georgeon (eds.), *Cafés d'Orient revisités*, Paris: CNRS, pp. 39-78.
- Georgeon, F./Dumont, P. (1997) (eds.): *Vivre dans l'Empire ottoman. Sociabilités et relations intercommunautaires (XVIIIe-XXe siècles)*, Paris: Harmattan.
- Gerber, H. (2000): »Ottoman civil society and modern Turkish democracy«. In: K.H. Karpat (ed.), *Ottoman past and today's Turkey*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 133-149.
- Gerber, H. (2002): »The public sphere and civil society in the Ottoman Empire«. In: M. Hoexter, / S.N. Eisenstadt/N. Levtzion (eds.), *The public sphere in Muslim societies*, Albany: SUNY, pp. 65-82.
- Ginio, E. (2002): »Migrants and Workers in an Ottoman Port. Ottoman Salonica in the Eighteenth-Century«. In: E. Rogan (ed.), *Outside In. On the Margins of the Modern Middle East*, London: Tauris, pp. 126-148.
- Hattox, R.S. (1985): *Coffee and Coffeehouses. The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Hersant, J./Toumarkine, A. (2005): »Hometown organisations in Turkey: an overview«. *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue No. 2: *Hometown Organisations in Turkey* (<http://www.ejts.org/document397.html>).
- Hoexter, M./Eisenstadt, S.N./Levtzion, N. (2002) (eds.): *The public sphere in Muslim societies*, Albany: SUNY.
- Hourani, A. (1970): »Introduction: The Islamic City in the Light of Recent Research«. In: A. Hourani/ S. M. Stern (eds.), *The Islamic City. A Colloquium*, Oxford: Cassirer, pp. 9-24.
- Işın, E. (1995): *İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat. İnsan, Kültür ve Mekan İlişkileri Üzerine Toplumsal Tarih Denemeleri*, İstanbul: İletişim .
- Karpat, K.H. (1985): *Ottoman Population 1830-1914. Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kırlı, C. (2001): »A Profile on the Labor Force in Early Nineteenth-Century Istanbul«. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 60, pp. 125-40.
- Kırlı, C. (2004): »Coffeehouses: Public Opinion in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire«. In: A. Salvatore/ D. F. Eickelman (eds.), *Public Islam and the Common Good*, Brill: Leiden, pp. 75-98.

- Kitromilides P.M. (1989): »Question in the Balkans ›Imagined Communities‹ and the Origins of the National«. *European History Quarterly* 19, pp. 149-94.
- Koçu, R.E. (2002): *Tarihte İstanbul Esnafı*, Istanbul: Doğan
- Kreiser, K. (1974): »Zur inneren Gliederung der osmanischen Stadt«. In: W.Voigt (ed.), *Vorträge des 18. Deutschen Orientalistentags Lübeck 1972*, Wiesbaden, pp. 198-212.
- Lucassen, J. (1987): *Migrant Labour in Europe 1600-1900. The Drift to the North Sea*, London: Croom Helm.
- Medick, H. (1982): »Plebeian Culture in the Transition to Capitalism«. In: R. Samuel/G.S. Jones (eds.), *Culture, Ideology and Politics*, London: Routledge, pp. 84-112.
- Mıntzuri, H. (1993): *İstanbul Anıları. 1897-1940*, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Moch, L.P. (1992): *Moving Europeans. Migration in Western Europe since 1650*, Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Nesin, A. (1966): *Böyle Gelmiş Böyle Gitmez*, 2 vols., Istanbul: Adam
- Özbek, N. (2005): »Philanthropic Activity, Ottoman Patriotism, and the Hamidian Regime, 1876-1909«. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37, pp. 59-81.
- Palairot, M. (1987): »The Migrant Workers of the Balkan and their Villages (18th Century – World War II)«. In: K. Roth (ed.), *Handwerk in Mittel- und Südosteuropa. Mobilität, Vermittlung und Wandel im Handwerk des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts*, München: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, pp. 23-46.
- Quataert, D. (1983): *Social disintegration and popular resistance in the Ottoman Empire, 1881-1908*, New York: New York UP.
- Quataert, D. (1994): »Ottoman Workers and the State, 1826-1914«. In: Z. Lockman (ed.), *Workers and Working Classes in the Middle East. Struggles, Histories, Historiographies*, Albany, pp. 21-40.
- Riedler, F. (2008): »Wanderarbeiter (*bekar*) im Istanbul des 19. Jahrhunderts: Zwischen Marginalität und Normalität«. In: A. Pistor-Hatam/A. Richter (eds.), *Bettler, Prostituierte, Paria: Randgruppen in asiatischen Gesellschaften*, Hamburg: EB-Verlag.
- Tamdoğan-Abel, I. (1997): »Les han, ou l'étranger dans la ville ottomane«. In: F. Georgeon/P. Dumont (eds.), *Vivre dans l'Empire ottoman. Sociabilités et relations intercommunautaires (XVIIIe-XXe siècles)*, Paris: Harmattan, pp. 319-34.
- Watson (1869): *Watson to Barron, Constantinople, 25/12/1869*, in: *House of Commons Parliamentary Papers 1870*, no. C68, vol. LXVI, pp. 232-3.
- Weintraub, J. (1997): »The Theory and Politics of the Public/Private Distinction«. In: J. Weintraub/K. Kumar (eds.), *Public and Private in*

Thought and Practice. Perspectives on a Grand Dichotomy, Chicago: UCP, pp. 1-42.

White, C. (1846): Three Years in Constantinople or Domestic Manners of the Turks, 3 vols., London: Colburn.

Wirth, E. (1975): »Die orientalische Stadt: Ein Überblick aufgrund jüngerer Forschungen zur materiellen Kultur«. Saeculum 26, pp. 45-94.

The Public and the Private: Discourses and Identifications among Vanlı Women in Istanbul¹

ANNA GRABOLLE-ÇELIKER

This text considers a »public Istanbul« not in terms of a bounded physical space, but as a social field à la Bourdieu, in which people are exposed to public discourses. It is argued that the »public« permeates individuals' lives to different degrees through discourses that are perpetuated by state apparatuses and by other groups. The »private« identity negotiations of women from Van (Eastern Turkey) who live in social housing blocks in Istanbul are explored in the context of public discourses these women experience in their lives. These women from Van are, for instance, exposed to official state discourses about migration to Istanbul, Turkish citizenship, Turkish and Kurdish discourses on Kurdishness, community discourses on their place of origin and on »traditions«, discourses on womanhood, and religious discourses on appropriate Muslim behavior. In this paper, a description of some of these public discourses is followed by an account of how three women, Hediye, Ayla, and Nur, create coherent narratives of identity through interacting with these public discourses. As I will show, the public sphere in which they move is

1 I gratefully acknowledge a travel grant from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft which allowed me to attend the »Public Istanbul« conference at which this paper was first presented. I would also like to thank Akile Gürsoy, Chris Houston, Esther Blodau-Konick and Anthony Pavlik for comments that have improved this paper.

diffracted and reshaped by these women's activities in the private sphere.

Research background

This article is based on ongoing research for my PhD. My investigation into the lives of people from Van was initially based on regular visits to a village in Van province as well as Van city for the last ten years. Information gleaned through participant observation, genealogical research and interviews there was then supplemented by seven months of fieldwork among people from Van in a neighborhood of Istanbul I call Tepelik. There I visited regularly and taught English to the children of the residents. This enabled me to meet more representatives of households, most of them women. I carried out interviews, investigated genealogies and took part in neighborhood activities, such as drinking tea together, cleaning carpets and a prayer meeting. I also attended a fundraising dinner of the local Vanlı hometown association and a large-scale picnic for Vanlı in Istanbul organised by all the Vanlı hometown associations together.

Vanlı women in Istanbul's Tepelik neighborhood

The Vanlı women and their families are part of a rural migration to cities which began after the Second World War (Keyder 2000, Erder 2000). The migrants that I am concerned with in this article are mostly Kurdish and from rural parts of the province of Van, in the east of Turkey. None of them, even the children, call themselves »Istanbullu«² – rather, they are »Vanlı«³, or even more specifically, from certain districts of Van. They live in Tepelik⁴, a lower-class quarter of central Istanbul. Many of them came to Istanbul after a severe earthquake in Van province in 1976. They were offered temporary housing for the winter in eight housing blocks, totaling eighty flats. Of the original families, thirty-five still occupy their flats. Nine more flats have been bought for some of their

2 See Öncü on the »myth« around *İstanbullu* and the concomitant »others« (2000: 117-119).

3 In this article, I refer to people from Van as »Vanlı«. The ending li/lı/lü/lu designates a person from a certain place.

4 In order to protect the identities of my informants, I have changed the names of the Istanbul quarter as well as personal names. I also avoid the use of district names of Van for the same reason.

children who have married and set up their own households. Thirteen additional Vanlı households later moved to the Istanbul housing blocks from Van to be closer to their relatives. Four flats are now empty, and the remaining nineteen have been bought by non-Vanlı. Thus, of the eighty flats, fifty-seven are now occupied by Vanlı. Fifteen Vanlı households are made up of extended families spanning three generations. The Vanlı in the blocks make up a multi-stranded network of households. They are linked by a common origin from three districts of Van and by being neighbors in the same blocks. Most importantly, many of them are linked by blood or marriage ties. Furthermore, frequent day-to-day interactions between many of the Vanlı have intensified these relations.

While the blocks and their inhabitants are part of Tepelik neighborhood, the spatial organization of the site separates the block slightly from the rest of the neighborhood. Physically the blocks are distinct because they are surrounded by small yards and park and playground areas. It is said that the blocks were originally intended as lodgings for police officers. Other houses in the area have been built much closer together, facing directly onto streets, often even without pavements to separate them from the thoroughways. Many of the buildings in this denser urban fabric also house textile and woodwork workshops in their basements or on the ground floors, as well as a variety of shops and grocers, thus blurring the line between residential and commercial/industrial area.

By contrast, the Van blocks were specifically designed as residential spaces, with plenty of open space between them allowing children to play in safety; the women wash carpets and wool in the yards, and groups of old men or housewives socialize on benches during the summer months. The block inhabitants can be considered privileged in that they do not pay rent and are thus significantly better off than other families in the area with similar income. Some families who live in the blocks have been living rent-free for the last thirty years. The future of the blocks, however, is uncertain. The land belongs to a foundation, while the blocks belong to the local government. The block inhabitants have recently been asked to pay rent, but would prefer to buy the flats instead. They argue that they have invested a lot of money in the improvement of the blocks, which were bare cement casings without windows or doors when they moved in. Apart from the basic kitchen, bathroom, flooring and paintjobs in the flats, the residents of most blocks have invested in prestigious plastic double glazing, and have had the outside and the stairwell of the blocks repainted several times. Some flats have also had gas-heating installed, replacing the older coal stoves.

While the housing blocks may be physically somewhat separated from the neighborhood, the inhabitants are socially and economically firmly embedded in the quarter of Tepelik. The women do their shopping in local grocery stores and at the weekly market. They also, like many other women, work for piecework shops in Tepelik from home, sewing beads onto clothes. In addition, many Vanlı have relatives who have moved nearby and with whom there is often daily contact. The blocks thus represent a concentration of Vanlı, but their residents by no means constitute a closed group. However, from my observations I would posit that the social relations of the Vanlı women are often restricted to block inhabitants (who may be either non-Vanlı neighbors or people from the same district and/or relatives) and to relatives from outside the blocks. There is, for instance, with the exception of the few Alevi women living in the blocks, little interaction between the Sunni Vanlı women and the many Alevi women in the area.

The Vanlı are a mixture of lower class and lower middle class families whose financial situation is improved by the fact that they do not have to pay rent for their housing. Of the first generation women, none have worked outside the house. Men mostly worked in semi-skilled jobs, such as drivers or electricians. Quite a few work, or have worked, for the local council, which is apparently a result of the contacts established by one Vanlı who joined the party of the local authority government in the 1980s. Some Vanlı have opened their own stores which are run by several households together. One extended family runs a bakery, another a furniture workshop and store, while a third extended family has just opened its third grocery store. Two men, both middle-aged, are qualified engineers, and two other men have worked as civil servants. Among the second generation of young men a lack of qualifications is still prevalent. Some young women work in the ubiquitous and highly exploitative textile workshops, while a few have managed to qualify and work in professional jobs.

The local primary school is close by and all children attend school, at least up until the eighth year. Some girls then leave or are withdrawn from school by their parents, and some boys have displayed a great degree of disinterest in schooling. Markedly, many of the girls are academically ambitious, aiming for university study and a job afterwards, in contrast to their mothers, who received very little, if any, schooling. When I offered English lessons for the block inhabitants, most of my students were girls, and some parents complained that they could not get their sons to attend.

»The public«: A discourse community

While the group of Vanlı living in the blocks is not completely closed to the outside, they can nevertheless be considered a »discourse community«. Within this permeable community, there are discourse »strands«. Discourse »strands« (»Diskursstränge«, in Jäger 2001) are a collection of discourses that share the same theme, i.e. a strand represents all the things that are said/thought about a certain theme. Discourse »fragments« are smaller units within each strand, and represent different discursive positions on the same theme. Within these fragments, there are collective symbols that allow participants in these discourses to interpret social reality (ibid: 84). In the following paragraphs, I will outline discourse strands I have identified as most relevant to the lives of the Vanlı women in the housing blocks. Within each strand, of course, there is theoretically an infinite variety of discourse fragments; however, in this paper they are sometimes presented in opposites. This simplification is unavoidable but will be balanced by accounts of individual narratives later on.

Discourse strands about places of origin

Most of the Vanlı in the blocks have a rural background since their migration to Istanbul took place over thirty years ago, when villagers from Van province had not yet moved in great numbers to the city of Van. They thus came to Tepelik directly from their villages. While all of the families living in Tepelik now have relatives who have left villages for Van city, the older generation and many of the second generation women (who migrated with their husbands or came to Istanbul in marriage) experienced a childhood, and perhaps also adulthood, in a village. Most of the young adults and children who were born in Istanbul know about their parents' village through visits to Van, visits from relatives to Tepelik, and through the narratives of their parents. The »village« and »village life« are collective symbols that are used by all the Vanlı women and men I have met.

A common discursive position when talking about village life is nostalgia. Nostalgia for village life is particularly strong when a woman has many relatives remaining in the village whom she does not see often, or if she remembers a carefree childhood; often the girls of the house do not need to work very hard, as their mother and the »brides« are available to do housework. Virilocal residence after marriage, i.e. with or

near the husband's family, means that many women lose touch with their friends from childhood and adolescence.

Nostalgia is also embodied knowledge, as contrasts are made between village life and urban discomforts: Istanbul's toxic smell of burning coal in the winter and the sickly-sweet smell of uncollected rubbish in the summer is contrasted with the fresh rural mountain air; the chlorinated undrinkable tap water in the city with the clear cold streams in the village; the white bread loaves of the city with the flat bread baked in the *tandır* ovens of the village; the anonymity and coldness of urban relations with the crowded, happy gatherings in the village; the danger of urban life for children and teenagers compared with the freedom to roam in the village; and the weddings in stuffy wedding »salons« with cheap cake and lemonade are compared to outdoor dancing and home-made food at village weddings. In short, a rural idyll (cf. Rapport/Overing 2000: 315) is evoked. This perceived idyll becomes particularly poignant because there is no return to the village. On the contrary, through the process of chain migration more and more relatives have moved to Istanbul and other Western Turkish cities in an effort to increase their economic and social opportunities. The lack of profitability of animal husbandry in Van's rural areas has forced many young men to work on construction sites outside of Van, while the lack of schooling opportunities in the countryside has led many of them to bring their families to Van or to Western Turkey, in the hope that their children will one day do better.

Thus another discourse fragment sees village life in a much more critical light. All the women I have spoken to are grateful for living in the city, as they say the living conditions are better. Though carrying water in the village is mostly a thing of the past, many women speak of the hard work involved in this task, as well as constantly baking bread for big families, looking after the animals, and living through the harsh winters. Additionally, women who now live in the city are aware of the inherent power they have obtained with the allocation of household budgets. In rural Turkey by contrast, it is usually the men who go to town to do the shopping unless enterprising salesmen come to the village. Furthermore, in Istanbul many of the women even earn their own money with their sewing and embroidery skills, working for the piece-making workshops. Many women also participate in money and gold collection days with neighbors and relatives.⁵ When I asked whether

5 Women who trust each other through neighborhood, friendship or family ties come together at regular intervals and contribute a fixed amount of money or gold to the group. The lump sum is then handed to a different woman each time, following a pre-arranged order. This allows the women

their relatives in the villages also practiced this custom, one woman replied, »The women [there] can't lay their hands on a penny!«⁶ In addition, the women in Istanbul are able to make use of health services for themselves and their children more easily. At the health centers women can also obtain information about and access to birth control methods. Although health circuits now extend to villages and many women there now have fewer children, village life is frequently still accompanied by too many pregnancies, stillbirths, and even infant deaths. Finally, many women hope that the city can offer their children better educational opportunities.

As Rapport and Overing note, the rural-urban distinction is made using ideas about progress and »modernity« (Rapport/Overing 2000: 320). The city thus represents the future, where most Vanlı villagers will soon end up living. A city like Istanbul, with all its evils of pollution, crime, drug use, and anonymity of social relations, is still seen as the inevitable way forward. Furthermore, as other researchers focusing on low-income quarters of Istanbul have noted (e.g. Erder 1996, White 2002), the living space which might be called *gecekondu mahallesi*, i.e. a neighborhood of shanty housing⁷, or more recently *varoş* by outsiders⁸, is not necessarily seen in such a negative light by those inhabiting it.

to make bigger purchases without having to use credit cards or making debts.

6 »Kadının ellerine bir kuruş gelmiyor ki«.

7 Gecekondu literally means »put up overnight«. While the first gecekondu were indeed one-storey buildings which were put up quickly and surrounded by a bit of garden, later migrants built multi-storey buildings, albeit in an unplanned manner. Research on gecekondu quarters in the cities can be found in a thematic issue of the European Journal of Turkish Studies 2004, as well as Erder 1996, Wedel 1996 and 1997, Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2001. Pérouse has criticised the overuse of gecekondu which is used to describe a multitude of phenomena, legal, architectural and social (2004: 1-3).

8 *Varoş*, said to be the Hungarian word for »suburb«, has become part of popular Turkish discourse when describing »the others« in the city. Işık and Pınarcıoğlu quote Oyar's definition: »The term varoşlar, which has been repeated again and again over the last years [...], has come to mean settlements which have been founded on the outskirts of and within the city, but which are psychologically, socially, and culturally separate with their rural identity«.(Oyar 1997: 78 in Işık/Pınarcıoğlu 2001: 194, my translation).

Discourse strand on Islam

In both the village and the city, the religious attitude of Vanlı women I talked to could be summarized by a statement one of the women made: »First of all, I am a Muslim, *çok şükür*«⁹. Many of the women described being a Muslim as something to be grateful for, in return for which one should pay one's debts (*borç*). Praying five times a day and fasting during *Ramazan* and during other holy days are taken-for-granted duties that women perform happily – in the women's everyday conversations they spoke approvingly of these duties and of the comfort these rituals bring them. In the city, sending one's children to Quran classes during the summer holidays and attending prayer sessions for special occasions (*mevlüd*) are also valued. Some women took their religious commitment even further, attending women's prayer and religious discussion meetings (*sohbet*), reading the Quran regularly, or taking Quran lessons if they did not know how to, and studying other religious pamphlets and books offering guidelines and rules for everyday life.

The women all agreed on the fact that »there is so much more to learn« about being a good Muslim, but realistically, they made pragmatic choices about their religious commitment. If a woman had small children, she was too busy looking after them and keeping up with her household tasks to sit down for religious study. If she was making much-needed money from the time-consuming piecework, she would think twice about joining the *sohbet* circle. Similarly, I found that although every individual was meant to be responsible for the saving of their own soul, the women were more perturbed by other women than by men who did not fulfill these duties. There is thus a pragmatic acceptance of different religious commitment men and women are expected to make; while men might be too busy working to perform *namaz* regularly, or are drinking alcohol because »men will be men«, similar behavior by women would not be accepted as easily. However, women whose husbands *do* pray, fast and do not drink, give thanks for their good fortune.

Discourse Strand on Traditions (*örf adet*)

»*Örf adet*«, meaning »traditions«, is a phrase which evokes a complete lifestyle. I have heard this phrase used in very different situations: sometimes in order to quash any criticism of the status quo, and sometimes, in

9 »Thank Goodness«

a resigned manner, in order to describe religious/traditional rules that both men and women are required to follow. Thus, denoting behavioral rules as *örf adet* is a strategic way of getting widespread acceptance for them. The elderly generation is often said to be the warden of *örf adet*, but realistically, these rules are kept alive or revived through their appropriation and/or internalization by individuals. »Our traditions« (*bizim örf adetlerimiz*) are an undefined mélange of village, Vanlı, Kurdish and Muslim behavioral rules. Thus for instance, circumcision, semi-arranged marriages, the silence of daughters-in-law in front of their elders, women's modest attire, hospitality towards visitors, the reluctance of some parents to let their daughters go to school or work, respect for elders, and gender-segregated socializing are all behavior said to be based on *örf adet*.

Discourse strand on being Kurdish

It is noteworthy that not all people from Van are Kurds, but that most migrants with a rural background are¹⁰. Of the Vanlı in the Tepelik blocks, there was only one household that was not Kurdish. The intensity with which the majority of Vanlı identify themselves as Kurds depends on several factors. The first factor is the district they come from. As clashes between the army and the PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party) have been concentrated in the southern districts of Van province, Vanlı from other districts have been much less touched by the war and appear less conflicted in their ethnic stance. The Vanlı who have migrated to Tepelik are from three districts all to the north of Van, an area with less Kurdish nationalism and pro-Kurdish activism¹¹. A second factor influencing how Kurdish Vanlı feel is related to migration; Çelik points out that Kurds who have been forced to migrate by the military's village expulsion policy often form a »resistance identity« in the city (2005: 150), in contrast to Kurds who are part of older migration waves. The Vanlı migrants in Tepelik are of two kinds. The first is an early group which migrated to the city in the aftermath of a destructive earthquake in 1976.

10 This is true today, as there are no Armenian rural settlements remaining in the Van area.

11 They have, though, in the past, voted for the pro-Kurdish parties. In the 2002 general elections, there was considerable support for the DEHAP (Democratic People's Party),: in district 1: DEHAP 26.44, ANAP (Motherland Party, centre-right) 23.76, AKP (Justice and Development Party, religious-conservative) 16.35, in district 2: AKP 31.19, DEHAP 23.82, DYP (True Path Party, centre-right) 8.10, in district 3: DEHAP 53.86, AKP 15.03, CHP (centre-left) 8.49 (source: <http://www.belgenet.com>).

This migration preceded the formation of the PKK and the armed conflict which began in the early 1980s. The second group consists of families who have come to Istanbul since the 1980s, principally for employment rather than political reasons.

A third factor influencing the degree to which Vanlı identify as Kurds are their socio-economic ambitions. Çelik notes that even some forced migrants cut themselves off from politically active relatives and acquaintances because their priorities are economic survival (ibid). In the lower and lower middle class families I have met, parents are very concerned about getting by and offering their children better opportunities, be it through education, a good marriage or a good job. Nevertheless, I have been told that up until a few years ago, there was a lot of rioting in Tepelik and neighboring quarters by left-wing¹² and Kurdish youth, particularly on sensitive days, such as 1 May or 21 March (*Newroz*)¹³. Some young men from the blocks were said to be involved. However, these activities seem to have petered out.

A fourth factor shaping Kurdish identity is the social network that individuals belong to and the dominant discourses present in these networks. Among women, being Kurdish is often a taken-for-granted or unpoliticized attribute. It means that the women of the older and the middle generation can joke, fight, and talk in Kurdish to each other and their spouses. It does not necessarily mean that they speak Kurdish to their children, who grow up speaking Turkish in Istanbul, or worry about whether their children will learn Kurdish. For most people, categorical identification as a Muslim is more salient than being Kurdish. Judging from my interviews and research, for most of the women, the prospect of their children marrying a non-Sunni or a non-Muslim is a much more worrying prospect than their not speaking any Kurdish or marrying a Turk instead of a Kurd.

Finally, it is important to note that a discourse of Kurdish solidarity is often unable to overcome entrenched regional prejudices. A discourse of Vanlı solidarity, for example, may be more powerful than a Kurdish

12 Many inhabitants of Tepelik are Alevi, many of whom have strong links to left-wing politics. Graffiti on the walls in the area shows support for the centre-left CHP and for more radical organizations.

13 Newroz/Nevruz, with the Kurdish and Turkish spelling respectively, is a spring holiday celebrated all over Central Asia. The lighting of fires is said to commemorate the celebration of the death of a tyrant. However, in Turkey, the day has been appropriated as a symbol of Kurdish nationalism and the call for cultural rights (the spelling in itself is controversial, as the »w« is banned by a »Turkish alphabet law«), ever since Kurdish prisoners set themselves on fire in a prison in Diyarbakir in 1982 in order to protest against the torture under the military regime of 1980.

one, and I have often heard Vanlı diatribes against Kurds who come from other Kurdish cities, such as Diyarbakır. Similarly, on a sub-regional level, many Vanlı are still able to evoke tribal loyalties among people. This becomes particularly obvious during local and general elections, when candidates have in the past managed to collect thousands of bloc votes on the strength of shared tribal membership.

Today, children in Tepelik, unlike their parents' generation, are enrolled at school for at least eight years, during which time they are exposed to the hegemonic discourse fragments about Turkishness that silence other discourses about Turkey's ethnic and religious variety. Even if the children are exposed to discordant discourse fragments at home, educational and professional ambitions seem to outweigh concern for minority ethnic solidarity. At school Vanlı share classes with children from all over Anatolia who have migrated to Tepelik. They are unified in their efforts to »do better« than their parents, especially the girls. Particularly mothers support these efforts because they have experienced their own participation in urban life as impeded by illiteracy, lack of general knowledge, and poor Turkish language skills.

I observed the only explicit, and thus perhaps politized, identifications as Kurds during Vanlı hometown association meetings. Officially, hometown associations provide a network of mutual support for Vanlı, just as they do for migrants to Istanbul from all over Anatolia, but its members also strive to establish and maintain contacts with local authorities and political parties. Vanlı with political ambitions sometimes become active in the hometown associations, of which there are several in Istanbul and one just next to the housing blocks in Tepelik; political parties may flirt with the associations in order to obtain bloc votes. The DTP (*Demokratik Toplum Partisi* – Democratic Society Party) seems to have most contact to the associations due to its Kurdish interests. A fundraising dinner and a large-scale annual picnic I attended as part of hometown association events featured Kurdish singers and some speeches in Kurdish. It is noteworthy that the use of Kurdish in public alone often suffices to label an event »political«. Because the local hometown association in Tepelik does not include any female members, these politicized identifications seem more salient to the men, and furthermore only to those particularly active in the association.

Discourse strand on Vanlı women

»If you are writing about women, I'll tell you about my mother and sister and make you cry. You will see how incredibly difficult their lives

have been«, one young Vanlı woman who lives near the blocks told me. During the course of my research in Van and Istanbul I have heard many stories about the difficulties Vanlı women face, particularly in the village¹⁴. In my conversations with them, women of different ages drew attention to their being »married off« at a young age, some of them barely having reached puberty. They talked about the many children they had, some of whom died. They remembered the hard physical work in the village and women ageing before their time. They spoke about how, if they were married, their happiness depended more on good relations with their mother- and sisters-in-law and fellow brides rather than with their husband. In this discourse, rural life is considered more difficult than urban life, perhaps for two reasons. First, the physical hardship of village life takes its toll on women, and second, women feel more in control of their lives in the city.

While urban life is portrayed as providing women with the opportunity to attend literacy courses, earn money from home, and visit health centers, there are still complaints about the problems of being a woman. As mothers, women worry about their children's safety in the city; as wives they make do with the money their husbands bring home and thank God that their husbands don't drink or gamble; as daughters-in-law women look after their parents-in-law and probably observe some traditional *örf adet* avoidance rules such as refraining from eating, drinking, speaking or caressing their children in front of their fathers-in-law.

Despite the small income some woman have managed to secure through their piecework, they are financially dependent on their husbands, and should they be unhappy in their marriages, would mostly be unable to get a divorce. They would, as housewives, have paid no social security contributions, and realistically, many of the men earn too little money to pay alimony, even if they were prepared to do so. A woman's decision to get divorced is often not supported by her family, who may refuse to support her morally and financially. Furthermore, while the state mostly awards women custody of children, Vanlı *örf adet* »demand« that children stay with the father's family after a divorce.

While I am not suggesting that most marriages are unhappy, it is also true that the penalties incurred by a separation or divorce are understood by women and weighed carefully. As a result, women who do experience an unhappy marriage may be forced to remain in the relationship. In my research among the Vanlı migrants in Istanbul, I noted three

14 Bora and Üstün describe the collective narrative of experienced violence that women in Turkey pass from generation to generation (2005: 23).

cases of divorce in the wider area¹⁵. In each case, the woman's family supported her decision for divorce, two women returning home to their parents, and one middle-aged woman being supported by her son. On the other hand, I noted two other cases in which women were extremely unhappy in their marriages, but were unable to leave. In one of these cases, the father told his daughter to stay put despite physical and psychological abuse; in the other case, the reason for staying in the marriage was largely financial.

At the same time, however, it is misleading to depict Vanlı women as only the victims of male domination. We might argue with Bourdieu that a »legitimate world-view« in a certain social field is not questioned by individuals because »objective power relations« that exist in the social field encourage the acceptance of this world view (1985: 728). Indeed, many of the women seem to have internalized a discourse on proper female behavior which perpetuates a lot of the domination. As in any tightly-knit group, like that which the inhabitants of housing blocks represent, gossip is a powerful way of keeping others in line. Dress codes, demeanor outside of the blocks, housekeeping skills and child rearing are topics of conversation through which women can show up failings in others while simultaneously warning their listeners not to trip up themselves.

»The private«: Three women, Hediye, Ayla and Nur

This part is concerned with the impact which the discourse strands described above have on women's lives. I introduce three very different women, Hediye, Ayla, and Nur, who all live in the Tepelik blocks. They are between twenty-five and thirty-five years old and their families are from three different districts in Van. While Ayla and Nur grew up in the blocks, Hediye came to Istanbul in marriage six years ago, after growing up in a village. Through their narratives, I will show how these women make sense of their own lives. Thus I will refer to their »identification« rather than »self-understanding«, that is an explicit rather than tacit process of making sense of one's self (cf. Brubaker Cooper 2000). This means that I accept as a premise that it is impossible to know fully how these women see themselves, but I know them through their representations to me. I argue that these women, like us all, are influenced by dis-

15 There are of course many more cases of divorce; this should be understood as anecdotal rather than statistical evidence.

courses current in their discourse community, but that they interact with them and reshape them into unique autobiographical narratives.

Hediye

The first woman, Hediye is 32 years old and grew up in a village in Van, in Yeşilköy. She is the fourth of ten children, eight of whom are married. Her recently widowed mother still lives in Yeşilköy with her two eldest sons, their families and her youngest unmarried daughter. Another of Hediye's sisters is married to a relative and lives in Yeşilköy, too. Yet another sister is married and lives in Van, while four of Hediye's brothers live in the village, but come to Istanbul to work in a nightclub, three of them leaving their families behind. In Istanbul there are several nightclubs run by men from this village, and working there is an alternative to working on building sites for migrant laborers from Van.

Hediye was married at the age of seventeen to a relative of hers in Yeşilköy. After the religious betrothal (*imam nikahı*), Hediye moved in with her husband's family. Before their marriage, Hediye's husband¹⁶ went to work abroad for long periods of time and came back for the wedding. Three months after the wedding, the husband left again, and did not come back to the village. Gradually, all communication ceased between him and Hediye, leaving her in the humiliating position of living with her in-laws without her husband. Eventually, after three years, Hediye's own family put their foot down and took her back. They put pressure on their son-in-law's family in order to force him to return to the village and face her, at least for a divorce. Finally, he did come back and they got divorced. In our conversations, Hediye expressed her thanks to God that there were no children from this union. She bitterly recounted that through this marriage she had become a »second hand good«. Although she had only been with her husband for several months and was still a young woman of marriageable age, she said, it was clear that she would not marry a young, single man again. In the following years, she had dozens of marriage offers, mostly from widowed men looking for someone to care for their children, or from married men looking for a second wife. It was her paternal cousin working in Istanbul who recommended her to Doğan Bey, a man who was recently divorced himself. Although Doğan Bey was twenty years her senior, Hediye accepted his marriage offer. She had learnt from past experience and in-

16 Hediye never mentioned his name; it was as if he had been delegated to the past.

sisted on seeing his divorce papers and on having a registered marriage, entitling her to her husband's pension in the event of his death.

When Hediye came to Istanbul six years ago, she moved into the blocks, into the flat that Doğan Bey »owned«. Together they have had two children. Hediye's new neighbors in the blocks had also been her husband's ex-wife's neighbors for over twenty years; his five children had grown up in the same flat too. Indeed, one or two of the block inhabitants are relatives of both Doğan Bey and his former wife. Out of this difficult situation, Hediye has managed to create a narrative of contentment. She says that she keeps herself to herself, socializing mostly with her immediate neighbors in her block, and with her husband's and her own relatives who live further away. Keeping a low profile, it seems, has been her strategy to gain acceptance. After all, the divorce of her husband must have been the cause of much gossip and disapproval in an environment where divorce is considered antithetical to »our traditions«. ¹⁷ She describes her aim in life as looking after her husband well and also adheres to the discourse on good housewifery, placing emphasis on cooking and keeping the house clean. Hediye says she is grateful for marrying a man she loves and finds attractive, for her two children, and for now living in the city. She does piecework very well and cooperates with other women in the block to meet shop deadlines. She deals with her husband's ambiguous attitude towards piecework by doing it mostly out of his sight, well aware that the financial contribution of up to 150-200 YTL ¹⁸a month is welcome.

One source of conflict between Hediye and Doğan Bey, particularly in the beginning of their marriage, has been their differing attitudes towards religion and traditions. Doğan Bey is very active in the local hometown association, and has repeatedly expressed his frustrations with *örf adet* and religious beliefs, which he thinks »imprison« Kurdish people. Doğan Bey is part of a network in which identification as, and politicization of Kurds is very important. At the beginning of their marriage, he took Hediye to association activities. However, he could not get her to comfortably wear her hair open, in a style that for him presumably symbolizes the »modern« Kurdish woman, and he laments her lack of interest in »bigger matters«, claiming that she refuses to develop further, or take on a leading role among the women to match his own

17 I should note that Doğan Bey's anti-traditional stance has meant that his unmarried children (one still at school) live with the mother and that he has bought a business for one son in order to support the fragmented family.

18 10 Turkish Lira is about 5 Euro.

among the men. Hediye, who is normally keen to support her husband, has quietly resisted this pressure.

I believe that Hediye's priority is to get along well with the women in the blocks, whom she spends time with every day. It is these women who help her to look after her children, lend her sugar or money, accompany her to the health center, help her finish piecework, invite her round for a chat and tea, or tell her about special offers in shops. In order to get along with them, Hediye must conform to certain behavioral expectations. All of the Vanlı housewives in the blocks cover their hair, and many of them wear a *pardesü*, a long loose coat, when they go out. Not only would a new style of dress be alien to what she herself is accustomed to, it would also alienate her from her neighbors. In the long run, Hediye's relationship with her neighbors is more crucial to her integration into the blocks than her relationship with her husband. Fully aware of this, Hediye has, during the last six years, aimed to fit in with her neighbors rather than to stand out. As identification with a Muslim way of life has great salience in these women's lives, Hediye has had immediate access to shared symbols, such as the *namaz* (prayer), the *abdest* (ritual cleaning), and the *oruç* (fasting). Asking her, as Doğan Bey has, to denounce much of what she perceives as Muslim practice means asking her to give up a mainstay in her life as well as to distance herself from much neighborhood activity. On the other hand, Hediye also does not get involved in all the religious activities, as she considers her children and her husband her priorities. Thus, in a quiet way, Hediye has balanced her husband's and her neighbors' expectations in order to find contentment.

Ayla

Ayla is in her mid-thirties. She was born in a district town of Van, but her family moved to Tepelik after the earthquake in 1976. She grew up and went to school there with her sister and brother. Ironically, the three siblings do not speak any Kurdish, although their mother could hardly speak any Turkish when she got married. Ayla is a mother of three children herself. With her husband and children she lives in the same block as her parents, in a flat that she bought after marriage. Ayla is a lively and outspoken woman. While she expresses contentment with her marriage and her children, she also conveys her frustration with her current life. Her narrative traces the difficulties she has come up against through the *örf adet* beliefs of her family and her environment.

Ayla is still bitter about her parents' decision to withdraw her from school after only five years, sending her to work at a young age instead.

When she got married at the age of nineteen, her father told her that she should stop working, now that she was married. This angered Ayla. She told me that she replied to her father by saying: »When I was working under your roof, was I prostituting myself that now you consider it dishonorable to work?« Despite her father's instructions, Ayla did continue to work after her marriage, first in textile workshops, and later in a better job. Her mother looked after her children while she worked. Ayla told me that through her contacts at work, she was also able to provide other women in the neighborhood with work too. However, her mother has stopped looking after her children because of ill-health, and so Ayla has had to stop working too. She is bitter because she feels that her mother's health problems are an excuse which masks a general disapproval of her working. She repeatedly told me that she wants to provide her children with a happier and wealthier childhood than she herself had; she sees herself engaged in a struggle with financial difficulties and ignorance around her in order to achieve this. She is willing to work at any job to provide a good living standard for her children. She dramatically remarked more than once, »I wouldn't do anything dishonorable, I would not steal, I would not prostitute myself, but I would clean sewers«¹⁹.

Ayla is remarkably dismissive of the commonly expressed theme of loyalty among fellow Vanlı. In her opinion, the local hometown association is passive and does nothing to improve the situation of women, particularly when it comes to enabling them to find work or childcare. She also criticizes the other women in the blocks for being more interested in gossip and material possessions than collaborative action.

Ayla would like to move out of the blocks, nearer to her sister, who lives in a quarter Ayla considers more desirable. However, as the flats do not officially belong to the Vanlı, she cannot sell hers in order to move. A move to her sister's would mean geographical as well as psychological closeness. In her narrative, Ayla frequently contrasts her sister's situation to her own; her sister, despite initial resistance from the parents, has opened a small business. She divorced her first husband and remarried later. In front of their parents, Ayla's sister does not follow *örf adet* rules of behavior or dress. Ayla says she herself always wears a skirt in front of her father, while the sister wears trousers, does not cover her hair and even dyes it. Ironically, Ayla thinks her parents are fonder and prouder of her sister because she has »made it« and they do not have the same expectations of her. Her sister's example, Ayla says, shows that resistance to dominant discourses can result in liberation. For Ayla,

19 »Namussuzluk yapmam, hırsızlık yapmam, orospuluk yapmam, ama lağım temizlerim«.

finding a good job would be her start of resistance. She would be able to contribute much-needed money to the household and thus raise her status within her nuclear family. She would wear more modern clothes and maybe not cover her hair (to find a good job she may be required to uncover), but this would not attract the criticism of the Vanlı women, because different standards are applied to working women.

Nur

Nur is twenty-eight years old. She was born in a district town of Van but came to Istanbul with her parents and siblings when she was six. Just like two of her brothers, Nur moved into a separate flat in the blocks after marriage. When I first met Nur, she was wearing a headscarf and a *pardesü*, but during the summer of 2006, she began wearing the *çarşaf*, literally »sheet«, a black loose shroud draped over her entire body, covering her forehead and lower face up to the nose, and also buttoning the sleeves at the fingers in order to cover her wrists and the backs of her hands. Nur is an eloquent self-assured young woman, tall and good-looking, and to see her in the *çarşaf* was a great shock for me. For me, the *çarşaf* represented a male invention, one aimed at making women »safe«, as in »asexual«, for anyone but her husband. The Kemalist discourse in Turkey has always represented head covering, and in particular the *çarşaf*, as an insidious political symbol in danger of spreading and undermining the secular republic.²⁰

In order to go beyond my initial reaction, I decided to ask Nur to tell me her story herself. It turned out that her self-representation is a narrative of personal reinvention and liberation rather than subjugation. She represents her current situation as the climax in a long search for happiness.

When Nur was 17 years old, she got married to her mother's nephew, a young man who had grown up in Istanbul too. She had been going to an İmam Hatip boarding school (a religious high school) and said she did not know anything about boys, nor was she interested in them. Nur said that her family was »much more ignorant« then, and that

20 Despite the common impression that headcovering has been encouraged and has increased under the current religious AKP government, a recent study by Çarkoğlu/Toprak for the Turkey Economic and Social Studies foundation (TESEV) has found that there has actually been a decrease between 1999 and 2006: The percentage of women wearing a *türban* has dropped from 13% to 11%, another kind of headcovering from 53.4% to 48.8%, and the percentage of women wearing the *çarşaf* from 3.5% to 1%. While in 1999, 27.3% of women said that they did not cover their heads, in 2006 it was 36.5% (Çarkoğlu/Toprak 2006: 24).

neither her parents nor her siblings knew better than to have her married at an early age. Her husband is an understanding man, and has encouraged her to develop herself further and to venture out of the domestic sphere. He himself, though working as a security guard, has just received a degree in law from an open university.

Nur describes her life since marriage as a constant search (*arayış*) for meaning. She spent some time writing a book and reading a lot. For one and a half years, Nur then volunteered at a local orphanage. Later she joined a foundation and participated in pedagogy and psychology seminars. Meanwhile her husband discovered that he was infertile and they underwent long and psychologically taxing fertility treatment. After five years without success, they finally decided to give up and »leave it up to Allah«. Nur founded a discussion group which met and discussed religious books in its members' homes. After a while this led Nur to teaching other women at home. Yet, despite all of these activities, Nur said, she still had not found the meaning in her life. Finally, a friend suggested that she help set up a learning center at the local mosque. Nur was ecstatic, and they set to cleaning the basement of the mosque and turning it into a Quran course center. For the last two to three years she has been working at the mosque as a volunteer Quran teacher (*hoca*). Technically, her courses are illegal; only the Ministry for Religious Affairs is allowed to organize such lessons. However, in practice, every neighborhood has its own courses and they are very popular with local families.

Every day, Nur teaches women how to read the Quran at the mosque. During the day, she sometimes also organizes *sohbets* (religious discussions around a theme), and might attend or lead a prayer meeting (*mevlüd*) at someone's house. During the summer holidays many families send their children to Quran courses and Nur teaches the girls. When I visited her at her flat just before the holy month of Ramadan, she later went off to a prayer meeting she and her friend had organized in an empty flat in her block. Women from the block and from neighboring blocks had cleaned the flat, and they came together every day during Ramadan. Their aim was to read the Quran through from start to finish (*hatim etmek*), a task believed to have special merit.

Nur feels that she has gradually gained a new identity, and this is due to the fact that she has »fallen in love«. She declared this with passion, observing my reaction, to see if I understood what she meant. She described herself as being in love with Allah and in love with her *örtü*, her covering. It is only quite recently that she has changed her name from the worldlier »Gülşen« (rose garden) to »Nur«, meaning divine

light. The new name and her *çarşaf*, she says, are outward expressions of her love.

Although most of the Vanlı women are covered in some way or other, the *çarşaf* is considered a radical way of dressing. Indeed, Nur recounted that her family told her not to wear »that ugly thing«, and her husband, too, was dismayed. A mother of one of Nur's students expressed concern that her daughter would adopt Nur as a role model and be too heavily influenced by her. Nur herself acknowledges that the *çarşaf* has brought her many negative reactions; she says that people who do not know her consider her to be ignorant, backward and helpless. However, although many of the Vanlı women may say that the *çarşaf* is »not for us« and criticize it as exaggerated, they respect those wearing it and acknowledge their religious commitment. It has to be said that the acceptance of the *çarşaf* is probably dependent on the urban context; wearing it in the village would be quite impractical.

Wearing a *çarşaf* makes Nur unemployable in the secular world. Her husband has expressed ambitions for her to work and do well for herself, and Nur herself agrees that she could make a career. She has the intelligence and self-confidence to do well. However, she has no interest in any other work than her current one. Indeed, in many ways, she *is* a »working woman«. She leaves the house every morning, goes to the mosque and to other women's houses. She says she often leaves the house even in the evenings, when her husband is at home, and on holy nights (*kandil geceleri*) hardly comes home, something that is inconceivable for most of her fellow Vanlı women. She has a wide social network of her own, which goes beyond the neighborhood and relative relations that other Vanlı women have. Although she works voluntarily, she does sometimes receive money or gold presents from her students. So, despite the misgivings that some may express at her wearing the *çarşaf*, her occupation with religious affairs and her garb give her the license to ignore certain discourses on *örf adet* and appropriate behavior for women.

Some may argue that by wearing the *çarşaf*, Nur has internalized the male hegemonic discourse on appropriate female dress and is deluding herself if she feels that it is her own choice. This is a point which needs contextualization and has troubled many social scientists studying »Muslim women«. ²¹ It is a question of cultural relativism versus the insistence on universal human rights. Taken to an extreme, followers of the cultural relativism theory accept anything, in this case the veiling of

21 I use quotation marks in order to point to the artificial nature of this category.

women, as »part of their culture«,²² while critics argue that the »culture« label is being used to excuse violations of human rights. Abu-Lughod is highly critical of the Western perspective, perpetuated in scholarly and media circles, that »Muslim women« need to be »rescued« from the veil: »First we need to work against the reductive interpretation of veiling as the quintessential sign of women's imprisonment, even if we object to state imposition of this form, as in Iran or with the Taliban« (2002: 787). She points to the variety of veiling practices, asking her readers to respect them. She argues that a constant reduction of »Muslim societies« to the »veiling issue« blinds observers to transnational political and economic processes, such as the American support for the Taliban in reaction to the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviets, which create inequalities. Similarly, Mojab tries to synthesize a particularist approach, which sees women first and foremost as individuals, with feminism. She, too, argues that individual veiling should be respected if it is voluntary, while veiling and gender-based segregation as imposed practices should be criticised (1998). While the issue of women's veiling is being debated in academia as well as political circles in Turkey and Europe, Abu-Lughod and Mojab's perspective is helpful when considering Nur: While one may not agree with the necessity for veiling, it is at the same time patronizing to assume that women like Nur who cover themselves are »unfree« just by virtue of their clothing. Interestingly, when one compares Nur to her fellow Vanlı women, she seems to have more »freedom« of movement and decisions than many of them.

Conclusion

This text has described a »public Istanbul« not found in the physical spaces that are used by people; rather, Istanbul has been described as an arena for discourses of different degrees of »publicness« such as the education system, regional »traditions«, rural migration to cities, ethnic identity politics, and gender relations. A description of these public discourses was followed by an analysis of how individual women, who are both producers of and produced by those discourse fragments, synthesize, reject and/or adapt these fragments when they create the »private« narratives of their lives.

22 In the debate between cultural relativism and human rights the veiling of women has often been debated, as well as female circumcision, »honour killings«, and Indian sati/suttee (the death of widows on their husband's funeral pyre).

Discourses are »public« in that they are shared, but they are not necessarily shared consentingly. There are thus fragments of discourses revolving around the same themes and symbols. On an individual, »private«, level, individuals make sense of their lives by creating a unique blend of discourse fragments through which they present their lives to others. Hediye, Ayla and Nur are only three of many Vanlı women. Arguably, they are part of the same discourse community, meaning that they are exposed to and interact with similar discourse strands. However, they have presented themselves to me in very different narratives, showing the dangers of generalizing about perceived »groups« of people. As Nur said herself, »Just because we are from Van, it does not mean that we are the same!«

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (2002): »Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others«. *American Anthropologist*, 104, 783-790.
- Bora, A./Üstün, İ. (2005): »Sıcak Aile Ortamı«: Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Kadın ve Erkekler (»A Warm Family Atmosphere«: Women and Men in the Democratisation Process), İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985): »The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups«. *Theory and Society* 14, 723-744.
- Brubaker, R./Cooper, F. (2000): »Beyond »Identity«. *Theory and Society* 29, 1-47.
- Çarkoğlu, A./Toprak, B. (2006): Değişen Türkiye’de Din, Toplum ve Siyaset (Religion, Society and Politics in a Changing Turkey), İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları.
- Çelik, A. B. (2005): »I miss my village!«: Forced Kurdish Migrants in İstanbul and their Representation in Associations«. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 32, 137-163.
- Erder, S. (1996): Ümraniye: İstanbul’a Bir Kent Kondu (Ümraniye: A City Has Been Built in İstanbul), İstanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Erder, S. (2000): »Nerelisin Hemşerim? (Where Are You From?)«. In: Ç. Keyder (ed.), İstanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında (İstanbul: Between Global and Local), İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 192-205.
- Jaeger, S. (2001): »Diskurs und Wissen: Theoretische und Methodische Aspekte einer Kritischen Diskurs- und Dispositivanalyse«. In: R. Keller/A. Hirsland/W. Schneider/W. Viehöver (eds.), *Handbuch*

- Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse: Band I: Theorien und Methoden, Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 81-112.
- Keyder, Ç. (ed.) (2000): Istanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında (Istanbul: Between Global and Local), Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Haig, G. (2004): »The Invisibilisation of Kurdish«. In: Stephan Conermann/Geoffrey Haig (eds.), Die Kurden: Studien zu Ihrer Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur, Hamburg: EB-Verlag, 121-150.
- Işık, O./Pınarcıoğlu, M. M. (2001): Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları: Sultanbeyli Örneği (Cycles of Poverty: Squatter Buildings and the Urban Poor: the Example of Sultanbeyli), Istanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Link, J. (1983): »Was Ist und Was Bringt Diskurstaktik«. kultuRRRevolution 2, 60-66.
- Mojab, S. (1998): »Muslim« Women and »Western« Feminists: The Debate on Particulars and Universals«. Monthly Review 50, 19-30.
- Oyar, B. (1997): »Öteki'ne Yenik Düşen İstanbul (Istanbul Losing to the Other)«. İstanbul Dergisi 23, 74-79.
- Öncü, A. (2000): »İstanbullular ve Ötekiler: Küreselcilik Çağında Orta Sınıf Olmanın Kültürel Kozmolojisi (The Istanbullu and the Others: The Cultural Cosmology of Being Middle Class in the Age of Globalisation)«. In: Ç. Keyder (ed.), Istanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında (Istanbul: Between Global and Local), Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 117-144.
- Pérouse, J.-F. (2004): »Les Tribulations du Terme Gecekondu (1947-2004): Une Lente Perte de Substance. Pour une Clarification Terminologique«. European Journal of Turkish Studies, Thematic Issue No. 1 (Gecekondu), <http://www.ejts.org/document117.html>
- Rapport, N./Overing, J. (2000): Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts, London: Routledge.
- Wedel, H. (1996): »Binnenmigration und Ethnische Identität – Kurdinnen in Türkischen Metropolen«. Orient 37, 437-452.
- Wedel, H. (1997): »KurdInnen in Türkischen Metropolen: Migration, Flucht und Politische Partizipation«. In: C. Borck/E. Savelsberg/S. Hajo (eds.), Ethnizität, Nationalismus, Religion und Politik in Kurdistan, Münster: LIT Verlag, 155-184.
- White, J. (2002): Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics, Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Creating New Spaces, Claiming Rights. West African Immigrants in Istanbul

KORAY ÖZDİL

Over the last decade something publicly unknown is happening in Istanbul: West African immigrants are creating new public spaces around Tarlabaşı. Although these spaces are small in terms of number and size, the emerging spatial practices and relations can be regarded as an indicator of the cultural and social transformations that is shaped by the recent transnational migration movements via and in Turkey. Recent transnational migration movements through and within Turkey are accompanied by spatial practices. The West African group in Istanbul, mostly consisting of undocumented immigrants, has been developing local and transnational networks and connections to resist their exclusion from the formal citizenship rights.

The relationship between the establishment of public space and the claim making for of immigrant rights has become an important theme of enquiry. Clearly, establishment of spaces used exclusively by immigrants to help them, especially marginalized immigrant groups, to forge communities (Flores 2003). In varying contexts around globe, undocumented immigrants who are the target of exclusion from sort of formal rights, struggle to create public spaces as a means to reconstitute the pre-constructed confines of their political involvement in the given host society (Nyers 2003). It is empirically and theoretically significant to elaborate upon the ways in which immigrants create new spaces and develop new forms of social relations. Understanding this enables researchers to reconsider the conventional boundaries between citizen insiders and immigrant outsiders. Although irregular migrant groups often

live shadowy lives to seek invisibility, the existence of the public spaces owned/used by immigrants can be regarded as a challenge to the prevailing norms constructed around the division between citizens and undocumented immigrant. As I will explore through the case of the African immigrants in Istanbul, the creation of new spaces enables the subordinated individuals to collectively organize themselves as a group, as well as to protect themselves from repressive elements produced by local power holders.

In this way, my study aims to demonstrate that new public spaces established by the West African immigrants around Tarlabası act as a form of resistance against their targeted exclusion from the formal citizenship rights in Turkey. Drawing upon fieldwork I conducted in the West African public spaces, I will examine what role spatial practices play in fostering group solidarity and in establishing networks with the host society institutions and actors. Although most of these public spaces are owned by the Nigerian immigrants, I prefer to call them West African social spaces since they provide a public sphere for other ethnic groups from the West Africa region as well. The first part of this paper describes the general features of irregular migration in Turkey. The second part of this paper examines Sub-Saharan African migrants in Istanbul, which can be seen as a larger group to which the West-Africans socially belong. Then, by shortly elaborating my initial experiences during the fieldwork, I will show, using empirical observations, the isolation and spatial marginalization of the immigrant groups as a result of the host society's (in this case Turkey) legal system dynamics. Finally, I will discuss the emergence of migrant public spaces, focusing on a Nigerian restaurant. The remainder of the paper will further analyze various other survival strategies developed by West African immigrant as a response to exclusionary mechanisms of the citizenship ideology in Turkey.

Irregular migration in Turkey

It is noteworthy to make an initial clarification regarding the difficulties in developing relevant classifications to identify the status of several immigrant groups. While describing the particular circumstances of migrant groups, it is inevitably necessary to apply definitions and categorizations. But in reality the legal and political status of migrants is not fixed and is subject to frequent change (Kopnina 2005: 32). In the similar vein, the terms »irregular«, »undocumented«, or »clandestine« do not adequately explain the causes and nature of particular immigrant experiences. For instance »people who enter a country with proper document-

tion may decide to over-stay and take on employment in violation of conditions of entry, thus become[ing] ›irregular‹ in one sense whilst being ›documented‹ at the time of entry« (Rajaram Grundy-Warr 2005: 99-100). Accordingly, a comprehensive and accurate representation of irregular migration is extremely difficult and highly problematic. With these shortcomings in mind, this part of the article aims merely to draw a general outline of the demographic profile of irregular migrants in Turkey based on existing literature. In general, the literature on immigration policies and regulations in Turkey constitute studies with macro level approaches based on political science and demographic analysis. Moreover there are limited numbers of studies that reflect the sociological or anthropological aspects of irregular migration in Turkey (for ethnographically informed studies see Brewer and Yksekler 2006; Daniş 2006). Consequently, there is an evident problem concerning the lack of substantive knowledge on this specific issue.

Due to transformations of global migration patterns in the last two decades, Turkey has encountered atypical migration movements. Recent movements into and through Turkey consist mainly of asylum seekers, refugees, transit migrants, and clandestine laborers who »began to arrive in small numbers and subsequently in an ever-rising tide which has reached sizeable figures« (İçduygu 2005:331). Irregular migration into Turkey can be classified into three categories: immigration from Eastern Europe, transit migration, and asylum seekers (İçduygu 2005: 333). Immigrants from Eastern Europe are in search of employment in Turkey, while the second groups, transit migrants, intend to stay temporarily in Turkey en-route to European countries. Transit migrants who come to Turkey are mainly from the Middle East, predominantly Iranians and Iraqis; various Asian countries such as Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka; and African countries like the Congo, Nigeria and Somalia. For these migrants Turkey is a transit stop on the way to West European countries. Most of them enter in Turkey through illegal means while others become illegal as they overstay their tourist visas (İçduygu 2005). The third group of migrants in Turkey is refugees and/or asylum seekers. Most of those who cannot continue onwards to Europe decide to stay in Turkey. Many asylum seekers, despite their rejected asylum status also continue to stay in Turkey.

Sub-Saharan African immigrants in Turkey

»Africans« as used by the immigrants themselves, mainly refers to the black community in Istanbul from the African continent. However, Istanbul is also home to immigrants from Northern African countries such as Morocco or Algeria (Perouse, 2006). The geographical category »sub-Saharan Africa« is, therefore, more convenient to denote the regional background of the black immigrants living in Istanbul. Few statistical resources are available to evaluate the Sub-Saharan Migrants' demographic significance accurately. According to unofficial estimations, approximately 6,000 undocumented sub-Saharan migrants live in Istanbul (Brewer/Yükseker 2006: 31). Presumably, compared to many other cases of irregular migration, the population of sub-Saharan Africans in Istanbul has remained constant or has started to decrease since the early 1990s until present day. This decline in population leaves the sub-Saharan immigrant group with a lack of well established social and political representation and may be one of the reasons for the great power differentials between the sub-Saharan Africans and their host society in Turkey.

Sub-Saharan Africans in Istanbul are extremely heterogeneous in terms origin, political and economic conditions of their sending countries (including war and civil war), ethnicity, language, and socio-cultural capital. The immigrants from the sub-Saharan countries fall into the categories described above of asylum seekers, refugees, and transit migrants. They mainly come from Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Somalia, Rwanda, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Liberia and Guinea. Among the immigrants two main groups form the spoken languages; Anglophones such as Nigerians and Ghanalese and Francophone such as Congolese. One visible form of data regarding the increasing African population in Turkey was obtained from name of statistical office, or government indicating »the notable change in the composition of asylum-seekers to Turkey in 2003. In 2003 183 Somali and 64 Sudanese citizens sought asylum [in Turkey]« (İçduygu 2004: 333).

The sub-Saharan Africans immigrants in Istanbul can be broadly divided in two groups: West- and East-Africans. However, these geographical divisions should not be taken for granted, since the social and cultural divisions between East and West Africans living in Istanbul are generally blurry and dynamic. The main purpose of depicting such simplistic observation is to provide a simple picture of Sub-Saharan Africans of Istanbul. Although my research did not include the East-African immigrants, coming mainly from Somalia, Sudan, Eritrea, and Ethiopia, some East African informants indicate that East African immigrants are

culturally closer to each other. On the other hand, they are more isolated in comparison to the West Africans, such as Ghanaians and Nigerians who have stronger associations. Language is a significant problem for most East Africans who live in Turkey, since most Turkish people they encounter in their daily lives cannot speak English. The East African immigrants are mostly asylum seekers, many of whom do not look for a job since they do not see employment as a possibility. Somalian migrants, for instance, don't have passports since the Somalian government does not allow people to leave their countries, and so any opportunity of receiving a work visa is denied them.

The economic instabilities in West Africa, on the other hand, constitute the primary motivation of the West African immigrants' deterritorialization. To obtain upward economic mobility, they join immigration flows, like many other immigrants traveling from the global south to the global north, on illegal, risky, and expensive journeys. For the migrants, Turkey is a stop-over, on the transit-route to their preferred destinations: Europe and North America; places they imagine as sources of future wealth, and freedom as one Nigerian man did, before he started his journey:

»[...] before deciding to migrate, I did not know any place called Turkey. But when I lost my job at the airline company [in Nigeria], there was this need to move out of the country, to find a better job. People are going out: ›tomorrow this friend is going to Italy‹, ›Maybe I can pass to Germany‹. Then you want to go. Nobody wants try other ways, everybody [thinks they can] go to Germany, to London [to] make big dollars. That is the mentality of most of the immigrants«.

According to my informants, immigration from Nigeria started 15-20 years ago. Apprehension numbers from the Bureau for Foreigners, Borders, and Asylum¹ make up the estimates that nearly 20 Nigerians were apprehended in 1996 and 419 in 2001 (İçduygu 2003: 25). Although this data indicates an increase of Nigerian immigration, one cannot make accurate estimations of the Nigerian immigrants' demographic structures in the past.

Terminology describing migrant statuses is significant for this study, since immigrant illegality is constructed in part by the terminology itself. The terms ›illegal‹, ›illicit‹, and ›clandestine‹ are applied by various media discourses, politicians, and economic interest groups which represent immigration as a threat to the nation-state order and sta-

1 The Bureau of Foreigners is part of the Turkish Directorate of General Security of the Ministry of Interior.

bility (Pugh 2001). This study will apply the category of »undocumented immigrants« to refer the social group under examination. Furthermore, most of the Nigerian immigrants can be categorized as »transit migrants« who intend to make travel via Turkey to Europe. Inevitably these categories fail to fully describe the characteristics of the Nigerian immigrants in Turkey, since their community includes different immigrant profiles such as those of asylum seeker; some Nigerians living in Istanbul have applied for asylum status and did gain asylum status. There is also a group of Nigerians whose destination was not Europe, but Turkey where they are involved in the transnational trade networks between Turkey and Nigeria.

Fieldwork

This essay draws on ethnographic research I conducted between December 2005 and May 2006 ². Most of the research was conducted in Nigerian social spaces in Tarlabası where the African immigrants and other irregular migrants such as Iraqi Arabs, Iraqi Kurds, Iranians, Filipinos, and Kurdish immigrants found refuge. Ethnographic data concerning daily immigrant practices in public spaces was obtained primarily through in-depth-interviews conducted with total of three female and eleven male immigrants. In addition to these interviews, participant observations in the immigrant restaurants and international call centers, constitutes the bulk of the data around which this paper is constructed.

This section summarizes the early research processes, not only to contextualize my rationale for this study but also to describe the immigrant group's isolation and spatial marginalization by Turkish political and social dynamics, their invisibility in Turkish public discourses, and their strategies to seek invisibility in response to the alienating dimensions embedded in their encounters with Turkish citizens.

The scarcity of studies about immigrant groups in Turkey, particularly micro-level studies, in addition to the lack of basic quantitative information is one of the main problems for researchers concerned with African immigrants in Istanbul. Due to the limited research and literature on the African immigrants in Istanbul, data for the purpose of this study was collected by directly contacting organizations with close social links to the sub-Saharan African immigrants in Istanbul.

2 My first visit to the Amina Restaurant, where I met many of my informants and conducted interviews was on December 12th, 2005. My periodical visits – sometimes twice a week, sometimes twice in a month – continued until early May.

The initial data I collected is based on contacts and interviews with NGOs, such as Caritas³ and Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Refugee Legal Aid Program (RLAP)⁴, who work with asylum seekers. During my volunteer work at RLAP in the summer of 2005, I worked with asylum seekers and transit immigrant groups. There I learned about Turkish refugee law, strategies asylum seeker organizations use in their efforts to assist refugees and asylum seekers, and how refugee status is determined through the negotiations between legal aid officers and UHNCR.

While working at RLAP, I learned about the presence of some Anglophone sub-Saharan transit immigrants. Since I was not able to speak the native languages of immigrants from Iraq, Iran, or Afghanistan, for my research I decided to focus on the Anglophone immigrants. They lived in Tarlabası, a crime ridden lower class Istanbul neighborhood, situated very close to Taksim, one of Istanbul's commercial centers. I started to conduct spatial ethnographies in Tarlabası and interview real estate dealers. Meanwhile, I found an African restaurant, *Amina's Restaurant*, where the African immigrants met regularly.

During my first visit to the restaurant, I was »welcomed to the Africa in Istanbul« by Kanu⁵, a male immigrant who later became my key informant. Kanu was working on a film project documenting the lives of immigrants in Tarlabası, for which he was seeking financial and technical support. His interest in the living conditions of the African immigrants and in me, a Turkish citizen and university student, were important factors in the formation of our close relationship. Due to Kanu's connections to other Nigerians in the community I was able to obtain detailed information about the West African and Nigerians in Istanbul; Kanu was a frequent guest in Amina's restaurant, was well known and among other Nigerian immigrants, and was the human resources coordinator in the Nigerian Association. Moreover, I helped to translated conversations and mediated between the immigrants and their Turkish neighbors at the African restaurant. Among the immigrants I met at the restaurant, I made a random selection to make up my sample group. This process can be also described as snowball technique. Furthermore, I participated in and initiated group discussions, also called focus group interviews, among the immigrants in the restaurant.

3 Caritas is an international missionary charity organization providing social services to Iraqi Christians such as food, education and legal aid.

4 Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Refugee Legal Aid Program was established in 2004 by a group of lawyers and human rights activists to provide legal services to asylum seekers in Turkey.

5 All the names are pseudonyms.

Research Caveats

In my research I was unable to address several important issues due to a lack of access to specific data. First, the gendered perspective on immigration is missing from my research. Whereas the West African immigrant spaces were mostly dominated by men, the immigrant women used to frequently visit those spaces as well. The gendered aspect of immigrant experiences, including for instance, the effects of high rates of contract marriages, needs to be explored in future research. Secondly, during my research I learned about a group of immigrants who work in small factories and ateliers under unhealthy and poor conditions. Contacting this immigrant worker group was not easily possible, since these workers rarely visit the immigrant public spaces. Furthermore, since they worked long hours, they did not have much time to spare for interviews. In addition to gender and immigrant worker aspects my research, quotidian practices taking place between various state officials and immigrants urgently requires further research. Such research would provide insightful data on structural violence and on ways in which immigrants are excluded from opportunity structures in Turkey. Such a study would also provide further insight into institutionalized racial discrimination.

Creating New Spaces

The creation of »new spaces«, and the formation of new group identities has resulted in a considerable amount of scholarly attention (Işın 2002). Henri Lefebvre famously argued that »groups, classes, or fractions of classes cannot constitute themselves, or recognize one another, as ›subjects‹ unless they generate a space« (1991: 416). In other words, the construction of new spaces is an inherent social dimension of group making. Individuals who come together as groups need their own spaces which in turn enables the intensification of solidarity (Işın 2002: 31).

Due to the rise in the number of African immigrants living in places around Tarlabaşı, quite a few new restaurants, call centers, hairdressers, and night clubs, run by African immigrants have been opened in the area over the past ten years. Along with the services they provide, these commercial facilities are assuming an additional vital public function: Immigrants not only use these various commercial services these businesses offer, such as making phone call, eating or getting their hair cut, but also use these spaces to meet, and socialize with other migrants. In fact, most of the migrants use these spaces, primarily for socializing

purposes. Some places run by Turkish people can also be popular hang-out spots for African immigrants. A limited number of the night clubs on İstiklal Street, a popular entertainment street, are also known for their many African costumers.

The international call centers, hair dressers, and restaurants are in the less crowded and impoverished/under privileged/ places around Tarlabası and Taksim, places on İstiklal Street have become a gathering place for the African immigrants, and often turn to be more significant spaces for the formation of their group identity. The following section describes one migrant public space in Istanbul by focusing on various types of activities that reflect group formation of African migrants that occur in this space.

Amina's restaurant: A public space for immigrants

»Amina« is an African restaurant in Tarlabası, a crime and gangster ridden lower class inner city slum, once home to Istanbul's non-Muslim minorities. After the 80's, the neighborhood witnessed high rates of internal migration, consisting mainly of Kurdish immigrants. Tarlabası is a cosmopolitan place where Kurdish immigrants, some non-Muslim Turkish citizens, Iraqi, Iranian, and African immigrants are living.

Amina African Restaurant & Shop is one of the many Nigerian restaurants in Tarlabası. It is a popular place for immigrants, especially Nigerian, Ghanaian, and Tanzanians. The restaurant is situated in a very old building on a busy street. The ground floor houses a Turkish coffee-house, where the men play card games. Behind the coffeehouse, there is call-center where people can make international phone calls at lower prices to their home countries.

The restaurant is located in an upstairs apartment of the old Tarlabası building. The apartment has three rooms: a larder, a kitchen, and a bathroom. Upon entering the apartment, the main room of the restaurant is located just to the right. The room has no door, but there is a TV with a VCR player right next to the entrance. A showcase which stands to the right of TV displays whitening powder and fake hair, waiting to be sold. Since these products particular to the African market are sold too, the apartment-come-restaurant is also known as a shop.

The tables and the chairs are arranged so that everyone can see the TV wherever they sit. Accordingly, the middle of the room is empty. Located to the left of the entrance is the kitchen which is relatively small for a restaurant. Next to the kitchen are the toilet and the larder. The lar-

der also serves as bedroom of the restaurant's waiter. There is a main floor, which lies between the main room of the restaurant and another room, which constitutes the smoking section.

Amina, the owner of the restaurant has prepared a green and white menu, its colors representing the Nigerian flag. The top of the menu says Amina African Restaurant & Shop. Although the menu offers a wide selection food and drink including beer, hot drinks, soft drinks, *banku* with pounded yam rice, *gari*, fried meat and fish, cow tail and fish pepper soup, a famous Nigerian soup, the only things that one can actually order is *banku* with pounded yam rice and soup, beer and fruit juice.

Amina doesn't function like an ordinary restaurant. At Amina's it is not mandatory to order something; on the contrary most of the time, the immigrants who visit the restaurant might watch TV or a Nigerian movie, or chat amongst each other while they wait for their friends. Although Amina is not always happy with this, she generally accepts it.

Another factor that lends the restaurant its commercial character is trading between the use of the space as a market place. At Amina's immigrants not only eat, drink and socialize, but also buy and sell textiles and clothes. Immigrants who have recently arrived in Istanbul bring huge bags of clothes which are bought by customers who sometimes want to financially support the new arrivals. In addition to this, the restaurant functions as a shelter for some of the new comer immigrants, who haven't yet found a place to live in Istanbul. Moreover, various religious rituals are also held in the restaurants: in another Nigerian restaurant I observed a baptism and a wedding ceremony.

Discussions and conversations between immigrants at the restaurant reflect the different topics through which the migrants feel culturally close to the Turkish society. Turkish football is popular particularly among the Nigerians since there are a number of African players on the Turkish team. During the games, the sense of Turkish belonging increases among the immigrants through the identification with the African football players on the Turkish team.

Especially on the weekends during the football games, Amina's gets crowded. Although the immigrants aren't very familiar with Turkish pop culture icons, their enthusiasm for Turkish football teams and players is similar to that of Turkish fans. A frequent topic of conversation in male dominated migrant public spaces is African players in the Turkish league.

They also know the names of the African football players from the English clubs indicating that their identification with African players transcends the Turkish national level and encompasses the transnational level.

Furthermore, the African community in Istanbul holds an amateur football tournament with teams representing many African countries. »We found that [Turkish] people here focused on the negative things about us«, Donald, a slender man who fled from the religious riots between Christians and Muslims in Nigeria three years ago, remarked. »We thought that as footballers we could let them know about us in a positive aspect« (Schleifer 2005). African immigrants hope that this tournament will change the negative public image of Africans constructed by discourses plagued by racism in Turkey. Many immigrants come to Turkey from Africa to play football in the major Turkish clubs in an effort to achieve upward social mobility. However, since most newcomers are not accepted in the first league clubs, they try their chances in the lower division clubs. Due to legal restrictions, the lower division clubs cannot provide immigrants with resident status or work permits in Turkey.

Drug dealer as social stigma

For irregular migrants who commonly experience hostile attitudes in spaces also inhabited by Turkish people, creating their own spaces becomes a vital in their efforts to strengthen ties with other migrants and to develop group solidarity. When social pressure is applied by from the members or institutions of host society on irregular migrants, occupation of their own spaces enable migrants to generate a sense of security in an atmosphere of instability. The following account of a conversation that took place in the African restaurant, Amina, illustrates the importance of migrant public spaces in that sense.

The incident took place during one of my frequent visits to Amina's African Restaurant. All of the customers, mostly Nigerian immigrants, and I were sitting in the main room of the restaurant watching a Nigerian movie, imported from Nigeria. Martins's, a Nigerian man in his fifties, interrupted the weary mood with his sudden panicky entrance into the restaurant. »Enough, it is really enough!« he shouted. »I am sick, I am sick of them! What do they want from me?« While we tried to understand him, he continued: »They asked me for drugs, two [Turkish] boys came to me and asked ›do you have stuff ?‹ Just in front of the apartment! Why do you do this, why should I live like this every time?« he shouted. Some customers stood up in an effort get Martins to calm down, but most of the customers were laughing, not at Martins, but about this very common incident, which had started to become a joke among the Africans. Amina, the owner of the restaurant, was among those laughing the most. She turned to me and said, »you see my friend,

this is what we experience most of the time» and continued by joking in her Nigerian accented Turkish with a popular Turkish phrase: “*Burası Türkiye abicim burada her şey var, burada her şey olur* [This is Turkey, this is where anything might happen, brother!]” Then a popular theme of conversation commenced between Amina, some other customers, and I: their regret for being in Istanbul, away from their home countries, and their sense hopelessness. »Istanbul is a faculty, a university for Africans; we learn life here in Istanbul, the troubles of life, how to live here...« they lamented.

The account demonstrates how the occupation and sense of ownership African immigrants have over a public space allows them, in a collective manner, to share quotidian experiences that are heavily influenced by the alienating strategies of the host society. More importantly, collective practices such as group conversations, not only foster the growth of a common migrant group identity, but also assign new meanings to the spaces in which the group conversations (or other practices) occur in.

As this example reveals the drug dealer stigma can dramatically shape the daily experiences of African migrants. Moreover, this social stigma and other forms of marginalization and exclusion, such as criminalization, create a high-level of self consciousness among migrants. Most migrants especially experience this self consciousness in host society public spaces. This is neither to say that the immigrants aim to be totally invisible, nor do they always feel threatened by physical or symbolic violence in Turkish public places. However, the unease generated by stigmatization affects migrants’ behavior in public places occupied mainly Turkish people. Immigrants often prefer not to be seen in groups or participate in collective activities in such visible spaces; instead their restaurants or international call centers serve as safe spaces in which migrants can initiate collective activities.

Forging associations and claiming rights

In his study »New Citizens, New Rights: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship«, which is based on fieldwork among the Chicano community in San Jose, William Flores argues that the Latinos forge community as well as rights in their claim for space. By formulating these as cultural citizenship practices, Flores draws attention to a process by which immigrant groups in San Jose maintain cultural rights and political claims in society (2003: 304). According to Flores, claiming space is one of most fundamental components of Latino immi-

grants' cultural citizenship practices in which »members of marginalized groups are free to express themselves and feel at home«. Latinos create spaces of their own in which they can develop cultural identity constructions, group survival, and community organization. Flores' argues that »without the ability to express themselves the immigrant groups have no ability to belong to the dominant culture« (ebd: 297). Although the African migrants in Istanbul haven't developed organizations and resistance groups in the same scale Latino immigrants in the US have, the ways in which the African immigrants create spaces of their own and use are similar to the ways Latinos use their created spaces to forge cultural citizenships.

While The West African immigrants strongly oppose the boundaries constructed by the Turkish state that separate citizens and non-citizens, they were not able to establish a powerful responsive political tool until present day. Yet again, the existence and survival of African migrants, construed as illegal by the Turkish government, can be regarded as a challenge to the prevailing relations and norms constructed around the division between the citizen members and immigrant outsiders.

As Flores's argument implies, establishing a sense of ownership over space plays a key role in the ways in which immigrants politically organize themselves in their efforts to claim citizenship rights. In the same way, Amina's restaurant serves as a setting in which the Nigerian Association can gather to initiate processes through which they can begin to assert more rights. Although this association was not able to obtain legal status from the Turkish state yet, its members are working to advance the association's recognition through their weekly meetings. The extent to which they can effectively develop strategies to negotiate with Turkish actors remains to be seen.

Since the Nigerian Association cannot develop explicit political struggles, due to the illegal status of most of its members, they seek to gain rights by playing within the opportunity structures of Turkey. The rights which the immigrants seek are mostly and fundamentally related to their status in Turkey. Especially the difficulty of having residence permit, due the restrictive features of the immigration law is a major concern among immigrants. Therefore they demand the transformation of Turkey's immigration law which is at stake in the way the immigrant illegality is produced. They believe that by having residence permits they will be protected from the police detention or deportation back home or to a third country. As such, by having residence permits they would have a legal status in Turkey, which would create possibilities to have access in health services and better housing conditions.

Moreover, the immigrants believe that gaining resident status will enable them to freely move between Turkey and Nigeria, thus facilitating more opportunities for commercial activity between the countries. For example, Kanu indicated that some West European countries give immigrants temporary work and resident permits in return for payment. He told me that the Turkish government should also apply a similar law which would additionally provide economic revenue for the Turkish state itself. He continued:

»[If] the government gets one thousand dollar[s] from every immigrant, they would make a lot of money. Through such a law the immigrants can work and make money and pay the Turkish state for their resident and work permits. It would bring a lot of solution to the problems of the immigrants.«

Considering these types of demands of immigrants, the Nigerian Association tries to accomplish basically these has two functions: First, as a hierarchical institution it helps to a community formation; second through its legal recognition, it helps the community to obtain more rights from the government. Immigrants with higher social and economic status founded the association with the anticipation of obtaining work or resident permits from the Turkish state. However, with little support from the Nigerian embassy the Association was not recognized by the Istanbul Foreigners' Police Department [*Yabancı Şube*] and can therefore do little to assist the Nigerian community in their claim for more rights. Efforts to register the Nigerian Association with the Istanbul's government also failed. Furthermore, none of the immigrants I interviewed indicated that their empowerment efforts had lead to any kind of improvement in their relations with state institutions or public authorities.

Immigrant illegality and unemployment

For undocumented West African immigrants, unemployment and exclusion from the Turkish labor market is of major concern. In general, newcomer immigrants seek and learn about the employment opportunities in Turkey through the West African social spaces they also inhabit. Most of the time their efforts to find work result in major disillusionment when they experience, first-hand, the restrictive legal procedures involved. One example of such disillusionment is illustrated by the unwillingness of companies to pay the financial costs and wade through time

consuming bureaucratic procedures to obtain the required legal documents, such as work permits, for their qualified non-Turkish employees.

My informants have maintained that those who register their commercial activity with state institutions or those who buy real estate can also receive work or resident permits. However, most immigrants neither have sufficient economic income or capital to start a business or buy property. Accordingly, the procurement of status and citizenship is directly related to income and status.

The study »Irregular Migration in Turkey« published by the International Organization of Migration (IOM) is one of the few studies about irregular migration in Turkey (İçduygu 2003). This study estimates that in 2003 the number of undocumented African migrants living in Turkey was between 3,000 and 5,000. It also maintains that most of the African immigrants are »overstayers and work illegally in mainly low-paid, difficult and dirty jobs« (İçduygu 2003: 28). Overall, this study paints a useful picture of the economic activities in which West-African immigrants are involved. However, the depiction of African immigrants as an illegal labor force doesn't correspond with my informants' accounts. According to them, there is vast unemployment and a deep-running discontent among the members of African immigrant community, despite the fact that some immigrants find access to various types of income generating activities. As a result of their social isolation, immigrants have limited opportunities for incorporation into the social structures that also lead to informal or formal employment prospects. Moreover, since most Nigerian immigrants are university educated and skilled workers, they intend not to work in traditional immigrant occupied jobs, which tend to be dirty, difficult, and often dangerous. On the contrary, they seek upward mobility and economic empowerment possibilities through employment. To examine the unemployment problem more carefully, the next paragraphs address the role of Turkish immigration law and policies in generating exclusionary practices for the foreign nationals.

The case of my informant, Uzochi, who works in an African restaurant as a waiter, exemplifies how most immigrants with graduate degrees are excluded from employment structures in Turkey. Uzochi has an electronic engineering degree from Nigeria. When he arrived in Istanbul, he started searching for an engineering job. However, without a work permit numerous companies refused to hire him. Most of the employers, he told me, asked him whether he was married to a Turkish citizen, in which case, fewer bureaucratic procedures would stand in the way of hiring him. Similar experiences have led undocumented immigrants to develop reactive strategies to obtain work permits. In my con-

versations with the immigrants, they indicated to me that there are three ways to obtain resident status: employment, marriage to a Turkish citizen, or study. Marrying a Turkish citizen is the easiest way to obtain residence permit, while lengthy and bureaucratic procedures and financial stability are necessary for admittance to university. Amina's story illustrates this situation:

»I found out that before I can find a good job, I had to become a citizen. Then, how can I become a citizen? Whether you marry a Turkish man or you work in company.... The owner of a company can apply for you to get a working permit. In Turkey it is very difficult to get a job; ...how can find [one]? So I decided to fall in love with a Turkish man. He is not really [a] Turkish man. This guy is Kurdish. This guy I met when I was working in Tünel. So this guy told me that he wants to marry me. So we agreed to marry. I agreed to that because I would be able to get a good job. So we married, I got my paper I started to look for job. But there were a lot of Turkish people who couldn't find job. And I was thinking how can they give me a job? Even the citizens had difficulties to get job«.

Furthermore, Turkey's EU application process has led to the consideration of new approaches to its asylum and migration policies. In 2003 the Turkish government proposed a draft law replacing the 1934 »Law on Settlement« in an effort to harmonize the Turkish immigration policy with that of the EU *acquis*. However, the revised law continued to permit only persons of »Turkish descent and Culture« to apply for citizenship in Turkey (Kirişçi 2005: 352). Furthermore the legal reforms have significantly impacted on the existing citizenship laws, »particularly concerning the acquisition of citizenship upon marriage« (Hecker 2006: 4). According to Turkey's old laws, a foreign woman who married a Turkish man automatically obtained Turkish citizenship, as in the case of Amina. Due to the increasing number of marriages, the legislation has now become subject to additional requirements. For example, »foreign spouses are now eligible for naturalization after three years of marriage. With reference to gender equality, the right to acquire citizenship by way of marriage is now also granted to foreign men« (Hecker 2006: 4).

Furthermore, in February 2003 a new law granting work permits for foreigners was approved by Turkish parliament. According to the new law, »foreign citizens are now allowed to work as interpreters, guides, photographers, drivers and waiters, as well as in other jobs that used to be open to Turkish citizens only« (Hecker 2006: 4). However, in practice, these legal reforms have little impact on the immigrants themselves. Most of them are aware of the recent changes in the law regarding work

permits but they were still unable to find employment in the professions that are now open to them for employment.

Transnational trade networks

Although many immigrants have limited access to the jobs, some of the West African immigrants participate in »income generating activities [which] occur outside the state's regulatory framework« (Sassen 1998: 153). Some ethnic groups in West African countries such as Nigeria, Ghana and Senegal have traditionally been long distance traders and have established informal transnational trade networks between Turkey and their countries of origin (Brewer and Ykseker, 2006: 57). According to immigrant accounts, transnational trade networks between Turkey and Nigeria emerged in the 1980s becoming the primary source of work for immigrants who could not make the transit to Europe and stayed in Turkey. Throughout the 80s and 90s, Nigerian businessmen have been importing textiles from Turkey to Nigeria and exporting auto by-products from Nigeria to Turkey. Moreover the flow of the people in this transnational network is not only one way; many Turkish businessmen in the textile industry have also migrated to Nigeria or travel between Turkey and Nigeria. This transnational exchange between Turkey and Nigeria has also generated new job opportunities. Many of my informants are »agents«, or »middle men«, responsible for buying textiles from Turkish producers and transporting the products to Nigeria. Nigerian immigrants and business men from Nigeria benefit from structure the informal economy provides. When they export large quantities of goods, they as undocumented immigrants, unlike formal registered and legal »agents«, bypass many bureaucratic procedures and avoid paying import and export duties.

According to Sasia Sassen, the immigration regimes in the globalized world are contradictory: while a liberal immigration for the elite personal of the global economy provide a flow of capital around the globe, restrictive policies and regulations are set up to prevent the integration of the lower class immigrants into the elite flow of capital and goods (Sassen 1996). In this way, Nigerian business men with higher economic status gain resident and legal permits and can therefore legally travel between Nigeria and Turkey for trading purposes. On the other hand, the majority of Nigerian Immigrants in Turkey are lower status

immigrants and they cannot provide the required starting capital.⁶ Therefore although they seek to work in the textile industry, they are unable to get involved in the transnational textile networks.

Conclusion

In the last decades, strict immigration regulations became instrumental in the attempts of governments of many countries to control and exclude immigrants from their respective societies. Following this, it has been often noted that the law, at some fundamental level, creates a condition of migrant illegality, and thus a high degree of social marginalization. Indeed, the legal and political constitution of migrant illegality produces a basis from which migrant subjection to physical violence and labor exploitation can grow (De Genova 2002, Calavita 1998).

These considerations are also in line with how social exclusion mechanisms operate vis-à-vis the groups who are defined by the nation-states as illegal aliens. Although these immigrant groups are the target of social marginalization, they continue to seek means of survival and informal incorporation in the social body of host society. In this respect, immigrants' social spaces play a central role. Drawing upon my ethnographic study, I argue that new public spaces constructed by the African immigrants can be identified as a challenge to the exclusionary mechanisms of the host society. More importantly, the creation of new spaces generates conditions in which immigrants engage in activities interpreted as informal attempts of inclusion. By arranging collective organizations in their own public spaces, the immigrants develop various formal and informal strategies of claim making. Accordingly the new public spaces serve as key sites where negotiations and interactions take place. These public spaces thus become both zones of the public exclusion and inclusion.

Although this study is not explicitly policy oriented, it explores various aspects of structural violence and exclusionary mechanisms the Turkish government exposes African migrants to. Accordingly, ethnographic data and theoretical approaches presented in this study provide suggestions for the betterment of the living conditions of undocumented immigrants. However, given the fact that the immigrants have already

6 I was able to obtain information about successful Nigerian trading networks because those people active in the these networks are more visible due to their higher economic and legal status. Due to their anonymity and illegality, it was of course much more difficult to obtain information and access the bottom and middle segments of African immigrants in Istanbul.

begun to seek ways in which they can claim rights, securing communication channels through which immigrants can articulate and negotiate their rights is of utmost importance.

If we consider that Turkish state neither has a history of substantive rights for immigrants nor has accepted large groups of non-Turkish speakers as immigrants, the path to immigrant engagement through political activism might seem difficult to achieve. However, this path is surely worth the struggle.

References

- Brewer, K. Todd/Yükseker, D. (2006): »A Survey on African Migrants and Asylum Seekers in Istanbul«. Unpublished report. http://www.mirekoc.com/mirekoc_eng.cgi
- Calavita, K. (1998): »Immigration, Law, and Marginalization in a Global Economy: Notes from Spain«. *Law and Society Review* 32(3), pp. 529-566.
- Danış, A. D. (2006): *Integration in Limbo: Iraqi, Afghan and Maghrebi Migrants in Istanbul*, unpublished research report (coauthored with Taraighi and Pérouse), http://www.mirekoc.com/mirekoc_eng.cgi
- De Genova, P. N. (2002): »Migrant ›Illegality‹ and Deportability in Everyday Life« *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31, pp. 419-47.
- Flores, W. (2003): »New Citizens, New Rights: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship«. *Latin America Perspectives*, 129, 30. 2, March 2003, pp. 295-308.
- Hecker, Pierre. (2006): »Country Profile Turkey«. *Focus Migration* 5.
- Işın, F. E.. (2002): *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- İçduygu, A. (2003): *Irregular Migration in Turkey*. Geneva: IOM.
- İçduygu, A. (2005): »Turkey: the demographic and economic dimension of migration«. *Mediterranean Migration Report*.
- Kirişçi, K. (2000): »Disaggregating Turkish citizenship and immigration practices«. *Middle Eastern Studies* 36, 3.
- Kirişçi, K. (2005): »Turkey: the political dimension of migration«. *Mediterranean Migration Report*.
- Kopnina, H. (2005): *East to West Migration: Russian Migrants in Western Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1991[1974]): *The Production of Space* (trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith), Oxford: Blackwell.

- Nyers, P. (2003): »Abject Cosmopolitanism: the politics of protection in the anti-deportation movement«. *Third World Quarterly* 24, pp. 1069-1093.
- Perouse, J. F. (2006): *Transit Maghrebis in Istanbul: Trajectories, Profiles, and Strategies in Integration in Limbo: Iraqi, Afghan and Maghrebi Migrants in Istanbul*, unpublished research report (Didem Daniş co-authored with C. Taraighi and J. F. Pérouse), http://www.mirekoc.com/mirekoc_eng.cgi
- Pugh, M. (2001): »Mediterranean Boat People: A Case for Cooperation?« *Mediterranean Politics*, 6/1, pp.1-20.
- Rajaram, P. K., Grundy-Warr, C. (2005) »Protection or Control?: Global Migration Policies and Human Rights«. In Fort, B. (ed.) *International Migrations and Human Rights: Proceedings of the 6th Informal ASEM Seminar on Human Rights Series*. Singapore: Asia Europe Foundation.
- Sassen, S. (1996): *Losing Control?* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sassen, S. (1998): *Globalization and Its Discontents*, New York: The New Press.
- Schleifer, Y. (2005): »Africans get way laid in Turkey« *Christian Science Monitor*.

Whose Space, Whose Culture? Struggle for Cultural Representation in »French Street« of Istanbul

SUSANNE PREHL

»I think this project (»French Street« Project) will be very important for our country, which is on the way to European Union, (this project is) especially (important) for Istanbul, which was the capital of the empires, as well as for Beyoğlu district, which has been the our city's window to Europe for centuries in terms of architecture and culture.« (Gürtuna 2002)

Ali Müfit Gürtuna was city mayor of Istanbul between 1998 and 2004. His statement above is an excerpt of an official letter sent to Mehmet Taşdiken's real estate agency in 2002, supporting the implementation the »French Street« cultural theme project in Istanbul/Beyoğlu.

The area of the mentioned project includes houses and public spaces of Cezayir Sokağı and Hayriye Çıkmazı, situated in the inner city district of Beyoğlu. »French Street« is a particularly interesting study case as it represents the first »thematic street project of Turkey« (Afitaş 2006:13). Since its reconstruction in 2004 this locality is commonly known as »French Street« as its development concept attempts to establish French culture in the traditionally non-Muslim, mainly Greek (Mills 2005), neighborhood.

Twenty years ago, it would have been impossible to imagine that Istanbul's public authority would support the redevelopment of an entire street based on a European identity. The nationalist identity model of the Turkish Republic, which still existed in the early 80s, maintained inward-oriented perspectives in urban planning. But since Turkey's politi-

cal re-orientation, in the 1980s, towards neo-liberal policies and internationalization of economic activities, the representation of urban culture and identity in the public domain has changed. As in many other countries, the impacts of globalization have affected urban development patterns and every-day life in Turkey (Öncü 1997; Short/Kim 1999; Eckardt 2001).

Related developments can be observed not just in Istanbul, but in many big cities around the world. International franchise companies, such as Starbucks or H&M sell their standardized products in prestigious parts of inner cities. Multi-screen cinemas show international movies, introducing different approaches to culture and lifestyle. Exhibitions and festivals bring globally known artists and musicians to regional and local places. Whether its new food, movies, music or clothes, that are introduced in the globalization process, their presences become a coherent part of urban landscapes in metropolises all over the world. They attest to a new global interconnectivity, not just in terms of business and goods, but of people and information, too.

The movement of ideologies, culture and goods, and the simultaneous powerful representation of their symbols through the media often appear to delete local identities of place. The same consumer products, brand names, and media images are spread around the globe. Chinatown in New York, Argentinean Tango in Berlin, French Cuisine in Istanbul or Christmas in Japan: nowadays it seems nearly impossible to link cultural practices to a specific place, or as Urry (2004: 57) states:

»The ideological content of western mass culture has spread around the globe. Its aim is to ensure an ever-expanding (western) economy by extending the consumption patterns of the affluent society to all other places. Through Hollywood movies, Disney's fantasy parks, and satellite television, a culture based on consumption now establishes a global hegemony.«

But according to Öncü/Weyland (1997: 8) this process is not the same as the homogenization of cultures. In fact, they claim, that globalization is a multilayered process rather than a unified phenomenon reflecting American and therewith Western cultural domination. Although most of the global traffic is one-way, cross current development can be recognized as well. Short/Kim (1999: 76) use the word »Reterritorialization«, while Hannerz (1997: 127) employed the term »Creolization« to describe the cross-current process. In this regard, big cities have become a reservoir of diverse cultural practices including ethnicity, language and religion, influenced by symbols, ideas, values and tastes from all over the world. Thus, cultural backgrounds are not just understood as empty

containers for the receipt of global messages, rather they are critical of how messages are received and consumed. De-territorialized cultures are re-territorialized in different forms in new localities (Short/Kim 1999:76).

In these globalized landscapes, urban development strategies in many cities try to underline local histories, cultures, and quirks in an effort to demonstrate what makes them different from other places, what makes them unique. Generally speaking, the reinvention of local idiosyncrasies is part of nearly every current urban development strategy. It includes historic preservation of inner city neighborhoods or the marketing of local products and services that mainly cater to tourists or highly paid individuals. Often financed by private, market oriented investors this »local« development has led to the emergence of urban spaces with specific cultural characteristics. Frequently, only a selective public is welcome to participate in the commercial and cultural consumption of these spaces.

This paper is mainly concerned with the cultural transformation of these public spaces. Crucial points of discussion and questions this paper asks include the following: How is the local culture transformed within the global economy? Which histories and cultures are considered appropriate for representation in urban spaces and why? How do the powers and requirements of urban actors influence that process?

With the recent political reorientation in Turkey, Beyoğlu, an Istanbul neighborhood, with its diversified cultural roots, is an important case study. The questions I discuss in this paper are essential and add meaning to the current debate regarding the development of public spaces in Istanbul. My goal, therefore, is not to reiterate the debate on worldwide cultural homogenization, or simply to describe a specific case of representing French cultural roots in a locality, but is to investigate the interconnection of global trends, their local responses and to examine the power laden structures behind that process. Using the »French Street« case study, I will examine the role played by Istanbul's public authorities, private investors, and the media in the planning, implementation and maintenance processes of this project.

The first section of this paper will briefly contextualize the case study area by turning to Istanbul's historical development and analyzing the Ottoman and Republican periods and their connection to European identity models. This is important as the »French Street« urban planning project's concept aims to reconstitute European cultural practices. Furthermore particular attention will be paid to the social and political changes after the 1980s embedding the case study in its current context. The third part of the paper gives an in-depth analysis of the development

and implementation process of the French Street project paying special attention to the urban actors involved. Finally, I will provide concluding remarks by linking the French Street case study to the broader theoretical debate.¹

Contextualization: Istanbul

Istanbul is not just the biggest city in Turkey, but also one of the most populated cities in the world. In 2006 Istanbul's population reached more than 10 million², its settlement area extending more than 100 kilometers in an east-west direction along the Marmara Sea. Today Istanbul is also a dominant economic center in the Middle East, the Balkans and Central Asia, and therefore attracts significant global capital (Seger/Palencsar 2003; Robins/Aksoy 1995; Keyder/Öncü 1994).

Furthermore the city is a popular tourist destination and hosts international film, theatre, jazz and art festivals. Since the late 90s, the »Biennale«, a large cultural festival that takes place in Istanbul every two years, has been an important platform for the city to exhibit its history. In 2007 the ninth Biennale was simply named »Istanbul« – a consciously blurry title. The title encompasses a plethora of things imaginable in Istanbul, but primarily refers to the real urban location of the festival and points to stories and metaphors inspired by the city (<http://universes-in-universe.de> 2007). And there are plenty of these stories. They tell tales about different cultures, ethnically and religiously diverse groups, they portray lifestyles and habits and speak about tensions and hopes; they define the everyday life in the city. In their diversity, the Istanbul stories emphasize the confrontation of contemporary Istanbul with its layered story of the past and present. In the following paragraphs I will introduce some of these telling layers.

A capital of the East-Roman and the Ottoman Empire for nearly 2000 years, Istanbul was one of the most important cities in the world until the beginning of the twentieth century (Seufert/Kubaseck 2004). After Byzantine Constantinople (later Istanbul) was conquered by the Ottoman forces in 1453, a large Greek community continued to live in

1 The presented article is the result of examinations on Istanbul carried out during the year 2006 and 2007. Besides a profound analysis of relevant publications and media, the study mainly bases its conclusions on a 3-month fieldwork by the author in Istanbul that consisted of space observations and interviews with private and public stakeholders involved in the planning and implementation of the French Street Project.

2 Census referring to city borders without independent suburbs.

the city after Mehmet, the Ottoman Conqueror, granted a perpetual right for the patriarchate to remain in the city. Since the Ottoman Empire was not based on the succession of aristocracy, but on the principle of efficiency, Greeks continued to play a significant role in the social and economic city life. Even after the Greek independence movement and the establishment of an independent Greek state in 1829, Istanbul remained the largest Greek Orthodox city throughout the Ottoman Empire (Keyder 1999: 8; Seufert/Kubaseck 2004: 66). »Ottoman Istanbul was no less cosmopolitan than Byzantine Constantinople« (Keyder 1999: 9), as it maintained a mix of ethnic and religious communities.

With the beginning of European expansion in the nineteenth century that was accompanied by top-down modernization attempts by the Ottoman State, local Muslims sought to find new »symbols of resistance« and began to import nationalist ideologies. Istanbul became the arena where critical oppositions – East versus West, Islam versus Christianity, and local versus global – were played out as Keyder (1999:9) states.

In this atmosphere the Ottoman Empire finally collapsed in the aftermath of the World War I. Fueled by the desire to found a Greek nation state in which the Balkans and Anatolia, including Istanbul would be settled by the Greeks, the Greek government started a campaign against the weakened Ottoman Empire. These developments mobilized the Turkish national movement, which led to the Turkish War of Independence from 1919-1922. Under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the Greeks suffered a devastating defeat and the Republic of Turkey was founded in 1923. These developments had serious consequences for the Greeks living in Turkey and furthermore for the ethnic structure of traditionally multi-ethnic Istanbul. In the Treaty of Lausanne, a forced population exchange was agreed, resulting in the deportation of 1.25 Million Greeks and 500, 000 Turks (Human Rights Watch 1990). The significance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate Church in Istanbul for the Greek Orthodoxy played an important role in allowing the exemption of Istanbul's Greek population from this mass deportation. Nonetheless, supported by the former anti-western movements, it was easy to dismiss the city's predominantly non-Muslim pro-western population. The new regime under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, however, remained sceptical to this oppositional model, which was characterized by an adherence to Islam. Consequently, from the Republican point of view, the ideal local cultural concept was »fiercely irreligious, embodying all the virtues of tradition without its vices, ready and willing to be injected with positivism and progress« (Keyder 1999:10). Istanbul, as the center of the traditional political system and deeply entrenched in Islam, thus lost its status as capital city to Ankara. The new capital also

became the new center of secular, rational and enlightened politics (Robins/Aksoy 1995).

The new Turkish nation state was very nationalistic and its constitution contained more ethnic references than democratic ones. In order to create a homogenous sense of national identity, immigrants were only welcome if they were either Muslim and could speak Turkish, or officially belonged to an ethnic group that could easily integrate into Turkish culture, such as Albanians or Bosnians (Kirisci 2007).

In the beginning of the 20th century 56% of Istanbul's population consisted of religious or ethnic minorities, such as Christians and Jews. These people were not just an integral part of the city's everyday life, moreover, as merchants, businessmen or shopkeepers they played an important role in Istanbul's international trading connections (Mills 2005:446; Keyder 1999: 11). In the Istanbul of the Turkish Republic these people were no longer warmly welcome. Anti-Christian minority policy drove nearly all of Istanbul's non-Muslim population out of the city. (Seufert/Kubaseck 2004: 87). In 1923 foreign enterprises had to force their Christian employees to resign, in 1936 the state started to take over churches and in 1942 a newly invented property tax left nearly all of the non-Muslim merchants in ruins (Seufert/Kubaseck 2004:161). In 1955 a government-instigated pogrom against Istanbul's Greek population living in Pera around Istiklal Caddesi took place. Eleven people were murdered and more than 600 were injured. During one night more than 72 orthodox churches were set on fire, more than 3500 Greek owned homes and more than 4000 Greek-owned businesses were badly damaged or attacked. Consequently more than 100,000 non-Muslim minorities left the country (ÖRKÖ 2005). Again in 1964 demonstrations motivated people with Greek citizenship to leave the country (Keyder 1999:11). Thus by the 1980s, Istanbul's Greek population had been reduced to fewer than 2000, Armenians to 50,000 and Jews to 25,000, compared to a total Christian population of about 450,000 in 1914. (Mills 2005: 446; Keyder 1999: 11).

In 1983 the newly elected ANAP government introduced the neoliberal political model in Turkey, replacing the inward-looking development policies of former governments. The large amounts of foreign trade and foreign direct investments received by Turkey are a clear indicator of the successful adoption of the new political model. Between 1980 and 2001 foreign investment experienced a twenty-eight fold increase reaching 2.7 billion dollars in 2001. In the same period, imports saw a fivefold increase from 7.9 to 41.4 billion dollars and exports a tenfold increase from 2.9 to 31.3 billion dollars (Islam 2001:125).

In this period Istanbul became the new showcase for international and national investments (Keyder/Öncü 1994:400). A huge variety of projects were initiated with the primary aim of transforming Istanbul »from a national primate city ravaged by rapid immigration into a newly imagined world city« (Keyder/Öncü 1994: 401). Especially under mayor Dalian, investment friendly projects were designed »to enhance the global image of Istanbul« (Keyder/Öncü 1994: 401) as a western and cosmopolitan city, ready to overtake its symbolic bridgehead position between the East and West, between Orient and Occident (Keyder/Öncü 1994; Robins/Aksoy 1995).

The new global interconnectivity allowed Istanbulians, especially highly paid and well educated individuals, to adapt to western consumption patterns and values. Accordingly, the rise of shopping malls, like Akmerkez and Kanyon, selling luxury goods; international brands like Starbucks, Mc Donald's, and Gucci; and of bars, nightclubs and world cuisine restaurants, revealed the emergence of new lifestyles. Istanbul was rapidly becoming a city of cultural consumption (Keyder 1999: 17), geared not just to its population, but to tourists as well; »[...] it is through the tourist's gaze that Istanbulites have come to realize the profundity of their loss: the disappearance of 2000 years of history«, as Öncü states, »the exotic beauty of the city's old neighborhoods, the romanticism of its indigenous wooden architecture, and the splendor of its historical monuments« (1997: 56).

Apart from these developments, the economic boom and open borders attracted an influx of working immigrants especially from the East Anatolian provinces and the Eastern Bloc. Istanbul's population increased rapidly from 2,7 mill. (1980) to 10 mill. (2006). The newcomers either »invaded« the abandoned inner city sites of the non-Muslim population or moved to informal settlements *gecekondu*, inhabited by cultural homogenous groups of immigrants with their own social networks based on kinship and local origin. Networking became an integral characteristic of Istanbul's development structures, be it in terms of business associations, political organizations or social activities (Erder 1999: 165). But still, the immigrant's religious and ethical values and therefore their claims to the city differ considerably from the elite and the well educated middle class. This unevenness has the capacity to ignite cultural conflicts, arising around the definitions of locality and identity similar to Keyder's (1999: 23) »modern-traditional« clash. These tensions and conflicts are part of Istanbul's urban development.

Öncü summarized the diverse and contradictory nature of Istanbul's new coexistence effectively: »In the 1980s, when the inhabitants of Istanbul were introduced to Mc Donald's hamburgers, Toblerone choco-

late and Italian pizza, they also got to know hamsili kebab, the taste of Kayseri manit, red cabbage, and the distinct flavors of Urfa, Antep and Bursa kebabs« (1993: 75). Under the impacts of globalization a sense locality specific to Istanbul has regained its former cultural diversity. In this way, immigrant's cultural origins are suddenly on display, while the emerging internationally spread lifestyles defined by western values of a globalizing city are easily recognized. At the same time, however, conflicts arise between the polarized groups, between the localizers and the globalizers (Keyder 1999: 23), who each have different attitudes and claims to the city. It is these conflicts that are ready to be played out in the public spaces of the city. After the election of the pro Islamic Welfare party in the 1990s, the question of what is native or local culture and what is being reformulated as local after years of westernization, is highly contested (Navaro-Yasin 1999: 61-63).

»French Street«: Representing history?

The case study area of »French Street« consists of two public streets, Cezayir Sokağı and Hayriye Çıkmazı. Cezayir Sokağı means Algerian Street respectively. Additionally, the adjoining 29 three to six storied 19th century buildings, and a small square are also part of the French Street redevelopment project. The project was initiated by Afitaş, a private real estate agency owned by Mehmet Taşdiken. He developed his ideas with support from the public authorities. Despite Taşdiken's connection to the public authorities, the project was initiated in 2004 without any governmental financial support.



Figure 1 and 2: French Street's appearance: Most of the newly renovated buildings house restaurants and bars, Restaurant seating and luminous advertising characterize the public space. Photos by Susanne Prehl, 2006

Today the newly renovated pastel painted buildings with colorful awnings, mostly house restaurants and bars, serving French food. Furthermore there are shops, an art gallery, and a hotel, while some of the upper floors are still used for living. The street's public space is characterized by high volumes of restaurant seating which reduces the effective walkable width of the street to one and a half meters. Moreover, the area is »furnished« by luminous advertising and street lamps that have been manufactured according to an old Parisian design (The guide 2005: 67). A large mural painting – a copy of the artwork »Jane Avril« by Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec – decorates the most visible façade.

Whose space?

The area of »French Street« is part of Beyoğlu, an inner-city neighborhood on Istanbul's European shore. The project itself is situated right behind Galatasaray School close to the İstiklal Caddesi – Istanbul's new center and main boulevard. This area is a prospering district, known for its restaurants, bars and art galleries. But Beyoğlu is not just a gentrified leisure, entertainment, and art center. Since Ottoman times the district hosted foreign embassies, international organizations, and serves as a residence for Istanbul's non-Muslim inhabitants. Beyoğlu, formerly known as Pera, was founded as a Genoese trading colony that was granted autonomy by the Empire in the thirteenth century. The colony inhabited the unsettled European side of the river bank, while the existing Imperial City was located on the other side of the river. In the beginning of the nineteenth century native minorities, including mercantile Greeks, Armenians, Jews and Levantines moved to Pera.

In 1889 the first Orient Express reached Istanbul from Paris. But it was not the first time that Beyoğlu was introduced to French culture. Moreover the area around İstiklal Caddesi was already known as the French speaking financial and entertainment center of the city, designated by the Ottomans as a reform area to transform Istanbul into a »Western City«. Characterized by a wealth of languages and cultural practices, and being less connected to the religious rules and social control of the Muslim society, Pera became the first »Europeanized« quarter of the city, dominated by symbols of modern living such as office buildings, banks, theatres, hotels, department stores, and multi-storey apartment buildings (Bartu 1999; Mills 2005).

The neighborhood still hosts various historic buildings that attest to Beyoğlu's multiethnic past, for instance religious facilities, such as the Santa Maria Draperis, Saint Antoine, the Armenian-Catholic Church, the

Aga-Mosque or the Greek Orthodox Church of Hagia Panalya can be found there. International hospitals like the German Hospital or schools such as the Galatasaray Lycee or St. Plucherie still characterize the reputation of the district (Türkiye Sinai Kalkınma Bankası 1990).

Since the political and economical reconstruction in the 1980s, Beyoğlu is one of the main investment areas for national and international shareholders in Istanbul. Several urban regeneration projects, such as the closing of the İstiklal Caddesi Street to traffic have already occurred in Beyoğlu. Today it is a very prestigious, partly gentrified district that is carefully promoted to the world as Istanbul's cosmopolitan and western city center. Especially after 1994, when the pro-Islamic Welfare Party was elected as the local government, Beyoğlu's development has been celebrated as a symbol of tolerance; »For party officials it was a crucial opportunity to demonstrate the ›Ottoman Model‹ of government, which they defined as the coexistence of different lifestyles in peace and harmony« (Bartu 1999: 40).

However this multi-ethnic identity promotion neglects one important part of Beyoğlu's past, namely the forced decline of its cosmopolitan atmosphere, mainly caused by the anti-minority policy under the Turkish Republic, as described in the previous paragraph. As a result Beyoğlu where the non-Muslim minorities were concentrated lost most of its inhabitants and the multi-ethnic flair of its heyday at the end of the 19th century.

»French Street« used to be a Greek settlement (Mills 2005). Since the state-sponsored riot in 1955 against the Greek population and other non-Muslims, many houses were abandoned and had open land tenures. They were then informally populated by immigrants, especially Kurdish people from Anatolia or Gypsies that were not able to formally obtain the buildings (Mills 2005). Consequently »French Street's« housing stock visibly degenerated and served as home for the low income class until a private developer decided to place his project idea of a »French Street« in the area of Cezayir Sokağı Street. As a result of this decision, the immigrant culture of the neighborhood was confronted with the planned cultural concept of a glamorous Western lifestyle.

Whose culture?

The official »French Street« project report, written by Afitaş, considers the recovery of Turkey's relationship to European Culture to be the main purpose of the project. It argues that the French Street project could bring back European, namely French, culture to Beyoğlu. Therefore, the

former multiculturalism of the district was nostalgically (Mills 2005) introduced as one of the main characteristics of the Cezayir Street area. Primarily Afitaş, the real estate agency, and Istanbul's city mayor Gürtuna were supporter of the project. Similarly Afitaş announced in the report (2004):

»French Street« Project is a transformation project in a social and cultural sense. For Turkey that is on the way to European Union and for Beyoğlu which accelerated in being culture-art and entertainment space, it is a project which will accelerate and give momentum to the transformation and civilization. [...] This is a transformation project which will have great contributions on the multi-cultural life of Turkey. [...] Moreover, this project will indirectly contribute to the world culture, peace and tolerance.«

Two years later the argumentation was still the same, and was published in the French Street Magazine by Afitaş: »[The] ›French Street‹ project expresses both the history of Beyoğlu and the history of the empire. Because in these lands a multiculturalism is born and [...] supported by Ottoman itself. Firstly starting from Beyoğlu, all of our ruined historical zones must reveal all our culture and memories.« [sic!] (Afitaş, 2006:11)

Thus the development model for Cezayir Street, introduced by the real estate agency, Afitaş, and encouraged by the public authorities, makes references to the quarter's history conveying through its architecture and design an »idealized« image of an elegant nineteenth century French speaking Grande Rue de Pera / Istiklal Caddesi (Mansel 1993). The idea behind the concept, concurrent with a nowadays Turkish passion for the Islamic and Ottoman past, draws a relationship with Istanbul's history as capital of the nineteenth century Ottoman Empires. In their historical representation, Afitaş chooses a period known for its pro-western and multiethnic aspects. By emphasizing a time period in which Istanbul opened its arms to the west and to multicultural influences, clear connections are made with today's globalizing Istanbul. Furthermore, the »French Street« project shares with other inner city rehabilitation projects, the task of »valuing« a poor neighborhood by enlisting private investment and by implementing popular entertainment and culture concepts. In the area of Cezayir Street the chosen concept of French identity is, according to Mills (2005), an invented one, as the area predominately used to be a Greek neighborhood.

Aiming to implement and promote the »French Street« project in a powerful way, the project's developer generated a French brand for Cezayir Sokağı, which represented how the street was transformed from

»an abandoned street with ruined appearance« to a lively street »reaching its own historical value« (Afitaş 2006: 13).

In its design »French Street« was thematically staged to create a »French flair« with pastel-colored walls, French paintings and furniture, as well as restaurants with French names playing French music and serving French food (Cumartesi VATAN 01/2004). Cultural events, such as concerts and exhibitions, also take place in several locations on the street. Furthermore a street magazine is published which contains articles about fashion, artists and lifestyle, thus catering to the interests of the street's target group, who are, as the street's director Taşdıken explains: »economically well situated and also culturally interested people« (2006). By implementing a French theme and by taking relatively high prices, the street management attracts a specific group of costumers that understands itself as modern and cosmopolitan elite, as Mills explains (2005):

»The emerging, self-consciously cosmopolitan-European identity of the cultural and economic elite in Istanbul builds on the secular and European part of Turkish national identity, while also deliberately contesting the nationalist narrative by undermining the definition of Turkey as an ethnically Turkish nation.« (Mills 2005:443)

Structures: Actors and power

Assisted by a team of architects, artists and scientists, Afitaş conceived the idea of »French Street« and presented the proposal to the city's municipality who quickly approved the project. As a result of his strong connections to the city's municipality, it is likely that Taşdıken, who was the consultant to Mayor Gürtuna at the time, played a decisive role in the projects approval.

The generally time-consuming process of approval, in the case of »French Street« took just a few days due to the fact that the project was accepted in one go. Approval included permission for renovation, demolition and reconstruction of the buildings, the termination of long term tenancy agreements of government owned buildings, and licenses and working permits for the restaurants (Interview French Street operator 2006; Beyoğlu Newspaper 07/2004: 5). However, the project's influential supporter – Istanbul's city mayor, Ali Müfit Gürtuna ensured its unusually quick approval process. In Istanbul's metropolitan governance system, the mayor's opinion has strong influence on the public decision making processes. His statement, cited at the beginning of this essay,

clearly shows that he identifies the »French Street« project as a means to reconnect Istanbul with its European cultural roots. The project's concept suited the governmental attempt to form a new »more modern and contemporary« composition for Beyoğlu by »protecting and respecting its former identity by highlighting traces of its past« (Beyoğlu Belediyesi 2006: 1). Employees of the city's municipality stated that they did not want to constrain private initiatives in the district (Büyükköksal/Özkan 2005). The incumbent mayor of the district of Beyoğlu was recently quoted in the »French Street« magazine: »That zone was in need of rehabilitation before, with this kind of a community it became an artistic place. [...] I thank to (the) architects for this appendage they have done to our town. It's now time for all parts of Beyoğlu for similar projects.« (Afitaş, 2006:80)

Afitaş convinced its private business partners to invest and buy most of the houses in the »French Street« area and managed to get long-term tenancy agreements for government owned buildings. In order to realize the project, most of the former tenants were given notice to leave their flats. In total, 48 tenants moved to other settlement areas for low income populations [Yedikule, Tarlabası und Şişhane] (Büyükköksal & Özkan 2005). Today the houses in »French Street« are rented to new tenants who are often involved with operation of the restaurants and bars in the area.

During the project construction process, public opinion about the project was heavily influenced by the media. Just before and shortly after »French Street«'s opening, several supportive articles were published in newspapers, for instance: »A French wind in Beyoğlu« [Beyoğlu'nda Fransız rüzgarı] Cumhuriyet (2004); Radikal (2006); »Don't ignore French Street« [Fransız Sokağı'na Fransız kalmayın] Tempo (2004); »Beyoğlu gathered to its Paris in spring« [Beyoğlu baharda Paris'ine kavuşuyor] Vatan (2004) and in magazines: »French people come back to Pera. Pera collects its parts« [Fransızlar Pera'ya dönüyor. Pera parçalarını topluyor] (Beyoğlu newspaper 2003). A complimentary magazine, The Guide – Istanbul, published for English speakers in Istanbul and distributed to hotels, advertising agencies etc. wrote about the »French Street« project:

»Beyoğlu is known for its handsome architecture but all too often old buildings are hidden under layers of grime accumulated over decades. One little corner of this historical district, which used to be known as Pera, has just regained its former splendour. In fact, the old Cezayir Sokağı, now known as Fransız Sokağı, is probably more attractive today than it has ever been, thanks to the efforts of developer Mehmet Taşdiken« (The Guide 2005:67). Thus

»French Street« appeared to be a warmly welcomed and widely supported project. But not all the reactions to the implementation of »French Street« were positive. The left leaning Postexpress published two interviews with former inhabitants of the neighborhood.

»Before, [French Street] was a very lively street in many senses. There were Romani; I have witnessed at least 15 Romani wedding ceremonies. There were Kurds; they were making fire and dancing in Nevruz. In addition, there were specific street vendors, for instance, there was a man who has sold oil for thirty years. That's to say, they will not be able to enter this street anymore. What will be experienced in this street? French culture? There is one art gallery and thirty bars. If it is so, they should be honest; they should say that they are establishing an entertainment center. Now, many colors have disappeared, it has become two colors. Here was a lively neighborhood in which the inhabitants lived a modest life« (Postexpress 08/2004).

After this critical comment concerning the investor's one-sided cultural concept and the lack of participation by inhabitants, the »French Street« project began to be publicly discussed. The renaming of Algerian (Cezayir) Street to »French Street«, and especially the tension filled historical connections between France and Algeria were criticized by the media. Furthermore, students of several universities discussed in term or thesis papers the concept behind »French Street«. Büyükköksal/Özkan (2005) reported in their paper about »French Street«, that the reporter of the newspaper Milliyet, Ahmet Tulgar, loudly insisted on his right not to be searched by the security before entering a public street. Additionally, Büyükköksal/Özkan (2005) write about two small demonstrations against the security and the street's renaming.

Furthermore, the well known internet panel for architects »Arkitera« opened a public opinion survey about »French Street«. It was found that 53% of the respondents expressed agreement with the project, while 45% of the survey participants were more critical of the French Street project (<http://forum.arkitera.com/istanbul/07/2004>).³

Furthermore, my own interviews with representatives of Istanbul's intellectuals such as artists, journalists, and university professors, revealed their advanced criticism toward the project. An artist who, since the late 60s, lives in Istanbul and concerns herself with the city's transformation, stated: »I see it as a real estate development project with the aim of making money. I must admit that I have not walked down the street. I looked down [the street from one end] and found it uninteresting. I did not feel

3 223 people have voted in the Arkitera opinion survey. (<http://forum.arkitera.com/istanbul/2004>)

like walking down a street that did not look interesting to me⁴. A member of the European Capital Committee expressed his critical position concerning the implementation of the project:

»They transformed this place into a French street. And it is humorsome that the name ›French Street‹ was Cezayir Street [Algerian Street]; the local people were Romani living there and they had to go. [...] So this type of transformation is no alternative. The vision of the public authority is that of the investors« (Member of cultural capital committee 08/2006).

One outcome of the ongoing public criticism was a complaint from French Street's operators union, consisting of restaurant's or shop managers, about the lack of commercial success. It was asked for a re-branding of the street, as is stated in a paper presented by the operator's alliances: »the search for alternative names for the street have resulted in associations between the street and the ›Algerian Independence War‹« (Unofficial action paper of »French Street« operators 2006).

Furthermore, the name »French Street« is no longer officially promoted. In 2007 large signs marking the areas entrances were erected, welcoming visitors to Cezayir Sokağı, not »French Street«. Even before the new signs were hung up, and soon after the opening of the street, visible security controls at street entrances were removed. Instead security employees dressed in street clothes patrol the area, but are not perceived as security. Music played in the restaurants is not just French, but international or Turkish as well. The developer adapted his concept to the special needs of its customers; their demands and lifestyles did not fit with the negative propaganda about the French-Algerian war or the rumors about the mistreatment of former inhabitants. They did not blindly accept the exclusively French concept of the street.

Conclusion

During the last century, Istanbul experienced significant political and therefore spatial and social transformations. Contemporary daily life in Istanbul has been influenced by Turkey's political and economic shift towards neoliberal policies and the liberalization of its markets in the 80s. In turn, these transitions have caused a shift with regard to the city's design objectives from local to global. Therefore the city government became market oriented and conducted its business in a less managerial

4 The artist asked me not to tell his name in publications.

oriented way. In fact, it was in the 1980s that the introduction of the metropolitan governance model enabled Istanbul's municipality to plan and implement projects by itself for the first time. Previously, urban planning in Istanbul was the task of the central government in Ankara. But Istanbul's tremendous growth made a coordinated urban development of the city impossible; rather the city's expansion was characterized by informal growth financed by private investors. Private enterprises started to influence planning processes and decision making leading to frequent private/public partnerships as they became an inherent component of urban development strategies in Istanbul.

As is comparable with cities worldwide, developments in Istanbul's center are mainly concerned with tourism, consumption and entertainment. Most of the prestigious sites are consciously designed by private enterprises for urban elites or tourists, whose lifestyles and consumption patterns are influenced by media and therefore by western values. One of these private development projects is the »French Street« in Beyoğlu whose concept follows a global trend of urban theming.

In times of ongoing competition between cities, the implementation of historically themed projects, which are specific to locality, is a commonly used urban strategy, especially in inner city districts. But how is this global trend translated to the local level in the case of »French Street«? Which powers stand behind the manifestation of »French Street«?

In my analyses the tremendous influence of the private sector on the representation of culture and on the decision on which culture is to be represented, has been underlined. The developer, Taşdiken, and his real estate group influenced the planning, implementation and the maintenance processes in Cezayir Sokağı considerably. By using their political and financial power to sell their concept, Afitaş inserted a »French theme park« into traditional residential city fabric with ease. Moreover, Afitaş was allowed to use nearly the entire project area for commercial and consumption purposes. Public authorities participated in the project's development, but primarily in a supportive role. Particularly the tremendous political power exercised by the Mayor of Greater Istanbul, Ali Müfit Görtuna, accelerated the authorization procedure by the Beyoğlu Municipality.

In summary, the power laden network structures behind the implementation process were crucial to the project's success. The developer used his private networks to finance the project by inviting friends to invest. Of most significance, however, were Taşdiken's connections to the highest authority in the municipality, which led to an accelerated application process and ultimately to project approval.

On the other hand, public discussion initiated by magazines and newspapers who published supportive and critical statements and the internet panel, Arkitera, that opened an opinion survey, provided a counter response to the development. In the case of »French Street«, this counter flow, absent in the planning process, was undertaken by the press and the city's inhabitants. Nonetheless, these discussions about the project's concept were first discussed after the project's implementation. The debate, however, highlighted several important points. Firstly, Istanbul's inherent social conflict between low income groups and urban elites were again revealed. A lack of participation from low income groups, and the challenges generated by prestigious inner-city development, also critical issues the »French Street« project, were underlined, while the superimposition of a French identity in a street named Algeria Street exposed unsolved issues of identity in Istanbul. Finally, the project's lack of success led only to a minimal economic turnover, to the alteration of its security measures and to the reduction of the French theme.

However, the private and public stakeholders used the image of a cosmopolitan and therefore European Istanbul to promote their project. The developers tried to nostalgically link French culture to the Ottoman Beyoğlu of the late 19th and early 20th century, a period known for its multi-ethnic population. By implementing French cuisine, French lifestyle and French music, the developer connected the local specifics of place, despite its somewhat invented nature, to a pleasurable experience of consumption. The French ideal is beloved in Istanbul, as it evokes the bygone times of a multiethnic, modern, and elegant Istanbul. Hence, it may be argued that an investment, like French Street, is worthwhile in a neighborhood like Beyoğlu that is supposed to be developed according to its European roots.

From the »French Street« case study it is not possible to concede that the Europeanization tendency described here is comparable to other worldwide movements. The design motifs in »French Street« are influenced by a longing for a European identity, but cannot be automatically derived from an affection for European culture. Nevertheless, the use of these French design motifs are, on one hand a consequent link to Ottoman history, but on the other hand, a marketable image of cultural tolerance in a global scale. The French design motifs have grown from a longing for the cosmopolitan glory experienced during the Ottoman Empire. The Greek identity, also part of the native European identity in Istanbul and Beyoğlu was after the wars, pogroms and population exchanges between Greece and Turkey, not deemed marketable. In exchange the association with France has been re-territorialized in Beyoğlu

but simultaneously creolized and replaced in accordance with the needs of the customer that fits in the expectation of the profit-oriented investor.

References

- Afitaş (2006): »Fransız Cezayir Sokağı i dergisi«. In: Aylık Kültür Sanat ve Magazin, Eylül/2006 (1), İstanbul: Afitaş.
- Afitaş (2004): »Projects report«, İstanbul: Afitaş.
- Bartu, A. (1999): Who owns the old quarters? Rewriting Histories in a global era. In: C.Keyder (ed.), İstanbul between the Global and the Local, Boston: Rowman & Littlefield. Pp. 31-46.
- Büyükkörsal A./Özkan M. (2005): Gentrification in Cezayir Street, Ankara: Seminar Paper, Middle East Technical University.
- Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker (2004): European Cities Monitor: Executive Summary. European Headquarter, London: Marketing Department Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker.
- Eckardt, F. (2001): Von der Global City zur Globalen Urbanität. In F.Eckardt (ed.): Global Cities, Kassel.
- Erder, S. (1999): Where do you hail from? Localism and Networks in İstanbul. In: C. Keyder (ed.), İstanbul between the Global and the Local. Boston: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gürtuna (2002): Supportive letter of İstanbul's mayor Ali Müfit Gürtuna for French Street project, İstanbul.
- Hannerz, U. (1997): Scenarios for peripheral cultures. In: A. King (ed.), Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp.107-128.
- Human Rights Watch (1990): Destroying ethnic identity: the turks of Greece, New York: A Helsinki Watch Report.
- Islam, T. (2005): Outside the Core: Gentrification in İstanbul. In: R. Atkinson/G. Ridge (eds.), Gentrification in a Global Context: The new urban colonialism New York & Oxon: Routledge, pp. 121-136.
- Keyder, C. (1999): The Setting. In: C. Keyder (ed.), İstanbul between the Global and the Local. Boston: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 3-30.
- Keyder, C./Öncü A. (1994): »Globalization of a third-world metropolis: İstanbul in the 1980s«. In: Review 17, No. 3, pp. 383-421.
- Kirisci K. (2007): Turkey: A transformation form Emigration to Immigration. <http://www.migrationinformation.org>, visited: 02.11.2007, İstanbul: Center for European Studies, Bogazici University.
- Mansel P. (1999): »İstanbul and the Olympics«. In: Financial Times supplement, June 24, 1993.

- Mills A. (2005): »Narratives in City Landscapes: Cultural Identity in Istanbul«. *Geographical Review*: July, 95(3), pp. 441-462.
- Navaro – Yasin Y. (1999): »The Historical Construction of Local Culture: Gender and Identity in the Politics of Secularism versus Islam«. In: C. Keyder (ed.), *Istanbul between the Global and the Local*. Boston: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 59-74.
- Öncü A. (1997): The myth of the »ideal home« travels across cultural borders to Istanbul. In Öncü, A./Weyland, P. (ed.), *Space, Culture and Power: New identities in globalizing cities*, London: Zed Books, pp. 56-73.
- Öncü, A./Weyland, P. (1997): Struggle over »Lebensraum« and Cultural Identity in Globalizing Cities. In Öncü, A./Weyland, P. (ed.), *Space, Culture and Power: New identities in globalizing cities*, London: Zed Books, pp. 1-21.
- Öncü A. (1993): Understanding Istanbul. In: *Istanbul (English Language edition) 1 (2) p.* 32-39.
- ÖRKÖ-Ökumenischer Rat der Kirchen Österreichs (2005): Vor 50 Jahren zerstörte ein Pogrom das alte Konstantinopel. http://www.oekumene.at/dokumente/20050905_progrom-konstantinopel.htm, visited 07/11/02
- Robins K./Aksoy A. (1995): »Istanbul Rising: Returning the repressed to urban culture«. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 2 (3) pp. 223-235.
- Segel M. & Palencsar (2003): »Istanbul – der Weg zurück zur Weltstadt«. (*Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen*) 147, 2003/4, pp. 74-83.
- Seufert, G./Kubaseck C. (2004): *Die Türkei: Politik, Geschichte, Kultur*. München: Beck.
- Short, J./Kim, Y.H. (1999): *Globalisation and the city*, Harlow, Pearson.
- Türkiye Sinai Kalkınma Bankası (1990): *Maps of Istanbul: From the Middle Ages to the Present Day*, Istanbul: Türkiye Sinai Kalkınma Bankası.
- Urry J. (2004): Reinterpreting Local Culture. In: M. Miles (ed.), *The city cultures reader*, Second edition, London: Routledge, pp. 54-57
- Watts, M. J. (1991): »Mapping meaning, denoting difference, imagining identity: dialectical images and postmodern geographies«. In *Geografiska Annaler* 73B: pp.7-23.

Internet sources

<http://universes-in-universe.de/car/istanbul/deu/2005/index.htm>, visited: 07/09/26

<http://www.migrationinformatio.org>, visited: 07/11/02

<http://forum.arkitera.com/istanbul/3101-fransiz-CezayirSokagiihakkinda-ne-dusunuyorsunuz-3.html>, visited: 20/01/2008

http://www.apa.com.tr/apa/g_istanbul_eng.htm, visited: 20/01/2008

Press sources

Beyoğlu Belediyesi (06/2006): Beyoğlu. Quarterly Magazine of Beyoğlu Municipality, Istanbul

Beyoğlu Idare (07/2004): French Street Special Issue, Istanbul

Cumartesi VATAN (03/01/2004): Fransiz Sokagi nisan sonunda aciliyor [The French Street will be opened at the end of April]

Postexpress (08/2004): Occupation, exile, plundering [Isgal, sürgün, yagma]

Beyoğlu newspaper 03/10/2003: French people come back to Pera [Fransizlar Pera'ya dünuyor] | Pera collects its parts [Pera parcalarini topluyor]

Radikal 26/08/2004: A French wind in Beyoğlu [Beyoğlu'nda Fransiz rüzgari]

Cumhuriyet 2004: A French wind in Beyoğlu [Beyoğlu'nda Fransiz rüzgari]

Tempo 09/2004: Don't ignore to French Street [Fransiz Sokagi'na Fransiz kalmayin]

Vatan 01/2004: Beyoğlu gathered to its Paris in spring. [Beyoğlu bahar da Paris'ine kavusuyo]

Sabiha in »Public Istanbul«

FERIDE ÇIÇEKOĞLU

The birth and development of the cinema is interwoven with the history of the metropolis. As the city of the 19th century transformed into the metropolis of the 20th, its visual representation evolved from still photography to moving images. Similarly, the coherence and connection of film with the city produces and reproduces the visibility of the woman as a public figure in the city.

Films of the 1920s such as *Metropolis* (Lang 1926) or *Sunrise* (Murnau 1927) portray women in urban public places as »public women«, seducing creatures even when they are not professional prostitutes. Both *Metropolis* and *Sunrise* each produce two distinct images of women: a motherly domestic figure and an uncanny »woman of the city«. Over the next two decades, this female duality continued to be portrayed on the screen either implicitly in romantic comedies, such as *Ninotchka* (Lubitsch 1939) or explicitly in *film noir*, such as Fritz Lang's *The Woman in the Window*, (1944) and *Scarlet Street* (1945). In each of these films, »woman of the city« appear as objects to be gazed upon by the viewer, women who stroll and wander seductively through the city. Even though the film industry produced the cinematic images of cities like Paris, Berlin and New York during the 1920s, the representation of women and their claim to subjectivity in metropolitan public space had to wait until well into the second half of the 20th century.

Istanbul, on the other hand, becomes a cinematic city only during the second half of the century. Istanbul's cinematic images reflect the modernization process and the impacts of migration from rural Anatolia to the city. In most of Turkey's 1950s films, Istanbul is portrayed as an indispensable element of its inhabitants' identity and as a challenge to its

newcomers. In Istanbul movies originating from this time, cabaret women are frequently present, similar to the 1930s and 40s genre of Mexican films known as *cabaretera*. In Turkish films such as *İstanbul Geceleri* [Nights of Istanbul] (Muhtar 1950) or *Yalnızlar Rıhtımı* [The Port of the Lonely] (Akad 1959), only those women who work at cabarets are seen in urban public places at night. These »public women« pose a contrast to the motherly housewives who are safely at home while their men relish the urban night life.

Sabiha, protagonist in the film *Vesikalı Yarım* (Akad 1968), is arguably the first female character who challenges this split (or female duality) between the housewife and the whore in films featuring Istanbul as a cinematic city. The film's title, *Vesikalı Yarım*, translated as »My Licensed Beloved«, refers to a »license« given to prostitutes and bar girls, enabling the authorities to trace and control the »public women«.

I have highlighted Sabiha as the main theme of this essay for several reasons. Firstly, Sabiha's role as a »bar-girl« (a prostitute to be picked up at a bar) codes here as a »public woman« and draws attention to the city's gendered cartography, decoding »public Istanbul« further. Secondly, the implicit controversy in the film's title, »My Licensed Beloved«, symbolizes a confrontation of public (license) with private (beloved). This confrontation suggests that Sabiha, embodying the coexistence and confrontation of public and private, is a promising agent of the metropolis. Finally, Sabiha has grown to be a vivid character in the collective memory of the city, especially since the film was revisited by Orhan Pamuk (*Kara Kitap* 1990) [The Black Book] and by a group of film scholars (Nilgün Abisel and others, *Çok Tuhaf, Çok Tanıdık* 2005) [So Odd, So Familiar] who have explored the reasons why *Vesikalı Yarım* has become one of Istanbul's most famous cult films.



Vesikalı Şehir [Whore of a City], a book I have written and named with reference to the film *Vesikalı Yarım* draws upon the film's heritage (Çiçekoğlu 2007). I contextualize the film among other films both from Turkey and elsewhere, where the city's image is identified with prostitu-

tion. As Sabiha is the first on-screen female character who violates traditional gender codes, I argue that Sabiha marks a turning point in the portrayal of women in public Istanbul. Sabiha is shown in transformation from a cabaret woman of enclosed spaces, to »a woman walker« of the city. This transformation is further emphasised, when in the final scenes of the film Sabiha is shown, akin to a *flâneuse*, »strolling aimlessly around« the city. Not only does Sabiha reverse the traditional female urban spatial identity from an image linked to enclosed interiors to one connected to exterior public spaces of social visibility; she also reverses her role as an object which is viewed or gazed upon, to a woman of subjectivity who instead gazes upon others.



In this illustrated essay, I will scan the narrative of *Vesikalı Yarım* with still images to show Sabiha's transformation. Additionally I will compare Sabiha with her cinematic contemporaries – women faced with the city and the male gaze, such as *L'Avventura* (Antonioni 1960), *Mamma Roma* (Passolini 1962), *Cléo 5 à 7* (Varda 1962) and *Klute* (Pakula 1971).¹

From the fringe to the center of Istanbul

The opening scenes of *Vesikalı Yarım* are located at the city's fringe, where even in the 1960s vegetable gardens were part of Istanbul's urban topography. The dialog between a group of men, as they load up a horse cart, reveals the romanticized and traditional nature of their relationships which are based on mutual trust. We understand that the gardens and the horse cart belong to Halil's family. Halil (played by İzzet Günay) is por-

1 While this essay is limited to films from the same period (mainly the decade of the 1960's), my book *Vesikalı Şehir* covers the entire history of modernization in Turkey, focusing on the recent Turkish cinema and discussing in detail the films since the 1990's. All pictures in this text are taken from the book (Çiçekoğlu 2007).

trayed as a charismatic character and a natural leader. Halil will later introduce himself to Sabiha (played by Türkan Şoray) as an authentic İstanbulite, born and raised in İstanbul. We get to know Halil more intimately when he arrives at his shop, where he greets his father and tends to a customer. Throughout this sequence of scenes, the film builds an association between the city's peripheral fringe and the realm of the familiar, predictable and safe. The Turkish music heard in the background further conveys an atmosphere marked by locality.

The change from day to night and the accompanying transition in music, from (traditional) Turkish to modern jazz, highlights the (spatial and cultural) differences between the city's periphery and center. Halil and his friends have made plans for a night out and go to the city center instead of the local pub. The division of urban space into fringe and center is further marked by the division of the public space into exterior and interior. Once the men decide to enter a bar, as they are attracted by a Turkish song, we are led to an inner space where Halil will meet Sabiha.



Orhan Pamuk has revisited this scene by playfully reproducing it in his novel *The Black Book*. Galip, the main character in the novel is searching for his wife Ruya when he meets Türkan in Beyoğlu, İstanbul's central entertainment district. Here, it is important to remember that Sabiha in *Vesikalı Yarım* is played by Türkan Şoray, an icon of Turkish cinema.

Pamuk recognizes the iconic beauty of Türkan Şoray as he recreates the cinematic scene in his novel with both admiration and irony:

»The woman in the leopard-skin dress must be Türkan, Galip decided; as she ambled toward him, she looked almost graceful. She was probably the closest to her original: she had arranged her long blond hair to fall over her right shoulder.

»Do you mind if I smoke?« she asked, with a lovely smile. A filterless cigarette appeared between her fingers. »Could I trouble you for a light?«

Galip lit her cigarette; her head disappeared behind a thick cloud of smoke. The music died and in the strange silence that ensued, she emerged

like a saint from the mist; staring into her huge black long-lashed eyes, Galip thought, for the first time in his life, that he might be able to sleep with a woman other than Rüyâ. (Pamuk 2006: 143)

In Turkish, most names have meanings and each name has masculine and feminine versions that differ from each other. *Sabih* means beautiful, while *Sabiha* means a beautiful woman. As Orhan Pamuk has brilliantly recalled, *Sabiha*'s sudden appearance, which mesmerizes Halil, has turned into an iconic symbol of desire for men during the past half century in Turkey. With particular reference to the idea of sexuality represented by this scene, why this scene has become an iconic one is further explored *Çok Tuhaf Çok Tamdık* (Abisel et. al 2005: 13-14).

Reminiscent of sexuality but remaining only a (teasing) promise, *Türkan Şoray*'s face is an icon of beauty; her eroticism is out of this world, too distant to be real, too misty to be accessible. Uninhibited sex associated with modern urban life remains visible but, in the image of the idealized woman represented by *Türkan Şoray*, inaccessible. *Sabiha*'s name, an old fashioned Ottoman name of Arabic origin, is also poised by inaccessibly. In a later scene, Halil asks *Sabiha* if »*Sabiha*« is her real name; she laughs at the question, responding that *Sabiha* is no choice for a nickname. Thus, not only her inaccessible beauty but even *Sabha*'s name becomes a symbol of the traumatic modernization process in Turkey.² After spending time together in another bar, *Sabiha* takes Halil to her home, in *Hamalbaş*, located in *Beyoğlu*, or *Pera*, »the other side« – as it was called in the late Ottoman and the early Republican period – meaning the non-Muslim part of the city. Halil lives in another part of the city, *Koca Mustafa Paşa*, in the old city. Halil and *Sabiha*'s neighbourhoods are connected by the *Galata Bridge*. Since the bridge's two halves are raised during the night for ships to enter the *Golden Horn*, making it impossible to cross to the old part of the city, *Sabiha* asks Halil to stay with her. This is how their love affair begins. As the story continues, Halil and *Sabiha* become separated rather than connected by the bridge. Throughout the film, the bridge becomes a meta-

2 The »nationalization of the language« was a process initiated in the *Kemalist Turkey* of the 1930's and continued in the 1960's after the military junda of May 27th, 1960. The language was subjected to a forceful modernity by extracting from it all the words that were Arabic, Persian or French in origin. Thus "Sabiha" becomes a ridiculously old-fashioned name in the late 1960's for those who supported this forceful modernity from *Ankara*, the capital of the republic, while for others it is a reminiscence of what was beautiful and authentic in *Istanbul* with its Ottoman heritage.

phor of both a link and a division between tradition and modernity³, further conveying Halil's identification with the city's fringe and Sabiha's with the city center, as a central theme of the film. Modernity, represented by the city, is accessible to Halil only through Sabiha, the agent of modernity since she belongs to the city center. Halil's view of the city from the distance, as he sits on a bench thinking about Sabiha, both at the beginning and at the end of their relationship, reestablishes this theme of inaccessibility.



From enclosed interiors to open exteriors

Enclosed interiors and open exteriors form a second duality, similar to the urban duality formed by the city center and its peripheral fringe. Together these dualities construct the atmosphere in which Sabiha's transformation from a prostitute to a housewife takes place. At home, Sabiha becomes a motherly figure once she removes her make-up. Halil is first surprised by this change but gradually becomes accustomed Sabiha's new visage, and insists she stay at home. Sabiha gives up working at the bar and fulfills her new role as housewife. She waits for Halil to go shopping and enjoys putting groceries in her kitchen cupboards. She emphasizes her joy by telling Halil that before his arrival, her apartment was just a shelter, now it is a home. At this stage in the film, we witness

3 The use of Galata Bridge as a metaphor and a symbol of the link/division between tradition and modernity has been a favorite theme in Turkish literature. Among the best known examples are *Fatih-Harbiye* (Safa 1931) and *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları* [Cevdet Bey and His Sons] (Pamuk 1982). Thermer criticizes westernization by symbolically dichotomizing the two neighborhoods as symbols of tradition and modernity: *Fatih* from the historical peninsula and *Harbiye* which was beyond the Pera district. The latter is the first novel of Orhan Pamuk which was written in the tradition of family saga, his only novel which has not been translated, by his own choice.

a second change in Sabiha's persona. Stepping out of her former social visibility as a »public woman«, we see Sabiha wearing a headscarf for the first time as she walks through the market. Sabiha's headscarf, which she wears outside of the house, now distinguishes her as belonging to a



man; she is no longer allowed to be an object of public gaze. A scene in which a street vendor suggests that she should buy a gift for her husband, emphasizes Sabiha's new role. She buys a cigarette case for Halil from the street vendor and she gives this to Halil at a waterfront restaurant. The sea and the ships, next to the restaurant, draw attention to their sense of discovery. »Whatever we do together, it is the first for me« Halil says. A departing ferry in the background, however, sets a tone of uncertainty and we sense that their relationship in their new public sphere is a transient one.



In the following scene Sabiha learns from a friend that Halil is already married. In distress, she takes a long walk at the waterfront. Questioning her relationship with Halil, and considering separation, we find Sabiha, once again, alone and without her headscarf in a public space. When in Halil's domain, however, Sabiha covers her hair, accepting the rules of patriarchy, like Halil's wife and his mother who appear in later scenes as background figures in interior (household) spaces. When Sabiha finally makes a journey to Halil's neighborhood to find out whether he is really married, she again wears a headscarf since she has stepped back into his

domain. The familial and traditional atmosphere conveyed by Halil's father playing with his grandchildren, possibly Halil's children, evokes a sense of loneliness and helplessness in Sabiha. The visual atmosphere of the scene and the sad tone of the music emphasize Sabiha's melancholy mood further.



Still refusing to believe that he is married, Sabiha approaches Halil, but when she sees him from a distance, she decides to leave. Halil follows and once he reaches her, begins questioning her. Annoyed, Halil tries to understand what has happened to Sabiha. »Going out without telling me, strolling around aimlessly... What does all this mean?« he asks. Implicit in this statement is the expectation that a woman should notify »her man« if she intends to spend time outside of the house in the city's public spaces by herself without a legitimate reason. »Strolling around aimlessly« does not qualify as a reason; after all, why would a woman want to »stroll around aimlessly« all by herself?



Why indeed, if not for prostitution? In 1960s, not only in Turkey but in Italy a woman walker in the city must have been a conspicuous sight. In the iconic scene from Pasolini's film *Mamma Roma* (1962), we see the protagonist, Mamma Roma, »strolling around aimlessly« as men accompany her, joining her and then disappearing, their place immediately taken by another, against the glittering night lights. Mamma Roma, played by Anna Magnani is an example of the impact the modernization process can make on women. Roma, having quit her family and her

homeland ventured into the city, left with no other choice but to street-walk and work as a prostitute. Rome's urban landscape functions as a (somber) backdrop to Mamma Roma's story as she witnesses the death of her son, a price she pays for the un-motherly life she has led in the city. Now that Mamma Roma has roamed the city's streets at night, working as a prostitute, she is unable to fulfill her former role, having lost her rights as mother. This metaphoric scene illustrates how the female *flânerie* carried a strong connotation of prostitution even in the 1960s, not only in Turkey but also in Italy.

Sabiha violates the spatial codes of urban gendered cartography

Halil finally returns to his home. When his son opens the door and announces the arrival of his father, Halil retreats back to his traditional home at the fringe of the city. His wife suddenly appears from behind a curtain together with their daughter. Halil's wife is portrayed as available, ready and submissive at all times. She asks no questions, makes no comments, let alone any criticism. She prepares the bed and she asks if he is hungry. In response, Halil merely nods a negative no as he looks out of the window from his suffocating room, gazing in the direction of the city, which is both invisible and inaccessible to him. His parents come in, he greets them with respect and he resumes his duties. He stays with his family but this becomes a form of exclusion rather than inclusion for him.



While Halil is excluded from »public Istanbul«, Sabiha walks into the heart of the city, traditionally a male environment. Sabiha's alienation in this male environment is emphasized in the final scene of the film in which she walks directly towards the camera. In spite of her loneliness, her mood does not suggest submissiveness. On the contrary, her subversive attitude is pronounced as she fixes her gaze upon the spectator, demanding subjectivity.

In this respect, Sabiha is a stronger character than, for example, the character played by Monica Vitti in Antonioni's *L'Avventura* (1960). Vitti's character has been looking for a lost friend, in the company with the friend's lover. Attracted to each other during the search process, Vitti and the lover make love in the outskirts of the city. Once back in the city, Vitti finds herself surrounded by men who seem to be aware of what she has just done. Not only has she betrayed her friend, but she has openly expressed her desire for a man, by making love with him in the public city. The condemning stares Vitti receives from the men in the city imply that her behavior is unfit and socially unacceptable for a woman, reminding her of the »sin« she has just committed. Vitti looks away, avoiding the spectators' gaze and the men's belittling stares, conveying herself as a more timid character than Sabiha, who in the final scenes of *Vesikalı Yarım* returns the spectators' gaze, by staring directly into the camera.



As an urban character, Sabiha may also be compared to Cléo, the famous protagonist in Agnes Varda's film *Cléo 5 à 7* (1962). At the beginning of the film, Varda portrays Cléo (played by Corinne Marchand) as a beautiful singer searching for consolation from a fortuneteller while she is waiting for the results of medical tests to learn if she has cancer. In later scenes, Cléo strolls along the streets with her wig and her high-heels, aware of being perceived as a beautiful woman even though she might be on the verge of death. Later in the day, Cléo discards her wig, and she begins to enjoy the city, looking instead of being looked at. Finally she meets a soldier who might also be on the fringe of death as he is leaving for war to Algeria the next day. Together, they collect her medical test results and though the possibility of death still looms, Cléo now faces life with more courage since she has found someone to share her fate with.



Cléo, whose transformation »from feminine masquerade to *flâneuse*« (Mouton 2001), has led to her analysis as a cult character, is useful in comparing Sabih's final stroll in the city. In the final scenes of *Cléo 5 à 7*, Cléo happily faces her new lover in a romantic symmetry that creates a contrast with Cléo's previous loneliness as a *flâneuse*. Sabiha's stroll towards the camera, in contrast, a lonely venture into the heart of the city, leaves a stronger impression of Sabiha as a *flâneuse* than Cléo's romantic happiness does. I argue that Varda's protagonist, Cleo, therefore strikes greater similarity with a wanderer in search of a man, than a true *flâneuse*'s aimless walk through the city.

Whether the protagonist Bree Daniel (played by Jane Fonda) in the film *Klute* (Pakula 1971) is a free woman of the city, or just another prostitute living in New York (Giddis 1973, Gledhill, 005) has been debated in several essays. In analyzing this question further, it is noteworthy that »Klute« is not only the film's title, but also the name of the heroic male character who supposedly saves Bree Daniel from a life of prostitution. It is obvious that the film's title reflects Pakula's favoritism towards the male character, Klute, instead of the female character, Bree. The film ends with a final shot of Bree Daniel's empty New York apartment where she lived as a prostitute, implying that Bree has left the metropolis for the peaceful country life together with detective Klute.

When compared with Sabiha, who gazes at the spectator, as if into the heart of the city, Bree Daniel hardly qualifies as a woman who claims subjectivity and public visibility. Bree has quit the city for the country, exchanging her loneliness for the protectiveness of a man. Bree Daniel is portrayed as a character who submissively accepts the traditional female role; much more so than Mamma Roma, who at least faces her tragic fate. It is noteworthy that Bree Daniel was identified as a subversive character and as a free woman by some film critics of early 1970s, showing that we owe much to the 1980s for our deeper understanding of women and the city.

The idea of *flânerie* as a gendered concept emerged at first in the 1980s through the publishing of Janet Wolff's article, »The Invisible

Flâneuse: Women and the Literature of Modernity in 1985. Since then the gendered nature of *flânerie* has been further analyzed by Buck-Morss, (1986, 1989), Wilson (1992) and Parsons (2000). In her 1985 article Wolff regards the »public women« in Baudelaire's city – the prostitute and the *passante* – not as actors of *flânerie* but as commodified objects of the male gaze, through which the diametric opposition to the position of the *flâneur* becomes apparent (Wolff 1985). After almost a full century of its original appearance in the urban terminology, *flânerie* once again became an object of critical interest in the late twentieth century, and was the focus of feminist critiques of »hegemonic modernism« (Parsons 2000: 39).

In spite of these extensive theoretical discussions, representations of women frequently continue to follow the conventions of the 1920's. In recent films from the last decade like *Dark City* (Proyas 1998) and *Sin City* (Rodriguez, Miller 2005) we can still identify the division of female characters into mother and whore, reflecting also the division in the male consciousness. In both of these films, the virgin, a naive woman in search of protections is dichotomized by another seducing female persona who has associations with the socially unacceptable nighttime city wandering.

With the feminist critique of Wolff, it was a revelation that even Benjamin positioned women as objects of gaze with respect to *flânerie*. In the meanwhile, in cultures like Turkey the discussion in the 1980s and 1990s focused on veiling and whether veiling could be seen as a facilitator in women's social visibility. Though arguable, it has been asserted that veiling allows women to participate in the city and should therefore be seen as an agent of modernization (Göle 1996).

Ugur Tanyeli has recently claimed that *flânerie* exists neither for men or women in Turkish urban community as »strolling around aimlessly« has traditionally been considered an unusual activity. Tanyeli argues that the conceptual dichotomy of public space and private space is an invention in Turkey, a dictionary novelty rather than a creation within the practices of daily life:

»So we cannot still talk about the *flâneur* but only groups of *flâneurs*. This demonstrates that the members of »groups of *flâneurs*« have not yet individualized themselves and that furthermore, members of social class to which particular *flâneurs* belong to, are reluctant to play the role of the public man or woman.« (Tanyeli 2005: 222)

I disagree with the non-gendered tone of this statement equalizing »public man or woman« but I argue that the *flânerie* is gendered in Turkey as elsewhere and may be even more so due to the shifts of modernity.

Let me finish by summing up the premises and references in this essay, upon which I elaborate in my book. I start with the basic premise, that cinema and metropolis are dual products of modernity, both vitalized by movement, one reflecting the other (Bruno 2002). I refer to *flânerie* (Baudelaire, Benjamin 1973) in the context of modernity revisiting the concept with a critical interest concerning women in public spaces (Buck-Morss 1986, 1989; Wolff 1985, Wilson 1992).

Conceptual dichotomies such as »traditional/modern« (Göle 1996) and »public/private« (Tanyeli 2005), as well as their urban spatial connotations such as fringe and center, enclosedness and openness, interior and exterior (Abisel, et al.) are some of the critical concepts that I analyze. Finally, the »woman walker of [the] metropolis« (Parsons, Mouton) is central to my argument and serves as the critical concept, re-reading the history of films both from Turkey and internationally, all the way from the 1926 film, *Metropolis* (1926) and *Ninotchka* (1939) to *Dark City* (1998) and *Sin City* (2005).

As a result, it may be argued that the public visibility of women in the city is an essential dimension of urban analysis. Films are a rich source, revealing the representation of women in the city and the reasons for the immense delay in the introduction of *flâneuse* as a public figure. Since *flânerie* of women has resonated as prostitution in male consciousness, the representation of the woman as a public figure in films of the city was possible only in the second half of the 20th Century. In this respect, Sabiha from Istanbul, who is among the female protagonists streetwalking the cities in the 1960's, still gazes at us as a pioneer of female *flânerie* on the silver screen.

References

- Abisel, N./Arslan, U. T./Behçetoğulları, P./Karadoğan, A/Öztürk, S. R./Ulusay, N. (2005): Çok Tuhaf Çok Tanıdık, İstanbul: Metis.
- Benjamin, W. (1973): »The Flâneur,« in Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism, trans. Harry Zohn London: New Left Books.
- Buck-Morss, S. (1986): »The Flâneur, the Sandwichman, and the Whore: The Politics of Loitering« New German Critique 39: 105.
- Buck-Morss, S. (1989): The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project (1989) Cambridge, MIT Press.

- Bruno, G. (2002): Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture and Film, New York: Verso.
- Çiçekoğlu, F. (2007): Vesikalı Şehir, İstanbul: Metis.
- Giddis, D. (1973): »The Divided Woman: Bree Daniel in Klute« , Women andil, Vol. 1, 57- 71.
- Gledhill, C. (2005): »Klute 1: A Contempororay Film noir and Contemporary Criticism«, »Klute 2: Feminism and Klute« In: Kaplan, A. (ed.) Women in Film Noir , Londn BFI Publications, 20-34, 99-114.
- Göle, N. (1996) The Forbidden Modern: Civilization and Veiling, Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mouton, J. (2001): »From Feminine Masquerade to Flâneuse: Agnès Varda's Cléo in the City«, Cinema Journal 40.2,
- Pamuk, O. (1995): [1982]: Cevde ey ve Oğulları, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Pamuk, O. (2006) The Black Book, trans. Maureen Freely London: Faber and Faber.
- Parsons, D. L. (2000): Streetwalking the Metropolis: Women, the City and Modernity, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Suner, A. (2006): Hayalet Ev Ev: Yeni Türk Sinemasında Aidiyet, Kimlik ve Bellek, İstanbul: Metis.
- Tanyeli, U. (2005): »Public Space/Private Space: The Invention of a Conceptual Dichotomy in Turkey« In: Art, City and Politics in an Expanding World: Writings from the 9th International Biennial, İstanbul: İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, pp. 210-22.
- Wilson, E. (1992): »The Invisible Flâneur«, New Left Review 91, pp. 90-110.
- Wolff, J. (1985): »The Invisible Flâneuse: Women and the Literature of Modernity« Theory, Culture and Society, 2/3, pp. 37-46.

Subjects that don't count. Places that are not important. 5 Artistic Approaches

SUSANNE BOSCH

SPACE/PLACE

»Space« is a key term and a basic concept of my artistic work. In its specific spatial context I understand each place as conditioned by history, material qualities, movements, activities, and narratives. Urban interventions and the design of concrete locations must respond to the context of the given urban composition and to deal with the present situation.

Public space

As an artist my interest focuses on functional architecture and everyday structures, on situations and activities of people who use and appropriate public space. I prefer to work in and with public spaces than to work in white cubes of the art world. I like the idea of an artist who serves the urban community through interventions in everyday places instead of attracting experts to specific venues such as art galleries and museums. As an artist I am creating (new) spaces through physical installations I place in public spaces. These interventions provoke experiences in the social space of perception and narratives by the audience.

Time

Time passes. According to our perception, time passes as an even and regulated flow. On the other hand, our perception of time is also subje-

tive. It moves at different paces and does not always remain constant. We all experience a non-homogeneous sense of time: caught up in some active pursuit, a look at the watch after 10 minutes reveals that three hours have passed by...

Time in Istanbul

I lived in Istanbul for 6 months in 2003 and I arrived with a very superficial knowledge about the culture. My impression of Turkey was dominated by my understanding of the Turkish migrants in Germany. Being a foreigner in Istanbul made me feel closer to the notion of »otherness« and migration, even though my circumstances were highly privileged: I had a monthly budget, a big apartment in Nişantaşı, a curator to take care of me, a German passport and a ticket back home (which at the time I wish I would not have had). As a woman of »typical German« appearance, my project in Istanbul began with unplanned, spontaneous story telling on the street: people stopped me, asking where I am from and often in perfect German, they would tell me about their lives as migrant workers in Germany. In this way began my artistic journey into the world of migration in Istanbul. Since that first journey, »migration« is a fundamental aspect of my artistic practice and it has become part of my life. Years later I became a working migrant myself, in Belfast, Northern Ireland.

Migration: Turkish imaginaries

From a contemporary German perspective, Turkey is well known for emigration of Turkish workers to industrial sites and cities in Germany and western Europe. Looking at a larger historical perspective, one becomes aware that Turkey has always been a country of immigration, due to the nature of its former empire and geographical location. The former Ottoman Empire embodied a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society. From its capital, Istanbul, the Ottoman Empire, stretched far into both eastern and western territories.

After the formation of the Turkish Nation by Atatürk in 1923, more than 1.6 million people immigrated to Turkey, mostly from Balkan countries and the Soviet Union seeking political asylum. The majority was recognized as refugees and was resettled to third countries such as Canada and the United States by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). In the late 1980s, this pattern began to change as increasing numbers of asylum seekers began to arrive from

Iran and Iraq, as well as other developing nations. Half a million mostly Kurdish refugees from Iraq also migrated to Turkey between 1988 and 1991, as well as Albanians, Bosnian Muslims, Pomaks (Bulgarian-speaking Muslims), and Bulgarianized Turks in 1989, 1992-1995, and 1999. Recently, Turkey has become known as a transit country for »irregular migrants« from Asian countries such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan on their way to the European Union. Turkey is also a destination for undocumented migrants from former Soviet Bloc countries. Until now, mainly Muslims or people from areas belonging to the former Ottoman Empire were successful in their immigration to Turkey:

»Legally, Albanians, Bosnians, Circassians, Pomaks, Tatars, and Turks – mostly from the Balkans – will be able to immigrate to Turkey, while others will face a closed door. Minorities claiming a link to Turkey who are not Sunni Muslims, that is, everyone from Armenians and Assyrians to Greeks and Jews, as well as unassimilated Kurds and Alevis, will find it difficult to immigrate. Such a policy will not be in harmony with the emerging European Union »common« immigration policy, which increasingly emphasizes civic connections to host territory, employment prospects, and cultural diversity, rather than a prospective immigrant's ethnic or national origin as grounds for immigration.«¹

Many people don't plan to migrate to Istanbul; most people merely pass through the city to their way to somewhere else.

»It is very difficult to estimate the numbers of irregular immigrants in Turkey. However, figures ranging from 150,000 to one million are often cited. To these groups must be added trafficked people, particularly women. These are people who have either been coerced or deceived into traveling to Turkey for commercial sex work, and remain in Turkey against their wishes. There is also an increasing number of EU member-state nationals engaged in professional activities who are settling in Turkey, particularly in Istanbul, as well as European retirees in some of the Mediterranean resorts. They, too, constitute a relatively new phenomenon in terms of immigration into Turkey, and their numbers are estimated at 100,000-120,000.«

This paper introduces five artistic works to explore the issue of migration in Istanbul. Four works are from Turkish artists based in Istanbul, while the fifth example is an example of my own work as a temporary

1 See Kemal Kirisci, Center for European Studies, Bogaziçi University, <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=176>, 16.11.2006.

guest to Istanbul. The focus of this paper is the relationship these artistic observations establish with the construction and constitution of Istanbul's public space and spheres.

»Subjects that don't count, places that are not important« explores how artists use subjective-artistic narratives to visualize the meaning of migration for a personal biography. The artistic works also show how public political spaces reflect the structures in which migration is embedded. In all projects interviews make up the basic material, which mostly made using video- or other multi-media language tools.

»Unawarded performances«

In her video the artist and filmmaker Gülsün Karamustafa focuses on six Moldavian women who work illegally in Istanbul. Drastic political changes in Eastern Europe that were accompanied by the fall of the Iron Curtain led many women to come Istanbul in search of work. These women are skilled, yet their qualifications as nursery-school teachers or post office workers aren't considered valid in Turkey, especially without legal working papers. But the Moldavians are welcomed workers as their Gaugasian language is close to modern Turkish. Most of them find work as domestic servants, taking care of children and tending households of wealthy families.



Figure 1: Film stills »Unawarded Performances« by Gülsün Karamustafa, 2005, photo by G. Karamustafa.

Gülsün Karamustafa's film is based on interviews she conducted with Moldavian women caring for elderly ladies. Usually elderly Turkish women live with their daughters who care for them, but the older women who appear in these films belong to the generation and class who were educated under Atatürk reforms and western values.

As most of the Moldavian domestic workers have no legal working papers they caution public spaces and spend most of their days at home taking care of elderly ladies. In her film the artist introduces wealthy middle-class apartments in which these women spend most of their time. The interiors of the apartments are very tidy, silent, and empty; like a private house as a contemporary prison. The Moldavian women, most of them middle aged, proper and correct looking, never worked as servants before and were confronted with poverty after political changes and failure of economy in 1989. In the interviews these women, now domestic servants, speak about their backgrounds, their life back at home and their working conditions in Istanbul.

With the title »Unawarded Performances« Gülsün Karamustafa refers to the unnoticed disposition of the women who dedicate their lives to un-skilled, but necessary jobs in wealthy households. The video shows contrasting structures of class, living conditions, and gender rolls presented by the Turkish and Moldavian women. Sometimes the Moldavian women are portrayed together with their employees, other women remain anonymous; without legal working papers they all fear the police and deportation. As he agreed with the women, Karmustafa only allows screenings of the film outside Turkey. Listening to the stories of the Moldavian women, the audience is challenged by the everyday reality of illegal migration. A notion of victimization expressed through political transitions emerge in Karmustafa's portrayal.²

»The picture of my life«

Belmin Söylemez realized her film, *The Picture of my Life*, in 2003 for the artist group *Oda Projesi* together with the photographer Orhan Cem Çetin. The film was produced in preparation for the 8th Istanbul Biennale.

It is a documentary about and with the people of a little street in Galata, which focuses on the Kurdish population who made their home in Galata after escaping the grinding poverty and bloody conflict in south-eastern Turkey, where Turkish security forces battled Kurdish separatists on and off since the 1980s.

The new home for these Kurdish families is in the vicinity of an old 16th century tower in Galata, a former Greek and non-Muslims neighborhood at the north side of the Golden Horn. Since the riots against the

2 For more information see: <http://www.projektmigration.de/english/content/kuenstlerliste/karamustafa.html>, 23.11.2006.

Greek of 6th and 7th of September 1955, many houses in this area were abandoned and eventually taken over by Kurdish migrants from East-Anatolia.

The film tells two stories: With the questions »This is the picture of your life. Do you like having your picture taken? Do you have a favorite photo of yourself? How do you pose? How did you look?« the local Kurdish population was invited to pose in front of a professional photographer in any way they wanted. The photographer also invited them to show an older photograph of themselves they liked. Many women showed photos of former times and talked about their villages, which they miss. With her video *Söylemez* captures the entire situation around the photo-session, the private homes, the discussions about the old and new pictures and the process of posing in front of the camera.

As some of the women spend most of their life inside, locked in the apartments with their children, pictures are taken in front of the living room furniture. Other women chose the Galata tower to be in their photograph like a souvenir, already aware that they might not live there forever. The teenagers make no references to villages, but to film stars, to Spanish soaps and city life, to friends and family. They consider Galata their home and obviously enjoyed the fact that they lived close to the heart of a 21st century consumer and fashion center. It seems that through their new homes in Galata, these rural Kurdish migrants are confronted by urban spaces in a new way: they live between Istanbul's European center, between shopping streets, prostitution quarters and traditional styles of living.

Migration and space: Immigration has an impact on the identity of urban spaces and local places; at the same time migration profoundly affects the sense of place of local communities.



Figure 2: Film still »The Picture of my Life« by Belmin Söylemez, 2003, photo by B. Söylemez.

In the past few years »revitalization« projects have been taking place in Galata. Being so excellently located, it was only a matter of time before urban transformation with its capital-oriented face reached the neighborhood. In 2005 the art project Oda Projesi³ lost their space in Sakhkulu Street. In fact, residents in the entire neighborhood lost their homes to new development, leaving the Kurdish rural migrant population with repeated resettlement narratives.

»Brothers and sisters«

The video »Brothers and Sisters« (2003) by Esra Ersen begins with the following subtitles as a group of black men stand in front of a neo-renaissance building:

»Steve from Somalia stands at the seaward gate of the main train station that hosts most of the memorable scenes of old Turkish movies when immigrants from rural regions face for the first time a big city in front of Haydarpasha train station's gate. Steve is deceived by a guy who takes his money in order to take him illegally to Hamburg. The boat leaves him at the port of Haydarpasha instead of Hamburg. Standing in front of the station building designed by a German architect a century ago, he still thinks he arrived at that European city he so long dreamt of«.

The location this scene takes place is Haydarpasha. It is the main train station on the Asian side of Istanbul. Leaving the neo-renaissance German style station building behind, a panoramic view of Istanbul's historic skyline emerges.⁴ For many migrants arriving in Istanbul from the East, this is their first view of Istanbul, a first view of Europe on the

3 For more information about Oda Projesi see www.odaprojesi.org.

4 Its construction started in 1906 by Otto Ritter and Helmut Conu, two German architects who chose a neo-renaissance German style. They designed a large building, much in accordance with the ambitions of the German investors who were building the Istanbul-Baghdad Railway and undertaking the consultancy works for the Istanbul-Damascus-Medina Railway. Haydarpasha was an important link in the railway chain of the Berlin-to-Baghdad railway scheme, part of the German Empire's strategic plans to gain control over the trade routes between the East and the West in the late 19th century by building a railway connection between Germany and the Persian Gulf, thus by-passing the Suez Canal. The station was put into service on August 19, 1908 and formally inaugurated on November 4, 1909 More information about the railway station: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Haydarpasha%C5%9Fa_Terminal, 23.10.2007.

other side of the Bosphorus. Haydarpasha became an important site in the narratives of migrants.

Assuming the role of a social anthropologist, the artist Esra Ersen spent six months working with a group of illegal African immigrants stranded in Turkey and in the uncertainty of their lives in their European and African futures. Ersen becomes acquainted with their everyday life, describing their cultural milieu and the limitations of their social environment in her video.

In the interviews the African men demonstrate how well they know the city: they describe the peaceful middle- and upper class neighborhoods of Istanbul on the European side, as well of Beyoğlu's active nightlife. They define their own neighborhood, Tarlabaşı, a neighborhood right next to Beyoğlu, as the »grand finale of Istanbul, the deadly place«, an »atrocitiy«, a term to describe crimes ranging from acts committed against a single person to acts committed against an whole population or ethnic group. Tarlabaşı is described as a »refugee camp«, »the location of discrimination against the black community«.

Tarlabaşı is a densely populated maze of narrow streets that wind between crumbling Ottoman-era houses built on a hillside. It's located next to the commercial and cultural heart of Istanbul and, yet, most Turks consider Tarlabaşı a no-go zone. After decades of speculation the now run-down area Tarlabaşı is currently facing a gentrification-plan motivated by the real-estate boom in that central area of Istanbul.



Figure 3: Film stills »Brothers and Sisters« by Esra Ersen, 2003, photo by E. Ersen.

Ersen is always close to her subject; the viewer gets an idea of the everyday life and the nearest surroundings of the interviewee.

The situation of the African refugee community is made explicit through individual stories: Children of African migrants, born in Turkey, who have no chance to go to school due to their illegal status. Or of the death of an asthma sick refugee who was kicked out of the hospital. The hospital administration feared that the patient might not be able to cover

the medical costs. Or of an African woman afraid to go out because Turkish men treat them like whores. They never walk alone.

»The community only feels at ease at places where the city's characteristics do not prevail: Nightclubs, shopping mall, parks, and hotels, McDonald's«. (quotation from the film »Brothers and Sisters«, Esra Ersen 2003).

In the new global interconnectedness, these anonymous places are a coherent part of city landscapes, similar in different metropolis worldwide. It makes the »illegal« African feel at home, being part of the globalized world, in Europe or elsewhere, where he or she intends, or ends up arriving.

»In transit«

Filmmaker Berke Bas introduces in her documentary three migrant families, an Iraqi Arab family, an Iraqi Kurdish family and a Nigerian couple who are »in transit« in Istanbul. All of them are waiting for visas and work permits that never seem to arrive, stuck between the a remembered past and an imagined future. In 2003 Berke Bas accompanied the families who all lived in Tarlabası, for a year throughout their daily lives.

The Iraqi Arab family, an engineer couple with three children, well educated, arrived in Istanbul in 2000. Before their arrival, they imagined Istanbul like Rome. Living in Tarlabası, they were very disappointed. They are illegal immigrants. The local grocery store is their also mailing address. Every day they go there to check for the arrival of their Canadian visas. Huda is an electrical engineer, fluent in English, she teaches English to Iraqi refugees; Sadoon is an engineer and writes visa application statements for other Iraqis. Their story ends when the Canadian visa finally arrives and Berke accompanies them to the airport until the security check. A happy end.



Figure 4: Film stills »In Transit« by Berke Bas, 2003, photo by B. Bas.

Paiman, Ramadan and their four children moved to Istanbul in 2000 from Kirkuk, Iraq. They are Kurds. Ramadan traveled as illegal immigrant to Europe in 2003. Since then, the fairly young Paiman – she is about 35 years old – lives alone with her four children in Tarlabaşı and it seems that Ramadan does not send money. The film leaves the viewer wondering if he has abandoned his family in Istanbul. Harem is Paiman's youngest son and about 11 years old. As he started working full-time in an auto-repair garage he did not speak a word of Turkish. Hemen, the oldest son is about 17 years old. He takes the role of the father and makes decisions for the family and his mother. They live in the ground floor apartment. The neighbors living above them use their back terrace – where Paiman hangs clothes for drying – as a rubbish dump. At night the family barricades the apartment door. Paiman is scared, everyone knows their situation.

Transit families lead a life devoid of basic rights: no legal documents, no work permit, children with no access to education, limited access to health care, and language barriers. They live in constant fear of the police and the threat of deportation, intimidation from the neighbors, and subject to discrimination or blamed for drug dealing and robbery. Daily life is only supported by informal jobs and charity from churches. Life seems to have stopped and everyone hopes that it will start again if they reach a Western country.

Berke Bas shows more of Tarlabaşı, the kids on the street and the general atmosphere of the area. In an interview, local teenagers from Tarlabaşı state that they find the Iraqis problematic, their clothes are out of fashion, they do not speak good Turkish, they do not like the Turks, they think this is their country.

First step to leave Turkey – Visa queues

Known as a country of emigration, large numbers of Turkish people migrated to western European countries, particularly West Germany as the early 1960s. Emigration continues today through family reunification schemes and the asylum track.⁵ In Istanbul the difficult process of migration becomes visible in specific locations in public space.

Once I decided »migration« to be my research focus, I started to look out for evidence of migration in the public domain of Istanbul.

5 K. Kirisci, Center for European Studies, Bogaziçi University, <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=176>, 10.11.2006.

Lines of people in front of European embassies attracted my attention, as I noticed that these kinds of gatherings of people waiting patiently on the street for hours or days are not seen in other places in Istanbul. Taking a closer look, I discovered an industry around these queues: Copy services, shoe cleaning, tearooms, translators and solicitors offices.



Figure 5 and 6: Visa queue next to the French Consulate and at the side of the German Embassy, Autumn 2003, photos by S. Bosch.

I figured that the queuing takes place in the streets to the side or back of embassies, never in front of the main entrance or at the representative entrance. The way in which this queue were organized raised many questions, questions which I ask people waiting in line. In interviews, several Turks commented that this time-consuming system reflected the unwillingness of an economical and political system to let people pass easily, on the contrary, there is no way to make previous appointments and consultancies. That expresses most likely disrespect towards the migrating population.



Figure 7: Adems Cay Garden, since 1981 next to the German Embassy, 2003, photo: S. Bosch

Next to the German embassy, where the people with visa application waited, a tea house caught my attention. The tea place was a tiny hut, constructed from left-over wooden panels, about three meters square in size. Both the outside and the inside of the teahouse wallpapered with images of ideal Turkish landscapes.



Figure 8 and 9: Adems' Cay Garden, detail exterior and interior, 2003, photos by S. Bosch

Adem, the owner, started his business in 1981 and since then his tea place opens every night at 1 am, when people start to line up at the embassy hoping to get an appointment the following morning. Adem and I became friends. I was allowed to interview people, who came to his place about their imagined futures in Germany. My parallel conversations with Adem himself, were about his perception of Turkey as a place, from which there is no need to leave. As a convinced Kemalist, the interior of his improvised tea space was collaged with portraits of Mustafa Kemal Atatuerk, the founder of modern Turkey.

Mobile economies



Figure 10: Photocopying and lamination service, Galata Bridge, 2003, photo by S. Bosch.

Mobile economies are another way in which migration is visible in Istanbul's public spaces. Without official aid or a work permit immigrants are forced to do all kinds of work to survive. A plethora unimaginable of services is available on Istanbul's streets; all for very little money.

Nowadays legal migration happens within a framework of carefully negotiated bilateral agreements: governments make cautious decisions about migration, which are included in their development plans.

Similarly, migration today is not based on personal decisions, but often part of a government strategy to import or export workforces. Migration is an integrated part of the ruling economic system, supplying industry with an informal reserve.

Longing for a safe home

At the same time, I met Adem I also encountered a completely different and more invisible attempt of migration through Mehmet. Two colleagues of mine introduced me to Mehmet, a Kurd from Mardin near the Syrian border. Mehmet had turned his back on Turkey by going to Germany in 1992. Two of his older brothers were killed accused of being members of the PKK. His family lost its peace, and he never had the opportunity to improve his chances at home. After nine years in Germany, his political asylum was refused, he had to return to Turkey and landed in Istanbul.

His story made me aware of human trafficking in Istanbul: where it takes place, what it costs, who implications it has. Mehmet worked in a hotel in Aksaray, which is part of the district of Fatih on the Historic Island of Istanbul. In this busy neighborhood, which is frequented by mainly Russian and Bulgarian business people, people who are willing to cross borders illegally and are prepared wait for the traffickers to pick them up.

Mehmet worked in return for food and shelter at the hotel. Having now legal papers, he was highly dependent on his boss, a man from his village. Mehmet told me about his desires for a safe home. Through his story I was reminded of an encounter I had in Berlin in 2001 when I met several Bosnian war refugees. One of the refugee women told me that we was traumatized twice: Once through the war at home and once in Germany by not receiving a visa and legal status with permission to stay in Germany for years and years. She talked about the fact that her life had stopped years ago, and she does not dare to settle down until she is certain she will not have to move again.

In October 2003 Mehmet disappeared for almost a year. I believed him dead, but one day he called me, when I was already back in Germany, to tell me that he was living a happy life somewhere in Germany. I did not ask how he got to Germany with his history of refused asylum applications.

Forced or voluntarily, migration is a process similar to traveling. It is more about the movement or travel between places than about arriving at a particular destination. It is always about the desire to arrive somewhere, to find a place as home. I wonder if Mehmet found a home in Germany after making a second attempt.

When I myself returned to Germany in 2004, my artistic research on Istanbul took several new turns. I took part in an international conflict transformation training as I felt the need to improve my skills as a public artist who deals with conflict. I used that training to clarify my role as an artist in situations of conflict. The other aspect was to transform my interviews, my written material, images, and my experiences into a shadow theater I was invited to perform on the streets of Istanbul in September 2004 (*Hic bir gidememek*/to arrive nowhere, LOCK YOU MIND, 2004). Back in Germany I started to focus on the Turkish community in Berlin. I made contacts and started to learn a lot about the perception from the other side of migration.

Art as a public medium: Expression of realities of migrants' lives?

There are similarities between the art works presented in this article which all deal with migration. All of them represent illegal and precarious situations of populations through individuals. Migrant children and adults live in inhuman conditions for an unknown periods time. They have no regulations which they can turn to, no official help. But even as Europe is like a fortified castle without an entrance, some »loopholes« like Istanbul still exist and that is experienced as a situation of hope for some.⁶

6 Today, officially sanctioned immigration into Turkey has for all intent and purposes dropped to a trickle. Turkey allows nationals of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Iran, Moldova, Ukraine, Russia, and the Central Asian republics to enter the country quite freely either without visas or with visas that can easily be obtained at airports and other entry points (K. Kirisci, Center for European Studies, Bogaziçi University, <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=176>, 10.11.2006).

All the locations introduced in the films and documentaries are in the heart of Istanbul. In this cosmopolitan space they remain anonymous in the urban crowd and are visible in their own networks at the same time. Often living in now run-down areas in the city center, which will soon be part of urban transformation programs, the undocumented and unwanted migrant groups will be pushed out again, to the edges of this massive city, where they will be even less visible and less part of globalized Istanbul.

All individuals introduced in these artworks share their attempts for economical survival, for safe homes and dignified environments, their longing for reunification with family members in common. To achieve their goals or just to survive, migrants turn to illegal strategies. Migrants become criminals.

Subjects that don't count. Places that are not important

The artistic interest of this »in limbo« situation seems obvious; it is a reality that offers un-structured and un-shaped situations. The border crossing to human rights, illegality and contested territories interferes in the artistic practice.

Even if a personal biography told in this artwork might be connected to a criminal act, all of the artists take position, evoke empathy and understanding for the specific conditions of the persons affected.

I believe that there is a secret admiration for the people who cut their roots and start a lifelong nomadic traveling movement, as many migration biographies show. You never arrive, settle down, and assimilate fully. Most likely, you become a mobile force constantly overcoming all kind of necessities for stability and consistency. On one hand it fits very well into the idea of modern neo-liberalism, mobile workforces and at the same time it fits to the idea of an artist. What hits hard, is the price paid for this kind of life (loss of social networks and family, loss of physical or psychological health). As one of my interview partners, a retired Turkish worker in Berlin said: »If I would have known the price I paid to earn money, I would not have done it«.

While being in Istanbul and getting more and more involved in individual, difficult biographies of migration, I started to question: How much of an artistic approach might change or improve the situation? Does any kind of representation or research on migration change anything in the lives of individuals? Is the documentary or aesthetic transformation of the situations of any use for the migrants, for the wider so-

ciety or for the artist him/herself? However, I believe that art have impact on people thinking. An art piece may reach a target group that usually might be quiet protective about the kind of information it receives.

Notes on Contributors

Asu Aksoy is presently in charge of international projects at Santral Istanbul, a new international arts and culture initiative by the Bilgi University, Istanbul. She is also a member of the Artistic Committee of Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture, and a visiting fellow at University of London Goldsmiths College. Dr. Aksoy worked for many years in British universities on research projects focusing on urban and cultural transformation in the context of migrations, globalization, and technological change.

Sevil Alkan studied architecture at Middle East Technical University. She received her master's degree in European Urban Studies at Bauhaus University, Weimar, Germany. Currently, she continues her Ph.D. research there and works in urban and architectural design projects in Istanbul as an architect.

Ela Alanyalı Aral studied architecture at Middle East Technical University. She worked as a free-lance architect and also taught at METU as a part-time instructor. She received her Ph.D. degree with her thesis »Leftover Space as a Value and a Potentiality for the Public Realm in the City« in 2003. Since 2004 she has been teaching at the Department of Interior Architecture, Çankaya University. Her research topics include spontaneous use patterns in public open spaces and mapping techniques of urban experiences.

Funda Baş Bütüner is a landscape architect and urban designer. Currently, she is a Ph.D. candidate at the Department of City & Regional Planning in METU and a part-time instructor at the Department of

Landscape Architecture & Urban Design in Bilkent University, where she teaches design studio and contemporary landscape history. Her research focuses on urban landscape, urban edges, and contemporary tendencies in landscape architecture.

Susanne Bosch is an artist and course director of the MA Art in Public, Interface, University of Ulster, Belfast in Northern Ireland. Previously she lived and worked in Berlin and was an assistant professor at Bauhaus University. Her work concentrates on art in public space, installation, and site-specific pieces in exhibition spaces.

Feride Çiçekoğlu is the director of the graduate program for Film-TV at Bilgi University. She is a screenwriter and architect, with research interests in »film and the city«, focusing on İstanbul. She wrote screenplays and recently published »Vesikalı Şehir« (Whore of a City) İstanbul 2007.

Frank Eckardt is professor for urban sociology at the Institute for European Urban Studies, Bauhaus University, Weimar. He holds a Ph.D. in political science and is coordinator of the European project »Future Urban Research in Europe«. He has published on various aspects of urban research and has most recently finished his new book »The Complex City. Orientation in the Urban Labyrinth« (in German).

Ebru Erdönmez studied architecture at Yıldız Technical University (YTU) and received her master's degree in architecture from İstanbul Technical University, and her Ph.D. from Yıldız Technical University. Since 2007 she has worked as an assistant professor at Siegen University, Germany. She has won many prizes in international and national architectural competitions and she has published articles in various architectural journals. Currently she also instructs intermediate and diploma design studios at the Architecture Department at YTU. her research focuses on on urban design and public spaces.

Orhan Esen is a free-lance urban researcher, writer, lecturer, and city guide in İstanbul. He organizes educational seminars and intercultural events. He studied social and economic history at Bogazici University and architecture and art history at Vienna University. Together with Stephan Lanz he edited »Self Service İstanbul« (Berlin 2005) on urban transformation processes in contemporary İstanbul.

Anna Grabolle-Çeliker studied social anthropology and linguistics at Edinburgh University. She worked as a language instructor at Turkish universities for seven years, after which she returned to the study of anthropology with her ongoing PhD research on social networks, discourses, and identifications among people from Van, southeastern Turkey.

Murat Güvenç is an urban geographer and professor at the Department of Architecture and Urban Planning at Bilgi University. His main research interests are Istanbul's social, economic, and spatial transformations, and methods of urban analysis. Currently he is co-director of Bilgi University.

Susanne Prehl, is an urbanist and landscape architect. She studied European Urban Studies at Bauhaus University and lived for several months in Istanbul to write her master's thesis on the presented topic of French Street. Currently she is working as a landscape architect in Hamburg. Her main research topics are aesthetic and cultural practices in public spaces, urban transformation processes, space and landscape architecture.

Selim Ökem studied architecture at Istanbul Technical University and received his master's degree from the Product Design Department there. He was a visiting instructor at the Architectural Department of Siegen University. He has instructed student workshops in Istanbul, Ankara, Cyprus, and Kayaköy (Levissi). He received his Ph.D. from Yildiz Technical University in architectural discourse. His field of research is information societies and cities, architectural design and critique, and post-structural discourse on architecture.

Koray Özdil is an MA student in the Sociology and Social Anthropology Program at Central European University in Brussels. His research focuses on the transnational migration and the governance of immigration.

Florian Riedler is a historian working at the ZMO (Centre for Modern Oriental Studies), Berlin. His research interests are nineteenth century Ottoman urban and social history, the history of Istanbul, and Ottoman minority history.

Tim Rieniets is assistant professor, Chair for Architecture and Urban Design at the ETH Zurich. He is an urban researcher with interests in

new forms of segregation, urban conflicts, and shrinking cities. He leads the Urban Research Studio at ETH Zurich and is the co-curator Rotterdam Biennale 2009.

Kathrin Wildner is an urban anthropologist. She has done fieldwork in New York, Mexico City, Havana, Istanbul, and other urban agglomeration. In her researches she focuses on the constitution of public space, urban identities constructions, and ethnographic methodology in urban research. As a free-lance urban scholar she lectures, publishes, and participates in expositions. Currently she is assistant professor at the European-University Viadrina in Frankfurt/Oder, Germany.

Eda Ünlü Yücesoy is an urban planner and researcher in the Graduate Program for Architectural Design at Bilgi University. She completed her Ph.D. at the Department of Urban Planning and Human Geography at Utrecht University. She is the author of the book based on her Ph.D. research, »Everyday Urban Public Space: Turkish Immigrant Women's Perspective« (2006). Her research interests include public space, spatial relations, urban history, and social geography.

Senem Zeybekoğlu is a research assistant at the Department of Architecture at Yıldız Technical University. She is currently completing her Ph.D. thesis on globalization and culture-led urban regeneration in Istanbul at YTU.